INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
SHUCHAT-SHAW, Francine Belle, 1947-

CONGRUENCE: A METHODOLOGY FOR AESTHETIC CURRICULAR CRITICISM AND POST-CRITICAL THEORIZING: RECONCEPTUALIZING KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS, AS CURRICULAR FOUNDATIONS, IN SECONDARY CINEMATIC ARTS EDUCATION.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1976
Education, curriculum and instruction

© Copyright by
Francine Belle Shuchat-Shaw
1976
CONGRUENCE:
A METHODOLOGY FOR
AESTHETIC CURRICULAR CRITICISM AND POST-CRITICAL THEORIZING

Reconceptualizing Knowledge and Methods,
as Curricular Foundations,
in Secondary Cinematic Arts Education

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By
Francine Belle Shuchat Shaw, A.A., B.S., M.A.

* * * * * *

The Ohio State University
1976

Reading Committee:

Donald R. Bateman
L. Jane Stewart
Paul R. Klohr
Robert W. Wagner

Approved By

Advisor
Department of
Humanities Education
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement is gratefully extended to the following for permission to include extensive sections of copyright material:


VITA

I. PERSONAL

Name: Francine Belle Shuchat Shaw
Date of Birth: November 11, 1947
Place of Birth: Piqua, Ohio

II. EDUCATION

1965: Diploma, College Preparatory/Liberal Arts
      Central High School, Piqua, Ohio
1967: A.A., Liberal Arts
      Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri
1969: B.S. English Education
      The Department of Humanities Education
      The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1971: M.A. Humanities Education
      The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

III. AREAS OF STUDY AND RESEARCH

English, Language Arts, and Film Education
Interdisciplinary Humanities Education
Art Theory and Aesthetics Education
Film Theory and Production
Curriculum and Reconceptual Curriculum Theory
Twentieth Century American and English Literature

IV. PUBLICATIONS

"The Listeners," in Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution, and Curriculum Theory;


V. CONFERENCE MANUSCRIPTS


"Being For Ones Self, Being For Others," Conference on Effective Teaching, Rochester Institute of Technology (September 1975).

VI. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1969-1970: English Teacher, Eleventh Grade (Language Arts, English Literature) Pleasant View High School, Columbus, Ohio (Southwestern)

Winter 1971: Graduate Teaching Associate (James Moffett Language Arts Program)*

The Ohio State University, Department of Humanities Education, Columbus, Ohio

1971: Group Leader (Freshman Early Experience in Education)

The Ohio State University, College of Education, Columbus, Ohio

1972-1973: Graduate Teaching Associate (Literature and Composition in the Secondary School; Aesthetics Education*; Film and Literature for the English Teacher*; Student Teacher Supervision in English)

The Ohio State University, Department of Humanities Education, Columbus, Ohio

1973: Graduate Teaching Associate (Visual Literacy and Reading)*

The Ohio State University, Department of Early and Middle Childhood Education, Columbus, Ohio
1973-1976

Assistant Professor
(Film Theory, Production, Scriptwriting)*
Rochester Institute of Technology
Department of Film Making and Television
Rochester, New York

(*Curriculum Development responsibility)

VII. FILM PRODUCTION

"Apocalypse," The Ohio State University, 1971
"Requiem," The Ohio State University, 1972
"Footprints," The Ohio State University, 1973
"A Gift of HOPE," Project HOPE, The People-to-People Health Foundation, 1975

VIII. PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Pi Lambda Theta
National Association of Humanities Education
National Council of Teachers of English
Modern Language Association
American Educational Research Association
University Film Association
American Film Institute
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VITA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIST OF DIAGRAMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. THE MEANING, FUNCTIONS AND MODES OF RECONCEPTUAL CURRICULUM INQUIRY: CRITICISM AND POST-CRITICAL THEORIZING TOWARD RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF CURRICULAR FOUNDATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. CONGRUENCE: A METHODOLOGY FOR AESTHETIC CURRICULUM CRITICISM AND POST-CRITICAL THEORIZING; DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. AN APPLICATION OF CONGRUENCE TO CONCEPTUAL SCHEME OF THE MIDCENTURY CURRICULUM REFORM MOVEMENT: AN INFLUENCE ON AND RESOURCE FOR UNDERSTANDING CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS IN SECONDARY CINEMATIC ARTS EDUCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. INCONGRUENCE IN AESTHETIC EDUCATION: AN INFLUENCE ON AND RESOURCE FOR UNDERSTANDING CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS IN SECONDARY CINEMATIC ARTS EDUCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. CONTEMPORARY CINEMATIC ARTS EDUCATION AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL: RECONCEPTUALIZING KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS AS CURRICULAR FOUNDATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIBLIOGRAPHY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagram I: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Four Spheres of Inquiry and Practice Integral to Curricular/Instructional Systems.......................... 48

Diagram II: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Cluster A and the Substantive Domain..................... 49

Diagram III: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Substantive Domain and Its Relation to Other Spheres.......... 50

Diagram IV: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Curriculum Development Sphere and Its Relation to Other Spheres.......................... 51

Diagram V: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry and Its Relation to Other Spheres............. 56

Diagram VI: Conceptual Meta-Scheme For the Application of Congruence.......................... 57

Diagram VII: Reconceptual Substantive Domain; Curricular Foundations as Sources of and Influences on Inquiry and Practice................. 79

Diagram VIII: Reconceptual Meta-Scheme...................... 80

Diagram IX: Potentiality - Actuality and Function - Use Continuums.............................. 123
Diagram X: Conceptual Meta-Scheme of the Midcentury Curriculum Reform Movement ....................... 136

Diagram XI: Midcentury Conceptions of Knowledge and Methods ...................... 141

Diagram XII: The Aesthetic Education Environment in Relation to the Whole of the Artistic Enterprise ......................... 166
Chapter I.
INTRODUCTION

The chapters of research that follow this "Introduction" proceed from several foundational assumptions about the nature and responsibility of contemporary educational inquiry and inquirers. The state of the comprehensive field of education calls for inquiry that juxtaposes timely extensions of conventional wisdom with original departures and informed inventions, intelligently connects that which has been and that which might be. Collectively, contemporary educational inquirers must assume both historical and emergent postures, attending carefully to the heritage of the field as they have known it, and yet even more carefully to the evolving nature of their work in relation to the field as they would have it. It seems historically true that "the new" in a field must be rooted observably and firmly in "the old" from which it cautiously emerges, if respect and apparent autonomy are to be granted by the community; and yet, if educational subfields are to mature in meaningful and authentic ways, to broaden their conceptual bases and to value necessary pluralism in subject matter, methodology and function, inquirers must cultivate fresh grounds and new notions of continuity rather than simply patch and propagate designs abstracted from old designs. In these regards, educational inquiry must be increasingly understood as a creative tool with the power to transform the nature of educational experience; inquirers must be willing to venture in new, multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary directions, in the spirit of intelligent experimentation, with the hope of refining alternative positions from which to view the educational enterprise. Educational criticism must mature and become authentic "critical inquiry," facilitated by new methodologies that generate alternative positions; and, again in the spirit of intelligent experimentation, inquirers must be willing to engage in post-critical theorizing in order to develop, rather than simply assert, those alternative positions toward the reconceptualization of educational experience. With these approaches to educational research comes the inquirer's responsibility to perform the meta-theoretical task of becoming self-conscious and self-critical about the subject, method and function of inquiry.
The point of origin for this research was a curiosity about the relationship between a subject of study and the educational methods employed in relation to that subject; more precisely, this curiosity focused on the relationship between conceptions of knowledge and of educational methods prevailing in the context of secondary cinematic arts education, as a subject-centered curricular/instructional environment. In a general sense, the words of John S. Mann supported this curiosity:

...Put succinctly, we are on our way to thinking that sheer transmission of information and technique is the important part of education if not the whole of it. Since we are doing quite well at devising methods to accomplish this part, we tend to neglect the stickier, more frustrating, and less profitable sort of inquiry that might clarify for us such problems as... the various conceptions of the nature, function, source, and uses of knowledge that are implicitly conveyed to students through contrasting methods of transmitting knowledge...

Mann seems to imply that the nature, function, source and use of knowledge can be conceptualized in various, differing ways. He suggests that particular conceptions of knowledge can be implicitly transmitted through educational methods developed, perhaps, for that purpose with a sense of intentionality. As a consequence, these particular conceptions of knowledge are covertly expressed as unquestionable and become part of the student's experience. Such conceptions of knowledge are expressed implicitly as absolute, although no direct access is given to them for scrutiny. Stated differently, Mann suggests that various, differing methods of instruction exist as mediums with the power to convey correspondingly different conceptions of knowledge; that is, particular educational methods might be so organic to and engrained with particular conceptions of knowledge that they implicitly reflect these conceptions as absolute without making open, direct reference to them. In sum, Mann seems to confirm a relationship between subject and method, or between conceptions of knowledge and of educational methods; and this relationship seems to have as potential the characteristic of organicism or congruence, a characteristic which may be used productively or deceptively in subject-method development for educational experience.

Clearly, "knowledge" has traditionally been treated as a curricular foundation. Conceptions of the nature, function, source and use of knowledge, prevailing in periods of
educational history or attending particular fields and curricular environments, have been central among the foundational influences on the nature of formal educational experience. At the levels of both development and practice, such conceptions may be more implicit than explicit; still, major implications for the entire fabric and texture of curricular phenomena and classroom events largely spring from prevailing conceptions of knowledge.

Conceptions of knowledge partly comprise the foundational bases for interpreting, deriving and developing all separate but related elements involved in curricular phenomena and classroom events. "Educational methods" would seem to be central among these elements taking direction from implicit or explicit assumptions made about knowledge, both in general and in the context of a particular subject or field of study. Methods serve as agents or mediums with which to choreograph other interacting pedagogical elements toward fulfilling the educational aims intended in the design of curricular environments and classroom events; these elements drawn into relation through methods may be students, teachers, a subject or field, and the socio-cultural phenomena and realities that prevail to influence the educational environment and define its association with other life-contexts. Clearly, the nature of educational experience is directly related to, if not profoundly dependent on, the dominate educational methods selected and developed to choreograph pedagogical elements in particular settings and situations. Just as methods are sometimes said to facilitate or "deliver" the educational aims of a curricular environment or classroom event, so do methods "deliver" or "transmit" the prevailing conceptions of knowledge embedded in the foundation of such an environment or event.

From this curiosity about the relationship between conceptions of knowledge and of methods in secondary cinematic arts education, and about the organicism and congruence potentially shared by subject and method in particular settings, a cluster of questions began to emerge to give focus to the subject of this research. What are the prevailing conceptions of knowledge among secondary educators in the cinematic arts? Are these conceptions essentially unique to this field and significantly different from their conceptions of knowledge in the context of other fields? What educational methods prevail in secondary cinematic arts education, and are these unique to this field or similar to methods developed for other fields? Does or should a special relationship exist between these educators' conceptions of knowledge in the cinematic arts and their educational methods, such that an organicism or congruence between subject and method would exist? Might educator's discovery of the essential nature of cinematic knowledge give meaningful
direction to the development of educational methods uniquely "congruent" with this field. And finally, in what sense might the nature of educational experience and curricular phenomena be a function of prevailing, although implicit, conceptions of knowledge the way in which educational methods might relate to or derive from these conceptions?

These preliminary questions lead to a larger set, more general in nature but pertinent to mapping the reaches and expanse of subject-method relationships as a focus for inquiry. These questions are included in the "Introduction" to clarify the subject of this research.

A. What is or might be meant by an organic or congruent relationship between a conception of knowledge and a method of instruction/study? What might be meant by a conception of knowledge in a field and an educational method being translations of one another or being integrated with one another?

B. What are the sources of and influences on educators' conceptions of knowledge and of educational methods? In what manner, on what basis, and for what reasons might educators come to know or become committed to such conceptions of knowledge and methods?

C. Do educators formulate conceptions of the nature, function, source and use of knowledge (tacitly or explicitly, with or without precision and intentionality) that are specific to one subject/field or general and consistent for all subjects/fields?

D. Might one speak of the relative value and validity of a conception of knowledge that is unique to one subject/field and one that is generalized?

E. Do educators formulate conceptions of educational methods as if they were specific and appropriate to one subject/field? Are methods in any sense "inherent" in a specific subject/field, or are methods "imposed" on other bases? What are other bases, apart from a conception of knowledge in a subject/field, for selecting educational methods and determining that they are appropriate to a particular setting?
F. Might one speak of the relative value and validity of various, differing educational methods with regard to a specific subject/field?

G. Might a general conception of knowledge be used explicitly and intentionally to give substantial and meaningful direction to the selection and development of educational methods for a particular subject/field? Might a conception of knowledge unique to a particular field be so used, and might this be more productive? What would such procedures entail?

H. Are specific methods "inherent" or embedded in each separate field, methods of "coming to know" within the context of study in a field, that might resemble the modes giving rise to the field itself? How might such "inherent" methods be found and articulated? Might they be ferreted out through the discovery and formulation of a conception of knowledge in a field? Would such "inherent" methods be more appropriate for the study of that field than methods selected on other bases?

I. Is it possible for educators to formulate a general or specific conception of knowledge (its nature, function, source and use) that, if disclosed and made explicit, is flawed or in some way inappropriate to a particular subject/field, inappropriate to the aims of a curricular environment and classroom events in which students encounter that subject/field?

If so, and if educational methods are derived from such flawed conceptions of knowledge with any consistency (with or without precision and intentionality), might these methods also be found inappropriate to study of a particular subject/field, inappropriate to facilitating the aims of the environment and events in which students encounter that subject/field?

J. Precisely what might be meant by a conception of knowledge that is flawed or in some way inappropriate to a particular subject/field and the aims of study in that field? And
precisely what might be meant by an educational method that is flawed or in some way inappropriate to a particular field and the facilitation of aims in that field?

K. If methods can be derived from a particular conception of knowledge, is it valid to assume that a reconceptualization of knowledge can or will necessarily alter the selection and development of methods in a corresponding direction?

L. Especially at the level of curriculum development and classroom planning, would it be more valid to assume that conceptions of knowledge and of educational methods are independent concerns/foundations of a similar order, having inherent correspondences that draw them together to mediate each other?

M. Among the conventional curricular foundations, the conceptual sources of and influences on curriculum inquiry and development, "educational methods" are not traditionally treated as a separate central referent in the sense that knowledge, the learner and society are. Why are "methods" not considered and treated as a curricular foundation? Are they considered elements of a different order? Are they thought to be embedded in or subsumed by one of the other three foundational referents?

If "methods" are traditionally thought to be subsumed by "the learner," or derived from this foundational referent as it encompasses inquiry and data about human learning and development, pedagogical and teaching-learning matters, might not "methods" be as validly subsumed by and take direction from the other two foundational referents? Ought methods become a separate, central curricular foundation?

N. In curriculum inquiry and development, and later in environments and events, priorities frequently exist among the conventional foundations, knowledge, the learner, and society; such priorities might translate, respectively, into subject-centered schemes, student-centered schemes, and socio-relevant
schemes. How do these phenomena relate to the previous questions posed?

The subject of this research begins, then, as an inquiry into prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, source and use of "knowledge," as a curricular foundation of secondary cinematic arts education; this inquiry moves toward an examination of educational methods that dominate this same subject-centered environment and, finally, toward an exploration of subject-method relationships. The whole of this inquiry falls within the frame of the various focal questions posed in this "Introduction." This research is intended to be a critical and post-critical inquiry: disclosures give way to understanding answers to questions posed with respect to conceptions of knowledge and of methods in cinematic arts education, their sources and influences; the critical method formulated for inquiry will facilitate the reaching of a critical position about subject-method conceptions and relationships against which these particular answers might be assessed; this is, in effect, the generating of post-critical material, necessary to the task of building theory toward the reconceptualization of knowledge, as a curricular foundation, and of subject-method interactions.

The curiosity generated about this subject, once formulated, prompted two supportive concerns that warrant introduction in this chapter: as the questions posed to express the nature and expanse of the subject bring together aspects of numerous separate but related specialized areas of study, within what context might these be appropriately viewed together, or within what educational subfield might such a cluster of areas be meaningfully considered; and in terms of the nature of the subject and the various critical and post-critical aims of inquiry, what methodology and process of exploration would be most appropriate and facilitative?

The subfield of curriculum has been selected as the context within which to view and consider the conceptions of and relationships between subject and educational method in student's experience of the cinematic arts at the secondary level. The conceptualization of knowledge has been, and continues to be, a traditional focus of curricular inquiry, influencing the conceptualization and treatment of all pedagogical elements at the levels of theory, development and practice in curriculum itself and in other educational subfields as well; as influential as such curricular conceptions of knowledge have been for all subfields within various periods of curricular history, they have been controversial, problematic, and inadequately used in relation to the development of educational methods. The history of the curriculum field also gives this research broad access to the
midcentury curriculum reform movement, dominated by rationales with a central concern for the conceptualization and treatment of knowledge for educational experience. This movement not only provides an exemplary critical resource for understanding the process and eventuation of conceptualizing the nature, function, source, and uses of knowledge and subject-method relationships; the midcentury reforms also warrant examination for the influence they continue to exert on contemporary curricular regard for knowledge and its methodological expression in cinematic arts education; and relatedly, the socio-cultural and educational climate at midcentury warrant a review in relation to contemporary trends that would conceptualize and treat knowledge similarly. Further still, the functional value of this research relates to the post-critical process of changing conceptions of knowledge found to be inappropriate to a particular subject and inconsistent with a particular set of curricular/instructional aims, or reconceptualizing the nature, function, source, and uses of knowledge as a curricular foundation, in a way that might correspondingly alter educational methods and, ultimately, educational experience; in these regards, the curriculum reform movement provides an exemplary critical resource for understanding the historical nature of curricular change-phenomena, such as "reform," and for attending to the transformation of the character of curricular change itself. Consequently, for these initial reasons, among yet others, the subfield of curriculum seemed an appropriate context within which this research might proceed.

It is more specifically the emergent "reconceptual" movement of curriculum inquiry that provides the appropriate context for this research, as it frequently focuses on curricular foundations and assumes fundamental re-interpretive functions in relation to those foundations. This form of curriculum inquiry corresponds with the specific subject and aims of the present study, giving direction to the development and application of critical tools for its various aspects: the search for prevailing conceptions of a curricular foundation such as knowledge, embedded in secondary cinematic arts education as a subject-centered curricular/instructional environment; the disclosure of those conceptions that gives way to understanding them, their sources and influences; the critical scrutiny itself, which involves questions of appropriateness of prevailing conceptions of knowledge to this particular classroom subject and its particular educational aims; the critical exploration of subject-method relationships in terms of prevailing conceptions of knowledge and of educational methods in the cinematic arts; and post-critical theorizing, which emerges as a result of reaching a critical position and functions to reconceive the curricular foundation of knowledge when
prevailing conceptions are found inappropriate to cinema and
the aims of cinematic arts education.

In his essay "Curriculum Criticism," John S. Mann begins
to sketch the task of the reconceptual curriculum critic in
the following manner, touching on the subject of this present
research as his example:

...The school practitioner seeks
answers to such questions as what is
known and what should be known.
These questions concern the critic not
because he seeks answers to them but
because the fact that they are asked,
as well as the processes the practi­
tioner employs in seeking answers to
them and the character of the answers
accepted, all constitute data for him.
These fall into designs which it is
the critic's task to analyze. Thus he
will seek, for example, to discover
what ideas about (1) the nature of
knowledge, (2) the processes by which
knowledge is acquired, (3) the values
associated with knowledge, and (4)
the status of knowledge in relation to
other intellectual attributes, are
entailed in the designs he observes.
For instance, whereas the science
teacher may be interested in discover­
ing whether a pupil knows Boyle's Law
or in how to get a pupil to know it,
the critic is interested in discovering
what meanings of "knowledge" may
account for both the teacher's analysis
of the problem and his teaching
behavior with respect to the problem.
The critic may discover, for example,
that teachers vary considerably from
each other and from established
epistemologies in their understanding
of the meaning of the scientific
assertion that something is known.
They vary, that is, in their under­
standing of the logical status of
something regarded as known. And these
observations in turn may account for
or explain similarities and contrasts
between different science instruction
situations.3
Such critical analysis and discovery may reveal misconceptions of curricular foundations, such as knowledge, the learner and socio-cultural realities, and the reconceptual inquirer will use these disclosures in the post-critical task of reconceptualizing such foundations.

Reconceptualization connotes an authentic attempt to transform the most fundamental elements, and their essential characteristics, that interact in complex ways in educational settings. Efforts to affect change in these settings through rearrangement and reorganization of interacting elements and their complex factors will not result in sustained, authentic transformation without prior reconceptualization of the simple, central elements. The essential foundation of the more highly complex interactions, which are educational experience, must first receive concentrated reconsideration. It is the conception or understanding of these foundational elements that gives rise to the direction of interaction in educational settings, that define the nature and function of educational experience. If curricular/instructional expressions and events and the nature of educational experience in a particular field are to be authentically transformed in some direction as a result of critical disclosures, then fundamental reconceptualization of referents foundational to the entire curricular system - such as knowledge - is implied. Shifting and reorganizing the disciplines and their configurations in subject-centered schemes, rearranging and replacing subject matters and materials within disciplines, implementing different instructional methodologies or pedagogical styles - these alterations will not accomplish authentic transformation on any basis short of or in the absence of prior fundamental rethinking or reconceptualization of foundational referents, such as "knowledge." In the instance of this research, a critical question is formulated with respect to a conception of "knowledge," a fundamental element of curricular/instructional interaction, and its nature, function, source and uses, as the essential characteristics of knowledge. As this conception, seated in a particular period or attending a particular field, is explored and disclosed through a method of critical inquiry, the essence of potential reconceptualization becomes apparent. As reconceptual adjustments proceed in fundamental elements, a new foundation becomes apparent, giving rise to a corresponding, new view of a cluster of elements in the state of interaction in educational settings.

The emergent "reconceptual" curricularists provide a foundation for engaging in both critical inquiry and post-critical theorizing, frequently in combination, through methodologies of a creative, aesthetic, and political nature. James Macdonald perceives the reconceptualists, in relation to traditional and empirical curricularists, in this way:
A third group of individuals look upon the task of theorizing as a creative intellectual task which they maintain should be neither used as a basis for prescription or as an empirically testable set of principles and relationships. The purpose of these persons is to develop and criticize conceptual schema in the hope that new ways of talking about curriculum, which may in the future be far more fruitful than present orientations, will be forthcoming. At the present time, they would maintain that a much more playful, freefloating process is called for by the state of the art.

This group of inquirers engage in historical thinking, juxtaposing the heritage of the curriculum field with the emergent, connecting that which has been with that which might be; however, their gaze is forward-looking, their efforts concentrated on invention and the creative/critical remaking of the field, on the transformation of foundations, pedagogical elements and curricular language, on reconceptualizing the nature of educational experience. In these regards, the reconceptualists interpret curriculum criticism and post-critical theorizing as processes of disclosing and understanding curricular expressions of meaning, such as of conceptions of knowledge and of methods in curricular systems, and their consequences for educational experience. It is then largely within the framework of the emergent "reconceptual" mode and function of inquiry that this research is considered; and in this regard, a comprehensive treatment of this emergent movement is included as integral to this research.

It must be noted parenthetically that such inquiry, parallel and related to the character and focus of this research, is warranted within the contexts, traditions and historical development of yet other educational subfields; an exhaustive treatment and comprehensive scope would be the consequence only of collective, complementary studies from numerous vantage points and through a range of methodologies. Those established contexts that come to mind are language arts and English education, film education, aesthetics education, arts and humanities education, instruction, interdisciplinary studies education, and, certainly, from perspectives in the curriculum field not cultivated in this research.
With respect to the second supportive concern necessitated by the subject of this research, an aesthetic methodology for curriculum criticism and post-critical theorizing is developed in these chapters. This methodology is called congruence, and its function is consonant with that of reconceptual inquiry in general. This method of inquiry, its fundamental assumptions and aesthetic principles, its specific aims and functions, and the conceptual scheme on which it depends for critical disclosures and post-critical theorizing are developed and applied in various ways to illuminate the subject of this research.

The following descriptions outline the content of Chapters II through VI.

Chapter II illuminates the meaning of contemporary "reconceptualization" as a curricular change-phenomenon focused on foundations of educational experience; in this regard, the process of reconceptualization is contrasted with the process of reform, in order to distinguish the essential characteristics, patterns, vision and angle-of-view belonging to each. This chapter focuses on the functions and modes of emergent reconceptual inquiry, with the intent to explain the growing practice of and aesthetic methodologies for reconceptual curriculum criticism and post-critical theorizing; relatedly, the "call for" new modes of curriculum inquiry from within the field is traced, the call for alternatives to traditional and empirical inquiry to which reconceptual criticism and theorizing offer responses. This chapter also traces the development of the three traditional curricular foundations, from the late nineteenth century to midcentury, as the referents which become central to reconceptual inquiry.

Chapter III focuses on the development and application of congruence, as a reconceptual methodology for aesthetic curriculum criticism and post-critical theorizing. The various sections of this chapter describe: the conceptual scheme or "disclosure model" with which congruence is used, representing four spheres of curriculum inquiry pertinent to all individual curricular/instructional systems; the fundamental assumptions and valuations inherent in the method, its bases for assessing particular schemes and models; the aims of and functions served by congruence with respect to an individual curricular/instructional system; and the aesthetic principles of the method or the tools with which to view the design created by a particular curricular/instructional system as it is disclosed through a model. This chapter also introduces the application of congruence in a general way to the subject of this research, conceptions of knowledge, of methods and their relationships, within subject-centered curricular-instructional systems.
Chapter IV introduces the subject-centered curricular/instructional systems belonging to the midcentury curriculum reform movement, as influences on and resources for understanding contemporary conceptions of knowledge, of methods and their relationships in secondary cinematic arts education. This chapter includes an extensive, comprehensive application of congruence to the design of midcentury curricular/instructional systems, as these are generalized in the form of a conceptual scheme or disclosure model; this application of aesthetic curriculum criticism is the tracing and delineating of all elements within this midcentury conceptual scheme, with a special focus on midcentury conceptions of knowledge, of methods, and subject-method interactions embedded in the scheme. Conceptions of knowledge are found to give rise to conceptions of educational methods; and these foundational conceptions together are found inappropriate to midcentury subjects in general and the cinematic arts in particular, and incongruent with the aims of both midcentury curricular/instructional systems and current secondary cinematic arts environments. A critical position is generated and used for post-critical theorizing toward the reconceptualization of knowledge, methods, and their relationships. The meanings and understandings disclosed in this chapter are treated as influences on and resources for comprehending contemporary regard for knowledge and methods in secondary cinematic arts education; and the processes of applying this aesthetic mode of reconceptual criticism and post-critical theorizing are understood as resources for subsequent applications of congruence to the subject of curricular foundations, embedded in other curricular/instructional systems.

Chapter V introduces a contemporary form of the aesthetic education environment as a context within which secondary cinematic arts education is frequently practiced; as such, the tradition of aesthetic education is treated as an influence on and resource for understanding contemporary conceptions of knowledge and methods in cinematic arts education. This chapter represents another manner of applying congruence to a curricular/instructional system or environment, another search for and disclosure of embedded foundational conceptions of knowledge, of methods and their relationships that inform the nature of contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts. As in the midcentury disclosure model, foundational conceptions of knowledge and methods prevailing in the aesthetic education environment are found incongruent with both the subjects studied in this context and the aims of this curricular/instructional system. This curriculum criticism generates a critical position, corresponding with that reached in the previous chapter with respect to midcentury conceptions of knowledge and methods; this becomes material necessary to the
task of post-critical theorizing toward the reconceptualization of knowledge and methods in the context of aesthetic education. This chapter clarifies a conception of the nature, function, source and use of knowledge that would be most appropriate to fields studied in the context of aesthetic education; this chapter asserts the necessary shift in conceptions of knowledge and the manner in which this gives rise to a congruent shift in educational methods to facilitate the meeting of the environments' aims.

Chapter VI begins with descriptions of contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts at the secondary level, largely practiced within the context of aesthetic education and in subject-centered elective schemes. Application of congruence for critical analysis focuses on foundational conceptions of knowledge, methods, and their interactions embedded in the designs of curricular/instructional environments constructed for cinematic arts education; relationships between these conceptions and those associated with the midcentury scheme and the aesthetic education environment are identified. As these conceptions are found incongruent with the cinematic arts and the aims of cinematic arts education, a more appropriate conception of knowledge, methods, and subject-method relationships is asserted. In relation to this reconceptualization of knowledge as a curricular foundation for cinematic arts education and the methods springing from this new vision, the fundamental assumptions and valuations of congruence are reviewed and reaffirmed. Finally, this chapter includes a discussion of recommendations and implications for curriculum development and classroom practice in cinematic arts education; this is the translation of these chapters of criticism and theorizing into the language of practice.
FOOTNOTES


5Mann, "Curriculum Criticism."
CHAPTER II.

THE MEANING, FUNCTIONS AND MODES OF RECONCEPTUAL CURRICULUM INQUIRY: CRITICISM AND POST-CRITICAL THEORIZING TOWARD RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF CURRICULAR FOUNDATIONS

Reconceptualization broadly denotes the emergent transformation of the modes and functions of curriculum inquiry. As contemporary workers in the field wish to envision and elucidate formal educational experience in new ways, the collective, self-conscious task of developing methods for reconceptual curriculum inquiry surfaces now to facilitate new ways of viewing and talking about educational experience. Such a reconceptualization of inquiry moves in the direction of creating new methods of criticism and post-critical theorizing, taken together and particularly appropriate to the study of curriculum phenomena; these methods would focus on old and new curricular themes from new points of view, generating descriptions and understanding of human existential, biographic dimensions of educational experience that have not been well-expressed through traditional and empirical research. At a related level, reconceptualization can be understood as a curricular change-phenomenon, in the sense that reform is, however, one which departs intentionally from the manner and spirit of change characterizing the field's history; new critical and theoretical modes of inquiry would move toward fundamental re-interpretation, re-conception of curricular foundations, pedagogical elements, and their complex relations, aiming to transform, reconceive the nature of educational experience in significant ways.

In a January, 1971 issue of Journal of Educational Research, James Macdonald makes a functional analysis of three groups of inquirers at work in the curriculum field. He describes the traditionalists as those who generate guidelines for curriculum development in practical school situations, while the empiricists attempt to describe curriculum phenomena and validate related curriculum variables in the conventional sense of behavioral scientists. Macdonald identifies a third and smaller group as involved in generating fresh modes of critical and theoretical inquiry:

A third group of individuals look upon the task of theorizing as a creative
intellectual task which they maintain should be neither used as a basis for prescription or as an empirically testible set of principles and relationships. The purpose of these persons is to develop and criticize conceptual schema in the hope that new ways of talking about curriculum, which may in the future be far more fruitful than present orientation, will be forthcoming. At the present time, they would maintain that a much more playful, free-floating process is called for by the state of the art.2

In 1975, William Pinar extends Macdonald's analysis, naming this third group the reconceptualists.3 Although it is between 1968 and the present that the nature of reconceptual inquiry and the function of reconceptualization receive more explicit and precise attention, the "call for" reconceptual work begins as early as 1947, a call for alternatives to the modes and functions of traditional and empirical inquiry. Before focusing on developments and attention during these more recent years, such as Macdonald's and Pinar's contributions, a brief scenario tracing this call is included here to provide an historical perspective to the emerging response and alternative offered by the reconceptualists.

In Toward Improved Curriculum Theory,4 the publication of papers presented during the 1947 University of Chicago Conference on Curriculum Theory, the first effort can be found to emphasize the function of theory as distinct from the function of development or design. Papers by participants such as B. Othanel Smith and Virgil Herrick suggest the need for new modes of curriculum theorizing. The editors of this publication, Herrick and Ralph Tyler, describe in their overview a three-fold function of curriculum theory: to identify critical concerns in the curriculum development process and their implicit generalizations; to identify the relation between these points and their supporting structures; and to suggest future directions of approaches to resolve these concerns.

Distinguishing curriculum theory and theorizing from other forms of curriculum research and educational writing, in either an historical or contemporary context, is a difficult task. Paul Klohr, among others, has found little differentiation throughout the past between partial theoretical efforts, practical guidelines for curriculum development in the schools, or the scientific description and explanation of curricular phenomena. Klohr notes that the 1960, 1963, and 1966 issues of Review of Educational Research do not
significantly differentiate theory and theorizing from other modes of curriculum inquiry. Klohr notes that John Goodlad in 1960 and later the editors of RER curriculum issues call for more adequate curriculum theorizing.

As proponents of empirical studies and the adaptation of methods from the social and behavioral sciences held ground in curriculum and instruction, participants at a 1965 seminar sponsored by the Curriculum Theory Commission of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development were unwilling to delimit the nature of curriculum research. Elizabeth Maccia identified four modes of theorizing at this seminar, suggesting their appropriateness for the field of curriculum: event theory, formal theory, valuational theory, and praxiological theory.

There was evidence of Maccia's suggestion at the 1967 Curriculum Theory Conference at The Ohio State University, again noted by Klohr. This conference brought together Ross Mooney, Dwayne Huebner, and James Macdonald with work distinctly different from the empirical studies presented by James Duncan and Jack Frymier at the same conference. Here Mooney describes the individual curriculum worker as a producer of curriculum theory, "processing his own experience," rather than as a consumer of inquiry in a field constructed by others. Macdonald calls for more disciplined thinking, and Huebner contends that new modes of curricular language need to be generated, specific to the curriculum field and different from the language of the traditionalists and empiricists.

In 1967, Mauritz Johnson suggests that the nature and use of theory identified with the traditionalists and empiricists, notably in the context of reform, function in the direction of "improvement rather than understanding." Curriculum inquirers have been inclined toward pragmatic, atheoretical levels of thought, technologic and scientific modes of description, and empirical methods of study in approaching microcurricular pictures in the field. The consensus among current historians of the field is that curriculum research has been majorly comprised of general guidelines for practitioners and curriculum development in the schools and narrowly based empirical studies of curriculum phenomena and variables by applying theory and methodology borrowed from social/behavioral sciences; and this, without fundamental conceptual and theoretical research or a view toward wider macro-curricular issues. With regard to this, and the lack of theory which produces understanding, Herbert Kliebard notes:

...there has been virtually no toleration of the kind of long range research that
has little immediate value to practitioners in the field, but which may in the long run contribute significantly to our basic knowledge and understanding.12

In 1968, John Steven Mann reports that no comprehensive theories about curricular phenomena exist, that expressions of theory are interwoven in curriculum literature designed for other purposes:

With respect to curriculum theory itself - that is, highly general explanatory statements about relations among curriculum phenomena - there seems to be very little material ... I believe it is well known that there are no comprehensive theories about curriculum phenomena ... There are a few truly theoretical propositions buried here and there in works designed for other purposes.13

Various formative expressions of theory are interwoven into the larger fabric of the curriculum field as we have known it, without fundamental or consistent development. These expressions of theory are organically tied to the functions, themes, and focuses of complementary levels of work in the curriculum field. While contemporary reconceptualizations aim clearly to be critical and theoretical descriptions with distinct functions, themes, and focuses, and aim to understand the function of theory and theorizing, this has not been the case throughout the history of the curriculum field. As a consequence, functions and themes, or substantive structures, that might appropriately become the unique focus of theory have been subsumed or obscured by dominate technological and scientific models of curricular thought and their conventional substantive structures. Mann notes:

there are a number of phenomena traditionally of concern to the planners of formal educational experience which this substantive structure does not seem capable of comprehending. Thus, there are presently a number of efforts to develop alternative or complimentary substantive structures for curriculum theory.14

Also, with reference to the functions and modes related to the "production model" of the traditionalists and empiricists, Herbert Kliebard remarks in 1970:
The task of the next fifty years in the curriculum field is essentially one of developing alternatives to the mode of thinking and the limited framework that has so clearly dominated our first fifty years.15

Significant in this context are Mann's related comments about the shortcomings of traditional and empirical work in the field, with special regard for the function of theory:

While one might sympathize with the practitioner's need for solutions to particular problems, this sympathy should not lead the scholar into a misunderstanding of the nature and function of theory. Theory is explanatory, and explanation leads in many cases to control, or at least to prediction. In the long run, theory coupled with value commitment leads to a position about practice. But as Travers has pointed out, inquiry aimed at determining methods for maximizing a given effect is not likely to succeed very well in the absence of sound prior theory and is not likely to be an efficient approach to the development of the theory. Conversely, inquiry designed in accordance with the requirements for the development of sound theory is not likely, in the short run, to yield answers to the practitioner's questions. Nevertheless, the practitioner...should not overlook the likelihood that many of his most pressing difficulties are precisely the result of a short­sighted patchwork approach to past problems - an approach, which in the absence of sound general theory, tends to view as separate and isolated problems certain phenomena which are in fact intrinsic correlated characteristics of an entire system of phenomena.16

Here Mann begins to call for theory of a different order than inquiry found in traditional and empirical modes. He explains that what is called curriculum theory in these two modes is more properly called praxeology which "enables
people who cannot wait forever to make critical decisions in a reasonable manner. Instead of praxeology, Mann is calling for inquiry that will provide fundamental understanding of relations among phenomena:

...curriculum studies often fail to contribute to theory because they are designed to produce prescriptions for maximizing certain allegedly desirable effects instead of being designed to produce understanding of relations among phenomena...

In the long run...theory rather than praxeology will produce understanding, and understanding, in addition to being intrinsically valuable, will probably result in decisions that better serve the interests of educational institutions.

As James Macdonald delineates the three groups of curricularists at work in the field in his 1971 essay, "Curriculum Theory," he asserts that theory and theorizing "may be characterized as being in a rather formative condition." As Macdonald points to the need for the maturation of curriculum theory, he seems to suggest that this work, alternative to the nature of traditional and empirical inquiry, might be done by the emergent third group he describes, the reconceptualists. During a discussion of the nature of the curriculum field at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in New Orleans, 1973, Macdonald makes a similar assertion. The context for this discussion was "The Special Interest Group for the Generation and Utilization of Knowledge in Curriculum."

As George Beauchamp, among others, wished to delimit curriculum inquiry to the scientific and empirical studies, Macdonald was one to argue the legitimacy and necessity of a range of several approaches to the generation and utilization of knowledge in the curriculum field. Macdonald focused particularly on work that could be called theoretical but not necessarily in the strict scientific sense of theory.

In their 1975 textbook, Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner represent the development sector's observation that traditional and empirical inquiry suffer from limitations that only foundational curriculum theory, with distinct assumptions, functions and modes that complement development, might begin to resolve:
The main thrusts in curriculum development and reform over the years have been directed at microcurricular problems to the neglect of macrocurricular problems. Moreover, to a great extent curriculum research has been geared to narrowly based empirical studies having little bearing on the wider conceptual and practical problems of the curriculum. In the absence of a holistic conception of curriculum, the focus is on piecemeal and mechanical functions...an image of scientific neutrality through "hard" data while masking the valuations underlying the research and concealing the conceptual emptiness of the research. Thus, research often has been used as a tool of bias rather than a tool of reason...insufficient attention has been given to curriculum reconstruction based upon sound research and theory. \textsuperscript{22}

Parallel to these calls for reconceptual modes of inquiry, and primarily from 1968 to the present, a number of individuals have been at work in the field who associate themselves with the task of reconceptualizing curriculum theory and with what has been called the reconceptualist movement. These individuals have been generating a body of literature, some of which has been collected, that takes various directions within the general context and aims of reconceptualization; many of these inquirers have gathered at small conferences to share their work-in-progress; and several have emerged to assume historical postures, giving expression to the shape and nature of reconceptual inquiry as it grows and explicating its function in relation to traditional and empirical research in the field.

Prior to exploring the varied nature of the reconceptualist's response to the call for alternatives in curriculum inquiry, it will be significant to identify those individuals who have gathered together to associate themselves publically with this movement. The first public gathering of the reconceptualists occurred in May, 1973, at the University of Rochester Curriculum Theory Conference, chaired by William Pinar. Major papers were presented by Pinar; Maxine Greene and Dwayne Huebner of Teachers College, Columbia University; James Macdonald of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Donald R. Bateman of The Ohio State University; Robert J. Starrett of Regis College and Regis High School; and William Pilder of a Montessori school in Greenwich, Connecticut, and formerly of Indiana University. These papers have been published in a collection, edited by Pinar.
and given the title of the conference itself, *Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution, and Curriculum Theory*. This collection also includes seven "reaction papers," written by those serving as group discussion leaders during the conference: Robert L. Osborn, William T. Lowe, and Eleanor Larson, all of the University of Rochester; Charles Beegle of the University of Virginia; George H. Willis of the University of Rhode Island; Francine Shuchat Shaw of Rochester Institute of Technology; and Paul R. Klohr of The Ohio State University.

In October, 1974, Tim Riordan chaired a second conference at Xavier University, "Reconceptualizing Curriculum Theory." Here, Pinar, Greene, Macdonald, and Huebner were joined in making major presentations by Riordan; Klohr; Shuchat Shaw; David C. Williams of Eastern Kentucky University; William Burton of The North Carolina Center for Student Rights; Michael W. Apple of the University of Wisconsin at Madison; and Ross L. Mooney of The Ohio State University.

Between the second conference and a third at the University of Virginia, it is significant to note the 1975 publication of *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, edited by Pinar and brought out through the well-known "Curriculum and Supervision Series" of McCutchan Publishing Corporation. Although the nature of the work in this collection will be discussed later in this chapter, it is important to note that Pinar selects previous and new work from the following contributors: Macdonald; Apple; Mooney; Huebner; Greene; Pilder; Pinar; Willis; Shuchat Shaw; Lawrence A. Cremin and Philip Phenix of Teachers College, Columbia University; Herbert M. Kliebard of the University of Wisconsin at Madison; Alex Molnar of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee; John Steven Mann, formerly of the University of New Mexico; and William J. Murphey, formerly of Indiana University.

The third conference at the University of Virginia, chaired by Charles Beegle, was also named "Reconceptualizing Curriculum Theory." Held in October, 1975, Pinar, Greene and Riordan were joined by the following individuals in presenting major papers: Dan Jordan of the University of Massachusetts; Madeline Grumet of the University of Rochester; and Louise Berman and Jessie Roderick of the University of Maryland. Among those leading round-table discussions were Macdonald, Williams, who was then at SUNY at Albany, and many colleagues and graduate students from schools represented by major presenters from all three conferences.

Finally, at this writing, a fourth conference is being planned for November, 1976, at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, to be chaired by Alex Molnar. Major papers are
to be presented by Ralph Tyler, Elliot Eisner, Bernice Wolfson, Huebner, Macdonald, Apple and Mann.

The remaining sections of this chapter describe the nature of reconceptualization as a change-phenomenon and the direction of reconceptual inquiry, in various ways pertinent to this present research. These sections intend to provide an understanding of the response this emergent movement makes to the call for alternative modes, methods and functions in contemporary curriculum inquiry.

To give formal expression to the process of reconceptualization is not to introduce a wholly new phenomenon to the curriculum field. The history of the field is marked with the shaping and reshaping of curriculum inquiry, thought and practice related to formal educational experience; such evolution and transformation are expressed through instances and periods of curriculum reform and reconstruction, both of which are change-phenomena bearing similarities to the meaning of reconceptualization. The very origins of the curriculum field are associated with a reform movement, and its subsequent chronology is rooted in dialectical exchange, in reassessment, redefinition, reinterpretation of the content and function of both curriculum research and educational experience.

However, what is meant by the process of contemporary reconceptualization is distinctly different from the traditional process of change in the field. While reconceptualization may share with reform, for example, the abstract characteristic of being a change-phenomenon or of representing a period of change, formal use of the word reflects the contemporary intention to alter the traditional nature of change in curricular thought and practice. Formal reference to reconceptualization denotes the related pressing need to attend the transformation of curriculum research and inquiry in ways essentially different from those identified with reform.

Change throughout the history of the curriculum field has been defined as a literal re-forming or re-constructing of a fixed set of interacting pedagogical elements in the schools (objectives, content/materials, designs, space, time, teachers and students, activities/methods), a re-arranging or re-organizing of priorities and values among a fixed set of substantive foundations of curriculum research (knowledge, the learner, society). While the dominant color in the fabric of curriculum thought and formal educational experience shifts among a fixed set of possibilities through time, the overall texture remains relatively consistent. The intention of this sort of change has been in the direction of improvement.
The contemporary intention among a community of curriculum theorists is to shift away from change by reorganization of elements and foundations for improvement, and to shift toward change undergirded by prior theoretical reconception of elements and foundations for understanding. The tendency to change by rearrangement precludes reconception, as it takes for granted the meanings of pedagogical elements and substantive foundations of curriculum, thereby limiting the essence and meaning of each and the potential for new relationships. Instead, reconception means to bracket out the taken-for-granted and to understand anew the meanings of these elements and foundations of curriculum, as well as their relationships to one another.

William Pinar characterizes reconceptualization in this way, focusing his particular reconceptual methods of inquiry on the conventional curricular foundation of "the individual," or human being as learner:

I have taken what it is that is seen, and I have re-viewed it, and in the course of reviewing it I have come to see it anew. But the objective reality has not remained unaffected. In the reconceptualization the objective reality changes as does the subjective. I no longer see what it is I see as I saw it, and it is one, because I see differently, and two, what is seen is different.27

Contemporary reconceptualists are looking for change in the content and function of curriculum research, characterized and catalyzed by new conceptions, fundamentally new understandings of subjects germane to the curriculum field and educational experience. Such change is foundational to literal rearrangements of pedagogical elements and substantive priorities, if departures are to be authentic, sound, and well-informed.

Both traditional and contemporary curriculum thought are rooted in a commitment to the relationship between formal educational experience and other contexts or dimensions of human experience: cultural, sociological, political, intra- and inter-personal, economic, etc. This relationship is understood as a major frame of reference for approaching curriculum reform and reconceptualization; further, both reform and reconceptualization are largely functions of a change in this relationship, and the educational community's interpretation of it, as human-kind progresses through time. In both cases, curricular expressions of educational experience can be said to evolve and transform in some relation to changes in the nature and meaning of other human
life-contexts. Traditional reformers, and particularly those of the late 1950's and early 1960's, and contemporary reconceptualists understand and interpret this relationship differently, and as a consequence the patterns of change in each are distinct.

In past instances and periods of reform in the curriculum field, change may be equated with "reaction" as it typically evolves as a reactionary consequence of change in other contexts of human life and experience. Reform presents itself as being responsive to such change, and "responsive" in this context means "to keep up with," to participate in harmony with the larger picture and, ultimately, to preserve that picture as it takes shape. Reforms have been haphazard, short-term reactions to problems of the immediate past or challenges of the immediate future, reactions to special, often isolated social causes and fragmented educational issues. These arrow into the schools from a myopic vision and sensibility. Herbert Kliebard notes:

In the curriculum field ... the urge to do good is so immediate, so direct, and so overwhelming, ... issues tend to arise de novo, usually in the form of a bandwagon and then quickly disappear in a cloud of dust ... The field in general is characterized by an uncritical propensity for novelty and change.28

Kliebard remarks that curriculum reforms of the past can be viewed as "drives for special causes that rise to prominence, then fade and die,"29 threatening to reduce what seems to be a field of curriculum to a series of curriculum movements. Tanner and Tanner note the patterns of change in reform movements similarly, implicating the questionable consequences of such curricular interpretation of the relationship between educational experience and change in other life-contexts:

A succession of shifting demands and priorities imposed upon the schools during different epochs of social crisis has resulted in curriculum imbalance and fragmentation. ...Curriculum change has been characterized by a spirit of ad hoc improvisation, deviation, or vogue ... The consequence is that such innovations and reforms are short-lived, for they are readily discarded in favor of whatever counter-reforms
and shifting priorities come into vogue with each succeeding social crisis ... measures are adopted, modified, discarded, and rediscovered so as to be in fashion with whatever socio-political tone is most pervasive at any given time.30

While it is true that neither formal educational experience (and curricular expression of it) nor other collective contexts of human existence is consistently or definitively determinant in relation to the other, the predominant direction of influence in the relationship is clear in traditional curriculum reform. In these periods, curriculum thought and practice seem to adapt to, take definition and direction from, "whatever socio-political tone is most pervasive at any given time";31 this, without asserting a challenge or a balance of spontaneity and invention; this, without significant instances of leading to give impactful definition and direction to other collective contexts of human existence. In sum, traditional curriculum reformers interpret their role in the relationship between educational experience and other life-contexts as reflective and reactive rather than affective or in any sense radical.

The process of contemporary reconceptualization intends to exemplify a pattern of change markedly different from patterns of traditional curriculum reform. The process evolves in an effort to supplant the reactionary, messianic, and myopic characteristics of traditional reform, supplant the fragmentation of the socio-cultural fabric and of the network of educational concerns. Reconceptualization evolves as an effort to reverse or at least balance the still-prevalent direction of influence in the relationship between educational experience and other human life-contexts. Largely, all of these shifts in patterns of change in the curriculum field are functions of a reconception of the nature of formal educational experience and its relation to other contexts of human experience: cultural, sociological, political, intra- and inter-personal, economic and so forth.

The expansive substance inherent in collective contexts of human experience requires a dialogical relationship with formal educational experience, one that will allow the educational community to affect such an expanse. And the evolutionary, transformational nature of those collective life-contexts requires a relationship with education that permits this community to participate with, signify and give direction to broader socio-cultural movement, flux and change. A reconceived ontology and teleology are in order for formal educational experience, more broad, pervasive, and transcontextual in nature. Such a reconception would
provide the philosophic and pragmatic foundation for heightening the affectiveness of educational experience in relation to the comprehensive course of human existence.

(The prefix "trans," from the Latin, means through, across and beyond, so as to change. "Context" comes from the Latin "com," meaning with, together, thoroughly, jointly, and from the Latin "texere," to weave. From the Latin "contextus," context means connection and coherence, and from its past participle "contexere," context means to weave together. Context refers to the many parts that surround a thing and illuminate it, a milieu, an environment. Relatedly, the word "contexture," also from the Latin "contextus," means the act, process or manner of weaving parts into a whole, and the structure so formed.)

For the reconceptualist, this level of synchronization between formal educational experience and other collective contexts of human experience is characterized by confluence. Formal educational experiences and settings are made distinct, yet they share a channel with the whole existential process, a channel allowing for two-way movement and reciprocal flow between formal education and all other human life-contexts. In a confluent relation, each part may touch and give signification and direction to the other through multivarious interchange.

Moreover, the pattern of change intended in the process of reconceptualization calls forth the notion of praxis, of reflection and action through educational experience that moves toward transforming the collective contexts of human experience. The contemporary reconceptualist studies the nature of human experience and formal education in order to make explicit the incongruities and paradoxes in their relationship. Such study intends to reveal aspects of human experience unchallenged and unquestioned, unreflected and unexpressed, untouched and undirected, handicapped and paralyzed by the nature of contemporary educational experience. These reconceptual shifts supplant the patterns of change characteristic of reforms in the history of the curriculum field.

These inherent differences between curriculum reform and reconceptualization as change-phenomena are largely consequences of a difference in vision. While several aspects of vision have already been delineated, two others bear discussion; it might be said that whereas disappointments of past reform are consequences of miscalculated vision, more appropriate calculations facilitate the promise of contemporary reconceptualization. In the following
discussion, vision signifies the time frame serving as a reference to define and guide changes in the content and function of curriculum research; secondly, vision refers to the variable angle of view with which the curricularist approaches the field in its totality.

The definition and character of reform have been described as reactionary rearrangements of fixed pedagogical elements, shifting priorities among fixed foundational concerns, a "shortsighted patchwork approach to past problems." Kliebard explains this in part as a consequence of the "ahistorical" time frame used by the field to guide change in curriculum research; "This tendency to denigrate the past in favor of an enlightened and inspired present has had several important consequences for the development of the curriculum field." This stance has not provided a sense of continuity and direction for the more fundamental, deliberate and conscientious development of the field and, concomitantly, for similar kinds of understanding of the nature of formal educational experience - and for informing such experience. Huebner puts it this way:

Curricularists have tended to be ahistorical in the awareness of the various forms and institutions that make up their professional gear. The search is often for the new and permanent vehicles of salvation, and thus we fall prey to bandwagons and the bankwagon mentality. We have a tendency to search for the final solution, and to think that we can discover the one and only best way to talk about curricular phenomena.

Kliebard suggests that curriculum theorists need not be involved with formal historical writing, but rather that "a kind of dialogue across generations," with "ancestral counterparts" about basic concerns and facts in the field would provide the kind of "cumulative approach" much needed in contemporary theorizing. Tanner and Tanner concur:

Many of the curriculum "reforms" and "new" ideas that have been urged upon the schools in recent years have deep historical rootings ... yet such efforts have been promoted as though they were entirely new, with the consequence that educators fail to benefit from the lessons that might be learned from the perspective of historical experience. This does not mean that contemporary problems in the curriculum field can
be solved by simply turning to the past, but rather that an understanding of the shortcomings, failures and successes of the past is essential to the intelligent reconstruction of the curriculum in the face of emergent conditions in the contemporary scene.  

A second set of miscalculations in the vision of the curriculum field as we have known it, largely responsible for the nature of past reform, are related to the angle of view with which curricularists have approached the field in its totality. Angle here denotes both the variable degree of comprehensiveness in the "curriculum picture" as the subject of research, and the variable levels of thought and modes of study used to approach the subjects of curriculum research.

Tanner and Tanner suggest that the "curriculum pictures" as the subjects of research have not been comprehensive, but rather fragmented, narrow, "microcurricular" pictures of isolated problems, issues or relationships. This, they remark, prevails "to the neglect of macrocurricular problems... in the absence of a holistic conception of curriculum... without sufficient consideration of the necessary organic interaction of the elements that comprise the curriculum in its totality." This relates to James Macdonald's observation that, as curriculum writing evolves, there has been little consensus in the field about the identification and definition of the realm of phenomena and the substantive concerns that are germane to holistic curriculum pictures and, consequently, holistic research. The focuses and functions of research are diverse, and their collective and complementary potential are undermined by an either/or sensibility... Macdonald notes that the variety held in the collective work, especially at the theoretical level, is confusing to curricularists themselves; "the result has been something like a series of theoretical exchanges which have often been at cross purposes." 

Reconceptualization as a process of change in curriculum research assumes its task from an angle of view that respects holistic, "macrocurricular" conceptions of curricular phenomena and pedagogical elements, and engages in theoretical, conceptual modes of inquiry. Reconceptualization intends a comprehensive understanding of educational experience, where traditional reform and research have affected its fragmentation; it intends to generate special curriculum theory and conceptual tools differentiated in function and focus from other levels of curriculum work and research, where the collective past has scorned, borrowed, or merely suggested theory.
To begin bridging the meaning of reconceptualization as a change-phenomenon with the particular modes and functions of reconceptual inquiry, Dwayne Huebner's remarks are significant:

...we fail to operate as historical beings and shirk our responsibility for the continual criticism and creation of new forms of language and new ways of speaking. To be aware of our historical nature is to be on top of our past, so we can use it as a base for projection into the future.\(^1\)

With respect to the nature of educational experience, the ways in which curricularists conceptualize and treat foundations and interrelated pedagogical elements, it is "the continual criticism and creation of new forms ... and new ways ... as a base for projection into the future"\(^2\) that begin to characterize reconceptual inquiry; it is criticism and creation taken together or critical inquiry which provides the foundation and material for post-critical theorizing, that distinguish the mode and function of this emergent group of curriculum reconceptualists.

William Pinar extends and clarifies the meaning of this combined historical and emergent posture, which looks ahead to invent the new in informed ways, in the following manner; this passage is an unpublished draft of Pinar's "Preface" to _Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists_: 

I am thinking of Nietzsche's allegory of the three stages of humankind. The first stage is the camel, the beast of burden. One does the work of one's master, balking once in a great while when conditions become unbearable, but on the whole performing one's duties with compliance. The second stage is the critic, the attacker of herd values and oppression. He points out the errors of those who conform unthinkingly to other's values, as well as the problems of those values. The third stage is the highest evolutionary point; Nietzsche uses the image of the child and the Messiah. She is not a servant to others as is the camel, nor is she absorbed with the evil of others as is the critic. She is goodness, grace, and beauty; she is creation ... As a race we seem to go through this
progression perpetually... As is with race, so it is with a field of study. A tradition accumulates, and many initiates accept uncritically the values of that tradition. Their work is that of application, and occasionally the extension of that work theoretically... To surpass this situation, which becomes one of atrophy, the critic is required. His task is complicated and often thankless. It involves learning the language of the heritage, of the masters, in order to be understood. This learning nearly always occurs because the critic comes of age in the tradition; it is through his own usually painful self-education that he comes to realize the difficulties with accepted tradition. Only then does he begin to criticize in hope of rectifying the situation. While the criticism is consciously aimed at his colleagues, the real target lies within him, placed there by his early acculturation. So the effects of criticism are as discomforting to the critic as to those who are criticized. Yet this second stage is necessary for the third to begin... The final stage has just begun in the curriculum field. Some of us have begun to turn our attention from the past... and begun to look to the present and to the future.  

With reference to Pinar's view of a field of study, reconceptualization actually signifies the curriculum field's full journey as Nietzsche describes it for humankind, through tradition, criticism, and creation or invention. While the forward thrust of reconceptualization focuses its vision on the highest point, the third stage of creation in curriculum inquiry, thought and practice, this work does not emerge without secure grounding in and understanding of the whole evolutionary process in the field. The curriculum theorists residing at the highest evolutionary point in the field's journey must sustain genuine connections with the traditions from which their work evolves and a comprehensive understanding of the criticism through which their work is motivated. The reconceptualists must dwell in all three stages of the field's journey through time in order to develop insightful and authentic departures in the curriculum field itself and in the nature of educational experience. Living as historical beings, the reconceptualists aim to affect curricular change, the nature and patterns of which
will supplant the short-sighted vision of the reformers.

Although Pinar engages as a participant in reconceptual inquiry, he also assumes the posture of observer and the task of historian of this "movement just underway" in the editing of *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*; here Pinar weaves his interpretations of reconceptual modes and functions into the organizational scheme he creates for the contributors and into the prefaces he writes for each section. Pinar's observations, and those of Paul R. Klohr and Janet Miller who also engage in historians' tasks, play a significant role in the descriptions of reconceptual inquiry collected for this chapter. Focus on the interpretations expressed by these individuals reflects this present writer's point of view; certainly the nature of reconceptual inquiry may be interpreted differently by others at the present and in the future as this movement grows and matures.

When Pinar names Macdonald's third group of curricularists "the reconceptualists," he explains that they comprise only 3%-5% of the curriculum field. He understands this group as situated at the highest point of creation, having evolved through tradition and criticism, with no less a function than to generate new modes of theorizing in order to re-make the field. Although the call for alternatives may be interpreted by others as recognition of the need to complement traditional and empirical inquiry, many contemporary reconceptualists themselves would agree with Pinar that their collective function is first to challenge and then to supplant these other modes of inquiry. The reconceptualists understand their function in relation to the curriculum field as radical, as a literal reconceptualization of the modes and functions of inquiry. At a second level, their function is to generate theory in answer to the "call" they interpret as the need for fundamental understanding of the nature of educational experience, or the human existential, biographic experience of education. Pinar speculates that the fruits of reconceptual work, the emergent theoretical understandings, will have the power to alter the nature of traditional and empirical inquiry. He explains that at its most ambitious, the field will become a synthesis of two cultures, the scientific and the artistic and humanistic.

The intention to understand the human experience of education symbolizes the collective function of the reconceptual movement and literature; traditional intentions have been to guide and to prescribe for practitioners in their decision-making tasks in the classroom, and to arrange schema for the task of curriculum development; and empirical intentions have been to investigate and to measure, to predict and to control the variables of curricular phenomena and
behavioral change. Reconceptual intentions are more fundamental:

The function of this work would appear to be to understand, and this understanding is of the sort aimed at and sometimes achieved in the humanities. 46

The finding of new ways to understand and talk about the human experience of education necessitates the raising of new questions about the importance and the consequences of the educational journey, not considered or comprehended by previous curricular research. For the reconceptualists, this has meant looking at individuals and curricular phenomena in new ways, and then functioning in new ways in relation to both; the reconceptualists ask questions about the interaction of individuals and curricular phenomena that are of a different order than those that can be raised and answered through traditional and empirical modes.

The reconceptualists do not function primarily or initially in relation to practical/practitioners' tasks, observable and measurable events and behavior, or objective experience of education and the public world. Instead, their function relates to the internal and subjective experience of education and the existential experience of public arrangements and life-contexts, inner regions of experience that are neither represented nor penetrated through curricular designs of observable, objective reality. The reconceptualists attempt to understand the workings of these regions, and doing so necessitates a different kind of looking at individuals and curricular phenomena with variables, necessitates a reconceptualization of all pedagogical elements and curricular foundations, and their relationships. With this new looking, the reconceptualists function to identify, elucidate and understand inward dimensions of human experience that come into play in curricular phenomena, untouched through traditional designs, empirical research and their corresponding curricular practices. Pinar suggests:

Educational research as it is presently conducted cannot focus on interior reality, cannot eventuate in pedagogy that facilitates such inward turning. Its focus is elsewhere, on the public, the visible; this may have been adequate in the past, however I rather think it is a stage necessary to pass through in order to enable more comprehensive focus in the present and future. We have come as far as we can by focusing on the externals, and even those
foci of the traditionalists - curricular designs, instructional styles, objectives - roles of these can only be further comprehended in the context of educational experience with the alternative focus on inner experience. 47

In combination with their "subjective" function, the reconceptualists perform a "political" function. They note in often passionate ways the political dimensions of formal educational experience, as well as the inevitable, necessary and potentially productive confluence shared by formal educational settings and broad socio-political circumstances and life-contexts. For the reconceptualists, curriculum theory must be rooted in a sophisticated awareness of political phenomena. The message is clear, as expressed by Dwayne Huebner:

If we remember that education is a political activity in which some people influence others, and that school is one way to organize that power and influence, then perhaps we can try to share the control of the school and use it for our political purposes...the school can be, in part, an extension of our will and power - a vehicle for our political concerns. If we remember this, then we can recognize that the struggle to remake the school is the struggle to make a more just public world.... Talk about it in such a way that the political and economic nature of education can be clearly seen... What are the ingredients of this talk? There are three, three rights...First, the unconditional respect for the political, civil, and legal rights of the young as free people participating in the public world...The second right is the right of access to the wealth in the public domain - I mean primarily the knowledge, traditions, skills that shape and increase a person's power in the public world...The last right...is the right of each individual, regardless of age, to participate in the shaping and reshaping of the institutions within which he lives...The school is but a manifestation of public life. As educators we must be political activists who seek a more just public world. The
alternative, of course, is to be school people - satisfied with the existing social order.\^48

The reconceptualists bring to the fore, and develop foundations for thinking about, holism, inward/individual and outward/collective potency, politics, consciousness, temporality, transcendence, creativity, valuations, and human interests in relation to educational and existential experience, toward their collective intention to understand - the kind of understanding that will reconceive the nature of educational experience and the role of schooling.

In his "Preface" to Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, Pinar explains that "this attempt to understand has led to two functionally different kinds of work."\^49 First, the reconceptualists engage in criticism of contemporary educational experience and of traditional and empirical inquiries into and explanations of that experience; such criticism evolves from aesthetic, historical, methodological, socio-cultural and political points of view. Second, the reconceptualists in post-critical theorizing, or a movement from criticism to the creative articulation of new understandings and the generation of theory. It is on the basis of these functionally different kinds of work that Pinar establishes an organizational scheme for the collected papers in his text. The book is divided into four sections: (1) the state of the field, (2) historical criticism, (3) political and methodological criticism, and (4) post-critical theorists.

Consonant with their new functions are shifts in reconceptualist syntactical structures, or modes of inquiry, in both criticism and creation. They move away from technological and scientific approaches and language, inappropriate to their function; they move away from the language taken-for-granted by school people and from the strict application of borrowed theories and empirical methodologies. For the reconceptualists, theorizing is creative; new realms of thought and methodologies from other fields are used; however, these are drawn subjectively, through the reconceptualist's own experiential and existential base. Existentialism, phenomenology, the arts and humanities, sensitivities to cultural developments and political life, and radical psychoanalysis have offered the reconceptualists methodological tools with which to probe and understand the nature of educational experience. They have also drawn on humanistic reconceptualizations of such cognate fields as sociology, anthropoplogy, and political science. Their approaches are often philosophical, historical or literary. It is clear that the reconceptualists bring conceptual tools from other traditions to bear on the notion of curriculum as
an environment-producing field, and they generate conceptual tools from their own experiential frames to bear on the notion of curriculum as a knowledge-producing field.

It is significant to note at this point that conflicts do exist within this young movement of reconceptualists, conflicts between the subjective and political views which are manifest in different kinds of reconceptual inquiry. Janet Miller articulates a central conflict in "Quality: Perspectives in Reconceptualization," a paper she presented at the Virginia conference:

...it would be incorrect to assume that individuals who work within the Reconceptualist framework utilize similar methodologies, or work from similar philosophical or ideological bases. There are divergent views being expressed by those who are identified with the Reconceptualist movement. We must pay attention to apparent splits...

The emphasis of the work of the "postcriticals" -- Huebner, Macdonald, Greene, Phenix, Pilder, Murphy, Pinar, Willis, and Shuchat Shaw -- is "Self" and the tools utilized to explicate self are those of existentialism and phenomenology. The purpose of the postcritical thinkers, defined by Pinar, is "to understand" one's self as well as the nature of educational experience. The modes of inquiry are literary, historical, and philosophical, and Pinar's work, especially, demonstrates the strong influence of psycho-analytic theory.

William Burton, in a correspondence with Pinar in November, 1974, states that Pinar's definition of postcritical-- a concern with transcendence and consciousness, a moving away from the criticism of the old into a creation of the new-- obscures and minimizes the importance and necessity for political criticism and action. Burton states that the existential-phenomenological approach which characterizes Pinar's "post critical" thinking is an evasion of the reality of political oppression which characterizes life in the 1970's. Reliance upon such existential-phenomenological methodology,
Burton asserts, mystifies the issues and can only lead to a dead-end. Pinar's reply is that all acts must begin with self, and the recognition of self and of one's place in the world becomes ultimately political, for one is then free to act once one has understanding; one's experience may then be placed within its political, social, and psycho-social dimensions.

Burton's criticism of the concepts which characterize the "postcritical" modes of thinking are representative of a number of those who are concerned with the realities of oppression.

...people are working to reconceptualize not only a field which we name curriculum, but also the perceptions and angles of viewing the world which guide our actions and reactions to ourselves and others. Obviously, too, modes of inquiry, purposes, methods of analysis differ radically among Reconceptualists. The danger appears to be a negation of one another's perceptions through close adherence to the dictates of one's own convictions.50

In Paul Klohr's presentation at the Xavier conference, "Curriculum Theory: The State of the Field," he calls attention to nine common threads that run through the work of the reconceptualists, not all of which may be found within the work of each individual. These threads are included here as a conclusion to this section:

1. A holistic, organic view is taken of man and his relation to nature.

2. The individual becomes the chief agent in the construction of knowledge; that is, he is a culture creator as well as a culture bearer.

3. The curriculum theorist draws heavily on his own experiential base as method.

4. Curriculum theorizing recognizes as major resources the preconscious realms of experience.
5. The foundational roots of their theorizing lie in existential philosophy, phenomenology and radical psychoanalysis, also drawing on humanistic reconceptualizations of such cognate fields as sociology, anthropology, and political science.

6. Personal liberty and the attainment of higher levels of consciousness become central values in the curriculum process.

7. Diversity and pluralism are celebrated in both social ends and in the proposals projected to move toward those ends.

8. A reconceptualization of supporting political-social operations is basic.

9. New language forms are generated to translate fresh meanings—metaphors, for example.
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CHAPTER III.

CONGRUENCE: A METHODOLOGY FOR AESTHETIC CURRICULAR CRITICISM AND POST-CRITICAL THEORIZING: DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION

A number of reconceptualists have assumed meta-theoretical tasks with respect to the development of subjects, purposes and methodologies appropriate to reconceptualized curriculum inquiry and to an emergent discipline of curriculum theory. Paul Klohr suggests that reconceptualists frequently indicate in their work, explicitly or implicitly, "some of the additional work that needs to be undertaken to move the curriculum theory field forward"; he notes that such self-conscious, self-critical efforts are characteristic of the reconceptual movement and demonstrate "a significant level of maturity in the field" of curriculum inquiry. Those who engage in meta-theoretical tasks encourage the reconceptualist's collective effort to be self-observing and conscientious about the selection of curricular phenomena as subjects of inquiry; the development of new methodologies specific to the display and exploration of meanings and relations among curricular phenomena; and the delineation of intentions and aims for inquiry that direct the application of new methods toward the disclosure of meanings and relations and the generation of theory. John S. Mann expresses this meta-theoretical posture, making recommendations which this present research responds:

...I would suggest that it may be fruitful to observe the following points in efforts to build curriculum theory. First, assumptions about syntactical, organizational, and substantive structures should be made explicit to whatever extent possible. Second, problems should be identified in relation to these structures rather than in relation to "practical" problems of schooling. Organizational structures will suggest boundaries to the phenomena to be studied. Syntactical structures rather than methodologies borrowed
wholesale from other disciplines will suggest the approach to achieving warranted assertability. And substantive structures will generate models of interesting relationships among phenomena. It is at this stage, the generation of models, that speculation is appropriate...If the gathering of data is intended to further the development of the theory rather than to generate solutions to specific problems, the data must be interpreted accordingly. The main thrust of interpretation should not be toward application to school problems but toward refinement of models. The conclusion drawn from a study...should not be of the order of recommendation for practice but of the order of correcting speculations about the relations between...variables of interest.

This chapter represents an effort to develop congruence as a reconceptual methodology for curriculum criticism and post-critical theorizing. Congruence, as a method of inquiry, is held to be appropriate to the display and exploration of meanings and relations among curricular phenomena described as the "subject" of the present study in Chapter I; with the intention to disclose contemporary conceptions of knowledge and relations between these and educational methods in secondary cinematic arts education, this chapter focuses on the development and general application of the method's conceptual scheme (or disclosure model), fundamental assumptions, and aesthetic principles. The development and application of congruence constitute a response to and expansion of metatheoretical proposals for reconceptual inquiry in the work of Mann and George H. Willis; guidance and direction provided by these meta-theorists are interwoven and linked with descriptions of congruence through this chapter, reflecting the present writers' efforts to attend to self-observing tasks and participate cohesively with others to reconceptualize curriculum inquiry.
1. Conceptual Meta-Scheme

Throughout the history of the curriculum field, conceptual schema and models have been generated to reflect inquirers' perception of curricular phenomena and to facilitate inquiry about the designs and interacting variables of interest that constitute curricular phenomena. Such schema are both descriptive, reflecting the way in which individuals and collectives view or participate in educational experience, and prescriptive, having significant influence in directing the nature and interaction of variables that constitute educational experience. The conceptual scheme developed for the method of congruence begins as a descriptive expression of selected phenomena; this scheme becomes a disclosure model, permitting explanation of the nature and interaction of variables that constitute phenomena; finally, this scheme may be used in prescriptive ways, as it shares with other models the capability of translating descriptions and explanations into critical and theoretical positions about curricular practice.

The scheme developed for the method of congruence is actually a conceptual meta-scheme, generalizing and representing four spheres of curriculum inquiry and practice integral to most comprehensive curricular/instructional systems and situations. These four spheres are: Cluster A, six complex characteristics of the authors of curricular/instructional systems and situations, serving as sources of and influences on conceptual positions and practical decisions within the systems and situations; Substantive Domain, three conventional curricular foundations which become the conceptual subjects and central concerns of the sources of and influences on, both curriculum criticism/theory and development/practice; Critical Inquiry and Theory, representing the critical and theoretical questions and concerns of all kinds that might be formulated in the context of a particular curricular/instructional system or situation; Curriculum Development Sphere, the interacting pedagogical elements that fall into curricular/instructional designs and comprise events in school systems and classroom situations. In the conceptual meta-scheme, these four spheres are situated in a configuration or design which reflects the
potential interaction of the various levels of curriculum inquiry and practice represented by the spheres and the elements within the spheres. While this meta-scheme generalizes the dimensions and elements that constitute and interact in most educational environments, the scheme may be used to identify and describe concrete events in the classroom, particular patterns in a cluster of classroom events, the nature of a course or cluster of departmental courses over time, the nature of an entire school system - all in comprehensive, multi-leveled ways. This scheme is developed with the hope of finding new and more comprehensive ways to apprehend curricular phenomena and to engage in criticism and post-critical theorizing about phenomena. (See Diagrams I, II, III, and IV).
Diagram I: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Four Spheres of Inquiry and Practice Integral to Curricular/Instructional Systems
Diagram II: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Cluster A and the Substantive Domain
Diagram III: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Substantive Domain and Its Relation to Other Spheres
Diagram IV: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Curriculum Development Sphere and Its Relation to Other Spheres
The development of this meta-scheme derives from the assumption that a curricular/instructional system, situation or environment is comprehensive and multi-leveled and can be represented as a design of interacting spheres and elements. These spheres, the elements within them, and all potential interactions within the scheme represent variables which are more often implicit and inaccessible than explicit and available for scrutiny. In order to ferret out and disclose the meanings and interaction of these variables in a particular system or situation for critical inquiry and eventual theorizing toward change, the scheme displays the environment in its comprehensive and multi-leveled form. As the spheres and elements are displayed and described in the context of a particular comprehensive environment, the meanings and relations of selected variables represented might become the focus for critical inquiry and post-critical theorizing when the method of congruence is applied.

Much like a work of art, this entire scheme, or environmental design, is an organism, an organic unity, with a life of its own which may become the subject of aesthetic modes of critical and theoretical inquiry. That is, the design is a symbolic representation of ideas embodied and made explicit by the interacting parts taken together. Various levels of these ideas can be disclosed through aesthetic analysis of the interacting pedagogical elements, such as the meanings of the individual elements themselves in relation to one another in the Curriculum Development Sphere as well as the implicit foundational conceptions and values that underlie these elements in the Substantive Domain and Cluster A.

The function of analyzing the pedagogical elements is to provide explanation for the nature and function of each as all interact to form the whole, the design; the function of tracing implicit foundational conceptions that underlie the pedagogical elements is to provide a means to account for the environment as the living organism it seems to be. A display of the design which delineates the elements and the structure of their interaction can facilitate the making of statements and the drawing of inferences; these statements and inferences would concern the manner and degree of organic harmony or discord among the elements as well as the nature of foundational conceptions and values which may account for such harmony or discord. More specific to this critique, the display of the cinematic arts education environment, or environments which influence it, may disclose the prevailing foundational conceptions of knowledge and educational methods and permit the raising of questions about their congruence or incongruence as well as their appropriateness to this specific field; further, as this display may facilitate the disclosure of implicit conceptions of knowledge prevailing in the environment, these may provide a means for explaining the
nature of methods as they seem to exist within the environment.

As the methodology of congruence is used to make such disclosures, it asserts aesthetic standards of organic unity with which to judge and assess a curricular/instructional system or situation. Specific to this critique, conceptions of knowledge and educational methods ought to be appropriate to the cinematic arts, fully congruent with one another, wholly integrated with one another, authentic translations of one another. In turn, as implicit conceptions of knowledge are disclosed and considered in specific relation to the cinematic arts, these may be used to account for the nature of the harmonious or discordant relation shared by knowledge and methods. These ideas will be developed in later sections in this chapter devoted to the fundamental assumptions and aesthetic principles belonging to the method of congruence.

Finally, the conceptual scheme must be developed in a way that permits the application of the method of congruence to generate the kind of disclosures and understandings that pave the way for post-critical tasks. Methods must be agents of praxis, of both reflection and action on critical disclosures toward the reconceptualization of discordant educational environments.

Mann associates the development and use of a scheme or model with the transformation of the practitioner's material into the critic-theorist's material. He suggests that the critic-theorist generalize and relate the various levels of thought and practice, both implicit and explicit, from curricular/instructional environments, and that s/he then engage in analysis of a different order than the practitioner might:

Whereas the practitioner employs his material in the context of discovering means and ends, the critic may employ the same material as data for his analysis of the designs of educational events. Where the practitioner seeks solutions to problems, the critic seeks meaning in the manner in which problems are posed and solved. Where the practitioner may customarily evaluate his practices by examining their consequences, the critic construes practice as falling in designs that may be accounted for as expressions of meaning.
Mann exemplifies such a transformation of material and shift in order of inquiry in the following passage; his use of this example derives from a concern with one aspect of the present study, "the various conceptions of the nature, function, source and uses of knowledge that are implicitly conveyed to students through contrasting methods of transmitting knowledge."

The school practitioner seeks answers to such questions as what is known and what should be known. These questions concern the critic not because he seeks answers to them but because the fact that they are asked, as well as the processes the practitioner employs in seeking answers to them and the character of answers accepted, all constitute data for him. These fall into designs which it is the critic's task to analyze. Thus he will seek, for example, to discover what ideas about (1) the nature of knowledge, (2) the processes by which knowledge is acquired, (3) the values associated with knowledge ... are entailed in the designs he observes. For instance, whereas the science teacher may be interested in discovering whether a pupil knows Boyle's Law or in how to get a pupil to know it, the critic is interested in discovering what meanings of "knowledge" may account for both the teacher's analysis of the problem and his teaching behavior with respect to the problem. The critic may discover, for example, that teachers vary considerably from each other and from established epistemologies in their understanding of the meaning of the scientific assertion that something is known. They vary, that is, in their understanding of the logical status of something regarded as known. And these observations in turn may account for or explain similarities and contrasts between different science instruction situations.

As the meta-scheme facilitates the description of curricular phenomena in a particular system, or the display and identification of meanings and interactions of variables, a set of critical and theoretical questions and concerns can be formulated for the purpose of centering or focusing inquiry within the scheme. At this point, the scheme may be treated
as a disclosure model, permitting the critic-theorist to move from description to the tasks of explaining, accounting for, establishing reasons and tracing causes for the nature and interaction of variables constituting phenomena. Any set of critical and theoretical questions and concerns may be situated centrally within the sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry. From its center position, the process of inquiry may proceed in two directions to explore and relate: the conceptual foundations and assumptions tied into curricular/instructional thought at the levels of Cluster A and the Substantive Domain; and the patterns of interacting pedagogical elements falling into designs and comprising events in curricular/instructional practice at the level of the Curriculum Development Sphere.

With specific regard to the use of the conceptual meta-scheme for this research, a delineation of the sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry in relation to the other three spheres must precede the remainder of this section devoted to the scheme itself. (See Diagrams V and VI).
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Diagram V: Conceptual Meta-Scheme; Sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry and Its Relation to Other Spheres
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Diagram VI: Conceptual Meta-Scheme For the Application of Congruence
The central focus for critical inquiry and post-critical theorizing in this research may be simplistically identified as the relation shared by a subject of study and educational methods selected and developed for that subject. As this focus expands, it assumes the following logic for critical exploration and theorizing: to identify, disclose and understand prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, source and use of knowledge attending and influencing contemporary cinematic arts education at the secondary level; to identify, disclose and understand conceptions of educational methods in this same context; to explore the existing and potential relation shared by conceptions of knowledge and of methods in this context; to search for flaws in prevailing conceptions of knowledge, or assumptions about knowledge that are inappropriate to the cinematic arts; to use misconceptions about knowledge as a way of accounting for misconceived educational methods that spring from flawed assumptions about knowledge. The sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry, as stated previously, is situated centrally, between the conceptual foundation of "knowledge" in the Substantive Domain and the interacting pedagogical elements choreographed by educational methods in the Curriculum Development Sphere; as the scheme displays the meanings of these variables in a particular system or situation, the sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry may relate embedded conceptions of knowledge to practiced educational methods. The way in which this forms a "subject" of inquiry has been suggested by Mann; and within this central sphere the "subject" expands into the cluster of critical and theoretical questions and concerns described in Chapter I, the "Introduction."

With the critical/theoretical focus delineated, more detailed descriptions of Cluster A, the Substantive Domain, and the Curriculum Development Sphere are necessary. It must be noted preliminarily that Joseph Schwab's analysis of the three structures of disciplines, the organizational, substantive, and syntactic, have been borrowed to construct aspects of the spheres and elements in the meta-conceptual scheme for this research.

Cluster A is comprised of six categories that might be used to create a comprehensive characterization of authors of curricular/instructional systems or situations. These characteristics represent a significant profile of major sources of and influences on conceptual positions and practical decisions that infuse the entire curricular/instructional system or situation. In a sense, this sphere constitutes a foundational matrix of variable assumptions, experiences and inclinations which authors bring to all conceptual, theoretical, critical, developmental and practical curriculum tasks. To explore this sphere is to raise the following questions: what are particular authors' philosophic foundations,
valuations, organizational and syntactic structures and understandings, educational/biographical experiences, and existential/biographical experiences; and what influence do these characteristics exert as the authors engage in developing curricular/instructional environments for the educational experience of others?

A characterization of author's philosophical foundations and valuations might evolve as answers to the following questions:

1. What are the relationship and responsibilities of formal educational experience to the whole human existential process, all self-experience, all inter-human exchange, all human interaction with socio-cultural environments and life-contexts?

2. What are the aims, objectives, and purposes of formal educational experience, and in relation to what conception of individuals and collectives in time and place?

3. In accordance with what ontologies, teleologies and epistemologies ought formal educational experience be conceived?

4. In accordance with what human value systems and ethics structures ought the themes, focus and function of formal educational experience be conceived?

Organizational and syntactic structures associated with authors of curricular/instructional environments represent particular kinds of understandings and inclinations, borrowed from Schwab's analysis of disciplines. Organizational structures or understandings refer to the authors' definition of curriculum, conceptions of and approach to the field of curriculum, the role of curriculum inquiry and planning in relation to formal educational experience, the distinction between and relation shared by the curricular subfields of theory, development, criticism and practice. Authors' organizational structures connote their self-understanding as a curricularist and their assumptions about the responsibilities and tasks that constitute that role. With special regard to reconceptual inquirers, organizational structures stake out the reaches of critical and theoretical inquiry, delimiting the curricular phenomena specifically appropriate to these sorts of study.

In accordance with Schwab's analysis of disciplines, the syntactic structures used by curricularists in their own
field of study "are the patterns of its procedures, its method, how it goes about using its conceptions to attain its goals." These are the methods and modes for study. For gathering and evaluating perceptions and information, for generating proof and new knowledge. The syntactic structures used by authors of curricular/instructional environments must refer also to the bodies of knowledge, referential fields and resourceful traditions from which language, concepts and methods are borrowed and brought to curricular tasks; as curriculum inquiry is both a knowledge-producing and environment-producing field, the syntactic structures used are of necessity wide-ranging, diverse, and frequently multi- or interdisciplinary. As Dwayne Huebner explains:

...even a cursory glance over the language referring to curricular phenomena throughout the years indicates the multiple sources of our language. At various times curricularists have drawn freely from philosophy, theology, psychology and other behavioral sciences, sometimes various humanities and technologies and often the common sense language of non-disciplined persons. The curricularists' dependence on a variety of other disciplines and enterprises as the sources of his language...can be a strength for the field, for without built-in structures of criticism and creation, as an established scientific community, curricular language could stagnate.

It has become clear that syntactic structures used by authors of environments for the educational experience of others impact as heavily on conceptual positions and practical/developmental decisions embedded in a system as do philosophical foundations and valuations. As Dwayne Huebner notes, syntactic orientations carry with them particular functions intended by authors, functions of curriculum inquiry which arrow in to influence the whole of a particular scheme or system; Huebner describes six syntactic categories, (1) description, (2) explanation, (3) control, manipulation, or prediction, (4) legitimation, (5) prescription, and (6) affiliation.

Two categories of an author's biographical experience, the educational and existential, are also significant sources of and influences on the curricular/instructional environments s/he helps to create through all levels of curriculum
inquiry and practice. Both categories refer to areas of experience that may be unique to the individual curricularist, that is, the individual's personal educational experiences and existential experiences of all socio-cultural phenomena and life-contexts in a particular time and place; although these categories may permit generalizations about a cohering group of authors, these characteristics have closer ties to the curricularist as a holistic human being with a unique blend of personal dimensions. It might also be noted that educational/biographic experience refers to the curricularists' experiences within the Curriculum Development Sphere or the sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry, in professional roles; these experiences are synthesized with the author's personal experience of formal education as a student to comprise the whole of this element within Cluster A. While traditional and empirical inquirers have attempted to engage in curricular tasks with the intention to suppress their own educational and existential experiences as personal sources and knowledge on which to draw, reconceptual inquirers are explicitly processing their own educational and existential experiences as a direct source for informing their curricular tasks. The very special and important relationship between the more personal and self-expressive dimensions of the individual curricularist and his/her focus, method and function of inquiry have been largely unexplored and unacknowledged. Curricular inquiry, just as any other significant professional endeavor, involves a blending of the personal dimensions of the "self" with dimensions that may be temporarily labelled professional. Curriculum inquiry and practice might be more productively informed and shaped by these unique dimensions, were they acknowledged, explicit, and accessible.

The Substantive Domain, the third sphere of the meta-scheme to be considered, brings together and represents three conventional "curricular foundations"; (1) knowledge, subject areas or fields, (2) the human being as learner, and (3) socio-cultural realities, phenomena and life contexts constitute the central substantive concerns and conceptual foundations of all forms of curriculum inquiry. From the view of the critic-theorist, these referents are "sources" for curriculum authors, developers, and practitioners who interpret or conceptualize them in various ways to be translated into pedagogical elements designed to interact in curricular events and practice; as conceptual foundations underlying or implicit in practice and embedded in a comprehensive curricular/instructional system, these referents concern the critic-theorist for the manner in which they are interpreted, translated into and related to practice. Authors, developers and practitioners, who assume curricular tasks within a system comprehensively mapped by the meta-scheme, bring Cluster A characteristics and dimensions to
bear on their conceptualization of substantive foundations and translation of these into practice; this is the view the critic-theorist would hold, although authors themselves may not have an explicit awareness of such steps or the movement from conceptual levels of thought toward concrete levels of practice.

While organizational distinctions between curricular subfields such as theory (critic-theorists) and development (authors, developers, practitioners) might be more precise in terms of function, as each relates to formal educational experience in functionally distinct ways, these subfields share substantive foundations as subjects of inquiry and concern. Schwab explains that the substantive structure of a discipline consists of "a body of concepts - commitments about the nature of a subject matter functioning as a guide to inquiry." This structure is defined by the nature of the phenomena, knowledge, and variables of interest considered to be germane within the organizational boundaries; more simply, this structure represents the substantive focus of inquiry (or focuses) to which curricularists are committed (although the nature of the commitment might vary, and the labelling of the focus might vary slightly). Curricularists have identified and labelled the substantive structures of theory and development in various manners, dependent on point of view and the function of the scheme. The substantive structures for both curriculum theory and development are understood here as a realm of concerns and phenomena central to the tasks of theoretical and developmental inquiry or work/study; this realm has been variously named: the central concerns or conceptual tools of curriculum inquiry, its fundamental units or basic referents; the sources of and influences on theoretical subjects and developmental objectives; the subjects of analysis, conceptualization, interpretation and relationships around which theorizing revolves and from which developmental decisions are made. In Diagram III, the substantive domain is enlarged so as to reveal its central position in relation to both theory and development; however, it is clear that the nature, level and order of consideration, interpretation, and conceptualization will differ for theory and development. Stated in another way, and with reference Diagrams I, III, and IV, curriculum development can, and is ordinarily found to, proceed in relation to the substantive structures without theoretical foundations; however, as suggested in this four-part Diagram, theory can productively mediate the relationship between curriculum development and the substantive domain.

Knowledge, the learner, and society have evolved to become the "basic foundational structures...which have withstood to some extent the test of time and experiment and have achieved some degree of stability within a discipline,"
in this case, curriculum. These subjects are explored and conceptualized in terms of their "nature" as they seem relevant to a consideration of the curriculu, interacting pedagogical elements, curricular phenomena, and educational experience, in various and differing ways from the views of all inquirers assuming curricular tasks at all levels of thought and practice. These foundations, and the domain they comprise together, are of particular importance within the meta-scheme to reconceptual inquirers who attempt to reconceive them, understand them in new ways, through criticism and post-critical theorizing. For this reason, a brief tracing of the evolution of these foundations to their refinement in the field is included here.

In the Yearbooks of the National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Teaching, established in 1895, men such as Charles DeGarmo and Frank McMurry identify human growth and development and the subject matter content as referents for curriculum development, stressing their sequential correlation. As early as 1902 John Dewey suggests that the fundamental factors in the educational process are the learner, society, and organized subject matter. Less than two decades later, W. W. Charters and Franklin Bobbitt bring to the fore the notion of studying contemporary life and analyzing industrial and technological realities as they might be relevant to the understanding and determination of curricular phenomena.

From the 1926 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, the notion of "foundational sources" central and appropriate to curriculum inquiry emerge in a formal sense. In the first chapter, "The School Curriculum and the Drama of American Life," Harold Rugg explains that curriculum inquiry must be grounded in a concern for human growth and development and the "dynamic content of American civilization." He points to the need for a unified curriculum within which a synthesized conception of knowledge will facilitate congruence between the educational process and contemporary, practical life. Part II of the 1926 Yearbook addresses the relationship between the educational institution and the society and growing individual, pointing out the school's responsibility to both. This clearly establishes both society and the individual learner as two foundational referents of curriculum inquiry.

In a 1931 essay, "Education at the Crossroads," Boyd H. Bode identifies three sources of curricular aims: the subject matter specialist, the interests of the learner, and the standpoint of the practical man participating in contemporary life. Two years later, the 1933 Yearbook of the National Society of College Teachers of Education, The Educational Frontier, reinforced this emphasis on societal
frameworks for consideration of curricular directions.

In *The Changing Curriculum*, the 1937 Report of the Joint Committee on Curriculum (Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study) posited that curriculum inquiry must evolve from a foundation synthesizing individual growth and development and the values of society. Further, this report sketches the basic role for human growth and development data, implying that subject matter context could be sequenced in relation to such data.

In 1942, *Exploring the Curriculum*, H. H. Giles, S. P. McCutchen and A. N. Zechiel identify three basic approaches to curricular analysis and organization, in connection with their work in the Eight-year Study. These approaches were based on adolescent needs, specialized subject matter, and social demands. Several years later, Hilda Taba discussed three "sources of data" for curriculum inquiry in *American Education in the Post War Period*: studies of learners, studies of society, and studies of subject matter content. And finally, Ralph Tyler is credited with refining the three "sources for educational objectives;" in *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, Tyler lists these as studies of learners, studies of contemporary life outside the school, and suggestions from subject matter specialists.

As these three "subjects" co-exist in the Substantive Domain, they constitute a structure within which they share a sensitive relationship with one another. The value of "structure" as a concept lies in its emphasis on relations among and meanings shared by parts comprising the whole rather than on parts taken separately; this emphasis aspires to principles of organic unity and functional cohesion. As Susanne Langer states in *An Introduction to Symbolic Logic*:

"The structure of a thing is the way it is put together. Anything that has structure, then, must have parts, properties or aspects which are somehow related to each other. In every structure we may distinguish the relation or relations, and the items related."

Knowledge, the human being as learner, and socio-cultural realities and phenomena as subjects comprising the structure merely stake out a field of vision, and it is the relation or relations shared among the subjects which give focus to that field in all processes of inquiry. It becomes important to maintain this notion of structure with its emphasis on relations, so as to disallow fragmentation, biases and
fixedness and to ensure unity and flexibility of relations, signification and conceptualization among the substantive foundations of inquiry.

The Substantive Domain is like a tree, which is a structure or a set of relations among trunk, limbs, branches and leaves. However, the tree is part of a landscape which is a larger, more encompassing structure; and, each part of the tree itself is a structure which has related parts. As a consequence, the process of conceptualization from the views of authors, developers, practitioners and critics-theorists depends upon (1) a comprehensive rather than fragmented consideration of the referents as interconnected, confluent areas of inquiry, (2) an interdisciplinary, transcontextual consideration of the referents, as if each were a dynamic and diverse field rather than a fixed and narrow body of givens, and (3) a comprehensive consideration of these referents in confluent relation with the larger landscape, all existential phenomena and life-contexts, inclusive of but broader than the educational community, in time and place, and of which the referents are a natural part.

A great responsibility rests upon curricular inquiry as it focuses on the substantive structures with the intention of generating developmental and theoretical foundations for thinking about curriculum and formal educational experience. As early as 1902, as these conceptual tools were becoming recognized as central and foundational to educational research, John Dewey warned that these subjects must not be treated separately as independent foundations and directions, but rather as in organic relationships. It is clear that with authors' Cluster A characteristics, as sources of and influences on curricular tasks, come biases and senses of priorities during their process of conceptualization within the Substantive Domain; inquiry, development or theory then proceeds with bias and imbalance that treat the referents separately and differently rather than organically and comprehensively. It might be said that Cluster A too often arrows into the Substantive Domain selectively and posits its commitments in a fragmented and imbalanced manner. It has become clear, for example, that Ralph Tyler, who is credited in curriculum literature with the formalization and refinement of the three substantive "sources," as he names them, does not consider these in a comprehensive and organic fashion. Although all three sources comprise the foundation of Tyler's rationale, he considers them separately in determining educational objectives rather than in essential relation to one another. Tyler then seems to lay the referents or "sources" aside to take more obvious direction from philosophy. Once again, it is the conceptualization and interpretation of relationships among the referents at the
level of conceptual thought that translate into concrete interactions of pedagogical elements at the level of practice in the Curriculum Development Sphere. Where biases, imbalances, fragmentation and inorganicism exist in conceptual foundations, these flaws will also characterize interacting pedagogical elements in practice.

Macdonald explains that one might argue against the either-or bias and imbalanced conceptual treatment of substantive foundations from a philosophical position, but that such a bias is difficult to avoid on a practical level "since the nature of rational thought is linear and it does make a difference which one of the three referents one begins with." He continues:

This is frequently so because the choice of priority often implies a value position about a referent that makes the definition of this referent different from what its definition would be if it came later in the set of priorities.

The familiar consequence is that one or a combination of two substantive referents become the focus or "fundamental unit" of curricular thought and practice. Macdonald implies that no "fundamental unit" has evolved with consensus among curricularists, where this "unit" would represent an organic relation among the referents, with an essential congruence among their conceptualizations, or among conceptions of the "nature" of the three. The resultant units might translate into knowledge/subject-centered curricular schemes (separate disciplinary or interdisciplinary forms), student/learner-centered schemes, social-relevant/problems of living-centered curricula, and so forth. Other "units" have been translated as activity-centered or rational decision-making-centered schemes, both aiming to cut across all three foundations.

The cluster of critical and theoretical questions and concerns generated by the central sphere of Inquiry in the meta-scheme for this research focus on the relation between conceptions of knowledge and of methods in systems having "knowledge" as the foundational referent of priority. As the application of congruence proceeds in subsequent chapters, its focus on the referent of knowledge as a conceptual foundation, and its relation to methods choreographing pedagogical elements within the Curriculum Development Sphere, should be understood in the context of this present discussion. Since knowledge is the primary subject of this research, the final section devoted to the Substantive Domain addresses the manner in which this conceptual foundation might be discussed, that is, in terms of its nature, function,
It must be clearly noted that descriptions of labels used to talk about conceptions of knowledge are limited to curricular perspectives; no formal attempt is made to place, account for, or elaborate these discussions within the contexts of established schools of philosophic thought, such as the history of knowledge, philosophies or theories of knowledge, essence, functionalism, utilitarianism, and so forth.

The "nature" of knowledge refers to its essential character and existential constitution. To speak of the "nature" of knowledge is to identify its basic, controlling definition, what it fundamentally is, what kind and order of a thing or construct it is, and what its mode of existence appears to be. From an abstract view, the "nature" of knowledge may be treated as its denotation, as "nature of..." seems to imply a description of innate, inherent characteristics, the fundamental essence and unchangeable constitution of knowledge. However, it is clear that the "nature" of knowledge presents itself in a multiplicity of ways and forms to the knower or to the one who signifies what is the subject or object of knowing; that is, the "nature" of knowledge is open to philosophical scrutiny and debate, as it is not unquestionable, absolute, or consistently conceived in a uniform manner through time, in all sectors, for all purposes, by all signifiers. It is therefore necessary to speak of the "nature" of knowledge as a description of its connotation, or of the meaning one ascribes to it; the "nature" of knowledge is comprised of the characteristics a signifier believes to be inherent, and it is defined in accordance with the signifier's fundamental and highest purpose. Such conceptions are largely relative to the entire context in which they are apprehended, created, or selected; therefore, within ones asserted conception of the "nature" of knowledge there is a fine line between what may potentially be inherent and what is actually imposed. Further, such conceptions are not static entities for the signifier, rather they are subject to growth and change throughout the process of the activity or situation for which the conception was initially posited; ones understanding of the "nature" of knowledge is an instrumental expedient, a temporary bridge.

Such conceptions of the nature of knowledge are also subject to historical development and transformation within the context of educational/curricular thought and practice; connotation of its "nature" shift through time and from concever to conceiver. Frequently, however, what appears to be a fundamental change in conception is actually more of a shift in emphasis; a once-latent aspect of the "nature" of knowledge surfaces from a set of possibilities, reasonable and imaginable, in accordance with the purpose of the task and the manner in which the task is dependent upon some
conception of the nature of knowledge. Too, more than one essential or existential characteristic can comprise one signifier's conception; several polarized qualities may co-exist in a hierarchy to comprise one's conception of the "nature" of knowledge.

Finally, such conceptions are organic to, grounded in, and dependent upon conceptions of the function, use, and source of knowledge posited within the same thought-system. While each of the four aspects of a conception of knowledge may be described and discussed separately at a theoretical level, all modify one another; and ultimately, all must be taken together for a full understanding, a comprehensive conception of knowledge.

The "source" of knowledge may be a reference to its point of origin. It is an understanding of this concept of point of origin, its various established meanings and interpretations, that facilitates a clarification of the label "source" as a description for knowledge.

The point of origin of knowledge may be its root, its ultimate and fundamental source, prior to its existence in a recognizable mode. As the source of knowledge, the root is not easily or verifiably discernable; in relation to a specific piece or body of existing knowledge, the root lies within the unique foundation of its own particular evolution, vulnerable to subjective rather than objective recognition by the conceiver or receiver. The root of knowledge refers not only to its "pre-material" existence but moreover to the very essence or fundamental unit of the process of inquiry or method of thinking giving rise to its discernable mode of "material" existence, for objective and subjective awareness.

A second identifiable point of origin of knowledge is the generative force giving rise to a specific piece or body of existing knowledge. The generative force is a more specific reference to the evolving (evolutionary) processes, the creating (creative) methodologies that operate as knowledge comes into a mode of "material" existence or discernable form for objective and subjective recognition. The meaning of generative force as the source of knowledge is then very much akin to the methodologic or syntactic dimensions discussed previously, the processes giving rise to knowledge; in addition, however, this particular interpretation of point of origin as source refers to the causes, circumstances, and influences in which the generating processes of inquiry and evolving methods of thinking are grounded.

Thirdly, the origin as source may be the point at which knowledge springs into being, into a "material" form of existence that can be outwardly, objectively recognized; this
form may be a postulation, a fact or truth, a created object, a carefully formulated idea or generalization, a principle, a piece of information or knowledge induced or deduced—communicated or documented in some manner and "available" to would-be "knowers." This material form holds the roots and generative forces of knowledge within, collected, collaborated, and interwoven, and is in a sense their end result; however, this material form of knowledge, as it stands, is not necessarily concerned with its roots and processes of inquiry that gave rise to it; further, as it stands, this material form of knowledge may not make its roots and generative forces specific and available, may not give receivers access to them.

This aspect of the third point of origin of knowledge introduces the last to be discussed here: the source of knowledge as the point at which it presents itself in some "material" form to the receiver. In this form, knowledge may be treated as an object or subject to encounter, and the receiver meets it either objectively or subjectively, or from some combination of both perspectives.

If all four possible "sources" of knowledge as points of origin were placed on a continuum, consecutively as they are presented here, with "root" and "reception" in the extreme positions, a number of simplified analogues come to mind. The pattern created by the progression from root to reception may be likened to scientific and artistic methodologies or processes of inquiry and creating. For example, the stages of artistic creation may be labelled as the artist's creative inception, the developmental-creative process, the artifact itself, and presentation of the artifact to others. A second correlative of the source continuum might be a potentiality-actuality continuum; here, the root and generative forces as points of origin may be likened to various stages of potentiality, and the "material" forms of existence and the presence of knowledge in the consciousness of receivers may be likened to forms of actuality. Other similar continuums are those of essence-existence, means-ends, process-product, and syntactics-substantives.

Within a comprehensive conception of knowledge, descriptive references to the "function" and "use" of knowledge are directly relational; it is only a fine line that distinguishes these two aspects. Function and use exist together conceptually, on a potential-actual continuum characterized by movement, and the direction of movement, by the conceiver; the movement from functions intended and defined toward uses made is the direction of the conceiver's process. Movement on the continuum from the function intended and defined for knowledge toward the uses and applications made of it designates a shift in tense, as from potentiality to actuality and
action, from preparation and rehearsal to participation. Consequently, what occurs at the level of using and applying knowledge is directly related to what has been defined and intended as its valued function at the level of preparation. Stated differently, what is conceived as the function or purpose of knowledge at the level of preparation has a greater chance of manifesting and expressing itself at the level of use than what is not conceived as a valuable function of knowledge. However, it is clear that the process of movement itself, and the direction of movement, from intention to actuality can be called into question; in this regard, the functions intended at the conceptual level may contain flaws or contradictions, and this may make authentic movement toward actuality on the continuum - toward use itself - a complex and similarly flawed matter.

Further, movement on the continuum from functions intended to uses made of knowledge designates also a shift in point of view or principle/actor; here, function is defined by curricular/pedagogical authority and use is initiated and made by students. Or, the function of knowledge is defined by the controlling agent in terms of both its utilitarian and pedagogical influence or performance on students who encounter knowledge, and use or application is carried forth by the changed/knowledgeable student as principle.

Finally, conceptions of the functions intended and uses to be made of knowledge are directly related to conceptions of the "nature" and "source" of knowledge within the same thought-system. While one can only speculate on which conceptions give rise to which others, the interactions among and between these four aspects can be discerned and described in terms of congruence and incongruence.

The Curriculum Development Sphere in the meta-scheme represents all processes entailed in curriculum development, all processes required to generate designs and events, the translation of development and design into interacting pedagogical elements in practice, and the evaluation of development, design and practice. Collecting and relating these processes in a common configuration represents the attempt to generalize the many development and design models constructed in the history of the field and, moreover, the attempt to distinguish these phenomena from curricular tasks and inquiry designated in the meta-scheme as conceptual and theoretical in nature.

As stated previously, authors and inquirers engaged in tasks within the Curriculum Development Sphere share with critic-theorists the conceptual foundations within the Substantive Domain as sources of and influences on these tasks. Development and design of interacting pedagogical elements
into events and practice are the translation of foundational conceptualizations at the levels of Cluster A and the Substantive Domain, and this movement from conceptual levels of thought toward concrete levels of practice is a concern integral to both developers and critic-theorists. Conceptual intentions give character and focus to educational experience, give direction to interacting pedagogical elements in designs comprising curricular phenomena. The curriculum, in turn, is often said to "deliver" conceptualizations and intentions asserted at theoretical and conceptual levels; the curriculum, and the interactions of all components and elements of educational experience therein, are then a pedagogical synthesis and reflection of conceptual thought.
2. Fundamental Assumptions

The following are the fundamental assumptions and valuations integral to the methodology of congruence:

A. The cinematic arts, as any other body of knowledge, subject area or field, can be conceptualized in various and differing ways; that is, the nature, function, source and use of knowledge in the cinematic arts can be variously and differently conceived, understood, apprehended through reason or imagination.

B. Among the central influences on the nature of interacting pedagogical elements in curricular phenomena and formal educational experience in a field are the prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, source and use of knowledge that influence or attend that field. Such conceptions would inhere in a scheme representing a curricular/instructional system for that field or particular situations within that field. Conceptions of knowledge evolve in a complex manner as authors and inquirers assume all levels of curricular tasks, moving from Cluster A to the Substantive Domain; as such, major implications for the entire fabric and texture of curricular phenomena spring from these conceptions.

C. Moreover, conceptions of knowledge carry a heightened significance and impact for educational experience and curricular phenomena when "knowledge" emerges as the referent of priority during the conceptualization process within the Substantive Domain in relation to Cluster A dimensions. When knowledge emerges as the referent of priority at this level of curriculum inquiry, conceptions of its nature, function, source, and use influence and bias the fabric of curricular phenomena more than prevailing conceptions of other referents in the same domain, and moreso than they would if another referent, such as the human being as learner, were given priority. At the level of curriculum design, knowledge as the referent of priority translates into a knowledge-, subject-, or disciplinary-centered curricular schema, and this may
be expressed in various disciplinary configurations and interdisciplinary forms. The sensibility primarily focused on knowledge uses particular and discernable conceptions of its nature, function, use and source as the bases for understanding, interpreting, and giving direction to other referents within the Substantive Domain and to the elements within the Curriculum Development Sphere.

D. Among the many elements and dimensions comprising curricular phenomena and affected by conceptions of knowledge is the medium, or educational method, that choreographs interacting pedagogical elements within the Curriculum Development Sphere, helping to bring knowledge, however interpreted into the consciousness and experience of the individual student; in this context a medium is a method that facilitates interaction between the student and knowledge, a process through which the student comes to be involved with knowledge. Medium as method may be understood in at least two basic ways, as method of instruction or pedagogy from the teacher's view and as method of study or inquiry from the student's view. Clearly the nature of educational experience and the fabric of curricular phenomena are directly related to, if not profoundly dependent upon, the dominant medium or method of instruction and study conceived and encouraged in particular settings and situations.

E. Conceptions of the essential nature, function, source, and uses of knowledge in a particular field of study are meaningful sources giving direction to the selection and development of methods of instruction and study; such conceptions are among the various substantial foundations from which methods can be derived. Methods "inhere" in conceptions of the cinematic arts; that is, syntactical structures are made obvious, are suggested implicitly or explicitly in the conceptions of the nature, function, use and source of these specific bodies of knowledge themselves. As conceptions of the cinematic arts shift, different methods of inquiry, instruction, or study are implied within the new conception itself. These methods are there for the looking. These methods may refer to the disciplinary modes of inquiry, or formal expressions of the same "process of inquiry which gave rise to the fruitful bodies of organized knowledge comprising the established disciplines." It must be noted, however, that methods derived as modes of inquiry from a conceptual analysis of a field may not always refer to the substantive structures of that field, as they do in
the schemes of Jerome Bruner and Philip Phenix.

Two areas, then, at all levels of curricular research and planning related to a knowledge-, subject-, or disciplinary-centered situation, are particularly instrumental in giving character to an individual student's experience of formal education: prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of particular bodies of knowledge; and the dominant conceptions of mediums or processes of the student's involvement/interaction with knowledge, or methods of instruction and methods of study. Further, as prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge and dominant conceptions of methods of instruction and study are taken together in interacting forms, the fabric of curricular phenomena is given character. It has been suggested throughout this research that conceptions of knowledge give rise to conceptions of methods, that methods selected and developed are derived from and have as a central reference prevailing conceptions of knowledge. Further, it has been suggested that conceptions of a particular body of knowledge can give substantial and meaningful direction to the selection and development of methods in that particular subject area; within a conception of a body of knowledge, in the discovery of its essential nature, function, use, and source, lie significant implications for methods of educational instruction or inquiry through which students can come to be involved with and "know" that subject area. Conceptions of knowledge at the level of the Substantive Domain and conceptions of educational methods practiced at the level of the Curriculum Development Sphere are interacting conceptions and ought to be carefully considered in close relation to one another, as well as in relation to other factors. With respect to a particular curricular/instructional system represented and display by the conceptual meta-scheme, it is assumed that the system is an organism aspiring to unity, a complex structure of interdependent and subordinate elements with the potential to interact in a congruent manner; herein, separate levels of conceptual thought and developmental practice share the same fundamental referents or elements, and these separate levels of thought and practice have the potential to be related to one another, translated into one another, and integrated with one another in a congruent manner. To state this basic assumption differently, the foundational conceptions represented by the Substantive Domain and the developmental events related to "practice" represented by the Curriculum Development
Sphere are integral to all curricular/instructional systems, and the relation and interaction of conceptual foundations and practice ought to be characterized by congruence. Conceptions of knowledge and the methods of inquiry used in relation to those conceptions in educational experience must be congruent with one another. That is, methods of educational inquiry, instruction or study must be congruent with the essential nature, functions, uses and sources of the cinematic arts. Such congruence may or may not exist. It is within this context, of conceptions of knowledge and methods as they are taken together in interacting forms in curricular thought and practice, that questions may be raised with regard to subject/method congruence; are conceptions of knowledge and methods, in both thought and practice, organically related to one another, essentially interpreted and consistently translated for one another, and integrated into one another.

G. Wherever knowledge- or subject-centered schemes and systems dominate periods and traditions in curricular thought and practice, conceptions of knowledge and methods, their impetus, patterns, mutual influence and interactions can be discerned and described. These conceptions can be identified through a tracing of sources, influences, and curricular/instructional expressions and practices as represented by a comprehensive conceptual scheme: Cluster A, the Substantive Domain, and the Curriculum Development Sphere. These conceptions might be best ferreted out through a critical/theoretical exploration of curricular/instructional patterns and events at the level of "practice" in the Curriculum Development Sphere; these are the more explicit indicators of implicit conceptual foundations. Such an exploration would be formalized to comprise elements within the sphere of critical and theoretical inquiry, as explained in an earlier section of this chapter.

H. As the sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry first "looks" into the Substantive Domain, prevailing conceptions of knowledge within the scheme are explored in relation to the essential nature, function, source and use of the cinematic arts (a comprehensive conception unique to that field and formulated for the purpose of comparative assessment). Incongruences and imbalances, flaws and contradictions, may exist within a conception of the nature of knowledge in a particular field - and among/between conceptions of its proposed nature, function, source and uses. These several aspects may not be
congruently related to one another, translated into one another, or integrated into one another. If a prevailing conception of the nature of a body of knowledge is deficient, imbalanced or flawed in some respect, the conceptions of the remaining three characteristics of knowledge will follow suit. The sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry proceeds then in two directions, to explore the relation and interaction of conceptual foundations in the Substantive Domain and concrete development, design and practice in the Curriculum Development Sphere. Incongruent conceptions of referents foundational to the entire curriculum system will bias and influence all other spheres in that system within which they reside, especially interacting elements within the Curriculum Development Sphere, or elements of curricular/instructional practice. As conceptions of knowledge within a particular field of study give direction to that field's methods of instruction and study, these methods may reflect incongruences and imbalances, flaws and contradictions, existing within those conceptions of knowledge. It is within this context that questions might be raised with regard to misconceptions of knowledge giving rise to misconceived methods; in such a case, educational methods would not reflect a balanced conception of the field for which they are developed; subject and method would be incongruent.

I. A reconceptualization of knowledge is necessary when: a conception of knowledge influencing and attending a field, such as the cinematic arts, is found to be incongruent with the essential, unique nature, function, source and use of that field as formulated by the critic-theorist or by reconceptual authors; and when a prevailing misconception of knowledge is subsequently used as a foundation giving direction to the development of methods that choreograph interacting pedagogical elements in the Curriculum Development Sphere. Reconceptualization connotes an authentic conceptual transformation, a fundamentally new understanding of curricular foundations and their essential characteristics that underlie the complex interactions of pedagogical elements in educational experience. If curricular/instructional expressions of knowledge/methods interactions in the context of educational experience in a field are to be authentically transformed in some direction as a result of critical disclosures, then fundamental reconceptualization of referents foundational to the entire curricular system - such as knowledge - is implied.
Alterations within the Curriculum Development Sphere must evolve from prior reconceptualization of foundational elements and must be grounded in sound prior conceptual bases. Shifting and reorganizing the disciplines, rearranging and replacing subject matter content and materials within disciplines, implementing different instructional methodologies or pedagogical styles will not accomplish authentic, sustained transformation of educational experience without prior, fundamental reconceptualization of foundational elements such as knowledge. Stated differently, alterations within the Curriculum Development Sphere must be grounded in and must evolve from sound prior conceptual bases or theoretical positions. All spheres within the conceptual scheme constructed for this research must be in congruent relation with one another, must be congruent translations of one another, must be integrated with one another; as foundations are reconceived, their counterparts in development, design, events and practice are correspondingly reconceived. In the instance of this research, a critical question is formulated with respect to a conception of knowledge, a fundamental element of curricular/instructional interaction, and its nature, function, source and uses, the essential characteristics of knowledge. As this conception, seated in a particular period or attending a particular field, is explored and disclosed through a method of critical inquiry, the essence of potential reconceptualization becomes apparent. For the reconceptualist knowledge is conceived of differently, and therefore new understandings about methods make themselves apparent. As reconceptual adjustments proceed in fundamental elements, a new foundation becomes apparent, giving rise to a corresponding, new view of a cluster of elements in the state of interaction in educational settings. It becomes increasingly clear that conceptions of knowledge change through time as manipulated through Cluster A sources and influences, brought to bear by different groups of curricularists. To reconceive Cluster A sources for and influences on authors and inquirers is to reconceive the nature of the Substantive Domain; to reconceive the nature of the substantive domain is to do no less than reconceive the nature of curriculum, curricular phenomena and the human experience of formal education. The reconceptualist movement and literature are involved in these processes.

J. If a foundational referent such as "knowledge" is to be reconceived at the level of the Substantive Domain toward authentic reconceptualization of the entire
curricular system, this must be done in relation to the other foundational referents with which "knowledge" always interacts in the system. Within the conventional Substantive Domain, knowledge has been traditionally treated in relation to "the learner" and "society"; however, within the Curriculum Development Sphere, "educational methods" are traditionally represented as a referent interacting with knowledge. A reconceived Substantive Domain is suggested by this, in which "educational methods" would be represented at the conceptual level of curricular inquiry, to be considered in relation to "knowledge", "the learner", and "society", and to be integral to this Domain for consideration in relation to Cluster A. As Cluster A differs then for the reconceptualist, previous conceptions of knowledge and the methods to which these give rise become inappropriate, incongruent within the reconceptual approach to the paradigm. For the reconceptualist knowledge is conceived of differently, and therefore new understandings about methods make themselves apparent; these new understandings are based upon aspects of conceptions of knowledge other than their organizational structures and substantive structures as we have come to know these in the "disciplines." It must be understood that just as Cluster A sources and influences determine knowledge/method conceptualizations for educational experience, so do substantive domain sources and influences determine knowledge/method conceptualizations for educational experience; that is, through mediation among Cluster A dimensions and the collective substantive referents, as knowledge, the human being as learner, and socio-cultural realities, specific knowledge/method conceptualizations emerge. Consequently, in this regard, a new substantive structure must be generated for the reconceptualist in order to create a Substantive Domain that will make a greater degree of congruence possible among and between the spheres of curricular phenomena; this structure ought to reflect new work in and understanding of conceptions of knowledge, methods of inquiry, their relationships, their translations of/for one another, their integrations. This reconceived Substantive Domain and a corresponding reconceptual meta-scheme conclude this section in the forms of Diagrams VII and VIII.
RECONCEPTUAL SUBSTANTIVE DOMAIN

1. Knowledge, Subject Area or Field
2. Educational Methods (Instruction)
3. Human Being as Learner
4. Socio-cultural Realities, Life-Contexts, and Phenomena

Diagram VII: Reconceptual Substantive Domain Curricular Foundations as Sources of and Influences on Inquiry and Practice
Diagram VIII: Reconceptual Meta-Scheme
3. Aesthetic Principles

A survey of the field of curriculum inquiry reveals that its literature is marked with inclinations toward particular modes or processes of thinking, particular perceptual or conceptual frames of reference for reflecting and thinking about curriculum phenomena. Working within some form of the conceptual meta-scheme sketched in this chapter, curricularists seem inclined to study dimensions and elements of curricular phenomena through the lens of three "interaction" constructs; that is, curricularists look for, find and make relationships, translations, and integrations. These perceptual constructs or tools appear and reappear in various forms of expression throughout the literature of curriculum inquiry.

These three "interaction" constructs as tools for systematic study are constituents or subordinate "stages along the way" in formalized methodologies belonging to theorizing, criticism, and problem-solving in other disciplines, some having been borrowed and applied to the study of curriculum; apart from this, however, these tools seem organic to the nature of curricular inquiry, seem to evolve from within the discipline as its natural syntactic structures rather than as imposed methods for the study of curriculum. However, with regard to the process of curriculum criticism and theorizing, these systematic tools have not been formally developed as fundamental principles of a single comprehensive method; clearly, these tools have been less consciously in the literature of curriculum inquiry than their consistent appearance would suggest, and less systematically and cohesively than might be productive.

A careful study of the nature and meanings of relationship, translation, and integration would make clear their common denominators, their own correspondence and mutuality as they are taken together in the critical and theoretical study of curricular phenomena. Taken together in a curricular context, these perceptual lenses will function in ultimately different ways, and provide for study of a different order, than each would as a constituent or subordinate stage of traditionally applied methodologies from other disciplines. Herein are the signs of an emergent methodology for curriculum criticism and post-critical theorizing, the possibility of establishing fundamental principles for...
curriculum inquiry, in the same sense that scientific methodology and its fundamental principles exist for scientific theory and inquiry. For example, it might be said that the process of criticism and theorizing in the reconceptualist mode might fundamentally proceed through the collective "lenses" or principles of relationship, translation, and integration; these would be taken together as a methodology with which reconceptualists could study the conceptual scheme in their function to understand the nature of educational experience. This curriculum methodology might be a fundamental apparatus for reconceptual inquiry, giving access to a view of the conceptual scheme and the comprehensive and complex interaction of its parts for which other applied methodologies have not made explicit provisions. This emergent methodology is congruence.

Before exploring the nature and meanings of relationship, translation, and integration, their commonalities and mutualities, it is important to note that the idea of an emergent curriculum methodology is not meant to exclude ultimately or supplant the application of other disciplinary modes of inquiry, which may be appropriate to the function and nature of certain kinds and orders of study; the syntactical structures of inquiry must be compatible and consistent with the substantive focus of inquiry; no singular methodology or substantive focus can perform all functions, and the syntactic structure must necessarily and suitably vary to be in accord with a shift in substantive focus. The notion of a curriculum methodology suggests that a set of peculiarly curricular substantive focuses, problems, and issues exist related to the nature of educational experience to which traditionally applied methodologies have not provided access. It is equally important to note that aspects or components of traditionally applied methodologies may be constituents and "stages along the way" in this emergent curriculum methodology; however, the fundamental principles reside in relationship, translation, and integration.

The emergence and development of congruence as a curriculum methodology for criticism and post-critical theorizing in the reconceptualist mode must begin with a description and exploration of its three fundamental tools, or aesthetic principles. Relationships, translations and integrations potentially inhere in the conceptual scheme as "interactions" among and between spheres and elements. That is, the conceptual scheme is an organism, a complex structure of interdependent and subordinate elements whose relations, translations and integrations are largely determined by their function in the whole.

Relationship denotes a connection among or between elements in some identifiable context, an alliance, the
nature of which may vary in kind, order or level, degree or measure. Whatever the referents or components of a relationship, the context or quality they collectively form might be said to exist only as the components are taken together. Something can always be said of the bond that mediates and ties the elements in relation, that is, the elements share some common reference point. A relationship is conceived or exists, is facilitated by or is a result of likenesses or linkages in the nature, purpose or function, use or source of the elements. The sense of "relation" is that something qualitative is formed, abstract or concrete, as a function of connectedness. Other words that come to mind to describe or denote relationship are correspondence, agreement, correlation, mutuality, and congruence between or among referents or components.

The nature and connotation of relationship with regard to the conceptual scheme can be described in terms of consanguinity, organicism, a symbiosis among or between spheres, all elements, dimensions, and levels both noted and implied. That is, they share an intimate, essential bond as if of the same lineage or parentage; they are interdependent, mutually influential, and their separateness in any regard is understood in relation to the function of the whole; spheres, elements and dimensions are reciprocal and complementary, in harmony and symmetry, and the scheme they form to operate within is constituted and characterized as a function of the relationships they share.

Translation denotes a change from one form or appearance into another, a conversion from one language or set of symbols to another. With such a shift, however, the first expression and the translated construction share an essential bond; that is, in some essential sense, they mirror or reflect each other without essential contradiction or paradox. The first rendering and its translated form are capable of exchange or interchange, although their specific function, use or context may shift; that is, a consanguine and organic relation exists between both forms. Translation is also a hermeneutic process, and shifting from a first rendering to its transformed rendering may involve interpretation of the first. The essential sameness ought to be consistent, however the interpretation in the form of the translation may be a decoding, an elucidation of an adaptation, an amplification, or a general unfolding of some kind that makes the first rendering intelligible in its new form, new function, new context.

At the simplest level, the process of working through the conceptual scheme in any manner involves translation; conceptualization of any element or the relating of conceptualizations of several components involves translation. This
might occur in a number of directions, from the abstract to
the concrete and the reverse, from the experiential to the
material and the reverse, from the ideological to the concep-
tual, and the reverse, and so forth. Philosophical founda-
tions translate into theory, theory into practice; each are
translations or interpretations of the other, but they share
essential references. The Curriculum Development Sphere
incorporates translations or interpretations of theory, and
this sphere's existence is a complex translation or inter-
pretation of collective conceptualizations in Cluster A, in
theory, and in the Substantive Domain. The inquirer is
involved in the hermeneutic process, making translations of
educational - and existential - biographical experience in
ways that seem appropriate to the substantive focus of
inquiry; the developer translates Cluster A, the Substantive
Domain and theory in order to understand their implications
for the Curriculum Development Sphere; further yet, these
implications are given specific translation in the coordinat-
ing of all elements in curricular events. Individuals' experi-
ences and roles within different contexts in the scheme
are in a sense translations. As the referents in the Sub-
stantive Domain are conceptualized in relation to one another,
mediation among them is largely a matter of translating and
interpreting one to the other; understandings at this level
translate into a different form for the Curriculum Develop-
ment Sphere wherein these same referents reside. In general,
with regard to a particular comprehensive situation, the
texture of the scheme is even and without contradictions
between or among elements, dimensions, levels and so forth.

Integration addresses the entire conceptual scheme; it
calls forth notions of synchronism, harmony and balance,
blending and unity; integration refers to wholeness, fullness
and completeness, holism, inclusiveness and comprehensiveness. All elements and components are cooperative, inter-
woven coefficients within the same scheme in any one partic-
ular comprehensive situation. Integration is reminiscent of
other ideological constructs, synthesis, synergism and
organicism, all of which have a view to a coherent whole with
congruent parts. Synthesis refers to the composing or
combining of elements so as to form the comprehensive whole;
synergism is the cooperative action and relation of separate
but essentially interconnected parts, such that the whole is
rendered more effective than if the parts were considered
independently; and, finally, organicism, wherein the scheme
is a living process whose activities are a function of the
integrated system rather than the individual components.

A form of the search for congruence then might have as
its focus the whole of Cluster A and the whole of the Sub-
stantive Domain, either the interactions among these two
major spheres or between the dimensions in one and the referents in the other; herein, aesthetic interactions such as the following might be sought and noted:

A. between the whole of Cluster A and conceptions of knowledge within the Substantive Domain; between the whole of Cluster A and conceptions of the nature of knowledge, and/or the function of knowledge, and/or the use of knowledge, and/or the source of knowledge

B. between author's educational/biographical experience and their conceptions of the nature, function, use and source of knowledge

C. between author's educational/biographical experience and their conceptions of the human being as learner

D. between author's organizational structures/understandings and their conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge

E. between author's syntactic structures/understandings and their conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge

F. between author's existential/biographical experience and/or valuations and their conceptions of socio-cultural realities, life-contexts and phenomena

G. between author's syntactical structures/understandings and their conceptions of the human being as learner

H. between author's philosophical foundations and/or valuations and their conceptions of the nature, functions, use, and source of knowledge

To search for these kinds of interactions is to identify and understand the relationships, translations, and integrations shared by Cluster A dimensions and Substantive Domain referents. Such understandings reveal the extent to which, and the areas in which, congruence or incongruence, harmony or discord exists between the spheres and among their elements. It becomes possible through this methodology to trace and comprehend the sources of and influences on the author's conceptions within the Substantive Domain and, more particularly, the sources of and influences on the contradictions held within their conception of the four aspects of
knowledge.

In a second form of viewing the conceptual scheme the search for congruence takes several different forms; and the interactions within, among, and between elements and spheres are of several different orders. Those forms and orders most pertinent to the focus of this research are given greater elaboration and more extensive explanation.

First, for example, it will be seen that for a comprehensive understanding of what "knowledge" means to curricularists, it is necessary to delineate their conceptions of its nature and function, its uses and sources; such a delineation makes distinct the interacting aspects comprising a full conception of knowledge. This delineation is productive for this research, as it displays prevailing or influential conceptions of knowledge in a way that makes possible the search for congruence or incongruence, for coherence or contradiction within an author's understanding of a singular referent in the Substantive Domain. For example, the following interactions might be sought and explored in order to understand the congruence or incongruence in their relationships, translations, and integrations:

A. between and among conceptions of the nature of knowledge and the function of knowledge
B. between and among conceptions of the nature of knowledge and the use of knowledge
C. between and among conceptions of the nature of knowledge and the source of knowledge
D. between and among conceptions of the function of knowledge and the use of knowledge
E. between and among conceptions of the function of knowledge and the source of knowledge
F. between and among conceptions of the use of knowledge and the source of knowledge.

A third form of the search for congruence resides within the Substantive Domain itself, wherein the conceptualization process proceeds with a specific view toward its relationship to, translation for, and integration with the Curriculum Development Sphere. The referents of knowledge, the learner, and socio-cultural realities attaining a position in the Substantive Domain, and the priorities among them, hold their position in the Curriculum Development Sphere wherein these same referents reside in a translated form. For this reason, the process of conceptualizing these referents at the level
of the Substantive Domain proceeds with heightened importance and influential weight; the translation of these referents from the Substantive Domain to the Curriculum Development Sphere is the equivalent to the translation of conceptual thought into concrete practice.

The search for congruence within the Substantive Domain entails the identification of the author's interacting conceptions of knowledge, the human being as learner, and socio-cultural realities, life-contexts and phenomena. For example, this search might involve noting the following kinds of interactions:

A. between conceptions of the nature, and/or function, and/or use, and/or source of knowledge and the human being as learner; how is the author's conception of knowledge related to the conception of the learner? how might the author translate the assumptions and principles implicit in their prior conception of knowledge into their subsequent conception of the human being as learner? how might the author's conception of the learner influence the conception of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge? are the author's conceptions of knowledge and the human being as learner integrated? or in what sense and to what degree are their conceptions of knowledge and the learner congruent, confluent, mutually representative and influential, and reciprocal?

B. between conceptions of the nature, and/or function, and/or use, and/or source of knowledge and socio-cultural realities, life-contexts, and phenomena; how is the author's conception of knowledge related to the conception of socio-cultural realities? how might the author translate the assumptions and principles implicit in the prior conception of knowledge into their subsequent conception of socio-cultural realities? how might the author's conception of socio-cultural realities influence the conception of the nature, function, use and source of knowledge? are the author's conceptions of knowledge and socio-cultural realities integrated, congruent, confluent, mutually representative and influential, and reciprocal?
The fundamental aesthetic principles of relationship, translation and integration cohere with an essential consanguinity and with complementary dimensions. Taken together, these give rise to the curriculum methodology of congruence for inquiry of a critical and theoretical nature. Congruence connotes the essential collective nature and signification of relationship, translation, and integration, connotes their own commonalities, correspondences, mutualities, and complementary dimensions.

The general subject of reconceptualist curriculum criticism and post-critical theory is the nature of formal educational experience, as it might be discovered and described within the context of a conceptual scheme, and its function or purpose is to understand. It is suggested here that congruence as a methodology for inquiry, as a curricular syntactic structure, is appropriate to or congruent with the subject and function of reconceptual inquiry. That is, as an essential harmony must exist among subject under theoretical study, the function of the study, and the process or method of theorizing, congruence is suggested to denote the methodology involved. That the label "congruence" characterizes its own relationship with the subject and function of study is not to be confused with the fact that congruence is a curricular methodology with distinct fundamental principles. As the nature of curriculum inquiry shifts from what has been the focus and function of the traditional and empirical modes and shifts toward the reconceptual mode, a new, corresponding methodologic base or process for criticism and theorizing must be developed; its own foundational principles will provide appropriate access to the reconceptualist focus and facilitate its function. This reconceptualist curriculum methodology of congruence is a perceptual lens comprised of relationship, translation, and integration as the frames of reference; the critic-theorist looks into the conceptual scheme in search of these same interaction constructs.

As a methodologic "lens," congruence begins with a look into the meta-schema in an attempt to understand conceptions and workings of the whole and the relationships, translations, and integrations among its parts, with special regard for educational experience in the cinematic arts. In the search for elements with currently problematic or incongruent interactions, among themselves and within the whole scheme as an organism, the method draws focus to those components that might be theoretically reconceived so as to create productive and congruent interactions among them and within the whole. Such reconceptualization is the quest for congruence among all interacting components coming to bear on curricular phenomena and the nature of educational experience.
The aim of authentic reconceptualization of contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts is to create an essential congruence between the nature of knowledge in this field and the pedagogical methods developed in relation to its nature; a reconception of the nature of the cinematic arts would represent and integrate their evolutionary process/syntactic dimensions and their presentational product/substantive dimensions, and pedagogical methods congruent with this dual nature would represent and integrate creative expression and critical inquiry. This process of reconceptualization largely depends upon disclosing current misconceptions of knowledge, as a foundational element, which may lead to misconceived methods and, ultimately, educational experience which implicitly transmits misconceptions of the cinematic arts. Further, a more fundamental understanding of these disclosures may be facilitated by uncovering periods and traditions which have tacitly influenced and caused prevailing, foundational misconceptions in the cinematic arts.
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CHAPTER IV

AN APPLICATION OF CONGRUENCE
TO CONCEPTUAL SCHEME OF THE
MIDCENTURY CURRICULUM REFORM MOVEMENT:
AN INFLUENCE ON AND RESOURCE FOR UNDERSTANDING
CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS
IN SECONDARY CINEMATIC ARTS EDUCATION

Contemporary American secondary education in the cinematic arts is dominated by a knowledge-centered sensibility with the prospect of continuance, and this inclination is clearly rooted in several historical periods and traditions. The purpose of this chapter is to trace and discern the comprehensive conceptions of knowledge and conceptions of methods, their impetus, patterns, mutual influence and interaction, during a period that comprises a large and influential portion of the heritage of contemporary educational experience and curricular practice in the cinematic arts; this period is the curriculum reform movement of the late 1950's and early 1960's. The purpose here is to carefully delineate the comprehensive conceptions of the nature, function, uses, and source of knowledge held by midcentury reformers; and further, to collect and bring together the sources of and influences on these conceptions; and further yet, to follow logically the development and selection of methods of instruction and study as these derive from comprehensive conceptions of knowledge at midcentury. Such delineations are intended to provide an understanding of the profound impact and meaning midcentury conceptions of knowledge had for educational experience in general at that time, and the influence they continue to exert on contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts.

This comprehensive picture of the midcentury "conceptual paradigm" is described and explained with congruence as the methodological tool for "viewing." As the scheme is constructed, interactions will become apparent; that is, relationships, translations, and integrations among sphere and between elements within the paradigm will be made explicit for discerning both congruences and incongruences. As tacit incongruences, flaws, or contradictions become obvious, the need for reconceptualization within the scheme will become clear. The meanings disclosed in this chapter,
with respect to midcentury conceptions of knowledge and methods, are understood as influences on, and resources for, comprehending contemporary curricular regard for knowledge and methods in cinematic arts education.

The chapter exemplifies a comprehensive application of congruence as a reconceptual methodology to a particular meta-scheme, the midcentury paradigm. A critical-theoretical focus has been formulated; and through application of the method's aesthetic principles, criticism will generate material to be used for post-critical theorizing toward a reconceptualization of knowledge - retrospectively for midcentury and prospectively for secondary cinematic arts education.
1. Cluster A

An exploration of the midcentury conceptual paradigm begins with descriptions of Cluster A dimensions, as these represent a significant profile of sources of and influences on curricular thought and practice during the reform movement. This exploration characterizes a cluster of foundations and a matrix of assumptions which eventually infuse the reformer's conceptions of knowledge, methods of study and instruction, and their interactions. This exploration answers the questions, what were the reformers' philosophical foundations, valuations, organizational and syntactical structures and understandings, their educational/biographic experience, and their existential/biographic experience?

The existential-biographic experience of the would-be curriculum reformers at midcentury in America was centrally colored by the nations' socio-political affairs. With the launching of Sputnik I in 1957 and the country's fear of falling behind Soviet sophistication in scientific, technologic, and military advancements, the American reactionary impulse became interwoven in the biographies of the country's people, became absorbed into their lives and consciousness. The American involvement in the Cold War and the Space Age brought a sense of pressure to citizens to accept the challenge of an international scientific and technologic knowledge explosion and military advancement race. With America's decided participation in these affairs, the hopeful gaze of the federal government and committed national organizations focused on the country's gifted youth with the implication that educational institutions would take a major, central responsibility for the nation's mission. From the American federal point of view, the Soviet developments largely seemed to be a function of their superior educational system, wherein such advanced scientific and technologic knowledge would have been produced and military systems generated; as a consequence, influential and financially well-endowed sectors in this country joined the federal government in educational intervention in support and protection of the nation's socio-political interests. This situation and the events that followed can be identified as significant influences on the existential-biographic experience of reform curricularists, and educationists in general, at midcentury.
Federal intervention acts and foundation grants, conferences and reports gave substantial direction and character to the role educational institutions assumed during the nation's participation in the Space Era; these framed the nature of reform educator's existential-biographic experience, in both professional and personal contexts. Several of these, the most influential and pervasively determinant, are given a general description here.

As early as 1950, the National Science Foundation approved a course of action that would be influential in determining educational priorities with the coming of the Cold War and would position the NSF for significant curriculum intervention in view of the competitive Space race. The NSF Act of 1950 eliminated the social sciences from the Foundation's umbrella; in the interest of promoting scientific research of an exacting nature, the Foundation focused solely on scientific disciplines amenable to hypothetical testing, direct experimental verification, and mathematical treatment. Beginning several years later, and throughout the post-Sputnik era, the NSF contributed support to the reform movement; the Foundation directed hundreds of millions of dollars to university scholars, involved in hard scientific research, who developed national curriculum projects and materials. The NSF generously sponsored the development of new courses of study and disciplinary curriculum packages in physics, biology, engineering science, mathematics, and medicine, for elementary and secondary school levels, emphasizing the latter. In accordance with their position on the social sciences as less immediately pertinent to Space Age needs, the NSF contributed a much smaller amount of support to curriculum projects in anthropology, geology, and sociology from the mid-1950's through the decade of the 1960's; these social sciences were largely funded by other supportive agencies, although never to the extent that NSF was able to fund the "hard" sciences. In addition, the NSF spent over $100 million dollars on institutes for improving teachers' achievement in the physical sciences throughout the 1960's.

The NSF may be said to have taken its impetus for curriculum intervention during the late 1950's from the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. This Act represented the federal government's call to public elementary and secondary schools for their participation in the long-range crisis in national security, in fulfilling the need for more scientists, linguists, and technologists so as to keep the United States from being surpassed in world leadership. As the government considered the Space Age as a national crisis situation, it looked to educational institutions as central instruments of national purpose. The NSF was very much aligned with
the intention of the NDEA, which provided federal
cutting for instructional improvement in the sciences,
mathematics, and, in addition, modern foreign languages,
disciplines high on the curriculum hierarchy during
the reform movement. As an amendment to the George-
Barden Act, the NDEA also provided large funding for the
training of highly skilled and specialized technicians
and scientists in fields identified as essential for
national defense. This same act of 1958 provided support
for improved guidance and testing programs aimed at
discovering the most academically gifted youth and directing
them into prioritized intellectual pursuits. And in
conjunction with the Elementary and Secondary Education
Act, the NDEA invited technologic instructional devices
into the schools, primarily funding language laboratories
and overhead projectors during the early years of the
reform.

1959 brought the James B. Conant Report, commissioned
by the Carnegie Corporation and published as The American
High School Today. Conant's study, in view of his under­
standing of education's role in meeting nationalistic
needs, brought forth recommendations that were signifi­
cantly influential in curricular policy and practice.
Conant called for the pursuit of academic excellence,
to be accomplished through curricular reform within the
context of the comprehensive high school and the concept
of subject-centered general education. He recommended
ability grouping in courses, special counseling and
standardized testing programs, all with the intention
to identify academically gifted youth who might pursue
the sciences, foreign languages, mathematics, engineering,
and business for international work. With the aim to
assure gifted young students a maximum quota of academic
coursework, and advanced placement status therein, Conant
recommended and prescribed four years of mathematics, four
years of science, four years of English, and three years
of social studies.

Much lower in Conant's priorities were peripheral
fields such as art and music, which he encouraged in the
spirit of "electives," and one "American Problems" course
for all seniors in the high schools. Further, the arts
and humanities in general suffered during the Cold War
reforms; these subject areas received the low end of the
imbalanced financial support for curriculum revision
projects, although the United States Office of Education
did fund many English and social studies projects during
the 1960's. The Foundation on the Arts and Humanities
Act of 1965 was a response to this imbalance; with more
funding available from this point, these subject areas
attempted to follow the course improvement and revision
trends already established by the disciplines higher on
the curriculum hierarchy.
Conant was strongly moved by the notion of international competition, especially related to the sciences, and his recommendations for the high school during the Cold War were nearly paralleled in his report on and suggestions to the junior high school in his 1960 Education in the Junior High School Years. One year after the passage of the NDEA, the National Academy of Sciences convened the Woods Hole Conference. The space race on and curriculum projects initiated and underway, this 1958 meeting brought reform leaders together to search for a curriculum rationale to facilitate the growing movement of curricular revisions and course content projects into a mature stage and cohesive status. Largely, the participants at Woods Hole were the university scholars who were being funded for their research and curricular improvement projects by the NSF. This Foundation also contributed financial support for the conference itself, along with the United States Air Force, the Rand Corporation, the United States Office of Education, the Carnegie Corporation, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The curriculum rationale established by these scholars had overwhelming impact on the nature of formal education experience throughout the Cold War. As the substance and particular details of this rationale are described in subsequent sections of this chapter as is pertinent to this research, suffice it to note here that this conference report, published as The Process of Education, impactfully shaped and directed the existential/biographic experience of educators and curricularists at all levels and in all sectors.

The value structure of the would-be curriculum reformers lent itself to a fundamental allegiance to the nation's participation in the Cold War and to an acceptance of the challenge given to elementary and secondary educational institutions. The reformers accepted what seemed to be the necessary socio-political order in view of international developments and arrangements, and they held the desire to shape and manipulate educational institutions and curricular schemes and phenomena in order to meet the nation's needs and to serve the nation's interests. The reformers felt the pressures of the national situation as it was understood at the federal level, and they undertook to serve the crisis rather than to fundamentally question it. They were moved by the scientific and technologic needs of the nation in its competitive endeavors, committed to utilitarian fulfilment of socio-political needs through knowledge and skill production at the level of intellectual, academic excellence.

These very general value biases give rise to the philosophical foundations with regard to education that may be identified with the curriculum reform movement and
its proponents. The midcentury curriculum rationale and its particular details, established formally during the Woods Hole Conference and more elaborately refined and practiced throughout the reform movement itself, were rooted in several central philosophical conceptions and assumptions: essentialism, the disciplines doctrine, and selective education.

Essentialism as an educational philosophy echoes back to William C. Bagley, who in 1907 asserted that the curriculum ought to represent the race experience in an organized manner, enabling it to be transmitted understandably to youth:

...conserved against the time when knowledge shall be needed in the constructive solution of new and untried problems. 4

For Bagley, knowledge is the logical embodiment of the cultural heritage and intellectual virtues, to be acquired and stored for future use when it might be productively directed at and appropriately applied to modern needs.

The Space Age curriculum reformers apprehended the immediate national situation as the new and untried problem of modern times; this, and its eventuality over the horizon, was the future for which knowledge had to be acquired, stored, and applied. They interpreted the responsibility of educational institutions and the function of curricular phenomena within this narrow context, having been given decisive support and financial reinforcement by intervening agencies both outside and related to the schools. The reformer's aim to cooperate in creating a generation of knowledge-acquirers-producers-appliers, and to develop the nation's scientific, technologic, military, and linguistic resources was grounded in their philosophical allegiance to academic excellence, cultivation of the intellect, and attainment of high scholarly standards among youth. These fundamental elements of essentialism extend into statements about curriculum priorities and organization, both relating to the reformer's philosophical acceptance and adoption of the disciplines doctrine. Further, these same elements of essentialism simply means of facilitating academic excellence and advanced cultivation of the intellect among the nation's youth, both relating to the reformer's philosophical acceptance of selective education.

In accordance with essentialism, the established academic areas of organized knowledge best and most systematically represent the race experience. Arthur Bestor reminded the educational community of this precept of
essentialism in 1956, and Philip Phenix restated in 1962 that the curriculum ought to have as its source "the fruitful bodies of organized knowledge comprising the established disciplines." Toward the cultivation of intellectual development in youth, Bestor named the systematic study of grammar, literature and writing, mathematics, the sciences, history, and foreign languages. The curriculum reformers narrowed the scope Bestor envisioned, and the Space Age curriculum focused on the physical sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in order to facilitate national participation in the scientific and technologic knowledge explosion and all Cold War international affairs.

The reformer's philosophical commitment to advancement in these priority disciplines, that is, advancement as defined by the Space Age itself, meant the establishment of categorical specializations as a means to promote thorough intellectual mastery. Woods Hole Conference participants accepted this curricular arrangement as a "disciplines doctrine." The reformer's task was to distinguish the essential facts, skills, fundamental ideas and generalizations comprising the separate priority disciplines, creating sequences in which to impart them toward youth's mastery of pertinent academic subject matter.

To facilitate their aim of academic excellence and high, scholarly attainment in the sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages for a national situation labelled as an immediate and competitive crisis, the reformers accepted and implemented a selective educational system. Conant's report called for identifying the nation's most academically gifted youth to serve the nation's interests in priority disciplines, and this within the context of a comprehensive system of general education; he further recommended ability testing and grouping for a high and uniform level of quality control. The reformers found an authentic form of comprehensive, general education antithetical to heightened attention to the most gifted youth, and they practiced their philosophical commitment to an academically selective school system, felt to be essential in meeting the crisis of the times.

Within the context of Cluster A in the conceptual scheme, and in accordance with Joseph Schwab's analysis of the structures of disciplines, the "organizational structure" identified with the curriculum reform movement refers to its proponent's definition, treatment of an approach to the field of curriculum; this structure represents the reformers' conceptions of the nature and function of the curriculum in relation to formal educational experience; it reflects their understandings of the character of curricular work to be done as it might
be distinguished from other educational subfields bearing on formal educational experience and phenomena.

The curriculum was considered as the formal course of study, within which was held the foundational academic disciplines, or bodies of organized knowledge. The cumulative traditions of knowledge were regarded as the most significant and comprehensive vessels of the race experience; although the reformers would have agreed that the race experience goes much beyond these disciplines and can be represented differently to encompass the total culture of a society, they rejected such broad definitions in favor of a manageable organizational structure in view of the pressures on educational institutions during the Cold War.

The reform movement inherited Ralph Tyler's 1956 definition of curriculum as "all of the learning of students which is planned by and directed by the school to attain its educational goals." For Tyler, this definition encompasses educational objectives, the appraisal of student learning and all planned learning experiences. For Smith, Stanley and Shores in 1957, the curriculum is a reconstruction and a transference of the race experience:

A sequence of potential experiences is set up in the school for the purpose of disciplining children and youth in group ways of thinking and acting. This set of experiences is referred to as the curriculum.

In the 1959 edition of the Dictionary of Education, curriculum is defined as:

1. a systematic group of courses or sequence of subjects required for graduation or certification in a major field of study, for example, social studies curriculum, physical education-curriculum; (2) a general overall plan of the content or specific materials of instruction that the school should offer the student by way of qualifying him for graduation or certification or for entrance into a professional or vocational field; (3) a group of courses and planned experiences which a
Still in 1962, Alberty and Alberty assert that the curriculum is "all of the activities that are provided for students by the schools." 12

The trends in these definitions contain elements of William Torrey Harris' 1870 conception of curriculum as a structure that makes the accumulated wisdom of a race available to youth in a systematic and economic manner, a course of study that leads youth sequentially through the great ideas of a culture in a coherent manner. 13 Lawrence Cremin notes that the elements of Harris' curricular paradigm have withstood the test of time; the learner, the course of study, the materials of instruction, the teacher, and the evaluative process. 14 And as the mid-century curricular function was largely to bring about preconceived changes in students in accordance with nationalistic needs in the Cold War and space race, one is also reminded of the technologic curriculum rationale of the 1920's; Franklin Bobbitt and W. W. Charters understood the curriculum as a production process whereby students as the raw material were converted in accordance with preconceived industrial needs and utilitarian notions. In addition, for the 1920's and the 1950's reform movement, the function of the curriculum included or necessitated the training of specialists who, through the conveyance of the race experience, as expressed through separate disciplines, would facilitate this conversion of the country's youth. Curriculum reformer Jerrold Zacharias delineates the basic components of the reform process within the context of the curricular function in this way:

a) Process of determining precise boundaries of educational system/unit that will be treated
b) Process of identifying subject matter which is to be dealt with within the educational unit
c) Embodiment of subject matter in material form
d) Preparation of teachers in the new subject matter and in use of materials 15

Once again it is clear that the definition and function attributed to the curriculum during the midcentury reform movement are rooted in an acceptance of and priority focus on the nation's socio-political crisis and decided involvement. The curriculum was apprehended as the mechanism upon which a transformation of the nation's youth, narrowly and specifically appropriate to the Cold War and the space era, depended.

Within the context of the "organizational" understandings shared by the curriculum reformers is the
relation of curriculum and instruction. This many-faceted concern has a long, controversial history, the whole of which is not pertinent to this section. However, it is significant to note that while reformers at Woods Hole, and after, realized that curricular course-content revision must be complemented with attention to the nature of corresponding instruction, they in practice retained a central focus on subject matter as curriculum, separate from instruction. The reformers noted that instruction denoted two aspects: the ways and means through which knowledge is produced and developed, which relates to the syntactical structures or modes of inquiry belonging to separate disciplines; and the avenues of learning, or the processes through which learners become knowledgeable. This acknowledgement brought much rhetoric about inquiry-discovery, which cuts across both aspects of instruction, however this gave way to their traditional conception of curriculum, in practice, as content and to an understanding of the function of curriculum work as attending to the selection and organization of subject matter. The midcentury reformers would have agreed with Inlow's 1973 distinction, curriculum being a body of learning content and instruction, methodological avenues of learning. In 1964, after the reform was well into its mature stages, Broudy, Smith and Burnett remark:

...curriculum consists primarily of certain content organized into categories of instruction...modes of teaching are not, strictly speaking, a part of the curriculum.

Finally, it might be noted that agency-intervention in curriculum decisions helped to define the reformer's organizational understandings. In this regard, curricular work was to be comprised of separate disciplinary course-work improvement projects, in line with national interests, guidance and testing programs directed toward the discovery and selective grouping of academically gifted youth, accommodation for the training of highly skilled scientists, technicians and linguists, and advanced program capabilities for scholarly academic, intellectual pursuits.

Within these descriptions of Cluster A sources of and influences on midcentury curriculum research and inquiry, the dimensions of "educational-biographic experience" and the "syntactical structures" shared by reformers have two referent areas: first, these are the educational and methodological manners and customs, acclimations and habituations generally shared and practiced by the curriculum reformers through previous pre-Space Age professional work and study in the curriculum field or other subject areas; secondly, these dimensions refer to the same educational and methodological habituations as the reformers brought, translated, and applied them to midcentury Space Age curricular tasks.
The major human resource enlisted by the federal government and other financially supportive agencies, for the research and development of curriculum reform coursework projects for elementary and secondary schools, were university scholars. These influential scholars were primarily scientists and mathematicians; further, the academic fields of the Woods Hole Conference participants who would give character to the reform at large, were the sciences, mathematics, and psychology. These individuals aspired to academic excellence with respect to their own intellectual development. Their scholarly pursuits were rooted in a traditional separation of pure and applied knowledge within discrete, specialized disciplinary realms. The university scholars held high regard for the intellectual mastery of the cumulative content, fundamental principles, ideas and generalizations representing their disciplinary specialties, and they believed that acquisition of knowledge in its puristic form is preliminarily essential to subsequent learning, knowledge production, and knowledge application. The nature of their educational experience might be characterized as a combination of traditional university scholarship, advanced puristic research in narrow specialized disciplinary areas, and the inductive mode of scientific inquiry. Curriculum reformers in general were sympathetic and aligned with this sort of educational background and methodological approach, and collectively they had not engaged in mission-oriented tasks wherein pure and applied knowledge, or theory and practice within disciplines and corresponding disciplinary modes of inquiry, must be given equal emphasis, expression and unity.

As these scholars, the Woods Hole participants, and reformers in general brought this sort of educational biographic experience and these syntactic habituations to their midcentury task, they interpreted their mission as one of prescription and control for the school in the image of their own biographic experience and academic understandings. For these individuals, the crisis at hand demanded the transference of their own scholarly knowledge and intellectual capabilities into teachable and learnable forms for elementary and secondary educational institutions.
2. Substantive Domain

Within the foregoing section, Cluster A sources of and influences on midcentury American curriculum inquiry are described, as the first stage of viewing the conceptual scheme of the reform movement through the methodological lens of congruence. These descriptions together comprise the general ontology and the foundational assumptions and conceptualizations brought by the reformers to their paradigm's conventional substantive domain, wherein yet another process of conceptualization occurs. The second stage of working through and viewing the midcentury paradigm, and the subject of this second section of Chapter IV, then becomes the description of the reformers' conceptualizing processes within the substantive domain; as noted throughout this research, the referents within this domain in its conventional form are (1) knowledge, subject areas or fields, (2) the human being as learner, and (3) socio-cultural realities, life-contexts and phenomena.

In this second stage of viewing the midcentury conceptual paradigm, the search for congruence takes several different forms; and the interactions within, among, and between elements and spheres in the paradigm are of several different orders. Those forms and orders most pertinent to the focus of this research are given greater elaboration and more extensive explanation.

First, for example, it will be seen that for a comprehensive understanding of what "knowledge" meant to midcentury curricularists, it is necessary to delineate their conceptions of its nature and function, its uses and sources; such a delineation makes distinct the interacting aspects comprising a full conception of knowledge. This delineation is productive for this research, as it displays midcentury conceptions of knowledge in a way that makes possible the search for congruence or incongruence, for coherence or contradiction within the reformer's understanding of a singular referent in the substantive domain. For example, the following interactions might be sought and explored in order to understand the congruence or incongruence in their relationships, translations, and integrations:

A. between and among conceptions of the nature of knowledge and the function of knowledge
B. between and among conceptions of the **nature** of knowledge and the **use** of knowledge

C. between and among conceptions of the **nature** of knowledge and the **source** of knowledge

D. between and among conceptions of the **function** of knowledge and the **use** of knowledge

E. between and among conceptions of the **function** of knowledge and the **source** of knowledge

F. between and among conceptions of the **use** of knowledge and the **source** of knowledge

With respect to the special focus of this research, the central incongruence in the midcentury paradigm will be found within the reformer's conception of knowledge, as they bring the whole of Cluster A to bear on the whole of the Substantive Domain, and more particularly to bear on the referent of knowledge.

A second form of the search for **congruence** then might have as its focus the whole of Cluster A and the whole of the Substantive Domain, either the interactions among these two major spheres or between the dimensions in one and the referents in the other. For example, one may assume the whole of both spheres being taken together to interact during the second stage of the reformer's conceptualization process within the paradigm; herein, interactions such as the following might be sought and noted:

A. between the whole of "Cluster A" and conceptions of knowledge within the Substantive Domain; between the whole of "Cluster A" and conceptions of the **nature** of knowledge, and/or the **function** of knowledge, and/or the **use** of knowledge, and/or the **source** of knowledge

B. between reformer's educational/biographic experience and their conceptions of the **nature**, **function**, **use** and **source** of knowledge

C. between the reformer's educational/biographic experience and their conceptions of the human being as learner
D. between the reformers' organizational structures/understandings and their conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge

E. between the reformers' syntactic structures/understandings and their conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge

F. between the reformer's existential/biographic experience and/or valuations and their conceptions of socio-cultural realities, life-contexts and phenomena

G. between the reformers' syntactical structures/understandings and their conceptions of the human being as learner

H. between the reformers' philosophical foundations and/or valuations and their conceptions of the nature, functions, use, and source of knowledge.

To search for these kinds of interactions is to identify and understand the relationships, translations, and integrations shared by Cluster A dimensions and Substantive Domain referents. Such understandings reveal the extent to which, and the areas in which, congruence or incongruence, harmony or discord exists between the spheres and among their elements. It becomes possible through this methodology to trace and comprehend the sources of and influences on the reformers' conceptions within the Substantive Domain and, more particularly, the sources of and influences on the contradictions held within their conception of the four aspects of knowledge.

A third and final form of the search for congruence resides within the Substantive Domain itself, wherein the conceptualization process proceeds with a specific view toward its relationship to, translation for, and integration with the Curriculum Development Sphere. The referents of knowledge, the learner, and socio-cultural realities attaining a position in the Substantive Domain, and the priorities among them, hold their position in the Curriculum Development Sphere wherein these same referents reside in a translated form. For this reason, the process of conceptualizing these referents at the level of the Substantive Domain proceeds with heightened importance and influential weight; the translation of these referents
from the Substantive Domain to the Curriculum Development Sphere is the equivalent to the translation of conceptual, abstract thought into concrete practice.

The search for congruence within the Substantive Domain entails the identification of the reformers' interacting conceptions of knowledge, the human being as learner, and socio-cultural realities, life-contexts and phenomena. For example, this search might involve noting the following kinds of interactions:

A. between conceptions of the nature, and/or function, and/or use, and/or source of knowledge and the human being as learner; how is the reformer's conception of knowledge related to their conception of the learner? how might the reformers translate the assumptions and principles implicit in their prior conception of knowledge into their subsequent conception of the human being as learner? how might the reformer's conception of the learner influence their conception of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge? are the reformers' conceptions of knowledge and the human being as learner integrated? or in what sense and to what degree are their conceptions of knowledge and the learner congruent, confluent, mutually representative and influential, and reciprocal?

B. between conceptions of the nature, and/or function, and/or use, and/or source of knowledge and socio-cultural realities, life-contexts, and phenomena; how is the reformer's conception of knowledge related to their conception of socio-cultural realities? how might the reformers translate the assumptions and principles implicit in their prior conception of knowledge into their subsequent conception of socio-cultural realities? how might the reformer's conception of socio-cultural realities influence their conception of the nature, function, use and source of knowledge? are the reformers' conceptions of knowledge and socio-cultural realities integrated, congruent, confluent,
mutually representative and influ-

cential, and reciprocal?

The ultimate significance of this search for con-
gruence in its several forms and of exploring these
orders of interaction within the midcentury paradigm is
fourfold in relation to this body of research: to ex-
plor a comprehensive conception of knowledge, one with
profound influence on contemporary curricular thought and
practice, to examine fully its sources and evolution,
and to understand the ways in which methods of study and
instruction are derived from and interact with these con-
ceptions of knowledge; secondly, to make application of
and exemplify the use of congruence, as a curriculum
methodology, or as a set of tools with which to probe
the theoretical and practical interactions of such ele-
ments as conceptions of knowledge and methods; thirdly,
to probe this midcentury conception of knowledge and the
corresponding methods of study and instruction practiced
by reformers, with the lenses of congruence, in a way
that will illuminate and comprehend the problems and
contradictions residing in the midcentury paradigm.
Finally, it must be restated, this writer finds mid-
century conceptions lingering so heavily in the present
that a relational study is warranted; a working through
and an understanding of midcentury problems and contra-
dictions may facilitate reconceptualization of the found-
dation that continues to find a home for these incon-
gruences in contemporary curricular thought and practice.

This section of Chapter IV begins with a de-
scription and explanation of midcentury con-
ceptions of the nature, source, function, and
use of knowledge. Each of these four sub-
divisions is preceded with a brief discussion
of what is meant by these labels such as "the
nature of . . .," in relation to a comprehensive
conception of knowledge. Through the meth-
odological lens of congruence, the interactions
between and among these four aspects of the
midcentury conception will be explored.

It must be clearly noted here that discussions of mid-
century conceptions of knowledge are limited in this
research to an expression of the educationist/curricu-
larist perspective and sensibility as applied to the
specific task of preparing educational institutions to
serve and participate in the Cold War situation. Dis-
cussions of the denotations and connotations of the labels
distinguishing the four aspects of conceptions of know-
ledge are similarly delimited; no formal attempt is made
to place, account for, or elaborate these discussions
within the contexts of established schools of philosophic thought, such as the history of knowledge, philosophies or theories of knowledge, essence, functionalism, utilitarianism, and so forth.

As explained in the first section of this chapter, within one comprehensive curricular situation as represented by the paradigm (Cluster A, Substantive Domain, Theories, and Curriculum Development Sphere), prevailing conceptions of knowledge are central among the many influences on the nature of formal educational experience. Conceptions of knowledge evolve in a complex, relational manner as curricularists assume theoretical and developmental tasks at the level of working within and between the Cluster A dimensions and the substantive domain. When knowledge emerges as the referent of priority at this level of curriculum inquiry, conceptions of its nature, function, use, and source influence and bias the fabric of curricular phenomena more than prevailing conceptions of other referents in the same domain, and moreso than they would if another referent, such as the human being as learner, were given priority. The sensibility primarily focused on knowledge uses particular and discernable conceptions of its nature, function, use and source as the bases for understanding, interpreting, and giving direction to other referents within the substantive domain and to the elements within the Curriculum Development Sphere.

The midcentury curriculum reform movement clearly focused on knowledge as its referent of priority. Given the socio-political arrangements and sense of immediacy of the Cold War during the late 1950's, and given the responsibility placed upon and accepted by American educational institutions, the curricular reformers were in search of a rationale and a plan through which they might fulfill their commitment with certainty. Within the whole network of scientific, technologic, and military developments and needs preoccupying the nation and the schools, knowledge appeared to be the primary competitive tool; it seemed the most pertinent commodity to attain, develop and use to protect the nations' interests, the most utilitarian focus and expedient product with which to prepare and equip young citizens to serve the country through competitive participation in the space race. Further, from a curricular point of view, knowledge had absolute form and dependable substance; it was the central variable within the substantive domain and among the elements comprising curricular phenomena. Knowledge was thought to have teachable form and learnable substance; it was amenable to careful selection, organization and manipulation, a high degree of measurability and quality control within the curriculum. All of these qualities were thought necessary to the fundamental unit of a curricular rationale and plan if educational institutions were to rise intelligently and successfully to the Space Age occasion.
The "nature" of knowledge refers to its essential character and existential constitution. To speak of the "nature" of knowledge is to identify its basic, controlling definition, what it fundamentally is, what kind and order of a thing or construct it is, and what its mode of existence appears to be. From an abstract view, the "nature" of knowledge may be treated as its denotation, as "nature of..." seems to imply a description of innate, inherent characteristics, the fundamental essence and unchangeable constitution of knowledge. However, it is clear that the "nature" of knowledge presents itself in a multiplicity of ways and forms to the knower or to the one who signifies what is the subject or object of knowing; that is, the "nature" of knowledge is open to philosophical scrutiny and debate, as it is not unquestionable, absolute, or consistently conceived in a uniform manner through time, in all sectors, for all purposes, by all signifiers. It is therefore necessary to speak of the "nature" of knowledge as a description of its connotation, or of the meaning one ascribes to it; the "nature" of knowledge is comprised of the characteristics a signifier believes to be inherent, and it is defined in accordance with the signifier's fundamental and highest purpose. Such conceptions are largely relative to the entire context in which they are apprehended, created, or selected; therefore, within one's asserted conception of the "nature" of knowledge there is a fine line between what may potentially be inherent and what actually is imposed. Furthermore, such conceptions are not static entities for the signifier, rather they are subject to growth and change throughout the process of the activity or situation for which the conception was initially posited; one's understanding of the "nature" of knowledge is an instrumental expedient, a temporary bridge.

Such conceptions of the nature of knowledge are also subject to historical development and transformation within the context of educational/curricular thought and practice; connotations of its "nature" shift through time and from conceivers to conceivers. Frequently, however, what appears to be a fundamental change in conception is actually more of a shift in emphasis; a once-latent aspect of the "nature" of knowledge surfaces from a set of possibilities, reasonable and imaginable, in accordance with the purpose of the task and the manner in which the task is dependent upon some conception of the nature of knowledge. Too, more than one essential or existential characteristic can comprise one signifier's conception; several polarized qualities may co-exist in a hierarchy to comprise one's conception of the "nature" of knowledge.

Finally, such conceptions are organic to, grounded in, and dependent upon conceptions of the function, use, and source of knowledge posited within the same thought-system. While each of the four aspects of a conception
of knowledge may be described and discussed separately at a theoretical level, all modify one another; and ultimately, all must be taken together for a full understanding of a comprehensive conception of knowledge.

The midcentury curricularists and would-be reformers considered knowledge to be an embodiment of the cultural heritage, a representation of the total historical-societal process, a reflection of the products of all existing life-contexts and institutions of thought and practice. Herein, knowledge was considered the processes and products of all phenomena, systems of thought, of symbols and actions generated and documented over time. As such, knowledge had an independent value for the would-be reformers, securely linked to the virtues of scholarship and the intellectual life. However, with the onset of the Cold War and the call extended to educational institutions for national service, a more utilitarian sensibility began to infuse the curriculum community, coupling with rather than supplanting the reformer's belief in the intellectual value of knowledge. The nature of knowledge began to find its definition and connotation within the context of the Space Age, and its value became concretely linked to the manner in which certain bodies of knowledge might advance the American involvement and protect her interests in the Cold War. The reformers developed a heightened sensitivity to what is called the knowledge explosion, the accelerated pace with which Space Age-pertinent knowledge needed to be generated, documented, disseminated, accrued, and used; the necessary American developments and advancements in the scientific, technologic, and military areas was understood as dependent upon knowledge, indeed competitive American participation seemed to rest wholly on knowledge in these special fields. For the curricular reformers this meant an expedient, Space Age-defined narrowing of the "nature" of knowledge. Now it was an objective product identified with Space Age phenomena and fields of study, the tool of competition, and much in demand. The reformers focused on external national needs related to existing facts, formulated truths, generated propositions, records and statements given.

The reformer's interpretation of their responsibility to national needs via the curriculum made of knowledge the central substantive vehicle to manipulate and use toward expedient delivery of controlled service to the crisis situation. In this regard, the reformers were in search of a rationale that would perform several organizational functions; the reformers wished to categorize existing knowledge, to distinguish like-phenomena, processes and products of knowledge and make them systematically available; secondly, they wished to create frames within which to accommodate Space Age-pertinent knowledge in its expanding forms and in its specialized domains; and thirdly,
The reformers wished to order knowledge in a hierarchical fashion, in accordance with its external, functional characteristics as defined in the framework of the Space Age and its meaning for American life-contexts. Traditional modes for organizing knowledge into "thought edifices" were not unfamiliar to the reformers, and a heightened, more strict systematic and specialized use of established disciplinary constructs seemed appropriate to the prospective curriculum rationale at midcentury.

The functionally coherent and systematic arrangement of knowledge desired by reformers was accomplished through an affirmation of disciplines and a tightening of these as separate, specialized subject matter compartments. The disciplines, situated in a hierarchy favoring the physical sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, comprised the curriculum, or the course of study within the curricular framework. With this sort of an organizational structure, knowledge could be identified and selected, arranged and stored in relation to the appropriate established categories, systematically available and systematically possessed through instruction and study.

In their affirmation of this tight disciplinary scheme, the Woods Hole Conference participants were subscribing to what is known as a "disciplines doctrine." It might be said that the reformers did acknowledge that the nation's competitive involvement in the Cold War required scientific developments and technologic advancements identified with both separate disciplines and collaborative collections of disciplines; however, these curricularists held that study of distinct bodies of organized knowledge was more faithful to the nature of knowledge itself and the way in which such bodies represent distinct life-contexts; that the study of existing like-phenomena with assigned categorical boundaries would facilitate the necessary deepening/expanding of knowledge in each separate field; that study of separate disciplinary subject matter was appropriate preparation preliminary to cross disciplinary collaboration, transfer, and problem-solving. For the reformers, "knowledge" was defined as disciplinary knowledge, and the "nature" of knowledge found its true characteristics only in such subject matter. Their consensus was that the curriculum ought to be constituted entirely of the disciplines:

all curriculum content should be drawn from the disciplines or, to put it another way, only knowledge contained in the disciplines is appropriate to the curriculum...and non-disciplined knowledge is unsuitable for teaching and learning.
In this view, knowledge is the objective product, content or subject matter of distinct phenomena, having been created and generated by others and thought externally useful in relation to national service. It presents itself to the student as "given," or "settled," and as "second-hand." Here, knowledge is narrative information, remote in time, space and meaning from the student's acquaintance, "disconnected from the totality that engendered them [bodies of knowledge] and gave them significance," and existant for the student to ascertain through study and instruction.

In anticipation of the accusation that their curriculum rationale and disciplines doctrine would seem to reflect a strict traditional conception of the nature of knowledge, the reformers clarified their position in this way, as stated by Philip Phenix in 1962:

education should be conceived as a guided recapitulation of the processes of inquiry which gave rise to the fruitful bodies of organized knowledge comprising the established disciplines.

Wishing not to regard knowledge as a fixed body or a permanent product, the reformers asserted that knowledge was "search"; that is, the nature of knowledge, or its mode of existence, was conceived as a product of a process known as disciplined inquiry. This process of disciplined inquiry might be temporarily referred to as the methodological dimension of a discipline. The reformers held that inherent in a cohering body of generated subject matter or products of a discipline are the models of thinking and principles of inquiry comprising the process giving rise to the subject matter itself. From their view, these models and principles can be abstracted through a study of the subject matter, to become a set of methods for specialized inquiry and a process for application in that same field; these models and principles were thought to provide patterns of thinking, a means to approach phenomena, a manner of generating, ordering, and testing new phenomena in the field from which they were derived. It must be clearly noted that use of these models and processes was to be confined to the boundaries of the established discipline to which they were thought to belong.

With these assertions, the reformers wished not only to emphasize the dual nature of knowledge as both product and process, but also to stress that both disciplinary subject matter and the power to use its indigenous modes of inquiry to apply and generate knowledge were of equal importance to youth participating competitively in the Cold War situation. These concessions to "processes of
inquiring as inherent in the nature of knowledge represent
the reformer's awareness of the need for educational,
institutions, and the curriculum in particular, to facili-
tate not only knowledge acquisition but also its creation
and application to the new and untried problems of the
Space Age.

Establishing both product and process dimensions as
characteristic of the nature of knowledge and, in turn, as
foundational to their curriculum rationale, the Woods Hole
reformers moved from organizational concerns and reflections
of the nature of knowledge to structural concerns and re-
flections. In order to give direction to course content
revision and improvement projects, the reformers task was
to provide a set of governing concepts by which the sepa-
rate disciplines could be structured in the form of
"courses"; they were in search of principles that could be
used to structure disciplinary subject matters and corres-
ponding modes of inquiry, rendering these in forms that
would be teachable, learnable, and representative of the
dual nature of knowledge itself. Toward this end, the
reformers developed the "structure-of-a-discipline" con-
cept; this became part of their curriculum rationale
and served as the central guiding concept or principle by
which course content projects were approached and separate
disciplinary bodies organized.

In accordance with the reformer's conception of the
product (subject matter) and process (methodology) dimen-
sions inherent in the nature of knowledge, the "structure-
of-a-discipline" approach to disciplinary organization
correspondingly identified two interdependent "structures"
in disciplined knowledge. The first of these came to be
known as the "substantive structure;" this refers to
the subject matter or content, its fundamental principles,
ideas and generalizations, its products, truths and postu-
lations that comprise a discipline or cohering body of
knowledge and make it organizationally distinct from other
disciplines. This subject matter, or substantive dimension,
according to the "structure-of-a-discipline" approach, was
to be sequentially treated, progressing over time through
study and instruction from the simple and basic components
toward the more complex and compounded formulations. The
second structure or dimension of disciplined knowledge
came to be known as the "syntactic structure;" this re-
fers to what was preliminarily named the methodological
dimension inherent in the nature of knowledge, the models
of thinking and processes of inquiry giving rise to a
subject matter, used as patterns and methods for gener-
ating, ordering, applying, and testing that subject matter.
Familiarity with, understanding and applicability of the
syntactic structures of a particular discipline were
thought to evolve as the natural consequence of acquiring
and mastering the substantive structure of that same
discipline; this was dependent on the appropriate se-
quential development of that subject matter through in-
struction from the most fundamental toward the most
complex understandings.

Implicit in the reformer's logic here is their first
allegiance to the substantive structures or subject matter
of disciplined knowledge; secondly, their allegiance to the
acquisition and mastery of subject matter as the central
facilitative function of the curriculum and its disciplin-
ary organization; thirdly, their belief that such acqui-
sition and mastery is precursory to an understanding of
the syntactic structures of a discipline, and preliminary
to most sorts of "subsequent" learning, generation and
application of knowledge; and finally, this logic and its
expression in practice make clear that the reformers con-
ception of the nature of knowledge was actually imbalanced
with respect to product and process, leaning more toward
the substantive dimensions and less toward the syntactic
structures.

In sum, the reformer's rationale first separates like-
phenomena on the basis of existing content and organizes
it into established and closed compartments; it proceeds
to distinguish between disciplinary subject matter and
processes of inquiry, with the latter having its singular
reference in the former, and views both as established and
"given"; finally, the rationale arranges disciplinary products
and processes consecutively to make content-acquisition nec-
essarily precursory to process-acquaintance and methods-
application. Implicit in and emerging from the reformer's
rationale is an imbalanced pedagogical attention, favoring
the substantive dimension of knowledge and slighting the
syntactic; this translates into an equivalent distinction
and corresponding hierarchy between pure, abstract know-
ledge and knowledge in its concrete and applicable form.
Such an imbalance betrayed the reformer's continued sense
of the independent intellectual value of knowledge as
subject matter, independent of the utilitarian value to
which they claimed a commitment with the coming of the
Cold War. Puristic forms of knowledge as disciplinary
subject matter became the central focus of course re-
vision projects and curriculum reform in general, to the
neglect of applied knowledge, or disciplinary modes of
inquiry. And, as will be discussed in a subsequent section,
it was this same substantive focus that gave ultimate dir-
rection to midcentury methods of study and instruction.

References to midcentury conceptions of the "source"
of knowledge encompass several related meanings. Descriptions
of this particular aspect of knowledge may introduce components
of the reformer's view not yet discussed; however, this separate treatment of "source" intends primarily to clarify and elaborate several points made in relation to the "nature" of knowledge, and it permits alternative contexts for making those selected aspects of midcentury conceptions more emphatic. This subsection intends to make understandable not only what the reformers held to be the "source" of knowledge in several respects but also what is important about such conceptions and how they tend to influence educational experience and the curriculum. Too, through the methodological lens of congruence, the interactions between the reformers' conceptions of the "source" and the "nature" of knowledge will become clear; and, projecting ahead, the interactions between their conceptions of the "source," function, and use of knowledge; between their conceptions of "source" and "Cluster A" dimensions; between conceptions of "source" and other referents within the substantive domain, such as the human being as learner and socio-cultural realities.

The "source" of knowledge may be a reference to its point of origin. It is an understanding of this concept of point of origin, its various established meanings and interpretations, that facilitates a clarification of what was and was not the source of knowledge in the reformer's view.

The point of origin of knowledge may be its root, its ultimate and fundamental source, prior to its existence in a recognizable mode. As the source of knowledge, the root is not easily or verifiably discernable; in relation to a specific piece or body of existing knowledge, the root lies within the unique foundation of its own particular evolution, vulnerable to subjective rather than objective recognition by the conceivers or receivers. The root of knowledge refers not only to its "pre-material" existence but moreover to the very essence or fundamental unit of the process of inquiry or method of thinking giving rise to its discernable mode of "material" existence, for objective and subjective awareness.

A second identifiable point of origin of knowledge is the generative force giving rise to a specific piece or body of existing knowledge. The generative force is a more specific reference to the evolving (evolutionary) processes, the creating (creative) methodologies that operate as knowledge comes into a mode of "material" existence or discernable form for objective and subjective recognition. The meaning of generative force as the source of knowledge is then very much akin to the methodologic or syntactic dimensions discussed previously in relation to disciplinary knowledge, the processes giving rise to knowledge; in addition, however, this particular interpretation of point of origin as source refers to the causes, circumstances,
and influences in which the generating processes of inquiry and evolving methods of thinking are grounded.

Thirdly, the origin as source may be the point at which knowledge springs into being, into a "material" form of existence that can be outwardly, objectively recognized; this form may be a postulation, a fact or truth, a created object, a carefully formulated idea or generalization, a principle, a piece of information or knowledge induced or deduced - communicated or documented in some manner and "available" to would-be "knowers." This material form holds the roots and generative forces of knowledge within, collected, collaborated, and interwoven, and is in a sense their end result; however, this material form of knowledge, as it stands, is not necessarily concerned with its roots and processes of inquiry that gave rise to it; further, as it stands, this material form of knowledge may not make its roots and generative forces specific and available, may not give receivers access to them.

This aspect of the third point of origin of knowledge introduces the last to be discussed here: the source of knowledge as the point at which it presents itself in some "material" form to the receiver. In this form, knowledge may be treated as an object or subject to encounter, and the receiver meets it either objectively or subjectively, or from some combination of both perspectives.

If all four possible "sources" of knowledge as points of origin were placed on a continuum, consecutively as they are presented here, with "root" and "reception" in the extreme positions, a number of simplified analogues come to mind. The pattern created by the progression from root to reception may be likened to scientific and artistic methodologies or processes of inquiry and creating. For example, the stages of artistic creation may be labelled as the artist's creative inception, the developmental-creative process, the artifact itself, and presentation of the artifact to others. A second correlative of the source continuum might be a potentiality-actuality continuum; here, the root and generative forces as points of origin may be likened to various stages of potentiality, and the "material" forms of existence and the presence of knowledge in the consciousness of receivers may be likened to forms of actuality. Other similar continuums are those of essence-existence, means-ends, process-product, and syntactics-substantives.

Although the concept of point of origin as "source" of knowledge might be treated in alternative manners, it seems clear that midcentury curricularists' perspectives, interpretations, and models were not unlike those presented and elaborated here. For the reformers, each station
on the source continuum was acknowledged as a separate stage in the evolving generation and origination of knowledge; each point was distinct, although all points were related. Such distinctions with inherent relationships correspond with those found in the reformer’s curriculum rationale with regard to the dual nature of knowledge; that is, the various distinct points of origin correspond with the distinctions between and separation of the syntactic and substantive structures of disciplines, or the process and product dimensions of knowledge. Within the context of “source” as the point of origin of knowledge, the reformer’s conception of the source of knowledge corresponds congruently with their conception of the “nature” of knowledge; just as their favored substantive dimension represented the primary characteristics of the “nature” of knowledge, so did the actual or “material” existence and its presentational form for the receiver represent the “source” or point of origin of knowledge; just as the substantive structures of a discipline stood as the primary reference for coming to know the discipline’s syntactic structures, so did the material form of knowledge and its objective presence for the receiver provide the proper “meeting” for coming to know the roots and generative forces. In both cases, neither the syntactic structures nor the roots and generative forces were as significant for the reformers as the substantive structures and the material form of disciplinary knowledge. For midcentury curricularists, the source or point of origin of knowledge was the postulation, the fact or truth, the created object, the formulated idea or generalization, the piece of induced or deduced information— the actual, the existant, the ends, the products— communicated and documented, and in some manner “available.”

From the reformer’s perspective, the “source” of knowledge is understood as external to individuals involved in curricular phenomena and pedagogical situations. This is largely the perspective of the university academicians; while these individuals may have been engaged as both inquirers/generators and scholars/collectors in relation to knowledge, they assumed the objective vessel-posture of the scientist in both activities and passed this stance along to school people at elementary and secondary levels. University scholarship, as inquiry, research, analysis, testing, and so forth, attempts to bracket out internal, subjective sources or suppositions, making even these the object of external scrutiny and verification. At midcentury, the “source” of knowledge was to be “found” by students “outside” their own experiences; both inquiry and collection related to “given” knowledge, existing as sources independent of what may be called “subjective knowledge.” While in alternative curricular thought and pedagogical schemes the “source” of knowledge lies “within” individuals, midcentury reformers believed that the Cold War situation
permitted little curricular time for knowledge related to existential association, inner life, human nature, personal needs and social interests. The human being as "source" was bypassed for the disciplines as "source."

In the midcentury paradigm, the source of knowledge may refer to the curriculum itself, which contains the disciplines as the form of knowledge deemed appropriate by the reformers. To restate Philip Phenix's words,

...all curriculum content should be drawn from the disciplines, or, to put it another way, only knowledge contained in the disciplines is appropriate to the curriculum... the disciplines reveal knowledge in its teachable forms...and non-disciplined knowledge is unsuitable for teaching and learning.23

Too, with regard to the disciplines as sources of knowledge, it was the distinct form in which the university scholars brought them and the structures into which they analyzed them that served as the "source." Further, the "source" of knowledge might be interpreted in terms of the relative value of the various disciplines. From the reformer's view in this regard, the curriculum hierarchy gave preference to disciplinary knowledge that was or would be valuable to the adult Space Age-participant; consequently, not only were the sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages the major "source" of pertinent knowledge in the curriculum, but also their forms and the structures into which they were analyzed provided the "source" or model after which other disciplinary forms and structures were fashioned.

Within a comprehensive conception of knowledge, descriptive references to the "function" and "use" of knowledge are directly relational; it is only a fine line that distinguishes these two aspects. Function and use exist together conceptually, on a potential-action continuum characterized by movement, and the direction of movement, by the conceiver; the movement from functions intended and defined toward uses made is the direction of the conceiver's process. Movement on the continuum from the function intended and defined for knowledge toward the uses and applications made of it designates a shift in tense, as from potentiality to actuality and action, from preparation and rehearsal to participation. Consequently, what occurs at the level of using and applying knowledge is directly related to what has been defined and intended as its valued function at the level of preparation. Stated differently, what is conceived as the function or purpose of knowledge
at the level of preparation has a greater chance of mani-
festing and expressing itself at the level of use than what
is not conceived as a valuable function of knowledge. How-
ever, it is clear that the process of movement itself, and
the direction of movement, from intention to actuality can
be called into question; in this regard, the functions int-
tended at the conceptual level may contain flaws or contra-
dictions, and this may make authentic movement toward actual-
ity on the continuum - toward use itself - a complex and
similarly flawed matter.

For the curriculum reformers, movement on the con-
tinuum from functions intended to uses made of knowledge
designates also a shift in point of view or principle/actor;
here, function is defined by curricular/pedagogical author-
ity and use is initiated and made by students. Or, the
function of knowledge is defined by the controlling agent
in terms of both its utilitarian and pedagogical influence
or performance on students who encounter knowledge, and
use or application is carried forth by the changed/know-
ledgeable student as principle.

Finally, conceptions of the functions intended and
uses to be made of knowledge are directly related to con-
ceptions of the "nature" and "source" of knowledge within
the same thought-system. While one can only speculate on
which conceptions give rise to which others, the inter-
actions among and between these four aspects can be dis-
cerned and described in terms of congruence and incon-
gruence. For the midcentury reformers, the interaction
between conceptions of the function and use of knowledge
are of particular importance toward illuminating flaws in
their understanding of the "nature" of knowledge and their
eventual position on methods of study and instruction.

Within the context of their commitment to national
service, the reformers clearly begin with an image of a
function-use continuum and conceptual assumptions about
movement from preparation to participation with knowledge.
Preparation and participation are related here, as the
potential of knowledge was defined strictly in terms of its
actual use and applicability. For the midcentury reformers,
the most appropriate and valuable function of knowledge
was held to be its applicability toward national accomplish-
ment. "National accomplishment" was narrowly interpreted
in relation to emergent Cold War developments and corre-
sponding socio-political arrangements and conditions; within
educational institutions, knowledge was the "service" that
could be "prepared" toward such accomplishment. Its po-
tential function was held to be utilitarian and pragmatic,
fulfilling scientific, technologic and military needs as
well as related vocational demands. With the curricular-
ist's interpretation of their responsibility to "prepare"
youth for active service, the dissemination and acquisition
of appropriate disciplinary knowledge was considered a contribution to the nation's "potential" competitive power in its race for supremacy. After the essentialist position, the function of knowledge in the form of organized disciplinary bodies was the preservation and storage of pertinent aspects of the race experience for later use in its own maintenance and in the solving of new and untried problems. Knowledge was held to be the instrument of national accomplishment; its highest function was its applicability toward fulfilling national Space Age aims.

Toward these ends, the reform curricularists understood a second, related function of knowledge to be the rigorous academic, intellectual preparation of youth who would later use and apply knowledge in utilitarian and pragmatic ways. That is, in order to equip students to initiate and carry forth the primary function intended for knowledge, educational experience and curricular phenomena had the task of making knowledge the instrument of intellectualization. In this context, and as a direct adjunct to the larger national function of codified knowledge, the function of knowledge here is defined in terms of its ability to sort out the most academically gifted youth, train and develop their intellectual faculties, make available disciplinary forms and structures proper to preparation for national service, attune youth to the necessity of social adaptation and national service, to bring them into alignment with the national sense of purpose in the Cold War and Space Age.

What the midcentury reformers did not conceive as the function of knowledge must be clearly noted. It was not intended to prepare students to question the national situation or to assume reconstructionist, transformational roles in relation to the Space Age. And as the reformers did not attend to the more subjective, existential knowledge of the inner and personal/social lives of students as individuals, the preferred "exterior" knowledge was not meant to function in relation to the "self" of students.

Projected at the other end of the potentiality-actuality continuum, on the other side of the function of knowledge as utilitarian, competitive equipment and as preparation of youth's intellectual power, were the reformers' conceptions of the "use" of knowledge. The reformers projected that students would acquire and synthesize disciplinary knowledge in order to apply it within the context of national, Space Age demands. These notions of acquisition, synthesis, and application taken together imply a process of education, or authentic movement on the continuum from potential functions intended to actual uses made. This process is one of transferring disciplinary knowledge, selected and organized in forms and structures encountered in educational institutions, into forms in which it can actually be used and applied.
It was in relation to this process of transferability, the need for practical use and specific application of existing knowledge, coupled with the need to prepare youth to generate new pertinent knowledge, that the reformers emphasized the dual nature of knowledge itself: the disciplinary subject matter, or substantive structures, and the disciplinary modes of inquiry, or the syntactic structures. The question becomes, how, on the potentiality-actuality continuum, did the reformers intend to facilitate such transferability, or the authentic process of movement from functions intended toward uses and applications made?

As has been noted earlier, the reformers held that the syntactic structures of a discipline, or its modes of inquiry and patterns of thought, were the tools with which students would use, apply, and generate knowledge. They held that these syntactic structures and disciplinary modes would become apparent, familiar, and part of the students working power through mastery of the substantive structures of disciplinary subject matter. The reformers envisioned this consecutive ordering and directional movement from disciplinary substantive understandings to syntactic familiarity and power much as the process of transferring disciplinary subject matter into forms in which it could be applied. It was with this general process that the reformers intended to facilitate transferability, or the authentic process of movement from functions intended for knowledge toward uses and applications made with it.

However, if the components of the reformer's process are superimposed on the potentiality-actuality continuum, as it has been described in this subsection, a number of incongruences become apparent and identifiable; in the following table the equivalents revealed in such a superimposition are noted: (See Diagram No. IX).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions Intended for Knowledge</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Uses Made of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentiality Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actuality Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Structures of Disciplinary Subject Matter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Synaptic Structures of Disciplinary Modes/Processes of Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Forms of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Forms of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Acquisition of Substantive Structures of Disciplinary Subject Matter as Curricular/ Instructional Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syntheses and Transfer of Substantive Structures; Discernment, Use, Application of Syntactic Structures as Student Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Defined by Curricular/ Instructional Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use Initiated and Carried Forth by Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram IX: Potentiality-Actuality and Function-Use Continuums
While the reformers intended to focus on the utilitarian, pragmatic functions of knowledge, and while their interpretation of midcentury curricular functions conceptually favored the use, application, and production of knowledge, their process of movement from preparation/preparatory focus to actuality/applicable tools must be called into question. The initial stages of this process and its proposed eventualities were disparate entities. The functions intended for knowledge at the conceptual level contained contradictions, incongruences in relation to the application and use to be made of knowledge, when this occurs, and when the process of movement on the continuum is governed by preparatory components rather than desired actualities/eventualities, authentic movement toward application and use is flawed and impaired.

What occurs at the level of using and applying knowledge is directly related to what occurs at the level of preparation; what is neither integral nor consciously attended in preparation may not manifest itself with certainty at the level of action. While the reformers wished this sort of control, their imbalanced preparatory practices did not contain the elements that would facilitate their utilitarian, pragmatic intentions for knowledge. They focused on substantive mastery in preparation for syntactic participation; on pure, abstract forms of knowledge as supplying the potential for using applied forms of knowledge; on the belief that student synthesis and application were functions of their acquisition of disciplinary subject matter, as facilitated by the curriculum; and on the intellectualization and academic development of human beings as learners who were expected to become a generation of knowledge producers and appliers.

Once again, these incongruences are directly related to other aspects of the reformer's imbalanced conception of knowledge, such as their favoring of the disciplinary substantive structures, or pure dimensions of subject matter, as fundamental characteristics of the "nature" of knowledge. Their acknowledgement but subsequent disregard of knowledge as "search," as resourceful modes of inquiry and patterns of thought, is synonymous with their disregard of applied forms of knowledge and the actual use of knowledge itself. All of these imbalances and incongruences mitigated against the reformers' conceptual intentions for the function of knowledge.

To conclude this third section of Chapter IV, focused on conventional referents within the midcentury paradigm's substantive domain, the curriculum reform movements' conceptions of the human being as learner and of socio-cultural realities must be described. These descriptions will be
Midcentury conceptions of the human being as learner might be appropriately expressed in relation to a continuum denoting human ontological centers. The extremes on such a continuum might be characterized as subjective, interior-rootedness and objective, exterior-rootedness. These centers are frames of reference within which individuals see and understand themselves, their interactions with others, and their relationships with socio-cultural realities and public life-contexts. These frames of reference will be very generally delineated, as a way of subsequently describing and clarifying midcentury ontological perspectives of and assumptions about "students" held by reformers and built into their curriculum rationale. Further, the interactions between midcentury conceptions of the human being as learner and a knowledge will be noted.

Individuals perceive phenomena, participate in experience, and constitute meanings from both subjective and objective centers. They picture themselves as separate individuals with unique characters, private sides, and distinctive identities; and individuals picture their exterior, publically-shaped selves and social characters that evolve through social participation and cultural sharing with others. Human beings are sensitive to their interior instincts, personal needs, inner voices and rhythms; and they are sensitive to social expectation and cultural adaptation related to the order and laws of the public, physical, and political world. Individuals are self-experiencing, spontaneously and conscientiously involved in processes of self-development, self-fulfilment, of "becoming" through absorption in the present; and they are self-observing, discursively analyzing and building their sense of acculturation and socio-public development, with views to the past and the future. Human beings are inner-directed, sensitive to private impulses and self-made standards; and they are outer-directed, sensitive to socio-cultural standards and public sanctions, reliant on the guidance and judgmental gaze of others. Individuals interpret reality independently, constitute personal traditions, visions and intentions; and they internalize public visions and interpretations of the world shaped by the dominant culture, through processes of socialization and collective living. No attempt is made here to elaborate or pass judgment on the substance of this informal, abridged delineation of ontological centers, and no attempt is made to account for their developmental and circumstantial meaning in the language or context of scholarship devoted to such studies. However, the general possibility of balance and integration with respect to these centers might be asserted here, and the implicit dangers of a
singular, extreme position on the continuum that would mitigate against such synthesis.

In this regard, it might be said that with the coming of the Cold War and Space Era the curriculum reformers assumed an objective, exterior-rooted perspective, a publically-shaped character, and a socially adaptive posture for themselves and for student-learners. They seemed to gravitate toward an extreme position on the continuum, picturing themselves and students as parts of a collective national service force in relation to the immediate felt-crisis. The reformers seemed to internalize public visions and interpretations of reality for all school people, defining their instincts and intentions, their purposes and responsibilities in accordance with socio-political expectations of the dominant culture at a national level.

For the reformers, these public ontological perspectives and national role-images may be said to have surfaced in an exaggerated manner, as other human instincts and images, intentions and needs resting at the other end of the continuum were largely neglected. The curriculum reformers conceptualized student-learners in a "fitting" manner with respect to socio-political circumstances given and accepted, commitments to national service made, and the acquisition-production-application of knowledge as the highest priority decided. The reformers concern was with adapting appropriate students to attend wholly to national needs and expectations, and with prescribing the most efficient, predictable, and productive manner of fulfilling their commitments. By midcentury there had already been much criticism within educational communities of curricular attention to more humanistic ontological centers; pedagogical dwelling on subjective, interior-rooted frames of human reference was held to be permissive, time-consuming, and non-productive in view of the competitive efficiency and academic excellence thought to be required by the Cold War situation. Consequently, it might be said that the reformers held a divided view of the human being as learner, rather than a balanced, integrated, or holistic view.

Human beings as learners at midcentury were conceived as objective receivers, collectors, and potential producers and appliers of knowledge. They were considered as initially less knowledgeable than the pedagogue and those on the frontier of the knowledge that would become the object of study/instruction. The divided view of human beings as learners at midcentury favored their intellectual capacities, in relation to the knowledge students were to accrue, produce, and apply, and their academic potential, which the world of knowledge was intended to develop. Individuality among human beings as learners was recognized exclusively in relation to intellectual capacity and academic potential;
students were recognized on the basis of the degree to which they were able to attain excellence in those respects, wherein standards of excellence were set by the reformers. Students were tested and tracked accordingly, as the reformers' intentions were to single out and focus on the most gifted students in the nations' interests.

From the reformer's divided perspective, students as learners were conceptualized as a generation of young intellectuals, as miniature adult scholars, who would specialize in particular disciplinary fields pertinent to Cold War needs and Space Age competition. The relationship between elementary and secondary level students and disciplinary knowledge was understood as parallel to the relationship between university scholars and their academic research and disciplinary specialization. The Woods Hole Conference participants, and reformers in general, held that the intellectual capabilities of elementary and secondary level students were not qualitatively different from those of mature university scholars, that differences were only those of degree. Bruner asserted that "intellectual activity anywhere is the same whether at the frontier of knowledge or in a third-grade classroom." Consequently, conceptions and treatment of knowledge, the structuring of disciplines, the selection, sequential organization and presentation of subject matter, and the development of materials were largely modeled after university scholarship, scholars and their intellectual capabilities.

Thus, the curriculum is not conceived in terms of its appropriateness for the child as child, but for a child who is a miniature adult and who is to become a full-sized adult by dealing with a scaled-down version of the logically formulated subject matter of adult scholarship. The authenticity and integrity of childhood is sacrificed by seeing the child as merely a future adult scholar.

Such emulation neglected theoretical developments of Whitehead, Dewey, and others, and the research of Piaget, focused on developmental stages of intellective capacities which are manifest in qualitative changes through maturational processes. Relatedly, the reformers' conceptions and treatment of knowledge were neither rooted in students' existential biographies nor made congruent with their personal-social needs, subjective centers, adolescent problems. The holistic young human being as a referent within the substantive domain was not used as a source
or influence on the reformer's curriculum rationale or conceptions of knowledge.

With respect to midcentury conceptions of the third conventional referent in the substantive domain, socio-cultural realities, life-contexts, and phenomena, much pertinent description appears throughout this chapter. Although conceptualized narrowly and confined to immediate socio-political developments at the level of a national "crisis," this third referent might be said to have provided the initial impetus for the direction of the curriculum reform movement; put in this context, socio-cultural realities may seem to have been the reformer's "referent of priority" among the substantive domain conceptualizations. However, the nature of the reformer's response to the Cold War, expressed through their curriculum rationale, all conceptualizations within it and practices deriving from it, reveals that they misunderstood even the social situation to which they claimed a central commitment. The reformers may have contended that their rationale facilitated "social problem-solving," a commitment and activity traditionally associated with this third substantive referent, in relation to their interpretation of the Cold War and the corresponding responsibilities of the curriculum; however, their pre-occupation with knowledge and subsequent misconceptions of its nature, function, use, and source in relation to the national situation mitigated against authentic social problem-solving. Their curricular approach was incongruent with their conceptual intentions.

Too, the reformer's narrow interpretation of this third referent, singularly contingent on Cold War and Space Age phenomena, meant that their rationale disregarded other aspects of contemporary social life properly associated with this referent. Where the tendency exists to regard the curriculum primarily as an instrument of a sharply focused social cause at the level of national service, a barrage of other socio-cultural concerns and phenomena are ignored.
3. Curriculum Development Sphere

The central purpose of this fourth section is to describe the general form midcentury conceptions of knowledge assume as they are expressed and manifest within the Curriculum Development Sphere. Within the foregoing descriptions of Cluster A and Substantive Domain conceptualizations, knowledge not only emerges as the priority referent for the reform movement and the focus of its curriculum rationale, but also becomes synonymous with a set of distinct disciplines. Clearly, comprehensive conceptualizations of knowledge, at both theoretical and developmental levels of curricular research and planning, strongly influence the nature of educational experience, the fabric of curricular phenomena, and the character of curricular designs. The translation of foundational conceptualizations and assumptions into concrete curricular arrangements resembles the transformation of theory into practice, which is a concern integral to both theoretical and developmental inquiry. Conceptual intentions give character to the focus and function of educational experience, give direction to the structures of curricular phenomena and the configurations of curricular designs. The curriculum, in turn, is often said to "deliver" conceptualizations and intentions asserted at theoretical and developmental levels; the curriculum, and the interactions of all components and elements of educational experience therein, are then a pedagogical synthesis and reflection of conceptual thought.

Congruent with the reformers' foundational conceptualizations and assumptions within Cluster A and the Substantive Domain, their curriculum rationale translated into a "disciplinary" development sphere, or a discipline-centered curriculum design. For the reformers, the fact that disciplinarity was only one of the various modes for organizing knowledge, already established and documented by midcentury, was virtually ignored; however, it is clear that a discipline-centered scheme most faithfully and congruently reflects the reformer's comprehensive conception of knowledge. The use of disciplinary constructs is the "purest" form of organizing knowledge, within the range of subject-centered curricular schemes, through a separate housing of the individual subject areas. This form was adapted by the reformers from university models. Herein, the disciplines are separated into distinct compartments, collectively used as organizational
devices and components giving structure to the curriculum. The disciplinary houses are used to create the overall design of the educational neighborhood, to systematize the environment, structure the day's schedule, time, space, school people and their activities.

Further, it might be noted that disciplinary schemes, and related subject-centered designs, established and practiced both before and after the midcentury reforms, represent the most widely accepted and predominantly used approaches to curriculum/knowledge organization. The disciplinary approach has been durable because of the characteristic instructional and operational conveniences it offers. This arrangement provides a clear and systematic means for the creation and establishment of "courses," or instructional categories, which corresponds with the experience, backgrounds and capabilities of faculty members and administrators in the public schools. A design with separate knowledge compartments can easily accommodate new areas of specialization in the form of "courses," and existing disciplinary constructs can be modified, split, revised and made current without disturbing the neighboring domains or the overall framework. Relationally, texts, curriculum packages, and other instructional materials can be created in a systematic and standardized manner to correspond with separate disciplinary constructs, and conveniently modified and revised from their own previous forms as separate courses change. Clearly delineated realms of concentration allow for more coverage within each specialized area, greater depth of disciplinary treatment, a clear vantage point and approach. This curricular arrangement also provides for "vertical articulation," or coordinating the various courses of study within each disciplinary category through the consecutive grades. More important for midcentury reformers, perhaps, is the "clarity of pedagogical-mind" afforded by a discipline-centered curricular scheme. This structuring and sequencing of separate disciplines congruently reflects the structure of the human sensibility fixed on puristic conceptions of knowledge/knowledge products and focused on the logic of separate subject matter domains. This curricular arrangement represents and perpetuates the integrity of the separate disciplines, which is a concern of traditional importance to proponents of intellectual, academic scholarship. Further, this arrangement serves as a concrete affirmation that pedagogical preoccupation with knowledge, seemingly for its own sake, is acceptable.

Central to the structuring of separate knowledge domains within the midcentury discipline-centered scheme were the reformers' conceptions of the "structure-of-a-discipline" rationale and the "spiral" curriculum. Both of these central concepts embody and express midcentury understandings of knowledge. To reiterate briefly, the
reformers held that students must grasp both the substantive structures of subject matter and the syntactic modes of inquiry of each separate discipline, the latter becoming apparent through student's mastery of the former. Each discipline was held to be distinct by virtue of its separate substantive and syntactic structures.

...the curriculum of a subject should be determined by the most fundamental understanding that can be achieved of the underlying principles that give structure to that subject. 27

The subject matter content of each separate discipline was structured in accordance with what appeared to be its own substantive logic, progressing from the simple to more complex principles, ideas, and generalizations. In this respect, each disciplinary domain was thought to have its own "spiral." With vertical articulation in the curriculum to coordinate subject matter in the separate disciplines through consecutive years, students progressed through each "spiral" over the years, or through graduated, sequential development of subject matter from the simple to the complex.

A curriculum as it develops should revisit these basic ideas repeatedly, building upon them until the student has grasped the full formal apparatus that goes with them... 28

The disciplinary curricular scheme and its treatment of knowledge were incongruent with the reformers' conceptual intentions for the eventual use of knowledge in the context of their commitment to national service. Deriving from midcentury conceptions of knowledge, disciplines were housed separately; and the subsequent substantive focus and preoccupation with pure, abstract forms of knowledge effectively block expression of applied forms of knowledge and exercise of inquiry processes, even within a separate discipline. Subject matter was selected and organized on the basis of its disciplinary purity rather than its applicability or necessary interdisciplinarity. While this curricular scheme provided for vertical integration, or the deepening and cohering of knowledge within one domain, all forms of horizontal integration, the widening of knowledge through the development of interdisciplinary relationships and collaboration, were effectively blocked. Tanner and Tanner cite the following 1967 description by Alvin M. Weinberg in their discussion of "the incongruence between the mission-oriented society and the discipline-oriented university":

Our society is mission-oriented. Its mission is resolution of problems arising from social, technical, and psychological conflicts and pressures. Since these problems are not generated within any single intellectual discipline, their resolution is not to be found within a single discipline...In society the nonspecializer and synthesizer is king.

The university by contrast is discipline-oriented. Its viewpoint is the sum of the viewpoints of the separate, traditional disciplines that constitute it. The problems it deals with are, by and large, problems generated and solved within the disciplines themselves. The university's standards of excellence are set by and within the disciplines. What deepens our understanding of a discipline is excellent. In the university the specialist and analyst is king.
4. Methods of Instruction and Study

The conceptual paradigm, representing midcentury curricular thought and inquiry and reflecting reform movement logic and sensibility, has been described through the first sections of this chapter. As a general conceptual scheme, this paradigm was designed and developed for this research, to represent comprehensive curricular systems/situations, their spheres, dimensions, and the interactions among the levels and components of thought and practice. With respect to the midcentury curricular system, the conceptual paradigm has been described in order to provide a comprehensive and foundational context within which the reform movement's conception of knowledge might be apprehended and understood. The curriculum methodology of congruence has been used as a lens for viewing this conceptual paradigm, as a tool for describing and explaining its interacting spheres, dimensions, referents and elements involved in midcentury conceptions of knowledge. Looking into the conceptual paradigm with the methodology of congruence facilitates the display of midcentury logic in such a way that flaws and contradictions, or incongruences, are made apparent with respect to conceptions of knowledge; such expression and exposure provide the background against which a fundamental reconceptualization of knowledge can emerge for the contemporary era of curriculum inquiry and practice, which continues to be troubled and influenced by midcentury conceptions.

It is now time to bring the whole of these foregoing discussions into focus within the context of midcentury conceptions of "educational methods," or methods of instruction and study. Throughout this chapter allusions have been made to midcentury positions on such methods and on interacting conceptions of knowledge and methods, and these allusions become the central subject of this fourth section of Chapter IV. As conceptions of and interactions among the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge can be examined for incongruence, conceptions of "methods of instruction and study" within the same curricular system can be examined for corresponding flaws and contradictions; ultimately, knowledge, methods, and their interactions can be so examined and conceptually transformed, or reconceptualized.
As described in various sections throughout these chapters of research, conceptions of knowledge within a comprehensive curricular system/situation carry a heightened significance and impact for educational experience and curricular phenomena when "knowledge" emerges as the referent of priority during conceptualization processes. Methods of instruction and study, as mediums helping to bring knowledge into the consciousness and experience of students, are central among elements of educational experience and curricular phenomena affected significantly and impactfully by conceptions of knowledge prevailing within the same curricular system. Methods are understood as mediums facilitating interaction between students and knowledge, however conceived, or as processes through which students come to be involved with knowledge. Methods may be understood in at least two basic ways, as instruction and pedagogy from the teacher's perspective, and as study and inquiry from the student's perspective. Clearly the nature of educational experience and the fabric of curricular phenomena are profoundly affected by and dependent upon prevailing methods of instruction and study conceived and encouraged in curricular systems/situations.

At all levels of inquiry, thought, and practice related to knowledge- or discipline-centered curricular situations, then, conceptions of both knowledge and methods are particularly instrumental in giving character to student's experience of formal education. Further, as prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge and dominant conceptions of methods of instruction and study are taken together in interacting forms, the fabric of curricular phenomena is given character. It has been suggested throughout this research that conceptions of knowledge give rise to conceptions of methods, that methods selected and developed are derived from and have as a central reference prevailing conceptions of knowledge. Further, it has been suggested that conceptions of a particular body of knowledge can give substantial and meaningful direction to the selection and development of methods in that particular subject area; within a conception of a body of knowledge, in the discovery of its essential nature, function, use, and source, lie significant implications for methods of educational instruction or inquiry through which students can come to be involved with and "know" that subject area. It is within this context, of conceptions of knowledge and methods as they are taken together in interacting forms in curricular thought and practice, that questions may be raised with regard to subject/method congruence; are conceptions of knowledge and methods, in both thought and practice, organically related to one another, essentially interpreted and consistently translated for one another, and integrated into one another?
As stated earlier, the purpose of this chapter is to discern and describe conceptions of knowledge and methods, their impetus, patterns, mutual influence and interactions; and this, during the midcentury curriculum reform period which comprises a large and influential portion of the heritage of contemporary educational experience and curricular practice in the literary and cinematic arts. The purpose of the previous sections has been to delineate the comprehensive conceptions of the nature, function, use and source of knowledge held at midcentury, and to collect and bring together the sources, influences, schemes and rationales surrounding and related to those conceptions of knowledge. This section intends to follow logically the selection of methods of instruction and study as these derive from and have as their reference comprehensive conceptions of knowledge at midcentury. Such delineations are intended to provide an understanding of the profound impact and meaning midcentury conceptions of knowledge had for educational experience in general at that time, and of the influence they continue to exert on contemporary educational experience in the literary and cinematic arts.

The following diagram, revised to specify selected midcentury positions in an abbreviated manner, reiterates the scope of this chapter. The central sphere of "Inquiry" represents the special focus of this research and the questions it poses with regard to conceptions of knowledge, methods, and their interactions in formal educational experience. (See Diagram X).
Cluster A

See Chapter IV and Diagram XI

Substantive Domain

1. Knowledge as Disciplinary Content first, and Disciplinary Processes of Inquiry second
2. Learner as Receiver of Content through Scholastic Methods of Guided Inquiry first, and Knowledge producer-applier second
3. Socio-cultural Realities in Space Age/Cold War context, to accept and serve

Sphere of Critical and Theoretical Inquiry

Knowledge as Substantive and Pure in Spirals

Educational Methods as Narrative, Scholastic through Guided Inquiry

Curriculum Development Sphere

Diagram X: Conceptual Meta-Scheme of the Midcentury Curriculum Reform Movement
The following remarks by Jerome S. Bruner, from his 1966 Toward a Theory of Instruction, serve as a pertinent abridgement and exemplification of the knowledge/methods-interaction problem experienced during the curriculum reform movement; these remarks reflect the focus of this chapter and appropriately introduce the knowledge/methods discussion in this particular section:

...a theory of instruction seeks to take account of the fact that a curriculum reflects not only the nature of knowledge itself but also the nature of the knower and the knowledge-getting process. It is an enterprise par excellence where the line between subject matter and method grows necessarily indistinct. ...Knowledge is a process, not a product. 30

Because Bruner presents these remarks within the context of the development of an instructional theory, "the nature of knowledge" would seem to refer to his notion of (and the reformer's affirmation of) the dual nature of disciplinary knowledge, or subject matter and modes of inquiry; and "the knowledge-getting process," within the context of instructional theory, would seem to refer to methods of instruction/pedagogy and study/inquiry. However, as Bruner continues, he speaks of a congruence between "subject matter" and "method," seeming to make subject matter synonymous with the nature of knowledge, and secondly to make method parallel with the knowledge-getting process. Bruner then seems to contend that instructional methods account for and reflect the nature of knowledge which is represented by disciplinary subject matter; and further, that where congruence exists between subject matter and instructional methods, it is singularly the subject matter that gives direction to and finds reflection in a knowledge-getting instructional process/method. What is not immediately clear is the fate of the disciplinary modes of inquiry: must instructional methods also account for and reflect these? and where congruence exists between subject matter and method, are disciplinary modes of inquiry implied or involved? In view of Bruner's comment, "knowledge is a process, not a product," does he mean to encompass modes of inquiry within "subject matter," taking for granted that both substantive and syntactic structures of disciplines give direction to instructional methods that are, in turn, congruent with and reflect both structures? Or does this last comment inform the second half of the quotation differently, wherein, "subject matter and method" would refer to the dual nature of knowledge itself, the line between disciplinary subject matter and modes of inquiry growing indistinct through instructional
methods and making "Knowledge...a process, not a product"?
Or, in view of Bruner's and the reformer's well-known
weighted attention to disciplinary subject matter as the
curricular path to familiarity with modes of inquiry, does
he reveal that bias here by dropping explicit instructional
representation of these modes and inserting a precursory
"knowledge-getting" method related only to subject matter?
Here Bruner would be relegating disciplinary modes of in­
quiry to the realm of instruction in as implicit a way as
he includes them in "subject matter."

The question of the fate of disciplinary modes of
inquiry has bits of its complex answer in all of these ex­
planatory attempts. Within the reformer's conceptual
understanding of the dual nature of knowledge, the separate
disciplinary modes of inquiry were considered the pillars
upon which students' abilities to use, apply, transfer
and generate knowledge depended. With such importance at­
tached to these modes and students' abilities to exercise
them during the competitive Space Age, in what form do they
appear in the curriculum and in instruction? How are these
modes concretized in practice within curricular phenomena
and events? Where and how are they reflected within the
midcentury paradigm? Bruner's Woods Hole Conference report
is again informative in these regards.

The reformers did not intend to represent disciplinary
modes of inquiry/syntactic structures in an explicitly dis­
cernable form in the paradigm, in curricular phenomena and
events, in the curriculum, or in instruction. They con­
tended that as students "get" or acquire disciplinary subject
matter, learn its substantive structures and master its
content, they would be implicitly familiarizing themselves
with disciplinary modes of inquiry and hence the ability to
use, apply, transfer and generate knowledge. It was pro­
posed that an understanding and mastery of the most funda­
mental principles, ideas and generalizations of disciplinary
content, graduated over time from the simple to the more
complex, would prepare and activate students to apply and
use knowledge within separate fields, to transfer and apply
content and modes of inquiry to problems cutting across
several disciplinary fields, and to generate new knowledge.

The continuity of learning that
is produced by the second type of
transfer, transfer of principles,
is dependent upon mastery of the
structure of the subject matter
... The more fundamental or basic
is the idea he has learned, almost
by definition, the greater will be
its breadth of applicability to
new problems. 31
Several preliminary conclusions can be drawn regarding the reformers' conceptual assumptions and understandings about knowledge/methods interactions from a curricular perspective. A related diagrammatic abridgement follows this list (See Diagram No. XI ), and both may be used referencibly in the continuing discussion.

A. Within the midcentury paradigm, curricular phenomena/events, and instruction, the equivalent of knowledge is disciplinary subject matter/substantive structures, rather than subject matter plus disciplinary modes of inquiry/syntactic structures. In the curriculum, students encounter subject matter explicitly and modes of inquiry implicitly; they are expected to identify, understand and use syntactic structures independently, after mastery of the subject matter content/substantive structures.

B. Congruence and organic interaction must necessarily exist between the curriculum/curricular concerns and content and the instruction/instructional concerns and methods. Inquiry and conceptual formulations in one area must take the nature of the other area into account. The nature of knowledge, the knowledge-getting process, the learner, the subject matter and methods of instruction are necessarily concerns of both curricular and instructional thought and practice.

C. In this regard, however, curriculum/curricular concerns and content are equated with knowledge as disciplinary subject matter/substantive structures, and instruction/instructional concerns are equated with methods explicitly facilitating acquisition of subject matter/substantive structures.

D. As instructional methods are to be made congruent with and explicitly reflect the nature of curricular/disciplinary subject matter and the manner of its acquisition, these same methods are neither similarly congruent with nor explicitly reflective of disciplinary modes of inquiry and the manner of their acquisition.

E. Instructional methods are related to "knowledge-getting" processes, or the acquisition of disciplinary subject matter/substantive structures.

F. Bruner first acknowledges that the curriculum reflects the nature of three components, knowledge, the knowledge-getting process, and the knower. However, when speaking of the necessary congruence between curriculum and instruction, he only refers to organicism
between the nature of knowledge (curricular subject matter) and the knowledge-getting process (instructional methods). Although Bruner addresses a congruence between subject matter, method, and the learner in portions of his writing, he frequently, as here, excludes the learner as an influence on knowledge/methods conceptions and interactions.

G. Within the midcentury conceptual paradigm, methods of instruction/pedagogy do not appear in the conventional Substantive Domain in the sense that knowledge, the learner, and society appear. Methods are assumed to be concerns of another order, not warranting foundational conceptualization at the levels of Cluster A and the Substantive Domain, but rather concerns of the instructional realm at the level of the Curriculum Development Sphere. Methods might, however, be considered a referent embedded in the referent of "knowledge" from the midcentury perspective.
Nature of Knowledge  =  bodies organized into separate disciplines;
Nature of Disciplinary Knowledge  =  subject matter and modes of inquiry;
Disciplinary Subject Matter  =  pure knowledge, substantive structures, products and
Disciplinary Modes of Inquiry  =  applied knowledge, syntactic structures, processes.
Curriculum Content  =  disciplinary subject matter;
Disciplinary Subject Matter  \rightarrow  scholastic methods, narrative instruction
or
Pure Knowledge, Substantive Structures, Products  \rightarrow  scholastic methods, narrative instruction
Disciplinary Subject Matter, Substantive Structures, Products  \rightarrow  disciplinary modes of inquiry, applied knowledge, syntactic structures, processes.

= equals
\rightarrow  informs, source of, gives rise to
\div  broken down or organized by

Diagram XI: Midcentury Conceptions of Knowledge and Methods
An examination of Jerome S. Bruner's 1963 essay, "Needed: A Theory of Instruction," serves to extend this discussion. This essay addresses the question of what might be instructional concerns in relation to curricular thought and practice and in relation to knowledge/methods conceptions and interactions. Bruner proceeds from the assumption that at this date, 1963, the field of curriculum was suffering from the lack of instructional theory, especially one closely tied with the nature of knowledge and the nature of the learner.

The sense of this essay is that a theory of instruction, and its expression in the form of methods, ought to be concerned with and take into account the nature of knowledge, among other factors. Further, it appears to be the nature of disciplinary knowledge itself, the substantive structures of separate bodies of subject matter, that gives direction to Bruner's development of "theorems" for instructional methods. A theory of instruction, Bruner explains, must concern itself with the structuring and sequencing of knowledge, or disciplinary subject matter.

Prior to describing what Bruner means by these instructional concerns in relation to the nature of knowledge, it is significant to note several general assumptions, tendencies and aims consistently interwoven throughout this essay and foundational to his positions on instruction and knowledge/methods interactions. Bruner places the task of initiating and prescribing in teaching-learning situations in the hands of the teacher; herein, instruction/pedagogy is a matter of imparting existing knowledge in accordance with predetermined objectives grounded in academic acquisition. Bruner names the value of instructional theory as a practical matter,

to guide one in the process of passing on the knowledge, the skills, the point of view and the heart of a culture.

Bruner's focus is on "well-defined problems with unique solutions," or on the pedagogical concern with given knowledge and understood phenomena about which students can be led to know. He further focuses on the "optimal" production of particular, prescribed ends with regard to the acquisition of subject matter/substantive structures through instruction. Bruner remains within the boundaries of what is known and what belongs to the established disciplinary realms of knowledge. While the pedagogue may concede to initiate instruction at the level of experiential representation of knowledge for students, Bruner's thrust is always an outward movement toward the ultimate substantive lesson; using as an example the movement from a seesaw experience to identifying Newton's Law of Moments,
Bruner lifts knowledge out of an existential reference/context to give it an objective, academic meaning or denotation. He says, "Only with time do children free themselves from this tendency to equate things with actions." The pedagogue breaks down and reduces complex subject matter content into simpler, manageable forms, to be grasped by students step-by-step; while this intends to facilitate subsequent combinings and syntheses of subject matter into its authentic complex form, the objective and codified content is not returned to its applied form, its existential representation and context.

Early in life and also early in our mastery of a subject we may have to represent things in terms of what we do with them - in much the same way as a child "knows about" balance beams by knowing what to do on a seesaw. We may then emerge with an image of it, however non-rigorous the image may be. Then and only then can language and symbol systems be applied with some degree of likelihood that their reference will be understood...You create a structure, not by starting off with the highest brow symbolic version, but by giving it in the muscles, then in imagery and then giving it in language, with its tools for manipulation. The basic task is to orchestrate the three kinds of representations so that we can lead the child from doing, to imaging what he has done, and finally to symbolization.

Bruner's notion that a theory of instruction must be concerned with the structuring and sequencing of knowledge relates directly to the reformer's curriculum rationale and comprehensive conception of knowledge, the nature of which lends itself to such operations. Instructional methods, according to Bruner, should break down and structure subject matter belonging to a particular discipline, into a minimal set of propositions, fundamental principles, ideas, statements and images "from which one can best generate the rest of what exists within that field." His example is the presentation of conservation theorems from which "a great deal of physics can be reconstructed." This structuring of the subject matter for instructional presentation should be "economical, productive and powerful" according to Bruner: substantive dimensions are structured economically when they "have the power of simplifying the diversity of information" and elemental relationships within a discipline;
substantive dimensions are structured productively when recombinings and new propositions can be substantively generated from the fundamental principles given; and, finally, substantive dimensions are structured powerfully when they reach a codified level of objective form, or when fundamental components of subject matter become symbolized in a language system for further manipulation and substantive recombinings.

With disciplinary subject matter so structured, the pedagogue initiates and facilitates its acquisition through inductive instructional methods. These methods relate to what Bruner calls the "optimal sequence" in which materials are presented to meet pedagogically-determined objectives rooted in substantive acquisition.

...Organisms ... operate by taking large packets of information and breaking these down into their own bite size ... any subject can be taught to anybody at any age in some form that is honest. There is always some way in which complicated problems can be reduced to simpler form, simple and step-by-step enough for a child to grasp.

Pedagogical representation of subject matter, in the form of instructional methods, may then take a sequence of three basic presentational forms that relate to progressively more sophisticated manners of processing information. This sequence begins with "enactive representation," or a pedagogical translation of a substantive given into an existential, applied context for students to know by doing. Not to return here, the sequence moves to "ikonic representation," or pictorial imaging of the properties of a substantive given. Finally, the sequence moves to reach its ultimate formalistic stage of "symbolic representation," wherein objective labels and language tools are used for the substantive given, along with rules for manipulating the language. Bruner believes that the use of such an instructional sequence facilitates eventual recombinings of substantive structures, the application and transferability of the subject matter, and the generating of new substantive propositions at the level of symbolic manipulation. Clearly, Bruner's instructional movement is away from existential references/enactive representation, wherein knowledge is tied to its applied context and actual use, and toward symbolized references, wherein knowledge is abstract/pure and objectified; such movement attends to formalistic manipulation of disciplinary substantive structures rather than applied/transferable manipulation of syntactic structures.
A. Given all conceptualizations within the midcentury paradigm, particularly at the levels of "Cluster A" and the substantive domain, what dimensions or referents do midcentury methods derive from? Given midcentury conceptions of knowledge, the human being as learner, and socio-cultural realities, what of these plays a significant role in determining midcentury conceptions of/positions on methods? Were midcentury conceptions of methods congruent with conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge? Were their methods congruent with their conceptions of the human being as learner? Were their methods congruent with their conception of societal needs?

As university scholars began work on course improvement projects, the unity of subject and method emerged as a key discovery. As they embraced a puristic, substantive conception of knowledge/subject, with university studies/scholarship as their model, the reformers proceeded to embrace a corresponding "intellectual" method. Their image of the learner had its reference in the university scholars with their same intellectual capacities; consequently, congruence exists among conceptions of subject, method, and learner.

The "structure-of-a-discipline" approach, dominated by puristic, substantive dimensions of knowledge as precursory to all forms of subsequent learning, gave rise to midcentury methods. Substantive/subject matter pre-occupation gave rise to methods characterizing the curriculum reform movement. Methods focused on the pedagogical-imparting and student-acquiring of content for its own sake, out of relation to its applicability, in the style of university scholarship in the traditional sense. While reformers made instructional methods congruent with their conception of the nature and source of knowledge, and congruent with its intellectualizing function, they did not make methods congruent with the intended use of knowledge. Had the reformers derived methods in accordance with the intended use of knowledge, its application, transference and production, midcentury methods would have been conceived differently to fulfill this intended function.

At Woods Hole, the intention was to conceptualize methods in relation to the need for applying existing knowledge, producing new knowledge, and transferring skills for Space Age problem-solving. Traditional notions of pedagogy, rote learning, and dissemination-accruance style were conceptually abandoned. The
participants wished to emphasize disciplinary modes of inquiry in order to fulfill their intentions, theorizing that knowledge was search which implied educational processes of inquiry, discovery, use of intuition. However, these aspects of the nature of knowledge were effectively supplanted by their substantive/subject matter pre-occupations. Consequently, methods of instruction that might have been derived from disciplinary modes of inquiry did not materialize. These modes and processes of inquiry did not find their way into methods of instruction because they had not found a respected, consistent position within the reformer's conception of the nature of knowledge.

"...the educational process must be one of collecting factual knowledge to the limit of their children's absorptive capacity..." 47

"The mind of man is taken captive by the spoils of its previous victories; the spoils, not the weapons and the acts of waging the battle against the unknown, are used to fix the meaning of knowledge, of fact, and truth." 48

Reformers' conceptions of the eventual use of knowledge did not modify/alter their conception of its nature and did not influence/translate into methods selected and developed.

As the reformer's focused on a "miniature scholar" image of learners, they did not select and develop methods of instruction in accordance with developmental stages of growth (Piaget, Whitehead and Dewey). Methods were incongruent with a more appropriate and holistic image of the adolescent.

The reformer's work on course improvement projects focused on content revision, selection, and organization. This work was held to be the key to improvement, and the reformers were critical of progressive movements that attended to methods instead of content. Method of instruction at midcentury was related to presentational forms of the substantive structures of disciplines.

The separation of disciplinary bodies of knowledge based upon subject matter/substantive distinctions and impetus toward puristic specialization encouraged pre-occupation with bodies of content, cognitive processes of the learner and acquisition-methods. Little explicit focus on disciplinary modes of inquiry, within separate fields and among collaborating fields,
meant little instructional representation of these. All of these practices mitigated against both specific and general transfer as Woods Hole participants had envisioned these.

B. Instructional methods utilizing "inquiry-discovery" processes appealed conceptually to the midcentury reformers. They envisioned these processes as methods opposing traditional rote learning and dissemination-accruance styles. "Inquiry-discovery" represented scientific methods to the reformers, utilizing intuitive and analytic processes in hypothetical thinking and problem-solving. They felt this method could be used effectively in relation to all disciplines, all bodies of subject matter.

Within the context of inquiry-discovery, the reformers differentiated between inductive and deductive methods. They favored inductive methods with the belief that they provided for more student-directed involvement, observation and experience. However, as the reformers favored student-acquisition of the fundamental "givens," the substantive structures of disciplinary subject matter, as precursory to all forms of subsequent learning, application and transference, inquiry-discovery was correspondingly interpreted. Substantive problems were treated as established, proceeding with givens and pre-determined sequences, with established-convergent styles wherein conditions are specified and results predictable.

Inquiry-discovery became more of a slogan than a reality; materials produced during the reform movement were not organized or presented with this method/approach as fundamental. Coverage was more important; inquiry-discovery was considered too time-consuming, and it was not held to be an instructional method offering pedagogical control over the desired acquisition of subject matter.

For the reformers, inquiry-discovery seemed congruent with the disciplinary content in the sciences, and congruent with the intended use of this knowledge. However, just as they fell short of working in direct relation to the intended use for knowledge, they fell short of actualizing inquiry-discovery methods.

C. To point the way toward reconceptualization of knowledge, methods, and their interactions, as these are seated within a comprehensive paradigm, aim to
align elements within the whole network so as to make them congruent with one another and to make the paradigm an organic system. Reconceptualization begins with identification of incongruences and flaws in logic and among elements in the paradigm. The following considerations can be used toward the making of a congruent reconceptual paradigm:

1. Conceptions of the nature of knowledge must emphasize both the disciplinary subject matter and the disciplinary modes of inquiry; the commitment must be to the interdependence of substantive and syntactic structure within the framework of a knowledge/discipline-centered schemes.

2. Both disciplinary subject matter and disciplinary modes of inquiry might be treated syntactically rather than substantively in terms of instructional approach, in order to make conceptions of the nature of knowledge congruent with conceptions of the use of knowledge.

3. Instructional methods must account for and derive from both the substantive and syntactic structures of disciplines.

4. Instructional matters are integral to curricular concerns; methods must be represented at all levels of the paradigm and be organic/congruent with all dimensions and referents therein.

5. The nature, function, use, and source of knowledge can be conceptualized in relation to one another, translated into one another, and integrated with one another, so as to make the various aspects of a comprehensive conception of knowledge organic, or congruent with one another.

6. Comprehensive conceptions of knowledge are concerns of both curricular and instructional inquiry, thought and practice; such conceptions are substantial and meaningful sources for deriving selecting, and developing methods; such methods are capable of being composed in a way that will account for a comprehensive conception of knowledge with congruent parts.

7. Conceptions of knowledge can be traced within the paradigm; incongruences can be identified for reworking or reconceptualization, so as to alleviate the contradictions or flaws.
8. A shift in conception of knowledge will probably mean a shift in conception of methods.

9. The intention and inclination to select and develop methods of instruction, rather than study, or a focus on pedagogy rather than educational inquiry, indicate a prior conception of knowledge different from a conception of knowledge behind the inclination to focus on study/educational inquiry.

10. Methods of instruction probably lead lives independent of particular bodies of knowledge; however, in the discovery of the nature, function, use and source of a body of knowledge lie implications for the selection and development of congruent methods.

11. A view of the curricular paradigm through the lens of congruence makes apparent the need to represent methods as a referent within the Substantive Domain. It must be a foundational consideration in relation to Cluster A conceptualizations, if methods are to be appropriately translated for the Curriculum Development Sphere.
5. The Influencial Midcentury Heritage

This research has been devoted equally to the explicit development of a reconceptual methodology for curriculum criticism and theorizing and to the exemplary application of congruence to a specific critical-theoretical focus within a conceptual scheme; this focal point, midcentury conceptions of knowledge and knowledge/methods interactions, has been the critical "subject matter" through which meanings and understandings have been discovered and disclosed. Both the development of congruence and the exploration of midcentury conceptions of knowledge and knowledge/methods interactions through the lenses of this critical methodology serve to "center" inquiry toward the ultimate aim of this research. They serve to identify and illuminate selected historical causes or influences on the nature of contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts at the secondary level; these causes or influences are in the form of conceptions of knowledge and knowledge/methods interactions, dominating midcentury curricular thought and continuing in the present, that largely account for the character of contemporary curricular phenomena and events in these fields. As the historical logic and meanings of these conceptions are discovered and disclosed, a "resource" is made available for comprehending contemporary curricular situations with midcentury characteristics, or a "reference" for relating prior and present phenomena and conceptions. This resource provides an understanding both of incongruences in midcentury logic and meanings as they affect educational experience and of resolving ideas toward a contemporary reconceptualization of knowledge and knowledge/methods interactions that would affect educational experience differently. Whereas midcentury and contemporary conceptual schemes and curricular systems share fundamental characteristics relating to conceptions of knowledge and knowledge/methods interactions and their meaning for educational experience, disclosure and understanding of historical incongruence paves a way toward contemporary congruence; such disclosure and understanding inform the journey toward the reconceptualization of knowledge and knowledge/methods interactions for secondary cinematic arts education.

This "historical looking" - for sources of and influences on contemporary curricular regard for knowledge, methods and their interactions in cinematic arts - might take the
critic-theorist to a number of other historical periods, academic traditions, or educational subfields for "subject matter" and to other methodologies for "tools." Clearly, the heritage of contemporary educational experience in this field at the secondary level, with special regard for the conceptions of knowledge, methods and their interactions, can be traced to many grounds and viewed/explained in many ways.

Contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts at the secondary level is strangely burdened with much conceptual baggage so explicit and pervasive during the mid-century curriculum reforms; strangely, because the conceptual schema and rationales characterizing the reforms did not primarily address or clearly focus on the cinematic arts in particular, or the arts and humanities in general; and strangely, because the logic and meanings within these schema and rationales, with respect to conceptions of knowledge and methods, were not intentionally or directly drawn from this field. The characteristics of midcentury curricular systems and phenomena with respect to conceptions of knowledge and methods—puristic disciplinarity, the substantive structuring and sequential presentation of subject matters, knowledge-centered objectives calling for acquisition and academic mastery of quantifiable and predictable "givens," a brand of scientific, disciplined inductive inquiry flavored heavily by intellectual, "banking," or "scholastic" methods of instruction and study—were largely drawn from and aimed at the sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Still, it was held that English, literature, visual and language arts could be similarly considered and approached. Further, during this period of time, the literary and cinematic arts were not considered preparatory vehicles parallel with priority disciplines for readying youth to participate in the Space Era; and yet, proponents of the nation's cause in these fields, even with non-Cold War-defined educational aims, struggled to imitate curricular directions and models set forth by and for the sciences and mathematics. Still, in the mid-1970's, an exploration of the contemporary nature of secondary educational experience in the literary and cinematic arts reveals adherence to mid-century conceptions of knowledge, methods and their interactions and reflects these conceptions as foundational to curricular systems and phenomena. Many present day curricularists believe that midcentury curricular influences on contemporary curricular thought and practice in the arts and humanities comprise a significant obstacle to fundamental change. Questions arise. The first regards general trends in educational institutions that relate to midcentury inclinations; this largely informs the second question, regarding the evidence of midcentury conceptions in secondary cinematic arts education.
What is it about the character of the contemporary socio-cultural fabric that makes 1976 educational institutions and sensibilities vulnerable to midcentury curricular conceptions of knowledge, methods, and their interactions? Why do the midcentury reform movement and the current period in curricular history warrant a relational study? What are the trends in 1976 educational institutions that conjure up midcentury inclinations?

The characteristics of midcentury curricular systems and phenomena were not innovations in educational practice; rather, their prevalence represented the resurfacing of knowledge-centered traditions, logic and sensibilities with deep historical roots in curriculum and other educational subfields, a re-emergence of a traditional interpretation of the role of schooling and the meaning of education in relation to socio-cultural phenomena and interests. However, the reform movement brought to educational communities an unprecedented pre-occupation with knowledge-centeredness, an imbalanced focus on subject matter in its pure and specialized forms, and all corresponding curricular conceptions and expressions. Easily emerging with these developments was the collective educational sensibility that had never moved fundamentally away from conceptions of, and relations among, knowledge, the learner, and society as these have been described. The reform movement served to affirm, solidify, re-inforce and elevate the status and value of these conceptions in an unprecedented way within the collective consciousness of the curricular community; this influence persists in 1976.

The first half of the 1950's was filled with criticism of progressive, child-centered inclinations and attention to methods of inquiry, of "soft" and humanistic educational practices; this left the late 1950's vulnerable to the re-surfacing of traditional knowledge-centered inclinations and attention to subject matter, to "hard" educational practices and academic pursuits, with the coming of Sputnik. The 1976 educational community, too, has in its consciousness the experience of more recent attempts toward humanistic practices and "relevant" education, from which it seems to emerge with a similar criticism and vulnerability. As John I. Goodlad comments:

Throughout the century, change and especially the rhetoric of change have flowed in cycles in this country, concern for the soft superseding concern for the hard, the hard then replacing the soft, and so on.51
It is but one singular cluster of attempts toward humanistic "counterreforms," picking up impetus in the mid-1960's, that separates the midcentury and contemporary knowledge-centered thrusts. The aversion to such humanistic attempts shared by both periods leaves them with a similar vulnerability perhaps not unlike that experienced during even earlier periods in curricular history; however, to say that 1976 educational experience is burdened with midcentury influence is to say that these particular reformers "cloaked" knowledge-centered traditions and expressions, developed and refined, packaged and disseminated them in ways more attractive to the 1976 sensibility.

In retrospect, the clarity and continuity of the mid-century influence on contemporary curricular thought and practice seem only slightly blurred and interrupted by the counterreforms picking up impetus in the mid-1960's: the re-emergence of humanistic student-centered inclinations and "open education"; the finding of the "romantic" critics, socio-political educationists, and a new progressivism with the unfolding lessons of world affairs; the rise of the "counter-cultures," liberation movements, and awareness of all forms of oppressor-oppressed relationships; interest in self-emergent and self-actualizing philosophies; and the seeming national awareness of the need to question the taken-for-granted, to shift value positions and transform priorities. These collective efforts and developments, emerging with strength and in many sectors, were not to have a significant arena or expression in the schools. Only half heard, and largely misinterpreted, these developments emerged in relation to the uncovering of cultural and socio-political realities that were threatening to the established and controlled structures of educational institutions. These developments were not to fundamentally transform the nature of contemporary educational experience. The counterreform efforts might be understood in one sense as a profound challenge to the conceptions of knowledge and methods giving rise to the seemingly stable curricular structure, and as such, these efforts could not supplant educationist's need to hold to "hard" curricular practices.

And although the incongruities and shortcomings of the curricular response to the Cold War have since been lamented by early proponents and successfully challenged from many points of view, the influence of knowledge-centered curricular conceptions and expressions persists. The majority of American secondary schools in 1976 are organized in various subject-centered curricular schemes, within which both separate-disciplinary and interdisciplinary treatments of subjects largely retain a substantive-centeredness and a puristic, academic character. Methods of instruction correspond. The durability of these schemes as 1976 looks
toward the future is largely a function of comprehensive midcentury conceptions of knowledge and methods, lingering in the consciousness of contemporary school people who, directly or indirectly, came of age in such knowledge-centered traditions and periods. This discussion of contemporary disciplinary and interdisciplinary treatment of subjects is extended and particularized in a later section of this chapter in relation to cinematic arts education.

The following list only briefly exemplifies the character of the contemporary socio-cultural fabric, revealing the vulnerability of 1976 educational institutions and sensibilities to midcentury conceptions of knowledge and methods:

A. A widespread, visible impatience with the seemingly non-disciplined, non-academic generation of students in schools during the past ten years of counterreform efforts. These students are being tested and scrutinized for their lack of basic academic skills. The spirit of humanism, experimentation, and consciousness raising/praxis seems to give way to reactionary efforts to reverse the observable symptoms with more rigorous academic experiences through schooling. These efforts are expressed through a new "back to basics" movement, an increase in behavioralistic practices, an increased use of instructional technology, and so forth.

B. This widespread impatience, evidenced both inside and outside academe, seems largely a function of national economic situations relative to vocational competition and financial struggles. Such situations evoke the utilitarian, pragmatic spirit in citizens of all ages toward obtaining vocational/financial stability through the acquisition of immediately marketable skills. A new age of technologic and scientific specialization in industries, social services, and so forth, begins; new developments and priorities in ecological, communications, technologic, scientific, and health fields translate into knowledge-acquisition-production-application requirements. Once again, specialized knowledge, in currently prospering and expanding vocational categories that offer immediate financial security, seems to become the educational focus and competitive tool. Correspondingly, vocational high schools, career/vocational education programs, community colleges, and continuing education/adult education programs enjoy expansion and increased attention, offering expedient and sharply focused preparation of immediately adaptable, applicable skills. Simultaneously, four-year universities, with long-established liberal arts emphases, begin to question their own roles in relation to these situations, giving increased attention
to equipping students with the straight vocational preparation they demand.

C. The prevailing conception of the human being is again a divided rather than holistic one, with attention to nurturing academic/skill dimensions relating to the public working world. The absence of a holistic, integrated educational context and environment, within which academic/skill dimensions might be one part, motivates the institutionalization of separate courses, activities and coping techniques that relate to humanistic concerns. One example of these is the "Complementary Education" programs, comprised of extra-professional curricular courses and activities that reflect human interests and personal-social-political needs of individuals and collectives. Other forms with similar purposes are Free Universities, encounter groups of many kinds within schools and industries.

D. A new emphasis on pedagogical effectiveness, productivity and accountability, in terms of numbers, time, and money. This encourages reliance on standards, testing, the making of objectives that can be controllably met and externally assessed, forms of teaching and learning that can be accounted for. Both "behavioral objectives" traditions and "management by objectives" programs increase and reflect these emphases. Productivity grants and long-range investments in instructional technology, such as mini-computer terminals, reflect the school's increased commitment to efficient and accountable methods of dealing with knowledge and its dissemination.
This research is directly concerned with a second and more specific set of questions posed by the persistent influence of the curriculum reform movement, relating to the evidence of midcentury conceptions of knowledge and methods in contemporary educational experience in the literary and cinematic arts at the secondary level.

In a picture constructed of current secondary curricular phenomena and educational practice in the cinematic arts, what working elements and foundational assumptions, explicit and implicit, reflect midcentury conceptions of knowledge, methods, and their interactions? What working elements reflect midcentury conceptions of the nature, function, use and source of knowledge. What is the curricular regard for knowledge in the literary and cinematic arts that gives direction to the selection and development of methods of instruction? In this picture, what appears to be the prevailing conception of the human being as learner, and this in relation to prevailing conceptions of knowledge?

If a conceptual scheme were delineated, reflecting contemporary curricular systems related to cinematic arts education, what would Cluster A, the Substantive Domain, and the Curriculum Development Sphere look like in relation to one another. Although there would be differences, what aspects would be consistent with the midcentury paradigm?

Prior to the midcentury curriculum reforms, seemingly specialized conceptions of literary and cinematic arts education had been variously developed and established. These conceptions were generated from philosophical and practical foundations seemingly differentiated from those giving direction to educational experience in other fields. Conceptions of the nature, function, use, and source of knowledge in these fields, educational aims, modes of instruction, and the very meaning of experience and involvement for students in the literary and cinematic arts appeared specialized and unique. Still, at midcentury, why were these fields so vulnerable to reform influences with regard to conceptions/treatments of knowledge, influences that were not intentionally/primarily specific to, directed at, or drawn from them? With such apparent differentiation, in many regards and many directions, how were curricularists and educationists in these fields able to reconcile their own established foundations with the various components of the midcentury curricular rationale? What were in fact the common denominators shared by these long-established educational traditions in the literary and cinematic arts and the midcentury rationale, with respect to conceptions of knowledge, methods and the learner?
What are the academic traditions foundational to educational experience in the literary and cinematic arts, holding these fields strong against fundamental reconceptualization of knowledge, methods, and learners? What academic traditions hold educational experience in these fields strong against more progressive and humanistic interpretation and treatment, surfacing now and again and historically related to the arts and humanities? What assumptions embedded in these traditions mark even new interdisciplinary efforts and arrangements in the literary and cinematic arts with conceptions of knowledge and methods having a midcentury character?

The remaining Chapters V and VI both take direction from these questions, aiming collectively to delineate the relationship between midcentury conceptions of knowledge, methods, and the learner and these conceptions as foundational to contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts. These discussions aim to provide understanding of the nature of educational experience in this field as a consequence of these prevailing conceptions of knowledge, methods, and the learner.
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It has been posited that the midcentury reforms serve as a contiguous source for and conceptual influence on the foundations of contemporary cinematic arts education at the secondary level; this movement influences the prevailing conceptions of knowledge attending the cinematic arts and the educational methods to which these conceptions give rise. Further, it has been stated that the conceptual foundations characterizing the midcentury paradigm are exemplary of those implicit in yet other and earlier periods and traditions; while the neighboring midcentury movement projects an exaggerated form of these conceptual foundations onto the present, both the curriculum reforms and the current field of the cinematic arts are inheritors.

The aim of authentic reconceptualization of contemporary educational experience in the cinematic arts is to create an essential congruence between the nature of knowledge in this field and the methods developed in relation to its nature; a reconception of the nature of the cinematic arts would represent and integrate their evolutionary process/syntactic dimensions and their presentational product/substantive dimensions; and methods congruent with this dual nature would represent and integrate creative expression and critical inquiry. This process of reconceptualization largely depends upon disclosing current misconceptions of knowledge, as a foundational element, which may lead to misconceived methods and, ultimately, educational experience which implicitly transmits misconceptions of the cinematic arts. These disclosures may be facilitated by uncovering periods and traditions which have tacitly influenced and caused prevailing, foundational misconceptions in the cinematic arts.

The aim of this chapter is to describe the academic tradition of aesthetic education, as it has influenced contemporary conceptions of knowledge, methods and educational experience in the cinematic arts. The foundations and model of aesthetic education as applied to the
study of literature, primarily, have been borrowed by cinematic arts education at the secondary level; for this reason, descriptions of this academic tradition will be supplemented with a discussion of its form in the context of literary arts education. Making the foundations of aesthetic education explicit, especially the conceptions of knowledge, pedagogical methods and the learner in which this tradition is grounded, provides for extended understanding and criticism of the curricular/instructional patterns in contemporary cinematic arts education, as will be described and reviewed in Chapter VI. Finally, it might be said that the foundations of aesthetic education, long-standing and well-established in the literary arts by midcentury, are in conceptual alignment with the foundations of the reform movement. It might be said that English/literary arts were sympathetic and vulnerable to the conceptual directions and influence of the reform movement partly as a result of their pre-midcentury commitment to aesthetic education and its own conceptual foundations. In turn, as literary arts education has largely sustained this commitment throughout the cinematic arts' concentrated visitation in the English classroom and in the hands of English teachers, it might be said that contemporary cinematic arts education inherits its midcentury character, in part, via the form of aesthetic education practiced in relation to the literary arts.

In 1973, Monroe C. Beardsley provides a recent version of his definitive and representative conceptual foundations for aesthetic education, focusing on the fundamental principles and aims that guide contemporary curricular/instructional treatment of disciplines in the arts. In "Semiotic Aesthetics and Aesthetic Education," first published in Philosopohic Exchange and reprinted in a 1975 issue of The Journal of Aesthetic Education, Beardsley reaffirms his foundational authority and sustains the directions he has helped to pioneer and develop in the tradition of aesthetic education. This essay, in which Beardsley described and exemplifies the contemporary form in which this tradition thrives in study of the arts, will provide the general framework and reference for this discussion.

For Beardsley and others, three conceptual areas comprise the foundation of aesthetic education, giving direction to the nature of curricular/instructional patterns and events, giving rise to the nature of disciplinary expressions and treatment, giving guidance to the nature of the student's role and educational encounter in relation to the arts. As Beardsley explains, a deriving of pedagogical implications necessary to the shaping of aesthetic education, a drawing of conclusions "about the appropriate ways of teaching people to understand the arts," depends upon a consideration of - and
a relating of positions on - theory of art, the sign-
nificance of art in human life and culture, and various 
mechanisms of human learning and perception. The first 
conceptual requirement is a theory of art, or an 
acceptable set of propositions and assumptions about the 
nature and fundamental characteristics of art forms;
Beardsley implies that inquiry in this area focuses on 
the whole of the creative process and both general and 
specific theories, as the theory of signs or symbolic 
functioning, the theory of iconic signification, ex-
hibition and exemplification theories, and imitation 
and mimetic theories. The second conceptual area re-
quires a focus on the significance of the arts in human 
life and culture, positions which might suggest and es-
tablish valuable aims and roles for individuals engaged 
in study of the arts in educational settings. The 
third conceptual area is an inquiry into the various 
physiological and psychological mechanisms of human 
learning and perception. Beardsley implies that inquiry 
into and positions on these three conceptual areas will 
render a sound and comprehensive foundation from which 
pedagogical implications might be derived for aesthetic 
education, in the form of fundamental principles and aims.

Beardsley seems to emphasize and favor the special 
consequences for aesthetic education that follow from 
theories of art and from the significance of the arts 
for human life and culture, respectively; although he 
admits "we still know too little" about human learning 
and perception and may simply have greater confidence 
in what his research in the other conceptual areas 
might render, it is fair to state that Beardsley's 
priorities are reflected in this imbalance. He empha-
sizes and elaborates with assurance and great detail 
that separate conceptual positions with respect to 
"theory" or "significance" of the arts will result in 
different pedagogical implications and forms of aesthetic 
education, different fundamental principles and aims.

More emphatically, however, and pertinent to this 
research, is that, barring these conceptual distinctions, 
Beardsley derives the general pedagogical implications 
and directions, the fundamental principles and aims 
common to all forms of aesthetic education, from an 
interpretation of "the creative process" he believes to 
cut across all "theories" of art and all positions on 
"significance." For Beardsley, "the creative process" 
is the whole of the artistic enterprise: works of art; 
and the various persons involved in the creating and 
receiving of art, persons understood in terms of the roles 
they assume in relation to one another and to works of 
art. In this context, a conception of "the creative 
process" is a set of statements and assumptions about the 
general nature of knowledge in the arts, in terms of an
individual's relation to and encounter with art. Beardsley provides a general interpretation and delineation of the creative process and thereby initiates the general foundation from which general pedagogical implications are derived, or the fundamental principles and aims common to all forms of aesthetic education. With respect to this research and the cinematic or literary arts, Beardsley provides a general conception of the nature, function, source, and use of knowledge in the arts, from which he suggests educational methods and knowledge/methods interactions in the form of a general curricular/instructional pattern for all forms of aesthetic education in these fields.

In the tradition of aesthetic education, "the creative process" is interpreted with an initial delineation of two complementary activities or roles, artistic and aesthetic activities, creative and critical human roles, in relation to works of art. This delineation is articulated as a developmental sequence or rationale comprised of discrete but related components or stages: artistic or creative activity and the artist or creator; works of art, objects or product as complete and independent; aesthetic or critical activity and the aesthetic apprehendor or receiver. This interpretation of the three components of the creative process is held to be appropriate and applicable to all forms of art and creative expression, all persons engaged in the artistic or creative stage, and all persons involved in any kind of critical apprehending or receiving art objects in presentational form. The following descriptions elaborate the three components or stages of the creative process as contemporary and tradition aesthetic education would most frequently view them:

A. The artist views the mass of unorganized experience, selects detail, creates a symbol which allows us to examine, imagine, think about feeling. The artist:

1. abstracts feeling data from his world,
2. formulates a symbol of that feeling,
3. creates a symbol that derives its meaning not from the various parts of which it is composed but from the interrelationships assumed when they are combined,
4. that he has available all kinds of materials, methods of construction, experiences of others,
5. that the symbol represents the artist idea of feeling,
6. that this symbol makes it possible to think about this feeling,
7. and that the artist's idea of feeling develops with the symbol but that the symbol also develops with the idea.
B. The object or art product is viewed by the audience and created by the artist as a single inviolable symbol representing the formulation of human feeling. The object or product:

1. is a single, total symbol,
2. is composed of language but is not subject to the laws of language,
3. is a whole which determines and governs the parts,
4. has parts that merge, become transparent so that the whole is apparent and emerges,
5. and it has no permanent content since it is dynamic and growing.

C. The audience views the symbol, thinks about, examines and imagines the feeling symbolized, and extends his understanding of man himself.

1. must focus on the art product itself,
2. must look for the interrelationship within the product,
3. must "see through" the language used, the techniques employed to the single symbol of feeling which is the complete poem (or play or novel.)
4. conceives the emotion objectively rather than experiencing it.

Prior to exploring the foundational conceptions of knowledge implicit in this delineation, it will be significant to juxtapose the initial pedagogical equivalent or broad pedagogical implication of this interpretation of the creative process to which the tradition of aesthetic education subscribes. Herein, what has been referred to as artistic and aesthetic activities and roles in relation to works of art translates into the traditional pedagogical distinction between artistic and aesthetic educational experience and postures in relation to works of art. Herein, "the creative process" as a conceptual framework translates into its curricular/instructional equivalent, for the purpose of expressing and delineating the "artistic enterprise" in pedagogical terms. Diagram No.XII represents the whole of the "artistic enterprise" as it would be expressed and delineated by the tradition of aesthetic education; although this pedagogical expression expands to delineate six central roles or postures assumed by persons involved in the artistic enterprise in an educational context, the charting is generally identical to the previous delineation of "the creative process".
Definition of THE CREATIVE PROCESS or THE ARTISTIC ENTERPRISE
a continuum
derived from art theory and pertinent to literary, cinematic, fine and performing arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTISTIC Activity and Education</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>AESTHETIC Activity and Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>artist/creating</td>
<td></td>
<td>audience/receiving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **ARTIST:** formulates, expresses, creates, makes art product
- **STUDENT:** receives, apprehends, perceives, engages with existing art product
- **ARTISTIC CRITIC AS COACH:** addresses artist, reports on the process and recommends improvement
- **AESTHETIC CRITIC AS COMMENTATOR:** addresses the receiver, talks about the product given, assists perception and apprehension of receivers
- **ARTISTIC EDUCATOR:** addresses the artist, develops requisite for creating, concerned with processes of creating and producing product to be presented to receivers
- **AESTHETIC EDUCATOR:** addresses the receiver to develop power requisite for receiving, perceiving, engaging with product, concerned with activities of receiving products created by other

Diagram XII: The Aesthetic Education Environment in Relation to the Whole of the Artistic Enterprise
Artistic education traditionally addresses the developmental activities and processes of creating, formulating, and making works of art, or creating through a form/medium of expression. As a rule, this educational realm exclusively involves the artist or creator who is engaged in the processes of intentional expression for the self and/or others; the artistic critic as coach who addresses the artist, or creator and the process with a view toward recommendation and improvement; and the artistic educator who addresses the artist with a view toward developing and cultivating the creative powers requisite for the process of expression.

Aesthetic education traditionally addresses the developmental activities and processes of receiving, apprehending, and perceiving intentional works of art or creative formulations in their presentational form; these developmental activities and processes may be a wide range of critical and hermeneutical modes of inquiry that lead to various kinds of aesthetic apprehension and understanding. Aesthetic education typically involves the student who is engaged in various processes of receiving and apprehending works of art or creative formulations that are encountered in presentational form; the aesthetic critic as commentator who addresses the student-receiver in order to assist with various kinds of aesthetic apprehension and understanding; and the aesthetic educator who shares the critic's responsibility with a view toward developing and cultivating the student-receiver's various critical and hermeneutic powers requisite for processes of aesthetic apprehension and inquiry.

For Beardsley, the "artistic" and the "aesthetic" are discrete but related complements that comprise the "core-concept" of the creative process in the sense of activity and of the artistic enterprise in the sense of education.

The interpretation of "the creative process" to which aesthetic education subscribes, and for which the foregoing delineation is a broad pedagogical equivalent, can be explored to reveal the implicit foundational conceptions of knowledge in which this academic tradition is rooted. It seems clear that this tradition's assumptions about the nature, function, source and uses of knowledge in the arts are made explicit by virtue of its conceptual artistic-aesthetic dichotomy and the distinct roles and discrete postures assumed by persons who must align with either one or the other component of that dichotomy. "Formal Studies" electives in creative arts disciplines such as literature and cinema at the level of the comprehensive secondary school, and within the general or exploratory areas, are typically and strictly conceived as aesthetic education rather than artistic education. In this context, the
strict distinction between artistic activity/education and aesthetic activity/education seems a valid rationale to the traditions’ proponents; as the aim seems clearly not to be artistic education, and as the conceptual dichotomy is taken-for-granted for its organizational clarity and simplicity, little consideration is given to breaking down the artistic-aesthetic dichotomy. The imbalance begins to emerge clearly; the artist, artistic critic and artistic educator would seem to have the advantage of focusing on the whole of the creative process, its artistic and aesthetic components, its entire evolutionary history within which intentional creative formulation depends upon a concern with both the powers of expression and the aesthetics of the eventual product in its presentational form; those engaged in aesthetic education, on the other hand, reside exclusively within the presentational stage of the creative process as receivers and apprehenders, and their critical and hermeneutical inquiries into expressive content, form and process are uninformed by experience in artistic activity.

As the student-receiver encounters completed works of art in the presentational stage of the creative process, within the context of aesthetic education, the nature of knowledge in the arts, with respect to subject matter, form, process, meanings and values, is conveyed as substantive, objective content. Even the syntactic structures and dimensions, disciplinary modes of expressive inquiry, those that would be the creators’ tools of form and process to use and apply in organic relation to subject matter, are transmitted as fixed objects or substantive-givens to be discerned from a critic-receiver’s posture. Such a curricular/instructional expression of the nature of knowledge in the arts is not congruent with its full evolutionary history and expressive nature, as the creator knows. This pedagogical expression, derived from the firm artistic-aesthetic dichotomy, is erroneous; it allows student-receivers no empathy with the process of using formal tools for original creation and subjective expression, and without artistic experience in the creative posture the student-receivers’ critical/hermeneutical abilities will be limited, uninformed, impaired. The “knowledge” that is important in aesthetic education is puristic and substantive, codified and systematic; it is a product that lies outside the receiver for acquisition, with its source objective and material. Knowledge in the arts seems not the process of inquiry or applicable tool of expression that it actually is; rather, critical and hermeneutical processes and modes become the applicable tools of “impression,” response to and understanding of the ready-made. These investigative tools do have the higher priority as they come between student and art as handles for substantive acquisition; in the context of foundational aesthetic education experience, critical/hermeneutical tools
do "get in the way," obscuring the full, essential nature of the arts. Although these tools intend to facilitate the function and aim of aesthetic education, they most frequently appear to be the central "field" of study in this context.

The receiver as student, the aesthetic critic as commentator, and the aesthetic educator all assume a "receiving" posture in order to apprehend and perceive a given work of art. Persons in receiving postures or roles comprise the audience, who focus on the art object itself with the aim of developing and cultivating the powers requisite for various sorts of objective aesthetic apprehension and perception. Beardsley explains that the aesthetic critic as commentator and the aesthetic educator share the responsibility of addressing the student receiver with a concern for his/her reception of the art product; these individuals facilitate

a narrowing of attention to certain features of the work rather than others, plus a willingness to engage... perceptual, emotional, and intellectual powers in grasping those features.7

The roles of the aesthetic critic and educator, Beardsley explains, may be the same and carried forth by the same individual in relation to the student receiver. In this context, the aesthetic critic-educator's central tasks and general aim are "to talk helpfully about works of art". 8

Taking the work as given, he asks what can be said about it that is both true and useful from the point of view of one who is concerned to make his apprehension about it - his perception of its form and qualities, his grasp of its meanings, his realization of its values - as complete as possible. 9

In Beardsley's widely-accepted and practiced approach to aesthetic education, the "appropriate ways of teaching people to understand the arts" 10 is to involve them in hermeneutical activity related to works of art presented and encountered, as in the posture of receivers "doing criticism" 11 of various kinds. Here, criticism or critical inquiry, the pedagogical activity traditionally associated with aesthetic education, is a hermeneutic activity consisting of acts of aesthetic interpretation. Criticism as hermeneutical activity, or interpretation, is considered an ally to creative expression in existing works of art, serving the function of translating that
expression into forms that human intelligence can grasp. Richard E. Palmer states this about hermeneutics:

The various forms of the word suggest the process of bringing a thing or situation from unintelligibility to understanding...

Something foreign, strange, separated in time, space, or experience is made familiar, present, comprehensible. Something requiring representation, explanation, or translation is somehow brought to understanding - is interpreted.

The hermeneutical activity or acts of interpretation involved in aesthetic education may take various forms in accordance with a particular focus and purpose, forms typically related to theories of art to which the aesthetic inquirer subscribes and which are considered appropriate to the art product received and apprehended.

The conceptual foundations of aesthetic education have burdened this array of pedagogical equivalents, general principles and aims, with two controversies; these, in turn, continue to vex contemporary curriculum and instruction in fields such as literature and cinema to which this tradition is applied.

The first controversy focuses on whether creative use and subjective application of art forms as symbol systems comprise a valid pedagogical rationale for students whose aims are not artistic, or whether creative experience has any facilitative, productive impact on the quality of the critical and hermeneutical inquiries engaged in by students. The traditional tendency has been to reject original creative experience as foundational or integral to "formal studies" that are concerned centrally and ultimately with criticism and hermeneutics. The widely-influential Theory of Literature is exemplary of this traditional view and logic, expressed as Rene Wellek and Austin Warren open the first chapter with an attempt to formulate the assumptions and rationale upon which study of the literary arts might be conducted. Here, they introduce the distinction between literature and literary study, or the dichotomy between literature as a creative art/symbol system with expressive and syntactic dimensions and literature as a species or body of knowledge which lends itself to intellectual and scientific study. If pedagogy were to follow from both aspects of the nature of literature, curriculum and instruction would be congruent with the essential dual nature of the field; however, Wellek and Warren dichotomize these aspects and proceed to use only the
substantive definition or conception of literature as a rationale from which to derive curricular/instructional patterns and events. Integral to this rationale is the author's belief that the task and aims of the student of literature are different from those of the literary artist. Wellek and Warren are cognizant of the potential incongruence, making reference to Stephen Potter's 1937 assertion that creative experience informs and is integral to critical inquiry and understanding. The authors are sensitive enough to the established charge that "experience of literary creation" may be organic to enlightened literary study to assert in the first paragraph of the text:

... it has been argued that one cannot understand literature unless one writes it, that one cannot and should not study Pope without trying his own hand at heroic couplets or an Elizabethan drama without himself writing a drama in blank verse.

Wellek and Warren dismiss the usefulness of both the "experience of literary creation" and the "second creation," which interprets and imitates existing literary art, for students whose aim is literary study, the acquisition of knowledge and systematic, substantive understanding of existing literature. Instead, the authors reserve creative expression for the artist and assert that:

... the task of the student is completely distinct. He must translate his experience of literature into intellectual terms, assimilate it to a coherent scheme which must be rational if it is to be knowledge.

On a continuum of positions with respect to this controversy, Wellek's and Warren's position is situated at a most influential extreme. There are yet other contemporary positions, less extreme and with less of a following. One asserts that both creative expression and critical/hermaneutical inquiry are important aims, but that the latter forms of inquiry must proceed and prepare for creative forms of experience; this position and pedagogical ordering are grounded in a midcentury structure-of-a discipline rationale, which assumes that fundamental substantive learnings are necessary to subsequent to eventual use, application, transfer and creation of the new. Another position on this continuum might be represented by James Moffett, who would more fully represent and integrate creative expression and
critical/hermeneutical inquiry in the context of "formal studies," with a priority on the former. Moffett would assert that formal study of symbol systems or forms of art requires foundational creative experience with and original use of them in relation to subjective content; his pedagogy is grounded in the rationale that one learns best by "doing" and through life-related application and, too, that the structure/components of curriculum and instruction must be congruent with the structure/components of both the subject and the student;

A student writing in all the same forms as the authors he reads can know literature from the inside in a way that few students ever do today. If the student has to work with language constantly in the functional way the professional does, he will come to know it in the professional's intimate way. Through reading, writing, and discussing whole, authentic discourses ... students can learn better everything that we consider of value in language and literature than they can be the current substantive and particle approach.21

... I recommend training the student to write for the class group, which is the nearest thing to a contemporary world-at-large; accustoming him to having his themes read and discussed workshop fashion; and asking him to write about raw material from his own experience which he is motivated to write about and to invent an appropriate rhetoric for... I have suggested structuring English curriculum according to the relations of speaker-listener-subject as the ultimate context within which all other concerns may be handled functionally and holistically, moving the student in his writing and reading from one kind of actual discourse to the next in a sequence which permits him to learn style, logic, semantics, rhetoric, and literary form continuously through practice as first or second person. Ideally this sequence would correspond both to his own intellectual and emotional growth and to some significant
progression in... the human processing of the world. The structure of the subject must be meshed with the structure of the student. A major failure of education has been to consider the logic of one almost to the exclusion of the psychologic of the other. 22

Moffett then supports the rationale that all forms of critical and hermeneutical understanding are more authentically informed by creative activity. Moffett's subscription to creative participation and experience as foundational to "formal studies" curriculum and instruction in the arts is grounded in yet other rationales, more appropriately discussed in the context of the second controversy attending aesthetic education.

This second controversy focuses on the familiar contention that many forms of critical inquiry and hermeneutical activity in relation to fields such as literature and cinema at the secondary level are essentially acts of creative expression and subjective exploration. Many would suggest that critical and interpretational activities are participative, self-expanding and experiential processes, in which the syntactic structures, modes of inquiry and patterns of thought from both the discipline under study and the critical mode itself are employed and applied. Such activities, many contend, are equal in educational quality, scope, expressive potential and authenticity to the original creative acts performed in the making of works under study. This "creative" practice of criticism and hermeneutics is typically supported by advanced scholars, aestheticians, critics and critical theorists in particular sectors, although it is clear that other such advanced inquirers adhere to a more strict conception of translation and puristic view of "textual" interpretation. This "creative" view is also maintained by many secondary educationists practicing aesthetic inquiry in the humanities, and particularly in literature, although the puristic view is equally represented among this group of individuals.

Several brief examples of this "creative" view of criticism and hermeneutics warrant mention, representative of those who would content that explanation, analysis, decodification, articulation and evaluation are essentially avenues permitting objective and subjective discovery and creative expansion - with respect to both the works under study and to what is newly generated as a consequence of the critical process and application of its tools. The cultural-sociological mode of inquiry into the arts is often exemplary: in this approach, criticism is conceptualized as a vital ally to original works of art for the respondent, allowing for expanded articulation and inventive
paraphrase of the original creation; clarifying commentary; the development of new relationships and the cultivation of new understandings that derive through the process of responding; the assertion of alternative positions in response to the original, supportive illustration and the positing of counter-directions; the development and refinement of the respondents' own sensibilities and socio-cultural awareness. Dwayne Huebner represents the view that hermeneutic inquiries, or interpretational activities in relation to existing and codified expressions, serve to motivate re-creation and, eventually, creation of the new. He contends that the fact of critical tool's availability is itself a statement of the student's right and potential to reject the taken-for-granted in ready-made, codified expression and to assert and formulate the new. He contends that critical tools are the keys to participation, to reassessment, re-definition, reconstruction and the projecting of oneself into the world. There are also those, such as Louise Rosenblatt in the field of literature, who treat critical and hermeneutical study of the arts as avenues motivating and initiating individualistic, subjective exploration. In this view, such study is believed to give access to creative inquiry and exploration of self and others in psychological, socio-cultural and historical contexts. There are also those modes of critical and hermeneutical inquiry in relation to the arts that focus carefully on the process and experience of creative formulation and expression, inception, intention, genesis, and the growth of consciousness into expression. These modes appear to be grounded in the assumption that art can not be approached as if divorced from experience, that art is a genesis with an evolutionary history, a manifestation of an individual's attempt to understand experience by framing and giving perspective to it. These critical modes seem to imply the creative potential of and possibility for those who study art approached in this fashion; these modes suggest the student's own promise for surpassing the given, breaking with the taken-for-granted, and for occasions to create new ideas, generate new patterns and perspectives.

With respect to the controversial nature of these assertions, significant questions must be raised about what may or may not be authentically creative in critical and hermeneutical activities related to the arts, specifically as they are practiced in the frame of secondary school settings: are there concealed aspects of these activities that hold back their creative potential, hidden and unrecognized facets that divert and cancel original expressive intentions for which such activities might be practiced; are there unintended or unrecognized learnings and messages implicitly transmitted within the framework of product-respondant relationships that would actually
repress creative expansion and expression; are there un-
intended side-effects from the consistent presentation
of models to students who are continually in receiver's
postures and apprehendor's roles, such that an intimi-
dation and implicit answer-centeredness would reinforce
strict focus on the ready-made and prevent challenge or
rejection of the taken-for-granted; what is the actual
creative potential in the more-or-less strict sequencial
progression through pre-determined avenues of established
critical modes and perspectives, in following the logic
of critical tools and rules that seem to have little per-
ipheral vision when presented as if use were a require-
ment; what are the realistic possibilities of overcoming
the outer-directed and answer-centered expectations of
students who are consistently in a receiver's posture in
relation to works selected by the teacher, considered to
have enough "authority" to be presented, and carrying the
implicit sense of being "settled" knowledge to be dis-
cerned and acquired; are there any deceptive qualities
about these activities, such that what appears to be dis-
covery, inventive expansion, and subjective articulation
is actually the result of answer-centered "leading" from
the teacher, paraphrase or "approvable" commentary, a
show of approved behavior, ritual, subterfuge; what is the
actual nature or "form" of creative activity that might
evolve within the frame of interpretational inquiry and
within the traditional aims, functions, and priorities of
aesthetic education; and within aesthetic education,
what is the relative value of product-centered creative
response and self-initiated creative expression, and
what are the relative values of separate levels of ex-
pression such as spontaneity, gesture and ritual?
FOOTNOTES

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. I am grateful to L. Jane Stewart for this abridgement of Susanne K. Langer's scheme.
5. This diagram is a charting of Beardsley's prose descriptions of the "artistic enterprise" and "creative process" in Semiotic Aesthetics and Aesthetic Education.
6. Beardsley, "Semiotic Aesthetics and Aesthetic Education." Notes 7-11 refer to this source.
15. Wellek and Warren, Theory of Literature. Notes 16-19 refer to this source.
CHAPTER VI

CONTEMPORARY CINEMATIC ARTS EDUCATION
AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL:
RECONCEPTUALIZING KNOWLEDGE AND METHODS
AS CURRICULAR FOUNDATIONS

Probably the most conspicuous connotation
of the word knowledge for most persons
to-day is just the body of and truths
ascertained by others; the material found
in rows and rows of atlases, cyclopedias,
histories, biographies, books of travel,
scientific treatises, on the shelves of
libraries.

The imposing stupendous bulk of this
material has unconsciously influenced
men's notions of the nature of knowledge
itself. The statements, the propositions,
in which knowledge, the issue of active
concern with problems, is deposited, are
taken to be themselves knowledge. The
record of knowledge, independent of its
place as an outcome of inquiry, is taken
to be knowledge. The mind of man is
- taken captive by the spoils of its prior
victories; the spoils, not the weapons
and the acts of waging the battle against
the unknown, are used to fix the meaning
of knowledge, of fact, and truth.

If this identification of knowledge
with propositions stating information has
fastened itself upon logicians and
philosophers, it is not surprising that
the same ideal has almost dominated
instruction.¹

This section of Chapter VI is comprised primarily of
descriptions and criticism of contemporary subject-centered
curricular areas and schemes, curricular/instructional
patterns and events relating to an increasingly prevalent
form of cinematic arts education at the secondary level.
The aims here are to identify and disclose prevailing
conceptions of knowledge, educational methods, and their
interactions implicit in these curricular/instructional expressions of the cinematic arts, and to provide an understanding of their meaning for and influence on educational experience. Initially, generalizations are set forth with regard to the curricular settings, areas and schemes, in which cinema and the cinematic arts as a field of study may be contemporarily situated at the secondary level. A review is given of the various existing curricular expressions and pedagogical applications of cinema and the cinematic arts within these settings, areas and schemes; within this survey, an increasingly prevalent form of cinematic arts education, as a separate field and disciplinary construct within a subject-centered exploratory education area, is distinguished and addressed. A descriptive picture is then constructed of contemporary curricular/instructional patterns and events in this particular emerging form of cinematic arts education, a composite of various influential examples and representative trends. This example is explored critically for its implicit conceptions of knowledge, educational methods, and their interactions with respect to the cinematic arts, and these conceptions as they affect the nature of educational experience through curriculum and instruction.

This descriptive and critical focus on contemporary cinematic arts education at the secondary level begins with a "wide angle" view of institutional organization and curricular schemata and moves toward "close-up" views of curricular/instructional expressions and events in this field of study.

It is currently within the general, specialized, and exploratory education areas comprising the comprehensive high school, and within disciplinary and interdisciplinary subject-centered curricular schemes at the secondary level, that cinema may be found in a variety of applications and serving a variety of functions, and that the cinematic arts as a field of study may be situated in a variety of forms, serving a variety of functions.

Contemporary educational institutions at the secondary level predominately intend to fulfill a commitment to parts or the whole of the "comprehensive high school" concept. Although this concept may assume various concrete institutional forms deriving from its various interpretations, the comprehensive high school design may be generally defined as providing for three basic areas of educational experience. General education experiences may engage an entire student body in formal study of fields concerned with the human and socio-cultural heritage and expressions of its contemporary forms and problems. This area, still somewhat comparable to liberal arts education, aims to encompass and represent pertinent fields of general interest shared by educated,
socially responsible and independent members of a free society. General education may be comprised of vertically and horizontally articulated sequences in the humanities, the language arts, the social sciences, the mathematics. Specialized education is comprised of formal studies that relate more directly to secondary preparation for post-secondary education, training, and work experiences. With regard to various sorts of college, vocational and professional preparation, the fields of study in this area may be intensified, advanced versions and specialized extensions of fields in the general education area. Too, specialized education may encompass career and vocational education programs, the range of offerings among different comprehensive high schools being more or less extensive and vertically articulated; these programs may include preparation for industrial and commercial arts, technical education, agricultural sciences, a variety of trades, public service vocations, and health professions. Exploratory, special interest or enrichment education is ordinarily comprised of elective and modular forms of fields within general and specialized education areas, or free electives and mini-course studies of fields of contemporary interest not represented within the other two areas. Most frequently, the fields of study in this category are not comprehensively represented or fully developed into sequences, are not vertically and horizontally articulated as are fields in general and specialized education; rather, exploratory, special interest and enrichment courses serve as elective adjuncts of contemporary concern to formal studies in the other areas. This educational category might provide for elective courses in the studio, fine and performing arts; communication arts, cinematic arts, and media studies electives; or special interest humanities modules such as contemporary literature courses, contemporary thematic - or issues-centered studies, philosophies or logic; and "experimental" courses representing new fields of contemporary interest to students or teachers, such as television and film production. Too, enrichment education encompasses student activities and organizations related to school publications, athletics, music, government and special interest clubs.

It is predominantly within various subject-centered curricular schemes that contemporary educational institutions at the secondary level intend to fulfill their commitment to parts or the whole of the comprehensive high school concept. That is, formal studies in general, specialized, and exploratory education areas are predominantly organized into subject-centered curricula. As Tanner and Tanner explain in their 1975 edition of Curriculum Development,

The arrangement of studies into subjects is the oldest approach to curriculum
organization, dating back to the medieval trivium and quadrivium. The subject approach also remains the most widely accepted organization of curriculum. The durability and pervasiveness of the subject curriculum can be attributed to many factors, but perhaps most important is that it serves as a convenient institutional means of systematizing knowledge for instruction, inventorying knowledge for academic credits, annexing new knowledge in the curriculum and accommodating the curriculum to the growing specialization of knowledge.\(^2\)

Within the general, specialized, and exploratory education areas, the fields of study may be organized into various disciplinary and interdisciplinary subject-centered curricular schemes. Disciplinarity frameworks might characterize the arrangement of fields; or, interdisciplinary frameworks such as fusion, correlation, or broad fields, or variations of these; might characterize the organization of disciplines within one or among several collaborating fields. Further, the disciplines within a field or the fields clustered as interdisciplines may be vertically and horizontally articulated in differing manners and to varying degrees.

Giving rise to these separate areas and schemes are conceptual distinctions or theoretical assertions of foundational distinctions. As cinematic arts education increasingly emerges to take its place as a disciplinary construct within contemporary exploratory education area electives, it becomes important to challenge intended and actual distinctions between disciplinary curricular/instructional patterns in exploratory areas and those patterns in general and specialized education areas.

Foundational and characteristic differences between general, specialized, and exploratory education may be asserted in various terms. Tanner and Tanner note that secondary educators often distinguish these areas in terms of the subject matter they separately encompass and the organization and treatment of content.\(^3\) Many developers would explain the various areas as organizational facilitators arising from the differing educational aims and objectives each areas' subjects seek to fulfill. Others would suggest that an intentional difference in the nature of educational experience, the manner in which methods and pedagogy engage and involve the student with a field, marks the need for and existence of three distinct areas. Many other explanations exist, often focused on differing conceptions of and
priorities among the conventional Substantive Domain referents, knowledge, the learner, and society; within the comprehensive subject-centered high school, such distinctions respect the relative degrees to which the three areas retain a knowledge-centeredness or attempt a student- or society-centeredness, and all that these imply, within the given context of a knowledge/subject-centered framework.

It has been widely implied that theoretical differences between general, specialized, and exploratory areas are rooted in distinct foundational conceptions of knowledge, particularly, and its related instructional treatment. That is, these areas are organizational expressions of intentionally separate conceptions of the nature, function, source, and uses of knowledge and of educational methods prevailing within the curricular systems to which they belong. It might be said that such fundamental differences, within the given confines of a knowledge/subject-centered environment, give rise to other explanations for and characteristics of intended or actual differences among the three areas. Tanner and Tanner suggest this fundamental distinction of the level of a conceptual intention, doubtful, however that such a significant difference is translated into actual practice. They note:

...General education necessitates an outlook on knowledge that is essentially different from the knowledge world of specialized education. The difference in outlook on knowledge also requires a different organization and treatment of knowledge for general education as contrasted with specialized education...Educators are often prone to distinguish general education from the knowledge world of specialized scholarship in terms of subject matter rather than in terms of outlook on knowledge and life, along with method of organizing and treating knowledge...Specialized-puristic scholarship requires a different outlook on knowledge and its organization than does general education.

Similarly, the conceptions of knowledge and of its instructional treatment implicit in and giving rise to exploratory education curricula are theoretically different from such conceptions implicit in and giving rise to general and specialized education curricula.

Of particular significance to this research is a comparison between the midcentury conceptual paradigm and
contemporary curricular/instructional patterns in the cinematic arts, with respect to their implicit and foundational conceptions of knowledge and educational methods. The mid-century paradigm represents a disciplinary general education framework with a specialized education character; Chapter IV identifies and elaborates the conceptions of knowledge, methods, the learner and society implicit in the mid-century paradigm, conceptions ordinarily associated with the foundations giving rise to specialized education. Subsequent to the influential reforms at midcentury were efforts beginning in the mid-1960's to counter the specialized education-dominated comprehensive high school, partly through revitalizing interest in and re-establishing distinctions between general, specialized and exploratory education areas; important here was making general and specialized education distinct, so as to render the general area free from its mid-century domination by the specialized area. Implicit in these efforts was the hope that the foundational distinctions among these areas, largely rooted in conceptions of knowledge and its methodological treatment, would give rise to correspondingly distinct educational experiences, presenting explicit alternatives to specialized education while retaining a knowledge/subject-centered curricular system. In this context, curricular/instructional patterns and events in disciplinary general and exploratory areas aimed to express conceptions of knowledge and educational methods other than those associated with disciplinary specialized education, represented by the midcentury paradigm.

General education was committed to a conception of knowledge that recognized the dual nature of disciplines, their substantive dimensions or puristic subject matter content, and their syntactic dimensions or disciplinary modes of inquiry and applicable processes; this it shared with the intentions of specialized-general education at midcentury, however general education challenged the compartmentalization of the disciplines in both substantive and syntactic respects, emphasizing the integrative characteristics of separate bodies of knowledge and separate modes of inquiry. These conceptions of the integrative nature of knowledge reflect general education's attempt to emphasize a society-centeredness within the given subject-centered frame of the comprehensive high school; herein, it was believed that the socio-cultural heritage and its contemporary expressions, problems and issues might be more realistically viewed from inter-and multi-disciplinary perspectives. These conceptions were translated into various curricular expressions, such as interdisciplinary schemes, greater horizontal as well as vertical articulation among subjects, aggregate curriculum models, the addition of a contemporary-concerns emphasis wherein a subject might be converted into a problems-or issues-or thematic-centered construct. Herein, subject
matters are expanded, shifted, up-dated, and combined to reflect a more contemporary and comprehensive view of the human socio-cultural heritage and the correspondingly necessary interrelationships among subjects comprising the general education area. While general education may have intended to revitalize the syntactic dimensions and applicable modes of inquiry belonging to its integrated subject matter, the aspects of disciplines either neglected or treated as substantive-givens by midcentury specialized education, it continued instead to focus on subject matters, puristic content combinations, substantive-givens in new groupings. It was in these contemporary and integrative ways that general education intended to conceive of knowledge differently and present itself as an alternative to specialized education as it was practiced at midcentury. General education attempted what might be called a reconceptualization of knowledge; however, like its midcentury predecessor, this form of general education became preoccupied with subject matter-dabbling and neglected the applicable tools of inquiry and processes of search availed by the collaborating disciplines. Tanner and Tanner note that general educationists still tend to concentrate on subject matter content and modes of inquiry, both as systematic, substantive-givens, albeit more contemporary and integrative. Like midcentury reformers, they emphasize facts and skills.

...as though they were appropriate ends in themselves, rather than tools for wider and richer learning: The traditional assumption has been that the child must first master the fundamental skills and facts before he can make use of these... in understanding his environment...The consequence is that the skills and facts are not translated into the working power of general education.5

In a significant sense, the post-midcentury form of general education retained incongruences found within its earlier form with respect to conceptions of the nature, function, source and use of knowledge. The intended function of knowledge was multileveled, primarily centered in preparation for social problem-solving, cultivation of the intellect, and socio-cultural unification; toward fulfilling these intentions, students were equipped with integrative, contemporary perspectives of their common heritage and shared "world of discourse" largely through liberal arts disciplines in some form. However, general education's impetus to up-date and reorganize subject matters to provide more realistic and comprehensive perspectives of contemporary social problems and issues still does not reflect the full and actual reconceptualization
of knowledge so blatantly needed during the midcentury reforms. Equipping students with fundamental facts, skills and baggage of updated and reorganized subject matter, existing "out in the world," to prepare them to apprehend and comprehend contemporary problems does not prepare them to solve the problems; such equipping is still neglectful of the active, methodological dimensions, applicable tools and evolutionary processes in knowledge - not about it - that release human beings to act and participate. This area retains the problematic tension between the intended function and the actual use of knowledge, an incongruence following largely from focusing on the puristic-substantive nature of observable, measurable knowledge, however organized and combined, with its objective and material source "out in the world" to encounter and acquire.

Exploratory, enrichment or special interest education is clearly rooted in a mixture of conceptions of the nature, function, source, and use of knowledge and of educational methods. This area retains its earlier function of including elective surveys and introductions to formal studies articulated in general and specialized education; over the past ten years, however, this component of exploratory education has been largely replaced by courses representing a very contemporary aspect or conceptual/thematic perspective of these formal studies as well as others, typically in the form of free electives and mini-courses. This particular component of exploratory education would tend to be rooted in conceptions of knowledge and methods associated with general education, however mixed with another set of such conceptions identified with a second, less "academic" component of the exploratory area. Herein, for example, are the studio, performing and fine arts, traditionally separated from the "academic" humanities when they comprise disciplinary constructs or "experimental" interdisciplinary electives that will not fit into general education wherein they may be only relationally treated. Herein also, accumulating over the past ten years, may be other electives and mini-courses in media studies, television and film production, contemporary concerns and literature. It must be mentioned that what may be a special interest introductory elective for one student may be part of another student's major vocational or career program in specialized education. The central point to be made here is that exploratory education is at least in large part rooted in student-centered conceptions of knowledge and methods within the given subject-centered frame. With specific reference to the studio, performing, fine and communications arts, the exploratory impetus has been to conceive of these fields as vehicles for self-expression and self-exploration. This area intends to emphasize the syntactic processes, the creative tools and applicable modes of inquiry belonging
to a field, with respect to the nature of knowledge; it intends to focus on the experiential, life-related, and individualized functions and uses of a field and its subjective, intuitive, and imaginative sources. Exploratory education tends to be less concerned with developmental acquisition of "given" substantive content belonging to a field and more concerned with developmental participation with a field's tools and processes. Clearly, this particular strain or aspect of exploratory education shares its conceptual roots more with humanistic schools of psychology and less with general and specialized curricular subfields. Finally, it must be noted, that such an impetus and conceptions of knowledge are found in varying degrees among a cross-section of exploratory options and areas, and that these have had varying degrees of influence on general and specialized areas.

Once again, subsequent to the influential midcentury reforms, efforts beginning in the mid-1960's were made to counter the specialized education-dominated comprehensive high school, partly through re-establishing distinctions between general, specialized, and exploratory education areas. Although all three areas retained disciplinary or interdisciplinary forms of subject-centered schemes, each was held to be rooted in a distinct conception of knowledge giving rise to correspondingly distinct modes of instruction and educational experience. Each of the three educational areas, although fundamentally knowledge-centered, might be aligned with one of the three conventional referents in the Substantive Domain, in order to abridge simplistically their theoretical distinctions with respect to conceptions of knowledge: general education conceptualized knowledge from an integrative socio-cultural perspective, specialized education from a puristic disciplinary perspective, and exploratory education from a subjective, human experiential perspective. Finally, in these contexts, curricular/instructional patterns and events found in disciplinary or inter-disciplinary general, specialized and exploratory courses were expected to be distinctive.

The questions posed by this "wide angle" view of the counter-reform's early conceptual, curricular and instructional intentions remain to be asked of mid-1970's actualities: has the subject-centered curricular community associated with the comprehensive secondary school significantly jarred its domination by midcentury specialized education, its conceptual foundations and curricular/instructional patterns? Has this community actualized its intentions through curricular/instructional events and practices to provide alternative educational experiences, grounded in different and more balanced foundational conceptions, beginning with the dual nature of knowledge and congruent educational methods? Is at least exploratory
education, however it might be represented in contemporary subject-centered comprehensive systems, rooted authentically in conceptions of the process/evolutionary as well as the product/presentational nature of knowledge, its applied/subjective as well as its pure/objective function and use, its pre-material/subjective as well as its material/objective source? Or, is the multi-purpose comprehensive secondary school experience yet or freshly neutralized by a midcentury puristic and substantive-centered sensibility and the "banking" instruction 6 that derives from it?

The cinematic arts and secondary education in this field are in a unique position to be challenged with questions focused on the transformation of mid-1960 intentions into mid-1970 actualities, with respect to altering conceptions of knowledge, educational methods, and the nature of educational experience. The war in Viet Nam and the rise of its countercultural associations ushered in efforts of many sorts in educational communities to obliterate midcentury influences, while retaining various forms of the still-predominant knowledge/subject-centered frame; these efforts were inclusive of those made to revitalize the distinctions between general, specialized, and exploratory education and, further, to develop fully the socio-cultural perspective of general education and the student-centeredness of exploratory education in the curricular experience of all students. The war also ushered audio-visual mediums and messages into the American experience and consciousness in an unprecedented way, making visual studies something of a movement coinciding in no small way with the various efforts to counter midcentury influences in the educational community; film, particularly, then nearing its fifty-fifth year in the public schools, drew an entirely new sense of interest and respect as the audio-visual generation's vehicle for information and understanding; film was seen anew, as integrally linked to the possibility of altering the nature of educational experience and developing socio-cultural perspectives and student-centeredness in the general and exploratory areas, respectively. At this very point in the mid-1960's, film and related visual studies could be found throughout the comprehensive secondary school, assuming all of their historical roles and applications simultaneously; however, as the counterreform efforts got underway, the cinematic and related audio-visual arts experienced a new birth as fields for organized, systematic learning in the public schools, warranting separate and multi-perspective, multi-purpose study related to relevant socio-cultural understanding, contemporary political awareness, arts and humanities appreciation, media aesthetics, commercial discrimination, and subjective and inter-personal experience. As the cinematic arts comprised the "new field" for systematic
experimentation, cultivation and development in comprehensive secondary systems over the past ten years, its authentic "Stage of Romance" in the schools might be considered to coincide with the past ten year course of counterreform efforts; further, contemporary curricular/instructional conceptualizations of film might be explored as exemplary of what counterreform efforts have accomplished in transforming mid-1960 intentions into mid-1970 actualities.

In 1976, while film continues to assume many of its historical roles and applications simultaneously in the public schools, and while this field has experienced multiple new curricular interpretations and treatment over the past ten years, an increasingly dominant pattern is beginning to emerge now. This discernable trend reveals an increasing curricular expression of the cinematic arts as a separate disciplinary field typically in the form of an elective within the exploratory education area, or its equivalent, in the contemporary comprehensive secondary school. This separate disciplinary treatment of the cinematic arts as an exploratory elective emerges through the early 1970's with seemingly great acceptance, parallel with or as an alternative to forms of "comparative media" or "comparative arts" electives in the exploratory area, and frequently concurrent with forms of interdisciplinary humanities courses or blocks inclusive of film in the general education area. The review in this section focuses on currently influential and representative examples of curricular/instructional patterns and events in the cinematic arts as a discipline in the exploratory area. It would seem valid, in view of earlier discussions in this section, to expect these contemporary patterns and events to differ significantly from such patterns and events found at midcentury and after for disciplines in general and specialized areas, to express implicit conceptions of knowledge, methods and learners that differ markedly from those foundations giving rise to general and specialized education, to provide correspondingly distinct educational experiences.

As stated above, the cinematic arts have sustained their historical roles and applications and have experienced multiple new curricular interpretations and treatment over the past ten years from which current dominant trends begin to emerge. While it is not within the scope of this research to elaborate on these matters, brief descriptions and tracings will inform and facilitate comprehension of the trends to be revealed in this section's review of current curricular/instructional patterns and events in cinematic arts electives.

The following list is comprised of the central historical roles and applications of film and film studies.
from approximately 1920 to the mid-1960's, in public schools at the secondary level:

A. Films were used for their content, particularly in English classroom settings, as vehicles to foster desirable moral standards, proper conduct, higher social ideals, ethical attitudes, value systems, to promote appreciation of democratic ideals and "the good life," and to promote good taste in film. Much of this was done to combat what was held to be immoral social influence, such as the popular commercial film.

B. Films were used as material to motivate composition and discussion, stimulate reading and writing assignments, and to promote the reading of good books.

C. Films were used as instructional tools or auxiliaries, primarily to transmit information related to the study of formal curricular disciplines. Such films represented and supplemented subject matter under study in the sciences, social studies, English, math, and so forth, in an educational manner. Films in this context were instructional devices or methods used in conjunction with presentations, demonstrations, discussions, and assignments.

D. The entire student body may have come together once or several times a year, during a time pre-empted from the regular daily schedule, to view a film. This may have been a fictional drama, a fiction or non-fiction educational film. A speaker may have been present to introduce or follow the film, and/or students may have returned to their own classrooms for discussions pertinent to the content of the film. Typically, these films related to English, social studies, adolescent problems and concerns, health, fitness, safety, moral standards, conduct, and values.

E. Films were used in English classroom settings to supplement the study of literature in many ways. In this context, film was approached as if it were strictly literature, however always pointing back to the enhancement of literary study.
F. Films were generally used as gimmicks to enliven teaching, to engage indifferent or hostile learners, to pacify frustrated and restless classes on Friday afternoons, to relieve fatigued and frustrated teachers.

G. Films were used in many classroom settings for students thought to be "slow learners," as motivational devices to spur exercises in reading, writing, listening, speaking.

During the past ten-year history of film studies in the context of secondary education, film truly emerges as a "field" for both concentrated independent study, forming its own context, and more comprehensive relational or interdisciplinary treatment. Film emerges in a number of directions in secondary settings through this period, assuming various curricular roles and pedagogical interpretations beyond its historical roles and applications. In general but not without controversy through this period, film has drawn progressively more serious and systematic attention as a "discipline" parallel in stature and educational importance with other disciplines in the humanities and language/communication arts that are currently integral to the comprehensive subject-centered system. Following here is a brief trace of the various curricular expressions and pedagogical interpretations through which film and film studies have progressively passed over the last ten years. Certainly these various curricular "visitations" within the comprehensive secondary system have most profoundly determined the foundational conceptions of knowledge and methods currently held among film educators and contemporary curricular/instructional patterns and events derived from those conceptions.

This period would seem to open "The Stage of Romance" for film education and move in the direction of "The Stage of Precision," applying Alfred North Whitehead's three-stage model for the development of individual mental life to the life of a discipline. Whitehead characterizes "The Stage of Romance" as

...the stage of first apprehension.
The subject matter has the vividness of novelty; it holds within itself unexplored connexions (sic.) with possibilities half-disclosed by glimpses and half-concealed by the wealth of material. In this stage knowledge is not dominated by systematic procedure.10

The second stage, "The Stage of Precision," begins in more recent years, toward the end of this important ten-year period. Of this Whitehead says:
In this stage width of relationship is subordinated to exactness of formulation. It is the stage of grammar, the grammar of language, and the grammar of science.12

The mid-1970's look ahead into the future for the eventual third stage in Whitehead's model. "The Stage of Generalisation"13 would constitute "a return to romanticism with added advantage of classified ideas and relevant technique."14

A. "Relevant Student-Centered Education for the Visual Generation." The educational community's desire to ride the wave of relevancy and humanistic education in a visual culture brought film into the secondary classroom, particularly English and language arts, as a seductive and popular form of entertainment. As medium and message, film was held to be rooted in the very center of the adolescent's life-thematic pre-occupations, pace and tempo, model aspirations, leisure time and recreational activities. John Stuart Katz describes this early peak of an undisciplined phase of film study as "spawned by McLuhan and his disciples, whose incessant bombardments are sometimes called the Marshall Plan, or McLunacy by those less generous."15

Katz continues:

At its extreme, this approach manifests itself in attempts to inundate the students in media. Don't interpret. Don't analyze. Just fill the classroom with films...and let the students react as they will. The teacher using this approach acts as a non-interfering anthropologist watching the primitfs perform rites which we outsiders from the pre-electronic generation can never fully understand.16

The Marshall Plan raised the consciousness of the secondary school with respect to student's attraction to electronic visual-audio media and its unique social/personal potency in the context of education. However, its undisciplined treatment here gave way to the curricular/pedagogical need for more order and organization, for a "heading" under which to "put" film studies that would promote more systematic treatment and observable learning.
B. A new interest in visual literacy surfaced and took a number of directions that would help to determine the various curricular/pedagogical interpretations and expressions for film in the comprehensive secondary system. The following definitions of visual literacy were to be used to guide the treatment of film in the system: as well-developed visual skills and perceptual competencies parallel in meaning and importance with verbal/reading skills and competencies, with enhanced ability to understand and interpret audio-visual language and imagery, and to integrate cognitive-sensory-emotional response; as a competency with the vocabulary, grammar, syntax or semiotics of film as a language, with the ability to read audio-visual information, and to translate audio-visual experiences into verbal tools for the purpose of interpreting content and analyzing the relation between form and content; as the ability to understand and interpret, decodify and codify human/socio-political/cultural realities and icons concentrated in all aspects and forms of a visual/audio-visual culture; as the ability to decodify and interpret the commercial manipulations of an audio-visually mediated society, having a heightened awareness of subliminal indoctrinations of an audio-visual environment, the facility of critical discrimination and independent action in relation to that environment; an understanding of human behavioral/sensory response to film resulting from the activation of an individual's sensor-ratios, or as a behavioral/perceptual science. Fulfilling these definitions became the responsibility of the various forms of film study that follow.

C. Although McLuhan's free-form continued to have an influence on all classroom studies in film, this field's marriage with English literature, language and composition - stands strongest throughout this period, providing an opposite, more academic and specialized approach. If McLuhan's approach represents a student-centered exploratory extreme on a continuum of conceptions of film study, the English classroom tradition represents the subject-centered extreme in both specialized-dominated general education and specialized education itself. Film experiences its longest and most vulnerable visitation in
this setting during this ten-year period, in a broad range of inter- and cross-disciplinary forms, carrying on its well-cultivated seat here. In this setting, film and literature are integrated in varying degrees and approached in similar ways, historically and critically, in terms of content, form, structure, function, aesthetics. Where English or language arts is part of a humanities block, so might film be and receive the same sort of treatment that literature and language do; and, just as literature electives emerge in the exploratory area, so might film studies, independently or in relation to literature, with a focus on a genre, a period, landmarks, directors, or a conceptual theme. Conceptions of knowledge and methods at this extreme of the English classroom, with respect to literature, language and film, have a distinct midcentury character. It must be clear, however, that while this curricular/instructional expression of film dominates, others that follow in this brief trace also found wide acceptance. The Motion Picture and the Teaching of English, published in 1965 by the National Council of Teachers of English, represents the central reference for this order of film study; after its publication, countless other books, sharing its perspective, became available to cater to the rising secondary market.

D. Film studies as part of Popular Culture Studies movement.

E. Film studies as part of Mass Media Studies movement.

F. Use of film to enliven, support and motivate study in the humanities disciplines or inter-disciplines. In this context, educators often subscribed to the "electric humanities" or "masspop" approach, using film as a token to relevancy or as a device leading to traditional academic study of other disciplines. As more contemporary subject matter or adolescent-level content replaced initial study of "classics" and "landmarks," film was used relationally in the spirit of "turning on" students to "rap sessions" about contemporary life. Media production may be integral to this approach, but it is seldom so. Media & Methods magazine typifies the sensibility drawn to this order of secondary film studies.
The student posture is ordinarily that of critic or historian, although these academic aims might be disguised. Next to the more typical English classroom, this approach found very wide acceptance and, in careful analysis, is not conceptually different from that more visibly specialized setting.

G. Film making projects may be a part of any of the curricular expressions and pedagogical interpretations described, or this aspect might be developed as an elective in the exploratory education area. The purposes typically cited for such projects are to acquaint students directly with the principles of film technique, as an activity to encourage sensitive viewing and critical evaluation from various perspectives. However, this aspect of film studies has clearly not been developed as integral to any of the curricular expressions described or as integral to fulfilling any of the definitions of visual literacy.

It is with these various expressions and interpretations of film and film studies education pervading comprehensive systems that this field enters the 1970's, arrowing rapidly toward its "Stage of Precision." At this point a trend begins to develop in practice and in the literature of recommendation and reportage, a movement toward establishing the cinematic arts as a disciplinary construct or elective within the exploratory area, or its equivalent, in the comprehensive system. Following here is a review of currently influential and representative trends, expressed as curricular/instructional patterns and events, that mark heavily in this rapid "arrowing" period. These will be described and critically explored for implicit foundational conceptions of knowledge, methods, and their interactions in educational experience.

The first exemplary report to be reviewed is Ralph Amelio's article, "Walkabout: Six Approaches to Film Analysis," a feature published in the February 1976 issue of *Media & Methods* magazine; this periodical has become one of the most influential references for film studies education in American secondary schools. In this article, Amelio brings together a cluster of curricular/instructional approaches to film study at the secondary level, and he delineates each in relation to Walkabout, a film adaptation of John Vance Marshall's 1959 novel. All six approaches focus on film analysis and appreciation, the most significant educational activities in relation to film for Amelio who suggests that both are equivalent
to formal criticism. In his scheme teacher-posed questions, reflecting the essence and direction of various critical approaches, "guide students" in their critical reflection and response to films screened. The teacher determines the appropriate approach for analysis and appreciation, selecting from six established modes of art/aesthetic criticism: cross-media, functional thematic, genre, stylistic, and critical-aesthetic. Criteria for selection are not given, although it is implied that choice of critical mode depends more upon the student's level of sophistication and less upon the particular films screened. The individual mode matters less than critical analysis and appreciation as an activity in a more general sense. Amelio asserts that the teacher who places students in a critical posture will be able to lead them to achieve "insights not only about the film but about themselves and their society as well."^21

With his six critical approaches to the structuring of curricular/instructional events, Amelio wishes "to provide a foundation for the serious use of film...these approaches are both a rationale...and a practical guide."^22 Clearly, Amelio has a foundational experience in mind for the study of film as a separate discipline, grounded in various formal critical events. Stated differently, Amelio would introduce film to students with various patterns of screenings and critical discussions for analysis and appreciation, believing these patterns will fulfill the achievement of insights into films, self, and society; also, Amelio would use this pattern of formal criticism as a rationale for introducing film into the exploratory curriculum, believing such a pattern will reflect the field's academic respectability.

The cross-media approach focuses on the comparative affinities and distinctive strengths of fictional prose and fictional audio-visual imagery through a novel-into-film study. Coupling this approach with the functional, Amelio would compare and contrast the "elements" of fiction (plot, structure, theme, message, style, symbolism, character development) with the "elements" of film (structure, camera angle and placement, lighting, editing, color, sound, composition, framing), for the purpose of analyzing and appreciating the relationships between content and form. Additionally, the functional approach focuses on "the technical use, selection and arrangement" of image and sound.23

The thematic approach "links the meanings inherent in the film...with those broad ideas which exist outside the film."^24 Amelio suggests that with this approach the teacher might urge students to use the film as data for anthropological and cross-cultural study, or as a catalyst for study of the ways in which film influences and reflects society.
The genre approach "seeks to identify and discuss the elements that contribute to making the film an example of a certain type or kind of work." Conventions in the use and development of plot, theme, character, setting, and imagery are recalled and discussed in relation to the filmmaker's typical or inventive choice and manipulation of them. In these regards, Amelio suggests a number of "specific questions" that teachers might pose, using *Walkabout* as his example.

The stylistic approach "seeks to identify and judge the personal characteristics of a filmmaker's works." Amelio exemplifies this critical approach by discussing the biography of Nicolas Roeg, the director of *Walkabout*; he recalls Roeg's other film work and characterizes his cinematic style, his treatment of the elements of film, and his preoccupation with particular themes.

Finally, the critical-aesthetic approach "considers the film's harmony, unity, integrity, vitality, emotional and intellectual involvement, and universality." Amelio believes this approach to be the most advanced and difficult, as it requires critical judgments of artistic value and perceptive aesthetic insights. Although he implies that this approach might best follow the others, Amelio explicitly suggests that students "begin this type of analysis by seeing what recognized critics have said about a particular film." Again, Amelio exemplifies by citing critical remarks made about *Walkabout* by Stanley Kauffmann, Pauline Kael, John Simon, Hollis Alpert, and Edmond Carpenter. Several of these remarks, which Amelio considers helpful to students engaging in the critical-aesthetic approach for the first time, follow here:

> 'As an adult film, it is homiletic and gooey!'  
> Stanley Kaufmann

> 'It is a plain, muscular film, handsome and shocking to look at...it is a violent fable, much of it about silence.'  
> Pauline Kael

> 'Walkabout stands in the noble tradition of inspiring men to great achievements in art and literature and perhaps in living.'  
> Edmond Carpenter

With respect to the emerging patterns in curricular/instructional events and practices for the cinematic arts as a discipline at the secondary level, and those patterns prevailing in current literature of recommended practices, Amelio's approach is prototypical; it is to be
found again and again in various forms and facilitated with various pedagogical styles. Amelio has in fact become an established member of the "recommending community" for the secondary school over recent years. Although this approach has been long-associated with and sanctioned in the study of the literary arts, in particular, at the secondary level, the curricular/instructional expressions of this approach in cinematic arts education make explicit the incongruent and imbalanced conception of the nature, function, source, and use of knowledge in which it is grounded. This conception has a distinct midcentury character in a number of respects.

Initially, Amelio brings the three conventional referents within the Substantive Domain into relation in curricular events: a body of knowledge in the cinematic arts; the human being as learner; and socio-cultural phenomena, themes and concerns as these exist in the films presented and in the experience/memory of learners. Among these, the body of knowledge in the cinematic arts is the referent of priority and the fundamental unifying element. It is for the purpose of analyzing and appreciating this body of knowledge that students and teacher come together, to assume the postures of receivers and the roles of critics, to respond with critical impressions to the creative expressions of others. Through a range of critical perspectives, these individuals focus on existing film products for the purpose of gaining insights about them - and insights about themselves and their society through these products composed by others.

In Amelio's pedagogical setting, learners are presented with finished film products and asked to focus on both subject matter content and the creative tools and elements, or on both the substantive and syntactic structures of particular films and film as a discipline. Subsequently, learners are asked to understand, to analyze and appreciate both dimensions or the dual nature of knowledge in the cinematic arts: the functional elements or modes and tools of creative inquiry in the form of cinematic expression, or syntactic dimensions of the cinematic arts; the themes and content conveyed by film, as they are given in film material itself, and as they serve as data for extended study of related substantive dimensions of the filmed subject matter; the conventional substantive structures that constitute particular genres, both the "typical," definitive structures and the atypical manipulation of available elements, or syntactic tools, toward inventive structures; factual information about a particular filmmaker, facts about his style, treatment of cinematic elements, and favorite themes; and the aesthetic accomplishments of particular films, which ought to involve both substantive and syntactic dimensions, both content/meaning and the form/creative tools of expression.
The first imbalance and incongruence is that both substantive and syntactic dimensions of the discipline of film, both the subject matter and the creative tools of expression/modes of inquiry, are conceived and treated as substantive-givens, as definitive content; such preoccupation with knowledge as "narrated" product rather than process in the cinematic arts translates into an instructional event in which students are passive receivers in respondents' postures:

Narration (with the teacher as narrator) leads the student to memorize mechanically the narrated content. Worse yet, it turns them into "containers," into "receptacles" to be "filled" by the teacher...

Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are depositories and the teacher is the depositor...the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the "banking" concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits... Knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing... negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry.

Amelio and others subscribing to conceptions of the nature of knowledge as product and definitive content attempt to disguise the banking method of education/instruction that follows from such conceptions with events centered around criticism, or critical inquiry. However, it must be clear that formal acts of critical analysis and appreciation are most frequently not acts of inquiry. Authentically engaging in acts or processes of inquiry in relation to the cinematic arts, and in ways congruent with film's disciplinary modes of inquiry and syntactic nature, would mean engaging in film making. In Amelio's prototypical curricular/instructional events, the learners are instead given predetermined critical tools in the form of teacher-posed, answer-centered questions, constructed and sequenced within the boundaries, interests and groundrules of various formal critical perspectives. The students respond to the leads given. Herein, it is the knowledgeable teacher's critical tools, according to their unique programming, that focus, link, seek, consider, identify, judge and discuss in relation
to what the teacher considers to be "settled" and definitive content. Such educational methods do not follow from authentic and balanced conceptions of the dual nature of knowledge in the cinematic arts, and such methods are incongruent with this disciplines syntactic structures and expressive, creative processes of inquiry. The students would surely inquire otherwise and, perhaps in time, would work with the knowledge revealed through the teacher's critical tools; however, as Amelio's approach is typical of student's foundational introduction to the cinematic arts at the secondary level, its mark biases and limits their subsequent involvement with this discipline.

Knowledge emerges only through invention and reinvention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other.33

Following from this first imbalance and incongruence in Amelio's conception of the nature of the cinematic arts are largely unfulfilled "functions" intended through his critical approach. He states that the prospective aims and intended functions of student involvement with the cinematic arts through this foundational critical approach are the student's achievement of "insights not only about the film but about themselves and their society as well."34 What this really means is the student's acquisition of "model" insights to which the teacher has prior access, "packaged" insights at which the producers of films selected by the teacher for screening have already arrived. The "sources" of knowledge, meant to motivate but which actually transmit and define these insights, are exterior and pre-formulated objects, existing film products as models of content, form, meanings and values, presentational insights to be deposited and received. Critical insights about the films, oneself and one's society are meant to be arrived at through vicarious study of second-hand experiences and information and through recall of experienced subject matter content now stored in memory. It is assumed by Amelio and others that students will arrive at meaningful insights without a primary reference to "self" and a primary experience in film making to inform their critical inquiry; without first-hand participation in and understanding of the expressive experiences and evolutionary processes of film making as these bear heavily on the creator and the finished product; without first-hand sensitivity to the powers of physical and figurative manipulation of content and form or the wide range of choice and alternatives from which a film product has been created; without sufficient information about production practices,
technical procedures and limitations of film making that have a significant impact on the finished product. Students are supposed to deduce truth, in line with the teacher's academic deductions and with what might be revealed through specific critical perspectives, rather than experience the truths that would inform critical analysis.

If it were suggested that the first-hand practice of film making by students as a foundational event would better facilitate the functions Amelio intends in his pedagogical setting, he would point out that his aim is not to develop students' technical skills in film production but rather to sharpen their analytical skills and critical appreciation in relation to film content and form. As James Moffett would explain, the misunderstanding implicit in Amelio's probable response grows out of a particular misconception of knowledge found among teachers of English. These individuals frequently fail to distinguish between "kinds and orders" of knowledge, fail to distinguish "between symbol systems and what is symbolized in the systems." Moffett would conceive of both English and film as symbol systems, essentially, that can not be treated as content areas at a foundational level, if their curricular/instructional expressions are to be congruent with this essential nature. It would be first-hand experiences using symbol systems that would more appropriately prepare students for eventual critical inquiry and insight-gathering. Even apart from the fact that participative activity in film making, subjective viewing and expressing, would facilitate more authentic insights into self and society, direct manipulation of the film medium as a symbol system would facilitate informed and truthful insights into the content and form of film products students receive for analysis and appreciation in class.

This review of Amelio's article closes here with a postscript from Moffett's Teaching the Universe of Discourse; his discussion of foundational conceptions of English as a symbol system, and the curricular/instructional expressions deriving from those conceptions, is pertinent to the problems with the approach suggested by Amelio.

Today the approach is far too substantive. Take up practically any textbook on language or composition and you will find it organized in this way: Categories, and therefore units of study, are derived by analytically decomposing language into the "elements." This is what I call the particle approach... Although this approach pays lip service to the interrelations of elements, it
cannot escape its own format. To cash in on current slogans like "sequential development," publishers often arrange these particles in an order of smaller to larger - from the word to the sentence to the paragraph to the whole composition. I do not know what development this corresponds to - certainly not to the functioning of either the language or the student.

... Genre divisions satisfy a passion for taxonomy... Perhaps more than anything else, genres are marketing directives. As such, they provide convenient rhetorical bins. Pedagogically, they constitute a hazard by making both teachers and students feel that they have to "define" what a short story or a poem is, i.e., find something similar in all examples. Even if this were not futile, one would be left with only a definition, another substantive reduction that does not help one to read, write, or even appreciate.

... we have unnecessarily deformed our subject to make it into a content like other subjects. But English, mathematics, and foreign languages are not about anything in the same sense that history, biology, physics, and other primarily empirical subjects are about something. English, French, and mathematics are symbol systems... when a student "learns" one of these systems, he learns how to operate it.

In insisting on a major division between symbol systems and what is symbolized in the systems, I am attempting to break up the bland surface of our traditional curriculum, whereby the Carthaginian Wars, the theorems of Euclid, irregular German Verbs, the behavior of amoebas, and the subordination of clauses all come dead-level across the board as if they were the same kind of knowledge. The failure to distinguish kinds and orders of knowledge, amounts to a crippling epistemological error built into the
very heart of the overall curriculum. The classification by "subject mat-
ters" into English, history, math, science, French, etc., implies that they are all merely contents that differ only in what they are about. The hidden assumptions of this clas-
sification have taught students to be naive about both symbols and the nature of information...

Fortunately, the curriculum builders of mathematics and foreign languages have made some progress... by reconceiving their subjects in terms of relations and skills. The most natural assumption about teaching any symbol system should be that the student employ his time using that system in every realistic way that it can be used, not that he analyze it or study it as an object...

If such an approach seems to slight literature and language, I can only say that this is a mistake of the substantive view. A student writing in all the same forms as the authors he reads can know literature from the inside in a way that few students ever do today. If the student has to work with language constantly in the functional way the professional does, he will come to know it in the professional's intimate way. Through reading writing, and discussing whole, authentic discourses - and using no textbooks - students can learn better everything that we consider of value in language and literature than they can by the current substantive and particle approach. 36
The aim of the final section of this chapter is to sketch a number of conclusions and directions suggested by this research. Such a sketch begins with brief thoughts from the work of others.

The knowledge which comes first to persons, and that remains most deeply ingrained, is knowledge of how to do ... When education, under the influence of the scholastic conception of knowledge which ignores everything but scientifically formulated facts and truths, fails to recognize that primary and initial subject matter always exists as a matter of an active doing, involving the use of the body and the handling of material, the subject matter of instruction is isolated from the needs and purposes of the learner, and so becomes just a something to be memorized and reproduced upon demand. Recognition of the natural course of development, on the contrary, always sets out with situations which involve learning by doing. 37

Practice of the arts and knowledge of the arts develop in reciprocal relation to each other... 38

...The main purpose of this book... may be described as the construction of an intellectual framework for philosophical studies, general or detailed, relating to art.

There are certain difficulties peculiar to this undertaking... In the first place, philosophy of art should, I believe, begin in the studio, not in the gallery, auditorium or library. Just as the philosophy of science required for its proper development the standpoint of the scientist, not of men... without any conception of its real problems and working concepts, so the philosophy of art requires the standpoint of the artist to test the power of its concepts and prevent empty or naive generalizations. The philosopher must know the arts, so to speak, "from the inside." ... A truly enlightening theory of art should rise upon important artistic insights and evolve naturally from phase to phase, as the great edifices of thought...
...grow from perennial roots to further and further reaches of their own implications.39

...each student filmmaker lives through the identical historical evolution of film in learning...He begins by trying to record technically correct pictures on film, perfecting his ability to obtain clearly focused, properly exposed images. He then realizes the power of different pictorial compositions, the strategies of long shots and close-ups, the effects of different lenses and filters. Then he discovers the power of editing in creating a film's meaning tone.40

...Teaching filmmaking without being cognizant of fundamental cinematic theories demeans film craft to the mere level of an amateur workshop. And the opposite: studying film history and theory without a corresponding experience in the elemental aspects of filmmaking leaves theoretical research without a solid basis, forcing the student to plunge into abstraction.41
The sphere of "critical inquiry" represents the central cluster of questions posed and explored through this research. From its center position, the process of critical inquiry proceeds intentionally in two directions, attempting to explore the conceptual foundations and assumptions tied into curricular/instructional thought and the developmental patterns and events characterizing curricular/instructional practice. Preliminarily, formulation of the "critical focus" is grounded in the basic assumption that the conceptual scheme can be used to represent and disclose a comprehensive, multi-leveled picture of curricular/instructional thought and practice in particular situations or systems. Further, it is assumed that the conceptual scheme is an organism, a complex structure of interdependent and subordinate elements with the potential to interact in a congruent manner; herein, separate levels of conceptual thought and developmental practice share the same fundamental referents or elements, and these separate levels of thought and practice have the potential to be related to one another, translated into one another, and integrated with one another in a congruent manner. To state this basic assumption differently, foundational conceptions related to "theory" represented by the Substantive Domain and developmental events related to "practice" represented by the Curriculum Development Sphere are integral to all curricular/instructional systems, and the relation and interaction of theory and practice ought to be characterized by congruence.

The critical inquiry formulated for this research is situated within a subject-centered conceptual scheme, or a curricular system having knowledge as the foundational referent of priority at the levels of the Substantive Domain and the Curriculum Development Sphere. The critical inquiry focuses on conceptions of knowledge, its nature, function, source, and uses prevailing within particular subject-centered systems, and the corresponding conceptions of educational methods as these might be derived from or suggested by the prevailing assumptions about knowledge. The aims of the critical inquiry are: to identify, disclose and understand prevailing conceptions of knowledge that have influenced contemporary cinematic and literary arts education; to discover flaws or incongruences in these conceptions; and to study the manner in which foundational conceptions of knowledge give rise to conceptions of educational methods. The aim is to discover foundational misconceptions that give rise to flawed practice in developmental patterns and events and, ultimately, to reconceive flawed foundations and, in turn, the nature of educational experience.

Reconceptualization connotes an authentic conceptual transformation of the most fundamental elements, and their
essential characteristics, that interact in complex ways in educational settings. Efforts to affect change in these settings through rearrangement and reorganization of interacting elements and their complex factors will not result in sustained, authentic transformation without prior reconception of the simple, central elements. The essential foundation of the more highly complex interactions, which are educational experience, must first receive concentrated reconsideration. It is the conception or understanding of these foundational elements that gives rise to the direction of interaction in educational settings, that define the nature and function of educational experience. In the instance of this research, a critical question is formulated with respect to a conception of knowledge, a fundamental element of curricular/instructional interaction, and its nature, function, source and uses, the essential characteristics of knowledge. As this conception, seated in a particular period or attending a particular field, is explored and disclosed through a method of critical inquiry, the essence of potential reconceptualization becomes apparent. As reconceptual adjustments proceed in fundamental elements, a new foundation becomes apparent, giving rise to a corresponding, new view of a cluster of elements in the state of interaction in educational settings.

Following here are the postulations suggested by the critical inquiry guiding this research:

A. Among the central influences on the nature of formal educational experience within a field are the prevailing conceptions of the nature, function, source, and uses of knowledge. Major implications for the entire fabric and texture of curricular/instructional phenomena spring from these conceptions. Moreover, these conceptions carry a heightened significance for educational experience when "knowledge" emerges as the referent of priority during the conceptualization process within the Substantive Domain in relation to Cluster A dimensions. Knowledge-centeredness at the conceptual level typically translates into a subject-centered system; further, the knowledge-centered sensibility uses particular and discernable conceptions of its nature, function, source, and uses as the bases for giving direction to other substantive referents and curricular/instructional elements.

B. Educational methods of instruction and study are among the central elements influenced by prevailing conceptions of knowledge attending particular fields. Conceptions of a particular
body of knowledge can give meaningful and substantial direction to the development of pedagogical methods. In the discovery of the essential nature, function, source, and uses of a body of knowledge lie implications for methods through which one might come to know that field.

C. Wherever knowledge- or subject-centered schemes and systems dominate periods and traditions in curricular thought and practice, conceptions of knowledge and methods, their impetus, patterns, mutual influence and interactions can be discerned and described. These conceptions can be identified through a tracing of sources, influences, and curricular/instructional expressions and practices as represented by a comprehensive conceptual paradigm: Cluster A, the Substantive Domain, and the Curriculum Development Sphere. These conceptions might be best ferreted out through a critical exploration of curricular/instructional patterns and events at the level of "practice" in the Curriculum Development Sphere; these are the more explicit indicators of implicit conceptions.

D. Questions may first be raised about the conception of the nature of knowledge attending a field; incongruences and imbalances, flaws and contradictions may exist here. These incongruences may also be reflected among/between conceptions of the nature, function, source and uses of knowledge. If a prevailing conception of the nature of a body of knowledge is deficient, imbalanced or flawed in some respect, the conceptions of the remaining three characteristics of knowledge will follow suit. In turn, flawed foundations at the level of conceptual thought or theory will bias and influence the entire system within which they reside, especially interacting elements within the Curriculum Development Sphere, or elements of curricular/instructional practice. As conceptions of knowledge give direction to conceptions of methods, it is within this context that questions might be raised with regard to misconceptions of knowledge giving rise to misconceived methods; in such a case, educational methods would not reflect a balanced conception of the field for which they are developed; subject and method would be incongruent.
E. If curricular/instructional expressions of knowledge/methods interactions in the context of educational experience in a field are to be authentically transformed in some direction as a result of critical disclosures, then fundamental reconceptualization of referents foundational to the entire curricular system—such as knowledge—is implied. Alterations within the Curriculum Development Sphere must evolve from prior reconceptualization of foundational elements and must be grounded in sound prior conceptual bases. Shifting and reorganizing the disciplines, rearranging and replacing subject matter content and materials within disciplines, implementing different instructional methodologies or pedagogical styles will not accomplish authentic, sustained transformation of educational experience without prior, fundamental reconceptualization of foundational elements such as knowledge. All spheres within the conceptual scheme constructed for this research must be in congruent relation with one another, must be congruent translations of one another, must be congruently integrated with one another.

F. If a foundational referent such as "knowledge" is to be reconceived at the level of the Substantive Domain toward authentic reconceptualization of the entire curricular system, this must be done in relation to the other foundational referents with which "knowledge" always interacts in the system. Within the conventional Substantive Domain, knowledge has been traditionally treated in relation to "the learner" and "society"; however, within the Curriculum Development Sphere, "educational methods" are traditionally represented as a referent interacting with knowledge. A reconceived Substantive Domain is suggested by this, in which "educational methods" would be represented at the conceptual level of curricular inquiry, to be considered in relation to "knowledge", "the learner", and "society", and to be integral to this Domain for consideration in relation to Cluster A.

G. Conceptions of knowledge and methods prevailing in a curricular system for a field of study have implicit in them conceptions of the human being as learner. As conceptions of knowledge and methods are translated and made explicit in curricular/instructional expressions and events, so are conceptions of the learner made explicit.
A reconceptualization of knowledge in the literary and cinematic arts must reflect the full, essential nature of these fields and provide fertile implications for the development of educational methods congruent with this essential nature. Various prevailing and potential conceptions of knowledge attending these fields have been explored, and these have tended to focus on two distinct but related dimensions. Within the context of disciplinary knowledge, these two dimensions have been referred to as the substantive structures and the syntactic structures, as existing subject matter content and the disciplinary modes of inquiry and patterns of thought giving rise to content, as the products of a process known as disciplined inquiry and the process itself that generates subject matter, as the puristic and abstract form of subject matter and the applicable tools, materials and principles of inquiry. Within the context of the artistic enterprise, these same two dimensions have been referred to as the created product and the creative process, the existing objects as presented and the expressive symbol systems and modes that generate products. Within the context of art theory, these same two dimensions are represented in terms of a progression or evolution through process to product, such as in theories of signs, expression, symbolization, abstraction, and codification; more specialized art theory proceeds to focus on aspects of process or aspects of product. Too, various other "processes of investigation" that are more independent of given disciplines but vital to most might also be identified with the syntactic dimensions of knowledge, such as principles of logic and reason, critical thinking, reflective thinking, functional thinking, sensory observation and recording, induction and deduction, problem-solving, the heuristics of discovery. These two dimensions of knowledge have equivalent expressions in many other frames and traditions, typically phrased in terms of the individual's relationship to the two aspects, the roles and postures an individual assumes in relation to knowledge, and the manner in which various different kinds and orders of knowledge are encountered. An important example of such equivalent expressions is the context provided by Martin Buber, who distinguishes between the I-You realm of creative discovery through subjective encounter and the I-It realm of detached acquisition through discursive objectification. 42

Most significant to this research are the pedagogical expressions of the two dimensions of knowledge, the educational methods that are suggested by this dual nature, the roles and postures of human beings as learners in relation to knowledge that are suggested. While the syntactic and substantive structures (to abridge the two dimensions), of a body or bodies of knowledge, taken together would seem to suggest an appropriately holistic
continuum representative of the full, essential nature of knowledge from a reconceptual perspective, these two dimensions have been viewed instead as dichotomous, with a kind of dialectical tension, as they are considered in the context of pedagogy, curriculum and instruction. It has become clear that the contemporary "picture" or conception of knowledge is not holistic, not balanced, not congruent with these essential two dimensions, and this dichotomous view assumes various pedagogical expressions. Perhaps the clearest and most appropriate example for the cinematic and literary arts is the equivalent of this dichotomy found in the tradition of aesthetic education; herein, the syntactic dimensions are associated primarily with aesthetic education and activities of receiving, apprehending and perceiving; and the two realms are made distinct in the context of pedagogy, curriculum and instruction, such that methods for aesthetic education do not cross into artistic activities but are ordinarily limited to receiving roles, apprehending and perceiving activities, and critical postures for students in relation to framed-knowledge generated by others. This exemplifies the way in which misconceptions of the nature, function, source and uses of knowledge may be implicitly conveyed through methods that derive from and transmit only one dimension of knowledge.

While it is clear that contemporary inquirers and developers recognize the dual nature of knowledge, their dichotomous view implies or leads to a prioritizing and an ordering of the two dimensions within the framework of pedagogy, in the development of curriculum and educational methods. As was described within the contexts of the midcentury paradigm and the aesthetic education tradition, foundational, introductory experience in fields such as cinema and literature is grounded in and comprised of explicit developmental focus on substantive dimensions, the dimensions of priority; through a study of these, progressing in a spiral from the simple to the complex, it is expected that the syntactic structures of that field, implicit in the substantive content, will be revealed indirectly and made comprehensible to and applicable by the learner. This curricular/instructional expression derives from Jerome Bruner's structure-of-a-discipline rationale, wherein "structure" refers first and foremost to substantive structure. This prevailing conception of knowledge as being predominantly substantive in nature suggests educational methods, once again, that serve this dimension to the explicit neglect of the syntactic, methods that distort a direct experience with a full, balanced conception of knowledge in a field; these methods have been variously described as "banking," puristic, and "scholastic."
A reconceptual response to the foregoing contemporary assumptions and practices would consist of the following points:

A. As James Moffett points out in his own attempt to reconceive the field of "English," it is valid to proceed with fundamental reconceptualizations of knowledge within predominating subject-centered schemes and disciplinary frameworks; these organizational structures will continue to predominate and are in the greatest need of such reconceptual work, as subject-centered systems based upon "knowledge" priorities and substantive content distinctions run the largest risk of mid-century characteristics. Within this given frame of a "subject" or discipline, however, conceptions of knowledge can be transformed so as to provide a new foundation for the development of methods and congruent knowledge/methods interactions.

B. The dichotomous view of the two dimensions of knowledge must be replaced with a holistic continuum within which both dimensions would be conceptualized as integral, related, organic and inseparable.

C. This holistic conception must be translated faithfully into appropriate pedagogical and curricular/instructional expressions, methods, events, and practices.

D. A reconceptualization would respect the evolutionary nature of the cinematic and literary arts as symbol systems, and thereby reverse the ordering of the two dimensions of knowledge in these fields, within the context of foundational, introductory experience. Bruner's substantive structure-of-a-discipline spiral would be replaced with a syntactic structure-of-a-discipline spiral. This spiral would more easily accommodate the explicit developmental focus on both dimensions of knowledge and would provide the student with direct foundational and subsequent experience within the holistic continuum.

E. There has been little assurance that the substantive spiral prepares for syntactic understanding and facility; however, there is much data to support the notion that syntactic involvement prepares for both substantive and
syntactic sensitivity. The reconceptual view would tend to reject the midcentury structure-of-a-discipline rationale, which Moffett interprets in part to mean that:

...when someone learns a certain content, he also learns that way of learning. This second kind of learning syntactic process tends to be hidden because it is not under focus, and yet for that very reason may be the more lasting. 46

F. It seems clear that some kind and degree of synthesis, or involvement with both dimensions of knowledge in a field, would complement and be integral to most curricular/instructional aims in the cinematic and literary arts. However, it also seems clear that the nature, degree, and quality of that synthesis are largely dependent upon the comparative treatment and ordering of the two dimensions, and upon which dimension predominates the explicit developmental spiral. Authentic conceptual and practical synthesis will be challenged by the inevitable need to order the two dimensions of knowledge in pedagogy, curriculum and instruction and to define the developmental spiral more predominantly with one dimension than the other. In any attempt to set forth a perspective within which the two dimensions may be meaningfully related, fully and equally represented, implicit biases and priorities will be difficult to overcome. The dimension selected for explicit representation in the spiral, the dimension defining the backbone of foundational and introductory experience, will be construed as significant for its own sake. In a sense, then, the question of attaining or transmitting authentic synthesis may rest upon giving priority to the dimension that is, in fact, significant for its own sake as well as an open, productive path to the other dimension.

G. "...Our subject...is not language but languaging. Approaching our subject in this way, we begin to see it, perhaps for the first time, not as a subject at all— but as a means. This new perspective is crucial: words are no longer artifacts...we must begin
to fit our classrooms into this new conception of knowledge...we must see our primary responsibility in leading students to the discovery of words as tools by which to sculpt and re-sculpt raw experience in order to discover its meaning and one's own relationship to that meaning. And we must help them to see literature as another person's attempt at the same process. For what is man's languaging, what is his literature, but his attempt to sort out and to come to terms with the world of his experience and with his own place in that world. And what is the study of literature but the sharing in someone else's struggle." 47

"...we generally approach composition and the study of literature as if they were ends in themselves...as if there were something intrinsically worthwhile about the product...rather than the process of writing - the process of sorting and discovering and creating...we fail to deal with it as a living example of another human's languaging...and put it in a glass case so that it can't be touched; and then we stand back with an antiseptic pointer like a curator in a museum and proceed to point out metaphors and allusions and plot development." 48

H. "...The dominant tendency in British and American literary criticism has been to conceive literary works as objects or artifacts, best understood in relative isolation from the writer's personal biography and undistorted by associations brought to the work from the reader's own daily life. The new critics on the continent...are breaking with the notion that a literary work can be dealt with objectively, divorced from experience. In fact, they treat each work as a manifestation of an individual writer's experience, a gradual growth of consciousness into expression...

For the critic of consciousness, literature is viewed as a genesis, a conscious effort on the part of an individual artist to understand his own experience by framing it in language. The reader who encounters the work must recreate it in terms of his consciousness." 49
...the individual, in our case the student, will only be in a position to learn when he is committed to act upon his world. The desire, indeed the need for orientation is equivalent to the desire to constitute meanings, all sorts of meanings, in the many dimensions of existence. But this desire... is not satisfied by the authoritative confrontation of student with knowledge structures (no matter how 'teachable' the forms in which the knowledge is revealed). It is surely not satisfied when the instructional situation is conceived to be, as G. K. Plochmann has written, one in which the teacher is endeavoring with respect to his subject matter, to bring the understanding of the learner in equality with his own understanding. Described in that fashion, with 'learner,' conceived generically and the 'system' to be taught conceived as preexistent and objectively real, the instructional situation seems to me to be one that alienates... like the approach to literary criticism Abrams describes, the view appears to commit us to a concept of curriculum 'as a floating Laputa, insulated from life and essential human concerns.' 50

I. A reconceptualization of knowledge in the cinematic and literary arts would respect the entire evolutionary frame of such expressive fields, a frame connoted by the whole of "the creative process" or "artistic enterprise." The importance of this frame lies in its holistic scope, its organicism, its emphasis on the expressive roots and processes from which contents and products grow. Such a reconceptualization would be rooted in expressive theories of art that respect the notion of genesis of the developmental processes involved in human abstracting and symbolizing toward abstractions formulated and symbols made. Cinema and literature are fundamentally symbolizing fields that make available expressive tools with which individuals engage in activities of sorting, reasoning, thinking, discovering, formulating, creating. Foundational, introductory experience with these fields must begin within the frame of this fundamental conception. Cinema and literature do not simply exist as they are
encountered in their presentational stages; they have an evolutionary history marked by series and progressions of creative activities that govern their eventual content and form, values and meanings. A conception of these fields must be functional with respect to the learner's immediate and future experience of them, must be fertile for translation into functional educational methods. It is the holistic continuum of the creative process, and the sense of direction, choice and evolution inherent in the continuum, that will translate into functional pedagogy, curriculum and instruction.

J. The processes of human abstraction, codification, or symbolization are developmental, evolutionary, progressive and increasingly more complex. Expressions evolve as framed, external equivalents for inner and outer phenomena. The process of expression is one of codification, the substitution of one set of symbols for another or "symbolic transformation," that reflects the human processing of the world. These expressions may begin as deep operations of the mind as inner acts of conceptualizing. There is a set of fundamental relations among elements involved in expression, such as speaker-listener-subject; the interaction of these elements moves through a hierarchy of increasingly more complex abstractions, a developmental sequence of codification stages that represent greater and more complex processing of phenomena by the human mind. As such external expressions come into being through the use and manipulation of a medium/language of discourse (such as English or film), a speaker's picture of the symbolizing medium will correspond or be congruent with his/her own developmental processing of phenomena. As James Moffett explains:

I have suggested structuring English curriculum according to the relations of speaker-listener-subject as the ultimate context within which all our other concerns may be handled functionally and holistically, moving the student in his writing and reading from one kind of actual discourse to
the next in a sequence which permits him to learn style, logic, semantics, rhetoric, and literary form continuously through practice as first or second person. Ideally this sequence would correspond both to his own intellectual and emotional growth and to some significant progression in "symbolic transformation," as Suzanne Langer has called the human processing of the world. The structure of the subject as a symbolizing system of syntactic processes must be meshed with the structure of the student... We must reconceive the subject in such a way that we can talk simultaneously about both the operations of the field and the operations of the learner. 52

K. With respect to foundational experience in an expressive field, a conceptual shift from a substantive/product-centered focus to a syntactic/process-centered focus suggests an equivalent curricular/instructional shift from learning about the manipulation of symbols. In relation to this and what has been stated about human symbolization, a reconceptualization of knowledge in the cinematic and literary arts would call for a functional curriculum, functional and naturalistic instruction. In these ways, a "student-centeredness" within the framework of subject-centered schemes might be achieved.

L. The evolving "creative process," as a symbol of knowledge holistically reconceived, human symbolization, and the whole of the artistic enterprise, must give rise to pedagogy that represents and integrates the student's artistic producing and aesthetic receiving, if methods are to be congruent with this holistic picture of knowledge. This is consonant with the Piagetian notion that learning occurs as an individual interacts with the environment and engages with its materials and processes; this view is also compatible with Dewey's belief in "learning by doing" and learning through processes of reflective thinking and active participation. Recon-
ceived educational methods for the literary and cinematic arts that respect the holistic conception of knowledge in these fields and the developmental processes of human symbolization assume the following: that creating and receiving symbols, expressing and apprehending, are reciprocal activities in educational settings, and the student ought not be limited to one kind of activity but rather should have the benefit of the mutuality shared by both; but that practice, as it relates to the direct and consistent experiences of formulating, creating and expressing, is the more critical component, significant enough for its own sake to define the explicit developmental spiral, and appropriate as an activity and a posture precursory to sensitive substantive encounters. As Moffett suggests, reorganization would center on the learner as producer and manipulator of symbols. If he is adept at abstracting and at understanding the abstractions of other people, this learner will have no trouble acquiring the accumulated knowledge of the past. 53

M. It is postulated that the broad range of foundational aims and intended functions of formal study in the literary and cinematic arts, within all general, specialized, and exploratory education contexts, ought to be rooted in a holistic conception of knowledge, with a predominate focus on its evolutionary, symbolizing nature; further, it is postulated that this broad range of aims and functions, traditionally rooted in some form of aesthetic education, would be best facilitated by a curricular/instructional blend of creative and critical activities, with a predominate focus on student use of symbolizing systems in every realistic way they can be used.

N. Creative participation and interaction with a field of study not only nurtures the student's own needs and abilities to think about, understand, frame and express phenomena and experience; such activities also deepen the students' range of sensitivities in receiving and apprehending framed expressions and codified content. It would seem that, for the student, consistent and
meaningful experience in creating, expressing and presenting his/her own formulations for dialogue with others, moving again and again through the whole continuum of the creative process, would foster a level of consciousness and perceptual sensitivity pertinent to meaningful substantive encounters. It would seem that engaging in aesthetic activities and assuming a receiver's role and critic's posture without a foundational and consistent involvement in artistic activities and a creator's posture would impair and severely limit the sort of response and understanding a student might attain in relation to knowledge "products." Meaningful and significant critical reflection and analysis of subject matters in established or new directions - all hermeneutical activity and interpretational inquiry in relation to products encountered - would seem to rest largely on the degree of empathy brought by the student with respect to content, form, and process. Curriculum and instruction ought to provide and prepare for the greatest degree of empathy in all conceivable directions and with respect to the whole of the creative process. It is this sort of pedagogy that would facilitate Dewey's reference to "the work done on the part of the percipient," 54 Sartre's reference to the reader's consciousness "of disclosing," 55 and Greene's reference to the reader who must "recreate it [substantive product] in terms of his consciousness." 56 Further, as the student's conception of fields such as the literary and cinematic arts, is as important as the philosopher's, the student must also follow Langer's advice to "begin in the studio, not in the gallery, auditorium or library" in order to understand its real problems and working concepts... and prevent empty or naive generalizations." 57

0. "The most natural assumption about teaching any symbol system should be that the student employ his time using that system in every realistic way that it can be used, not that he analyze it or study it as an object... If such an approach seems to slight literature and language, I can only say that this is a mistake of the substantive view. A student writing in all the same forms as
the authors he reads can know literature from the inside in a way that few students ever do today. If the student has to work with language constantly in the functional way the professional does, he will come to know it in the professional's intimate way. Through reading, writing, and discussing whole, authentic discourses... Students can learn better everything that we consider of value in language and literature than they can by the current substantive and particle approach."

"...A student who role-plays the artist (1) comes to appreciate and understand the art form intuitively without needing teacher explanation and tedious vivisections and post-mortems, and (2) that some of the benefits that accrue to the artist accrue to him. Anyone who has written some duologues or triologues, or one-acters, or a whole play is much more likely to grasp for himself what the dynamics are of a certain moment in Ibsen or Shakespeare, what the main vector is of a certain scene, or its purpose, why some scenes occur off stage and some on, how people's speech characterizes them, what the importance is of setting and objects, what a clumsy or expert exposition is, and so on. The same is true with fiction and poetry. Most inexperienced students take all the decisions of the artist for granted. In fact, they see no choice, only arbitrariness or inevitability. Appreciation of form comes only with a sense of choices - from the selection of persona, locale, and events... When you yourself invent, you see all the choices, make decisions; the arbitrariness and inevitability of what professionals do disappears. It all begins to make sense."

It is no less than the nature of educational experience that is at the center of reconceptualization, for this is much less dependent on what field is providing the context for study and much more dependent on how it is being studied, the conceptual relations among elements interacting within the context, and the posture of the student in relation to the conception of the field dominating the context. For too long, interpretational/receptive activity in the absence of creative/initiative activity has been affirmed;
the limitations of substantive focus and the restrictions to critical postures have been accepted and, moreover, respected. The quality of educational experience differs in relation to the absence or presence of foundational creative involvement with the syntactic process of symbolizing fields such as the cinematic and literary arts are congruent with the developmental structure of human symbolization, and these require congruent pedagogy.

One failure of English teaching has been to consider only messages, or consider them before or without placing them in the whole context of the communication frame wherein the student can see the operation of all relations. 60

...The structure of the subject must be meshed with the structure of the student. A major failure of education has been to consider the logic of one almost to the exclusion of the psychologic of the other... Atomizing a subject into analytic categories, inherent only in the subject, necessarily slights the internal processes of the student or language-user, who in any given instance of an authentic discourse is employing all the substructures, working in all the categories at once. We must reconceive the subject in such a way that we can talk simultaneously about both the operations of the field and the operations of the learner...What assures me that a correspondence is possible between phases of discourse and stages of growth is that all man's artifacts reflect him, and discourse is man-made. 61
The necessary characteristics of foundational experience with expressive fields and the ordering of these in curriculum and instruction have a significant analogue in the frame of Martin Buber's work. This analogue reflects and clarifies the reconceptual views of educational experience and the human being as learner, views that shift as conceptions of knowledge and pedagogy shift. Buber suggests a manner of experiencing a "subject" that seems initially to lie outside the human being, a manner that facilitates the individual's essential, intuitive discovery of correspondence with the subject. This is the individual's direct participation and interaction with the process of the subject in the present, which provides an understanding that is precursory to objectification and valid discursive analysis of the subject. Buber represents this realm of participation as the "I-You world," wherein the "I" as the human being and the "You" as the raw material of the subject are fused and in direct relation, creating themselves and with each other. Buber separates and makes distinct the human being's encounter in the "I-You world" and his/her eventual objectification and analysis of the subject in the "I-It world." In this second realm, the "You" becomes an "It" for the individual, a literary or cinematic product, an object among objects; the human being is more detached now and able to discern particulars and analyze elements in the subject. At this point, the "I" is able to apply a method of inquiry/analysis and a style of interpretation that derives from experience in the "I-You world," a method and style congruent with what was discovered there. Buber acknowledges the "I's" evolution from subjective relation in the present toward objective analysis in the future; he further acknowledges the individual's discursive and qualitative inclinations during the creative participation with the subject. However, making distinct and giving proper order to the two realms of experience are crucial factors, reflecting how necessary creative, subjective discovery in the "I-You" encounter is to eventual discursive, analytic activity. If the "I" moves into the "I-It" realm too hastily, the individual's foundational understanding will be stunted.
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