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Chapter I
Introduction

This study examines the relationship of curriculum theory to the design of instructional methods and materials. It redefines the basic unit for theorizing in curriculum as the student's ability to interpret curricular intents. In this respect, it differs from prevailing curriculum theory, where student response to instructional events is the focus of research. This study contends that the curriculum must address the student's intentionality in order to integrate curricular intents with the design of instructional method and materials.

The organizing question of this dissertation has been posed by Herbert Kliebard in his critique of the Tyler rationale: "how can learning experiences be selected by a teacher or curriculum maker when they are defined as the interaction between a student and his environment?" Responses to this problem have come from two directions, classroom interaction analysis in the field of instruction and recent work in curriculum by a small group of theorists known as the Reconceptualists. In curriculum theorizing the Reconceptualists conceive of learning as an
interaction between curricular goals and the learner's world view* or analytic structure.

The State of the Curriculum Field

Currently, three models for research and development in curriculum comprise the field. In a 1971 review of curriculum research, James Macdonald contrasted these three groups of curricularists and their divergent approaches to student - curriculum interaction.²

Tylerians. This group includes an estimated ninety percent of curricularists who base their efforts on some form of the Tyler rationale.³ Tyler's scheme for curriculum development has dominated the field for thirty years, at least since the publication of Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction in 1950. Tyler defines the learning experience in terms of accomplishing selected educational objectives. He maintains that the curriculum developer and teacher can control the learning experience by "manipulation of the environment in such a way as to set up stimulating situations - situations that will evoke the kind of behavior desired."⁴ The thrust of the Tyler model is to gather educational objectives as the basis for

*World view is the set of social norms and values the individual learner uses to interpret the actions and intentions of others and to formulate his own intentions and actions.
a curriculum design that will produce the desired product in the most efficient manner. As a rule, curriculists working in the Tyler model are involved in the development of specific curricula. The Tyler model offers a rationale to guide their work, but generally these curricularists do not generate theoretical statements about the possibilities for learning within a particular set of curricular goals.

Scientists. A second group of theorists, perhaps five to eight percent of the field, has moved the concepts and methods of scientific study into curriculum inquiry. These empiricists generate theory by discerning curriculum variables and relationships for empirical validation, rather than by testing the efficiency of specific curricula as in Tyler's method. For them curriculum theory becomes a long-range science for describing and validating how educational objectives are best accomplished. As a result, they focus on the measurement of instructional results and thus generally reduce broad curricular problems to narrower instructional questions.

Reconceptualists. According to Macdonald's analysis, a third group of individuals, often referred to as Reconceptualists, approaches curriculum theorizing as an intellectually creative task. This group of generally young theorists has tried to revitalize the field by introducing critical paradigms from other disciplines into curricular thinking. Their intent is to develop and evaluate new
conceptual schemes for talking about curriculum. In introducing new sets of values to the curriculum field, they have tended to acknowledge the learner's perspective in the design of curricular intents more carefully. Of those theorists examined in this study, Michael Apple and John Mann advocate a Marxist approach to curriculum theorizing, while William Pinar and Dwayne Huebner introduce hermeneutics into curriculum theory to investigate the student's perspective in a curricular environment.

Each group of theorists includes the learner's perspective or horizon* at some stage in its curricular efforts. Tyler's technical model points to three sources for determining educational objectives: suggestions from subject matter specialists for the handling of material, studies of contemporary life, and studies of the learner and the learning process. The nature of the learner is studied primarily in a psychological sense, that is, as it affects positively or negatively the realization of the selected objectives. The Tyler model seeks information about the learner, by "first, finding the present status of the students, and second, comparing this status to acceptable norms in order to identify the gaps and needs."5

*Horizon is the learner's personal basis for interpreting curricular intents. It is the expression of his intentionality as it apprehends educational experience.
The scientific model for curriculum inquiry examines the student's perspective as it affects the achievement of particular curricular goals. The interaction of the student's perspective and instructional method is studied with the object of facilitating the design of instruction. The researcher develops procedures for aligning instructional method and student perspective to achieve specific educational objectives. The Flanders model for research in classroom interaction is one example of scientific research in curriculum and instruction. It is discussed at length in Chapter Two.

In current curriculum theorizing, the Reconceptualists examine learning experiences as a negotiation of the learner's world view and curricular goals. The Marxists in this group analyze world view within a set of economic and political categories. They are interested in moving that process of negotiation toward particular political goals. In contrast, Pinar and Huebner believe that the analysis of world view is the foundation for "leading" the student to an increased awareness of himself as an actor in the social world. They view curriculum as an open dialogue with the student. The only objective imposed on the curriculum is that the student become aware of the way world view determines his own actions and the actions of others. This view of curriculum acknowledges
the student's perspective in a more complete way and is, in this sense, preferable to other models.

For a specific example of a curriculum that approaches this goal, we might look to Man: A Course of Study. In the 1960's the developers of MACOS tried to design a social studies curriculum that would help the student develop an awareness that his social behavior is a product of his culture. A significant part of the MACOS curriculum is organized around themes common to the student's own life and to the culture of the Netsilik Eskimos. These themes include: learning, parenthood, social organization, man's symbolic capacity, and the response of social structure to environmental demands.

In studying Netsilik Eskimo culture, the student explores ways in which a culture passes along its accumulated knowledge and beliefs. In MACOS the topic of parenthood is introduced because it is closely linked to learning and to children's dependency on their parents for providing life's essential needs. Parenthood is an important social structure because it passes on the learning necessary for the culture to survive.

The study of Netsilik culture is particularly useful because it is a society without elaborate power structures and social hierarchies. "Kinship ties and non-kin economic partnerships of the Netsilik reflect some of the most enduring social patterns known to man." The developers
of MACOS feel that analyzing these patterns helps the student think about the social impulses that govern his own life.

In MACOS, suggestions to the teacher for integrating the study of Netsilik culture with the student's own experience include a classroom discussion of how child-rearing and education shape people's behavior and attitudes in ways that reflect social need: "Through observation, play, and continuous association with their parents and other grown-ups, they (Netsilik children) learn the skills, appropriate behavior, and the feelings and beliefs of the adult world." The discussion is intended to provoke questions about the patterns of behavior between children and adults in our own society.

The goal of the Netsilik units of MACOS is for students to explore themes common to both cultures in the hope of stimulating a spirit of genuine inquiry. The developers of MACOS included these values in statements of curricular goals, but this study contends that they translated these goals into instruction and materials in very limited ways. For this reason, MACOS provides a clear example of the difficulty of integrating curricular goals and instructional methods.
The Scope of This Study

This study proposes a view of curriculum as the interaction of curricular intents, student horizons, and instructional materials. When curriculum development is defined as the design of curricular intents, its bearing on instructional method and materials design is already implied. In this view, curriculum design must be linked more closely and consistently with the development of instructional method and materials. And unlike prevailing approaches, this view employs the student's perspective as the vehicle for achieving this consistency.

This argument is developed in the following sequence: Chapter Two begins with a critique of Ned Flanders' interaction analysis as an example of the empirical research perspective in instruction that has come to dominate most published research in curriculum. The aim of this Chapter is to specify the shortcomings of an empirical stance for understanding the student's experience of the curriculum. Chapter Three analyzes the curriculum theorizing of four prominent Reconceptualists: Michael Apple, John Mann, William Pinar and Dwayne Huebner. It examines reasons for the increased importance of the student's horizon when theorists move from Marxist criticism to curriculum theory based in hermeneutics. This analysis provides a
background for examining the curriculum design process of MACOS and its inability to link curricular goals with the design of instructional methods and materials. Chapter Five proposes a more adequate approach to the integration of instructional materials with the curriculum. It makes these recommendations from the instructional material specialist's point of view by developing guidelines for collection development and materials selection.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER ONE


5 Ibid., p. 6.


7 Ibid., p. 31.
Chapter 2
A Critique of Instructional Analysis

The present perspective of mainstream research in the fields of curriculum and instruction focuses its attention on the observable qualities of student and teacher acts. Its object is to offer as complete a picture of observable classroom events as possible, in order to find causal relationships between instructional acts and student achievement. In searching for causal relationships, such research separates actions from intentions when examining classroom events. Additionally, with its focus on instructional acts, mainstream research isolates instructional procedure from the context in which learning occurs. As a result, it becomes difficult to connect recent research in instruction with curriculum theorizing. More importantly, by reducing classroom interaction to behaviorally defined events, this model separates instructional acts from the contexts in which they come to have meaning for learners. This study attempts to overcome those separations by describing classroom interaction as a negotiation of meanings and intentions among participants.

The cutting edge of research in instruction, particularly instructional analysis continues in the tradition
of classroom interaction analysis as developed by Ned A. Flanders. His work in classroom interaction analysis is representative of the empirical or scientific approach identified by James Macdonald.¹ The most complete discussion of the technique and its implications for educational research and practice can be found in *Analyzing Teaching Behavior*, which Flanders published in 1970.²

The primary intention of this chapter is to identify the implicit theoretical foundations of Flanders' work and to examine the adequacy of these conceptions for characterizing the processes of classroom interaction. Specifically, it is concerned with the adequacy of external events as accurate and sufficient descriptions of internal processes that form the immediate precedents for interaction in curricular environments. Because interaction analysis in general has its theoretical base in the Flanders model, discussion here will be limited to the theoretical propositions that underlie Flanders' work. But one could easily extend this analysis to the work of other researchers in instruction.

Flanders' Observational System

The Flanders model of interaction analysis attempts to classify overt classroom behaviors and code them within a ten-category system. In this system, Flanders codes
behaviors like teacher lecturing, criticizing, accepting and using student ideas, pupil response, pupil initiation of ideas, and even classroom silence. According to Flanders, these ten categories include all possible events in classroom interaction. In Flanders' system, classroom events are coded in three-second intervals to describe accurately the duration and sequence of events.

The category system permits careful analysis of the initiation and response patterns that characterize classroom interaction. By interpreting this data, Flanders attempts to establish causal links between various instructional patterns and educational outcomes.

The type of correlations that Flanders seeks through his analysis can be seen in his review of previous research in instructional analysis:

No single, specific, observable teacher act has yet been found whose frequency or percent of occurrence is invariably and significantly correlated with student achievement. There seems to be some suggestion, however, that (a) questions based on student interest and experience rather than assigned subject matter (b) the extent to which the instructor challenges the students to support ideas, and (c) the amount of spontaneous student discussion may be related to student gains.

Although Flanders reports that recent findings have been much more successful in linking instruction with student achievement, the character of these more recent studies has changed little. Instructional research based in the
Flanders model continues to rely on such commonsense criteria as student interest, instructor challenges to students, and spontaneous discussion in order to interpret empirical data.

Here we have one of the paradoxes of most empirical research in curriculum and instruction: Flanders uses sophisticated coding and correlation techniques to collect data, but falls back on the conventional wisdom of the field to interpret that data. The categories of interpretation are imposed on the data rather than rising from the data itself. Thus the interpretive criteria are not subject to the control that empiricists would like to claim for their work.

Chapter Three returns to this relationship between data and interpretation, but the immediate concern of this chapter is another problem in Flanders' approach, that is, his attempt to infer internal processes by observing external behavior.

Connecting Internal and External Events

This problem can be illustrated by one of Flanders' techniques for improving teaching behavior. In an effort to help teachers evaluate and change their instructional behavior, Flanders directs their attention to the relative proportion of teacher initiation to teacher response in
their classrooms. By comparing columns 1 through 4 of his matrix with columns 5 through 7, Flanders derives a direct/indirect ratio and makes this claim:

When classroom interaction shifts toward more consideration of pupil ideas, more pupil initiation and more flexible behavior on the part of the teacher, the present trend of research results would suggest that the pupils will have more positive attitudes toward the teacher and the schoolwork, and measures of subject-matter learning adjusted for initial ability will be higher. 5

This example illustrates how Flanders connects external behavior with internal processes. In this case, he derives from the analysis of overt teaching behavior a prescriptive claim about student attitudes and achievement. Throughout his work, he does not hesitate to develop such prescriptive statements about how quantitative shifts in classroom interaction will affect the quality of interaction in that environment.

The problem here is that Flanders sees no need to explicate the problematic relationship between individual intentions and the overt behavior his research instrument captures. He seems content to deal with the way internal states shape individual responses to external events by designing sensitive instruments for coding overtly expressed behaviors. But shifts in classroom interaction patterns do not necessarily mean that a qualitative change has occurred in the students' ability or willingness to
learn. But just such a simple connection seems to provide Flanders with a basic assumption for his research.

Flanders' View of Intention

Flanders himself neatly summarizes the problem at the core of his research model: "To know what teaching is plunges us into a subjective problem; to know what teaching acts occur is by definition an objective problem." Flanders has chosen the latter problem as the focus of his research and dismisses concern for the former as a hopelessly "subjective" undertaking.

In fact, Flanders frequently mentions and is obviously concerned about student and teacher interpretations of classroom events and their effect on classroom interaction. For example, in delineating his point of view, he grants a central role to intentions:

Must a teacher have intentions before he can act? Does a teacher prove his intentions by his actions? While the answer to both questions is usually yes," the asking of one question, rather than the other, suggests a difference in point of view. One question speaks of intentions; the other speaks of actions.

However, there is little room in Flanders' research model for considering intentions. For the most part, he seems to regard research into the role of intentionality as the product of careless analyses of teaching:
"It is not unusual to talk about teaching by prescribing altruistic intentions... Prescriptive intentions and conditional admonitions about teaching describe an endpoint of self-development and too often fail to suggest ways of reaching this desirable state of affairs. What is ironic here is that in deriving prescriptive statements about good teaching from the analysis of overt behaviors, Flanders himself ignores the way learning is accomplished in student-teacher interaction. Flanders claims that he is developing process explanations for the interaction of teaching and learning. Yet he neglects to generate verifiable hypotheses about how shifts in interaction processes affect basic indicators of student achievement, e.g., test results.

To develop such correspondences, Flanders would have to provide some conceptual analysis of how such shifts affect achievement. But his research perspective regarding the role of internal processes (teacher and student intentions, e.g.) seems to preclude this possibility. Flanders' model employs a research instrument that fails to capture those aspects of learning processes that one needs in order to analyze causal relationships. Because interaction analysis based on the Flanders model generally avoids establishing the interactional ground in which teaching acts come to have meaning for students, such analyses lack criteria for describing qualitative changes in the process of teacher-learner interaction.
The Flanders model analyzes behaviorally defined acts whose mode of description isolates them from the internal processes that are the basis of overt classroom behaviors. It neglects to link internal and external events and for this reason offers an incomplete conception of the teaching act. As a conception of teaching, it lacks any notion of reflexivity as the basis for developing prescriptive statements about curriculum and instructional methods. Since Flanders' model cannot specify relationships between subjective and objective phenomena by using categorical descriptions of overt behavior, it provides little help in solving the larger problems that persist in the design of curricula and instructional methods.

An Alternative Approach

What is needed is a mode of research that can investigate teacher-learner interaction as part of a larger process of interaction among curricular intents, instructional procedures and resources. The foundation of such a perspective lies in describing classroom interaction as a product of individual interpretations of classroom events. Then the learner's ability to assign meanings to classroom events becomes the basis for assessing the effectiveness of curricular intent and instructional method
and materials. Such an approach would recognize the important role of interpretive and subjective factors in the classroom, rather than put them beyond investigation as Flanders seems to do.

This means that researchers in interaction analysis need to begin dealing with the learner as a biographically-situated individual who enters a classroom with his own interpretive structure (horizon) for assigning meaning to classroom events. The researcher's knowledge of interpretive rules used by participants in the instructional setting would then suggest conceptual explanations for classroom behavior. Only then can quantitative data be gathered through interaction analysis to provide some empirical perspective of the instructional setting and to evaluate and inform notions of classroom process.

The research model suggested in this study would clarify the relationship of learner horizon to curricular intent as a basis for developing instructional methods and materials. It would begin to map the grounds for linking curricular intent with instructional method and materials development. Such a perspective would overcome Flanders' inability to link internal and external processes in a single mode of explanation. It would no longer concentrate solely on the obvious, concrete, and objective aspects of instructional situations. Nor would
it separate motive from action in interaction analysis, a move which has effectively severed the link between curriculum and instructional research.

Only recently has a small group of curriculum theorists begun investigating intentionality as a basis for developing new approaches to curriculum theory. They have attempted to reformulate the relationship between learner and educational environment that prevails in mainstream research. The Reconceptualists have looked to the interpretive disciplines of Marxism and phenomenology for more adequate ways to situate the learner in the learning process.

Among these theorists, there is a great concern for educating the student from within his personal context. Work by four prominent theorists in this group—Michael Apple, John S. Mann, Dwayne Huebner and William Pinar—exemplifies this regard for the student's horizon as the basis for organizing curricular intents and instructional procedures. These individuals offer widely divergent approaches for directing the development of the learner's view of himself as a social actor. The next chapter analyzes these divergent approaches as well as the common aims of these four theorists.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER TWO


3Ibid., p. 6.


5Ibid., p. 24.

6Ibid., p. 4.

7Ibid.
Chapter 3
Attempts to Conceptualize Meaning Among Curriculum Theorists

In an attempt to establish the primacy of the learner's self-understanding in designing curricular intents and instructional procedures, the Reconceptualists have gone outside the mainstream of research in education to find an adequate critical stance for theorizing. The goal of their theorizing is to develop concepts of curriculum that help the student reconceive his perspectives on society and himself as a social actor.

There is, however, a major division among Reconceptualists about the mode of inquiry best suited for theorizing about curriculum. The schism is best characterized as a debate over competing epistemologies. If there are two sources of intention in a learning environment, the student's horizon and the intent of curricular goals, the argument is whether Marxian analysis or hermeneutic analysis or some other method is most capable of investigating the interaction of student horizons and curricular intents. Both positions draw from sources outside the field of curriculum and the origin of much of the debate lies in the way they introduce Marxism or phenomenology into the discipline.
Marxists working in the field examine student-curriculum interactions as economic and class phenomena. Those using a hermeneutic approach rely almost exclusively on the student's perspective as a baseline for theorizing. Marxist theorists are able to claim practical and political implications for their criticism, while Reconceptualists working in a hermeneutic vein are treated harshly by the Marxists because they are hardpressed to demonstrate the practical implications of their theorizing.

The work of William Pinar and Dwayne Huebner will be used here to represent recent curriculum theorizing grounded in a phenomenological or hermeneutic approach. John S. Mann and Michael Apple are representative of theorists who have borrowed heavily from Marxism to develop an approach to curriculum theorizing whose goal is social criticism.

Two Views of Self-Understanding

For Pinar and Huebner, the curriculum should bring the student to some awareness of who he is as an individual, of the various ways he relates to his significant others, views himself among his peers, and understands his development as a person. In their view of curriculum, the student's biography takes on an important role. By examining what he understands as his biography, the
student develops an awareness of the personal basis for
his action in the social world. In Pinar and Huebner's
view, curriculum begins as an exercise in analytic self-
description.

Mann and Apple understand their work in curriculum
as bringing a Marxian analysis of contemporary American
society to bear on the student's perceptions of his so-
cial world. Here the implicit notion is that by learn-
ing the method of Marxist criticism, the student will
reach a clearer understanding of the society around him
and of his participation in it. In Pinar and Huebner's
view, the student's own experience of the curriculum is
the foundation of their analysis. In the Marxist ap-
proach, the tools of criticism themselves determine the
sense in which an educational experience is relevant to
analysis. As a result, the Marxist theorists have a
limited regard for the student's initial self-understand-
ing. What is important for them is enabling the student
to re-examine his experience of the social world from a
Marxist critical perspective. It is only at that point
that the student's self-understanding becomes significant
in their analysis.

If one were to diagram the split among Reconceptua-
lists over the position of student self-understanding in
the curriculum, it would look like this:
Student self-awareness and Student as biography vs. Critical self-understanding and Student as social actor

Pinar and Huebner believe the curriculum should develop a student's awareness of the way he relates to the world, that is, it should encourage in-depth description of how he lives his life. Especially for Pinar, autobiography and self-analysis become important elements in the curriculum. In contrast, Marxist theorists are most concerned with applying Marxian analysis in their theorizing. For the Marxists, self-understanding implies critical re-examination and development of the student's view of himself as a social actor. Their efforts in curriculum address the student's world view with the intent of developing a particular political awareness.

Of all the theorists in this group, Huebner's ideas are most broadly based. Like other Reconceptualists, he believes that through self-awareness the student should develop an expanded view of himself as an actor in the social world, but he stops short of saying that the curriculum should teach a particular critical understanding.
Separating Curriculum Theory from Instruction

In their attempt to refocus the study of curriculum away from behaviorist and empirical models, the Reconceptualists have separated curriculum theory from the study of how learning is accomplished in actual curricular settings. Their competing philosophical orientations generate observations and criticism about curriculum whose basis is not how learning is accomplished through student-curriculum interaction, but how it should proceed. The result is curriculum criticism predetermined by the categories of Marxist social criticism or, in the case of Pinar, criticism so molded by the particular experience of one individual as to yield little more than personal anecdote. Reconceptualists have not studied how curriculum-student interaction proceeds as a basis for their theorizing. However, they must be given credit for introducing critical methods into curriculum that acknowledge the importance of that interaction.

While their work in curriculum is not a-historical, the Reconceptualists' failure to study the patterns of student-curriculum-materials interaction in learning environment has made their work isolationist in character. The threshold of their work--their critical stance--is outside the experience of schooling and the possibilities within that experience for the student's social and
autobiographic revisioning. Mann, Apple and Pinar use diverse critical traditions without adapting them to the particularities of the curriculum field.

What results are methods of theorizing that are equivalent in the way they address issues in curriculum design. Neither method can be said to characterize the school setting more accurately than the other. If Reconceptualists are to address practical issues of schooling they must make student response to curricular environment the basis for generating theory. Yet the critical approaches they propose seem to preclude any systematic examination of student response to curricular environment as a starting point for curriculum theorizing. Each theorist works with the intent of imposing on the field new values or modes of theorizing that are, in fact, based outside the context of student-curriculum interaction. Of the four Reconceptualist theorists discussed here, only Huebner makes a case for developing guidelines for theorizing on the basis of how students interact with planned curricular intents.

Student Horizon in Marxian Theorizing

We can detect this problem in Michael Apple's statement about curriculum criticism:
The influencing by one group of another group of individuals--here younger ones--is ultimately a moral activity. As such it cannot be understood without recourse to and thus must be held accountable to ethical principle and obligations of justice and responsibility to other persons.1

John S. Mann makes a statement of intent similar to Apple's:

Curriculum...is a form of influence over persons and disclosures of meaning in a curriculum are disclosures about the character of an influence....This perspective certainly must be grounded in what the critic knows about right and wrong or good and bad.2

Mann attempts to distinguish between Marxist curriculum criticism and political advocacy, but when curriculum criticism becomes curricular intent, the distinction becomes moot.

What Mann, Apple and other Marxists working in curriculum offer is curriculum criticism based in the advocacy of selected moral principles for political purposes. For them, education is an inherently political act. We might say that Mann and Apple are Marxists who happen to be working in the curriculum field. Their work transforms the Marxist critical tradition into prescriptive political statements which they offer as curriculum criticism. In the process, they overlook the issues that separate curriculum theory from Marxist criticism. That is, at no point do they explain how the student interacts with curricular intents when reconceiving his perspective on self and
society. The actual basis of their theorizing is not the normative circumstances of the student in a curricular environment but rather the ethical imperatives that underlie their critical approach. Their use of Marxian terms like "synthesis" and "negation" is of little help in examining the interaction of curricular intents, student horizons, and instructional materials.

Pinar and Huebner on Student Horizon

Curriculum theorists William Pinar and Dwayne Huebner more carefully acknowledge the student's position as arbiter of the salience of curricular intents. Their goal is not to impose politics and ethics on theorizing in the field, but to analyze personal educational experience. That analysis of student-curriculum-materials interaction becomes their basis for evaluating and reformulating curricular intents. This is not to say that Pinar and Huebner overlook curriculum and curriculum theorizing as an instrument for social change. Their critical stance for theorizing in curriculum is based in the analysis of personal educational experience, and insofar as politics and ethics are part of that experience, they are a valid subject of study. However, Pinar and Huebner's stance for theorizing does not originate in a theory of social,
political, or ethical reality. Their aim is to capture those aspects of an educational experience salient to an individual for any reason.

This investigative stance is a strong challenge to the field because it approaches curriculum as an interactive phenomenon. Reconceptualists working from a hermeneutic stance have taken the field beyond the controversy over imposition in the curriculum by redefining the student's position in the instructional process. They establish the self-described experience of the student in a curriculum as the basis for examining and planning new curricular intentions.

Pinar and Huebner choose phenomenological method as the appropriate tool for curriculum theorizing that most carefully acknowledges the interaction of intents among students, curriculum, and materials. They hope to foster among students a regard for self-understanding as a basis for ethical judgments. The intent of their theorizing in curriculum is to teach students to think in a reflexive mode. Pinar develops a highly introspective model for theorizing whose social consequences are not easily explained or demonstrated. Huebner's ideas are more broadly based and deal more completely with revisioning students' critical viewpoints and interests.

Pinar claims to have developed a strong method for curriculum theorizing. However, it is Dwayne Huebner's
willingness to tolerate a number of stances for examining student-curriculum interaction and his insistence on adhering to commonsense interpretation of how this is accomplished that give his work credibility as theory-into-practice arguments. Both suggest a method for theorizing in curriculum that more carefully establishes the student's position as interlocutor in a learning environment as the pivotal consideration for efforts in curriculum theory. Both are important to the approach developed later in this study.

The Autobiographic Approach of Currere

In an attempt to refocus the study of curriculum away from its observable, external, and public aspects, William Pinar refers to the Latin infinitive, currere, as a beginning point for curriculum theorizing. The study of currere involves the investigation of the nature of individual experience of the public. It is the analysis of personal, biographic dimensions of public educational experience. Pinar goes on to supply a method of inquiry for currere and define the area of investigation open to it. Currere is methodologically rooted in phenomenology and psychoanalysis. It is the study of personal educational experience from a thoroughly subjective point of view. The subject for investigation is the nature of
"movement within one's own subjectivity."³ The method involves "the dynamics of breaking with the commonsense taken-for-granted world"⁴ and articulating one's experience of it. As Pinar writes,

We require a strategy that will allow us to "bracket" the educational aspects of our taken-for-granted world...to perform the "eidetic reduction" to bracket specific contents of consciousness, requires loosened identification with the contents, hence a perspective not equivalent to them.⁵

These subjective investigations are intended to provoke insights about the nature of one's educational experience.

The objective is first to render one's own educational experience...into words, using the associative form of minding. The second is to use one's critical faculties to understand what principles and patterns have been operative in one's own life, hence achieving a more profound understanding of one's own educational experience, as well as illuminating parts of the inner world and deepening one's self-understanding generally. The third is to analyze others' experience to reveal what I call basic educational structures or processes that cross biographical lines.⁶

Pinar describes and justifies the usefulness of currere in terms borrowed from psychoanalysis.

One central goal of currere is the integration of one's autobiography with his educational experiences. Pinar quotes Jung's The Integration of Personality to explain the need for students and teachers to re-examine their educational past. The goal is to reassess and re-evaluate previous educational experience in light of
one's biography and to develop a new sense of autobiography. As Pinar poses the problem,

> How is one to begin to focus one's attention on oneself in a noncritical even non-evaluative way, so that one can illuminate this inner world? How is such illumination related to integration?⁷

It is a matter of explicating one's educational experience and at the same time reintegrating that experience to become more aware of oneself. In Pinar's view, currere is a method that shares the assumptions that underlie meditative work as well as psychoanalysis and phenomenological analysis.

The method's primary intent is to yield information about educational experience that provokes personal insight, reassessment, and development. However, Pinar fails to address the implications of currere for formulating curricular intents and improving the quality of interaction among students, curriculum, and materials. He offers a method for curriculum theorizing that stops just short of having any bearing on issues of design and evaluation in curriculum.

Pinar's work has hardly any implications for theory-into-practice concerns because, as a method, currere is incapable of consistently identifying and integrating curricular values in any sphere beyond the personal and idiosyncratic. The most serious problem with currere is its inability to locate intersubjective sets of values
for theorizing in curriculum, values capable of guiding curricular intents into design and evaluation. With currere Pinar offers a method for self-exploration, assessment and reintegration whose substance is drawn from the contents of personal educational experience.

The research perspective of currere is embedded in the context of student-curriculum-materials interaction. Yet as a method it fails to explicate that context beyond the idiosyncratic view of any one participant in that setting. It is a method grounded in student-curriculum interaction. However, it is generally unable to supply the extrapersonal information about that interaction that is useful for curriculum design and evaluation. At this stage of its development, currere seems incapable of any valuing activity beyond the personal.

Huebner and Curriculum as Intent

Dwayne Huebner suggests some alternatives to Pinar's direction in the search for a method for curriculum theorizing. For Huebner, the central issue for organizing inquiry in curriculum theory is the "clarification of value frameworks or systems which may be used to value educational activity." He suggests that curricular language falls into five classes or value frameworks: technical, political, scientific, aesthetic, and ethical. The
curricular questions he proposes are rather value neutral and for this reason more amenable to methodological concerns. These questions are: "what can go on in the classroom?" and "how can this activity be valued?"

Huebner's analytic notion views curriculum as a system of organized, conscious intents that direct activities in a learning environment. In his framework, the analysis of curricular intents and their effect on student-curriculum-materials interaction is basic to the study of curriculum theory. In explaining his final level for valuing educational activity, the ethical level, Huebner writes:

Here the educational activity is viewed primarily as an encounter between man and man...The concern in this value category is not on the significance of the educational act for other ends, or the realization of other values, but the value of the educational act per se.

On the level of method, Huebner's position means that an educational act is not formulated to achieve learning outcomes that adhere to a specific ethical or value position. Rather, curriculum theorizing should be based in a respect for the student as the final arbiter of the salience of curriculum.

In Huebner's view, students, materials, and the curriculum can be represented as sets of organized intents, expressed as rules or actions with a definite value horizon and closure. The appropriate ground for theorizing
in curriculum then becomes assessing and reformulating the sets of values expressed in this exchange and negotiation of intentions. It is the qualities and process that characterize interaction in a curricular environment that become the basis for developing a method for theorizing in curriculum.

An approach to curriculum inquiry that is grounded in the interactional character of an instructional setting allows the theorist to begin dealing with the school curriculum's response to value questions that are external to it. Because the theorist lacks an ethical imperative, values that are external to the curriculum can be explored on their own terms as systems of intents from all others. This view can then be evaluated for its ability to help students reconsider and perhaps reconceive their own value positions.

The task of the theorist becomes one of organizing and presenting external value positions in such a way that students, curriculum, and instructional materials acknowledge those external values as completely and openly as possible. In this conception of curriculum, activities are designed to open the possibilities of interaction in the social world as the content and mechanism of a curriculum that will encourage student self-criticism and reappraisal of value positions. Huebner carefully states the goal of such a curriculum proposal:
The student encounters other people and natural man-made phenomena. To these he has the ability to respond. Indeed, education may be conceived to be the influencing of the student's response-ability. The student is introduced to the wealth and beauty of the phenomenal world, and is provided with the encouragement to test out his response-abilities until they call forth the meaning of what it is to be thrown into a world as a human being. 

By expanding the student's forms of responsiveness to the social world, the curriculum theorist places the student in a position to reflect on and criticize his participation in it. In this way the curriculum theorist opens the student's horizon for new ways of existing and meeting the world.

Curriculum theorizing in this mode leads students toward a personal response to issues involving personal ethics and society. What is lacking even among Reconceptualists is some conceptual framework for investigating and organizing these concerns with a view toward curriculum design. Particularly among those theorists known as the Reconceptualists, the methodological aspects of a proposal like Huebner's are only starting to be considered.

Toward an Adequate Theory of Curriculum

Pinar's work in curriculum theory has provoked considerable self-assessment among writers in the field. Theorists are now coming to be identified with various
epistemological stances. Among Reconceptualists, divisions along methodological lines are increasingly clear. There are theorists concerned with politics, social change, and the curriculum such as Mann and Apple, and those who gravitate toward a hermeneutic approach such as Pinar, Huebner, Joseph Schwab, and Elliot Eisner.

Of those theorists who approach curriculum theorizing in a hermeneutic framework, Pinar and Huebner are most clearly concerned with the analysis of educational experience. In many ways Pinar's own work, along with the publication of *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, has brought attention to and clarified the methodological differences among these theorists. With each stance claiming to create curriculum theorizing as a viable discipline, the field is at a point where questions about an appropriate method for a discipline of curriculum theorizing are being asked in various ways.12

Numerous theorists in the field are recognizing a need to look beyond an ethical basis for developing a methodology. Exploring the experience of schooling and its relation to curricular intents is the focus of theorists like Pinar and Huebner. Both suggest a methodology for theorizing in curriculum that more carefully establishes the student's position as interlocutor in a learning environment as the pivotal consideration for efforts in the field. Yet none develop a model of student-
curriculum-materials interaction, grounded in a notion of how learning is accomplished, as the basis for developing curricular intents.

Pinar has freed curriculum theory from the methodological imposition of external values. He has also limited its ability to encourage students to critically examine their attitudes and actions as social beings. The view of phenomenology that Pinar offers, a "self-hermeneutical" approach, is inadequate because his method fails to place the analysis of autobiographical experience into the larger sphere of social interaction. It allows autobiography to define what portion of the self-conceived social sphere is relevant. For Pinar, the fact that "human beings themselves understand, live in, and act on the social world as the common matrix of their lives" serves as an adequate conception of sociality.\(^{13}\) This in itself points to the shortsightedness of an approach to curriculum theorizing that studies only autobiography.

This autobiographic or static phenomenological approach makes present events intelligible merely in the light of past personal experience. It does nothing to reformulate the interpretation of those events. Pinar is to be lauded for removing the imposition of values from the methodology of curriculum theorizing. However, he has substituted the systematic study of subjectivism for
the study of subjectivity (an investigation of solitude and sociality) as the appropriate methodology for theorizing in curriculum.\textsuperscript{14}

Pinar has contributed a truncated phenomenology where needs of the field would be better served by the systematic exploration of social interaction as a basis for theorizing about curriculum intents. This approach has yet to precipitate a clearly articulated methodology for curriculum theorizing.

Pinar, like Mann and Apple, has adopted the interpretive stance of a philosophic tradition, phenomenology, and ignored the methodological issues that separate curriculum from philosophy. For many of the reasons discussed, phenomenology has a great deal to contribute toward developing a method for theorizing in curriculum. If curriculum is the planned interaction of instructional intents, students, and materials, then curriculum theories become sets of intents organized in the hope of revisioning the critical perspectives of students. In the design of learning processes, explanations of how curricular intents are accomplished through instructional processes should inform theorists about which intents attend to the process of student learning as planned.

Making the transition from curriculum theory to instructional practice involves a more complete conception of student learning, and an epistemology that more
adequately characterizes the way curricular intents are accomplished through instructional processes and materials. A model of the student as actor, grounded in a notion of how educational process is accomplished, would become the basic unit for organizing curricular intents.

In an essay called "Search for a Method" Pinar suggests the need for such a concept in curriculum theory:

...it is clear to me that internal experience has its external and observable behavioral manifestations, although it is also clear to the untrained eye and given the current developmental stage of technology, internal experience might as well be buried, unobservable, inside. At this point we are not ready for a study that transcends the internal-external and subject-object splits.....15

Pinar is aware of the problem, but his method overlooks the reciprocal nature of interaction. Dwayne Huebner's analysis of educational experience as a negotiation of curricular intents, instructional process, and student horizon offers an alternative to Pinar's limited view of interaction. Taking Huebner's approach, an analysis of these intents, and their effect on student-curriculum-materials interaction is the most appropriate area of study for curriculum theory.

Conceptual Mandates for the Curricularist

In a critical essay on the Tyler rationale, Kleibard identifies the most persistent question in curriculum:
"how can learning experiences be selected by a teacher or a curriculum maker when they are defined as the interaction between a student and his environment? The focus of this study is how the curricularist can take into account a student's self-understanding as he formulates curricular intents and designs or selects instructional materials. This relationship is especially critical when the curriculum's intent is to create situations that help students articulate the way their norms and values structure their view of the social world. The central task of the curricularist is to offer students a means for understanding the nature of their world view by increasing their ability to comprehend the social world in a less self-centered way.

This proposal redefines the position of the student in the curriculum. The intent of curriculum is to focus on what, in the student's eyes and in their own, people's lives mean. It is the learner's responsibility to understand the meaning of another person's actions by reconstructing that person's context.

The intent of the Man: A Course of Study curriculum examined in the next chapter was to teach children what it meant to see the world as a Netsilik Eskimo. In coming to understand the context of the Netsilik's actions, the course developers hoped the student would, in some degree, comprehend his own behavior as a product of interaction
with his culture. What follows is an assessment of their ability to translate this curricular goal into the design of instructional method and materials.
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Chapter 4

A Critique of MACOS

This chapter examines Man: A Course of Study as an example of a curriculum that asks students to enter the world view of another culture, in this case the Netsilik Eskimos of Pelly Bay. Specifically, it is concerned with the MACOS developers' attempts to include students' intentionality in the design of curricular goals and instructional materials. MACOS' developers understood the importance of addressing the student's horizon as a basis for achieving the cultural insights that are the goals of MACOS. This chapter assesses how these curricular goals were translated into the design of instructional method and materials in the course. It then evaluates the relative success or failure of the curriculum design process used by the developers of MACOS in their attempt to address the student's horizon.

Materials and Rationale of the Course

Man: A Course of Study is a fifth grade social studies curriculum developed in the 1960's by the Educational Development Center under grants from the National Science
Foundation. It is an elaborate course that includes a variety of learning experiences. The curriculum is built around five major units. The first unit, called "What's in a Lifetime," introduces students to the way the course will approach the study of animal and human behavior. It is followed by units on the lifecycle of the Pacific Coast Salmon, the behavior of Herring Gulls, a study of the social organization of the East African Savanna Baboon, and ends with a study of a primitive human society, the Netsilik Eskimos of Pelly Bay. This last unit is by far the most extensive, covering over 56 days of planned instruction.

The materials developed for students in the course include: 26 booklets of stories, poetry, scientific explanation of animal behavior, and ethnographic field notes; 16 natural-sound color films in cartridges; assorted maps, photographs and posters. Materials for teachers include: a detailed set of daily lesson plans, background material on the subject content of lessons, and introductory reading on the rationale, method and materials of the curriculum. An additional set of materials was developed for teacher in-service education.

The development of MACOS began during the summer of 1962 at a conference held at MIT's Endicott House. The Endicott Conference drew together prominent scholars in the humanities and social sciences for the purpose of
reforming humanities and social studies curricula in elementary and secondary grades. The Conference, organized by Educational Services Incorporated, engaged prominent scholars in education—Francis Koppel, Jerrold Zacharias and Robert Havighurst, for example—to discuss the design of a school curriculum in the social sciences. Their goal was to build an intellectually honest curriculum that taught students a method of inquiry appropriate to the field of study.

The Endicott conferees were asked to apply recent research in the social sciences in designing a curriculum that would teach school students methods of inquiry used in current research. The development of appropriate instructional materials and methods followed. In 1964, Jerome Bruner, head of Harvard's Center for Cognitive Studies, took a year's leave to direct the early development of a fifth grade social studies course he called Man: A Course of Study.

MACOS' intention was to help children learn more about the meaning of human behavior and culture by exposing them to materials about animal groups and simple human society. Two major problems encountered in developing the course were the lack of a literature that children could easily grasp and the difficulty of providing field work experience. Douglas Oliver, Professor of Anthropology at Harvard, suggested that natural sound
or sparsely narrated films would be a reasonable replacement for the field work experience. Accordingly, filmmaking expeditions were organized to record the behavior of the East African Savanna Baboon and the migratory life of a remote group of Eskimos living above the Arctic Circle called the Netsilik. Other course materials were added, such as photographs, field notes, and ethnographic journals, to help students construct an authentic context for what they saw. The curriculum was organized around the themes of "tool making, language, social organization, the management of man's prolonged childhood, and man's urge to explain his world."²

Jerome Bruner described the scope of MACOS in this way:

...The content of the course is man: his nature as a species, the forces that shaped and continue to shape his humanity. Three questions run throughout:

What is human about human beings?
How did they get that way?
How can they be made more so?

We seek exercises and materials through which our pupils can learn wherein man is distinctive in his adaptation to the world, and wherein there is a discernible continuity between him and his animal forebears.³

MACOS materials were designed to show the evidence of the humanizing force of tools, language, social organization, etc. in the evolutionary development of man. By studying the reproductive cycle of the Pacific Coast Salmon, the
parental behavior of Herring Gulls, and the social organization of the African Savanna Baboon, students come to understand the differences between innate and learned responses to environmental demands. The curriculum culminates in the investigation of a primitive human society, the Netsilik Eskimos of Pelly Bay, and the creative cultural response of that people to the demands of a harsh environment.

MACOS' Approach to Animal Behavior

The MACOS curriculum guide stresses that similarities between human and animal adaptive responses should not be overemphasized. As one teacher manual in the course states, "in comparing humans and baboons, permit no anthropomorphism. Differences as well as similarities should be stressed." The MACOS animal studies units are designed to teach the learner to observe nature as a behavioral scientist and to translate these techniques into the study of the culture of Netsilik Eskimos. However, the instructional method of the Salmon, Herring Gull and Baboon units of MACOS seems at variance with the general goals of the curriculum. This becomes apparent in MACOS Program Director Peter Dow's discussion of particular learning objectives and instrumental aims:
We want children to begin to know and care about the humanity of man. To understand man's humanness we look beyond man to other animals, particularly animals whose lives illuminate special features of our own. A young salmon, for example, manages to swim, and eat, protect itself, and, if it lives long enough, find its birthplace five years later, all without the aid of parents. Why are human babies born so helpless? What part does our dependency on parents play in shaping what we mean by humanness? Dow justifies this shortcircuiting of the program's curricular goals by focusing on instructional method. "It is clear that these goals center around the process of learning rather than around the product." So it seems that the central metaphor of the MACOS curriculum - the question of what forces shape man's humanity - is lowered to the level of organizing instructional procedures, when it attempts to link studies of animal behavior and Netsilik culture. "The study of the behavior of other animals in their natural habitats provides many useful metaphors, a provocative set of images, to help us think in new ways about the uniqueness of man." The developers of MACOS make it quite clear that the study of animal behavior is useful only because it offers clear examples of simple social behaviors that approximate aspects of social behavior in human groups. This is the only link they draw between
segments of the curriculum that deal with behavioral observation and the study of Netsilik Eskimo culture.

As a matter of fact, Bruner's second question—How did man become human?—is not pursued, even though it seems to provide the primary link between studies of primate behavior and human culture. In the words of Peter Dow,

...The course does not pursue this fascinating path, because in developing the material we came to feel that a comparative rather than evolutionary approach to the study of man was the most effective way to introduce the subject to young children. The central question that defines the MACOS curriculum—What makes man human?—organizes only the materials of the Netsilik Eskimo unit.

Ignoring Student Horizon

Previous chapters show that a mainstream approach to curriculum is concerned primarily with meeting instructional goals, while Reconceptualists have attempted in some degree to model curriculum on the student's perceived needs. Dow's shortcircuiting of the relationship between curricular goals and instructional objectives is in many ways analogous to the split between mainstream curricularists and the Reconceptualists discussed in Chapter 3. That is, the animal studies units in MACOS reflect an
attempt to move instructional goals into curriculum and materials design without considering the integrity of the learner's point of view. Expanding the student's worldview is no longer the pretext and criterion for developing instructional intents.

What is objectionable here is not the substance of the instructional aims that Dow defines, but rather his notion of the process of curriculum development. He translates subject matter, in this case behavioral research methodology, directly into instructional goals. In the meantime, Dow overlooks the philosophical implications of Bruner's question: "What makes man human?" for the process of curriculum design and development. This denial of curriculum procedure accounts for the discontinuity between the MACOS animal studies units and the Netsilik unit. It amounts to overlooking both curricular intent and the student's position as interlocutor in the learning environment as the basis for designing instructional method.

Perhaps the flaw is in Bruner's work itself. In Toward A Theory of Instruction, he writes: "a curriculum... is the enterprise par excellence where the line between subject matter and method grows necessarily indistinct." MACOS exemplifies Bruner's approach to curriculum in operating under the assumption "that the world can be
observed, conjectured about, and to some degree ordered and understood using the tools of the behavioral sciences, and that an individual life can be viewed as part of the larger flow of human existence." Much like the discipline-centered curricula that are the focus of Philip Phenix and others, Bruner has created a methodology-centered curriculum. According to the Brunerian approach, the baseline for formulating curricular intents is to be found in the methods of the disciplines rather than in the student's position for responding to curricular intent. Bruner's approach derives instructional method and procedure from decisions about the content of curriculum instead of beginning with the matrix of student-curriculum-materials interaction for designing instructional method and materials.

One result of this narrow focus is that the curricular concepts of MACOS do not link the animal behavior units with the study of Netsilik culture in any capable way. The connections Peter Dow makes between these units are mechanistic ones designed to give some cohesion to instructional procedure in the curriculum. If the goal of MACOS is to enlarge the student's capacity to respond to the world as a human being," then we must question the instructional utility and intellectual honesty of linking explanations of animal behavior with the study of human culture.
Worldview in the Netsilik Unit

Ironically, the most likely reason that the key curricular concepts of MACOS succeed in the Netsilik units is that here curriculum content, materials and instructional procedure are derived from the discipline of anthropology. Fortunately, the developers of MACOS tapped into a discipline that recognizes the role and importance of the field observer's self-understanding in describing cross-cultural phenomena. By working in the discipline of anthropology, the developers of MACOS found a basis for extending curricular concepts into instructional materials and procedures.

When the methodology of participant observation enters the curriculum as the basis for designing instructional materials and methods, the student's position as "observer" becomes the primary concern in any design effort. The student lives and acts from his own particular worldview and through observation is taught to reach toward understanding the attitudes and beliefs of another culture. The emphasis of curricular objectives changes significantly from asking the student to observe and make judgments on objective data to having students encounter cultural data and search for a valid basis for interpreting its significance. The student's observations
are at once personal and an index of his own ethnocentricity working to make the actions of others intelligible.

In the Netsilik unit of MACOS, the focus of curricular goals is the student's ability to employ an interpretive structure for assigning meaning to human events. The criteria for evaluating a student's participation in the curriculum shift drastically. The student is no longer taught how he should organize events to interpret them, but learns to reconstruct the intentionality of subjects in the field setting as a basis for interpreting human actions. The student's ability to articulate the intentionality behind the actions of individuals becomes the basis for interpreting their meaning. For the developers of MACOS, this means educating the student's worldview.

It was the hope of MACOS Director Peter Dow that

...these studies will provoke students to reexamine what they think they know about themselves and about human beings generally, and awaken in children an awareness of the fact that what we regard as acceptable behavior is a product of our culture.  

The overriding curricular intent of the MACOS Netsilik unit is the expansion of a student's worldview to include previously unknown perspectives for understanding human actions. Only the Netsilik unit explores the issue of culture as the premise for grasping the meaning of
human actions. By studying Eskimo social organization, technology and mythology, the student develops a view of a divergent culture and how it serves to explain the actions of individuals within that culture. In this manner the Netsilik unit of MACOS helps a student sense how his culture determines his interpretations of human events.

Students may view the killing of animals as brutal or primitive acts yet, for the Netsilik, hunting is the primary means of survival. In coming to understand a society whose entire technology, social organization and food supply depends on game, the student no longer see the hunt as a brutal act, but as the Netsilik's only means of survival. Students confront their ethnocentrism by grasping the intentionality behind the Netsilik's actions. They learn how their judgment, and the judgments of all men, are shaped by the culture in which they live.13

In addition, as Peter Dow notes,

...We hope that at the same time they will develop a vocabulary for thinking about the human condition in ways that will assist them in coping with the immense cultural distances that divide the modern world.14
Thus, MACOS employs cross-cultural perspectives as a way of having students discover the reasons for the existence of different values in divergent cultures. The curriculum accomplishes this by emphasizing the symbolic dimension of Netsilik culture in explaining everyday activities. The MACOS developers define Netsilik culture as the symbolic forms a Netsilik uses to interpret his world. In emphasizing the need to understand the everyday life of the Netsilik as a product of their symbolic life or culture, Peter Dow writes:

> Because man interprets his world through language, he recreates it in a symbolic form that he can think about, remember, and even imagine in a more perfect state. This manmade world we call our "culture." By studying many aspects of a single culture, the culture of the Netsilik Eskimos, we hope that children will begin to perceive this idea in a very concrete way.

Netsilik myth becomes the basis of a schema for explaining the form and process of everyday activities that are the Netsilik's attempts to survive in the Arctic environment. To the MACOS developers, Netsilik hunting implements represent an ingenious plan for converting the meager resources of their environment into the means of the group's survival. As an explanatory pattern, the hunting motif includes kill strategy, rules that govern the behavior of individual men in the hunting party, and
a system for sharing the kill, as a set of mythic beliefs that insure the success of the hunt.

By examining mythic structure and content as a premise for the Netsilik's actions, the MACOS authors stress that the thought processes underlying behavior contribute most to our understanding of the Netsilik. By explicating the Netsilik's interpretive stance in the world, the authors explain the significance of observable behavior and the peculiar development and use of tools. By understanding modes of thought in the Netsilik culture, students grasp the origin and meaning of the Netsilik's expressed actions. In short, students are taught to recognize patterns of thought and their link with observable behavior.

The MACOS curriculum teaches students to recognize the cultural context for Netsilik actions by explaining their premise in Netsilik religion and myth. The curriculum examines culture as the determiner of appropriate behavior in Netsilik society. In MACOS the student comes to understand Netsilik actions as extensions of culture and myth. By teaching students the difference between their own culture and the Netsilik context for action, the MACOS developers hope that students will learn to "recognize patterns of thought and behavior and to appreciate the forms they take in different cultures."
It is also hoped that students will come to see aspects of their own lives in other cultures.

But here is the shortcoming of this approach: by working solely in an explanatory mode, MACOS approaches the study of Netsilik society only as the lived expression of previously articulated social rules or cultural practices. Culture is not studied as a context for practical actions. As a result, students in MACOS experience culture as explanation rather than as the basis for personal action. For example, students experience actions the Netsilik perform to survive in the Arctic as culturally determined acts. In this context, the need for the student to reformulate and expand his own experience of his culture is minimal, because he is offered explanation in place of the opportunity to experience life within different cultural norms.

MACOS' View of Culture

It is the definition of culture offered by the MACOS developers that moves their curriculum in this direction and prevents the student from becoming a participant-observer in a different cultural setting:

Culture is not something that can be observed as a whole, but is rather an abstraction drawn from behavior and patterns of behavior of a population, from their belief systems, from the results of their
behavior (their material possessions) and from the other criteria that may be important for the scientist's task.\textsuperscript{17}

For the developers of MACOS, culture is an abstraction for the sake of explanation, rather than explanation designed to open the experience of life in another culture to students. Thus the conception of culture offered in MACOS fails to create a reciprocity of perspectives between the Netsilik view of the world and the student's perceptions of his own cultural surroundings. In the study of Netsilik culture, Eskimo cosmology and religion are used to explain Netsilik worldview to students instead of offering students a means by which they can develop a reciprocity of perspectives.

The reduction of worldview to explanatory theme can be detected in this passage from \textit{Talks to Teachers}:

\textit{Netsilik seal hunting depends on the use of tools and strategy (technology), on cooperation with others in accordance with Netsilik social rules (social organization) and on the observance of the rituals and taboos connected with hunting and eating seal meat (world view).} \textsuperscript{18}

While the authors admit that "it is doubtful that a Netsilik carries around a similar completed picture in his head,"\textsuperscript{19} it is from that very picture that students are expected to explain Netsilik actions. The emphasis of the curriculum is on teaching a complete appreciation of Eskimo culture rather than on having students apprehend the world as a Netsilik might. In MACOS, worldview does not
mean the open-ended stance by which the Netsilik comprehend and cope with their environment, but a carefully integrated description of the symbolic significance of those acts.

While MACOS offers a model of explanation for Netsilik culture, it provides no discussion of how worldview serves as the premise for actions by individuals. That is, MACOS offers of model of explanation for Netsilik culture, but its failure to discuss personal intentionality as the basis for actions by individuals makes it difficult for students to enter the Netsilik worldview. Until the student has some grasp of the way intentionality structures his own actions as well as the Netsilik's, he cannot enter a cross-cultural situation as a participant-observer. An explanatory mode for dealing with cross-cultural phenomena does not demand that the student explore another system of intentionality. He only needs to examine the relationship between simple cause and effect to explain the Netsilik's actions. Such an instructional procedure has little possibility of bringing students to an awareness that much of their own behavior is directed by social norms and expectations.
MACOS and Ethnocentrism

The MACOS evaluation team formed by the Educational Development Center found that *Man: A Course of Study* had no measurable effect on students' ethnocentrism. Corollary results showed that there was little evidence that students in the MACOS curriculum developed insights into the way worldview influences their own behavior. Interviews with students showed that they do link some Netsilik ways with those of their culture, feelings for family and friends for example. However, students could not go beyond correlations of similarity to enjoy diverse aspects of Netsilik behavior. They understood the problem-solving behavior of the Netsilik as the expression of a culture different from their own and considered the Netsilik's response to survival demands as clever and functional.20

On the level of emotional response, students found much in Netsilik culture that was culturally unacceptable. The killing and skinning of animals, the treat of eating fish or caribou eye, the infanticide and senilicide were difficult for students to accept. In the evaluator's words, "there is rational understanding of such behavior, but it is not really seen as 'acceptable'--its visceral impact is too disturbing."21 Even the appearance of the Netsilik evoked comments from students about their poor,
sad-looking nature with little consideration for a difference in standards. While the MACOS curriculum did a good job of explaining Eskimo beliefs and actions to students, the evaluation team's results indicate that students were unable to enter the Netsilik world view as participant-observers.

In a study of the effect of MACOS on elementary students in the Newton, Massachusetts public schools, Richard Jones analyzes how the content of the Netsilik films evoked the kind of responses the developers of MACOS curricular goals had in mind. Unfortunately, teachers were unprepared to integrate students' affective responses to these materials with the ongoing instructional processes of MACOS. Jones contends that these important responses were lost because the instructional method of MACOS was not designed to include and cope with them. If the central goal of MACOS is to enlarge the student's capacity for diverse cultural experiences, it accomplishes this only in the content of its instructional materials. 22

Students' inability to enter the Netsilik worldview can be attributed to the way in which the MACOS' developers conceived the relationship of student-curriculum-materials interaction to instructional method and procedure. The course authors clearly and frequently articulate the need for students to enter the Netsilik worldview. However, they lack procedures for moving this concern into the
design of curriculum and materials. In developing curricular goals, the authors of MACOS did not cultivate the implications of the relationship between curricular intents and the student's own worldview for the design of curriculum, materials and instruction. As a consequence, the course developers' concern for the students' need to enter the Netsilik worldview has not been carried over into the design of instructional method. The result is an elaborate curriculum and set of materials that enters a cross-cultural, interactive learning situation with only an explanatory method of instruction.

The Limits of the Technical Model

The following statement is indicative of the kind of instructional development process that paralyzes the MACOS curriculum in its attempts to expand the student's own worldview:

...As children go on (viewing the films), they discover limitations of observation as a method of studying people. Observation, no matter how careful, cannot tell what a behavior means to a Netsilik. To understand the meaning of things and events, we must listen to myths, beliefs, and personal stories of the Netsilik. 23

In the view of the course developers, curriculum design deals solely with the scope and sequence of information to be learned in the course of study. The philosophical
aims of MACOS are ignored as a technical model for course development takes over. The curriculum developers' task is to relate course objectives to students in as complete a way as possible. In the design of curricular intents there is no implicit notion that curricular intent and instructional materials interact with the student's horizon or worldview to achieve learning goals. Rather, the interactive nature of student learning is overlooked in favor of explaining or telling the content of the course.

For the most part, MACOS fails to respond to the student's point of view and succeeds only in teaching him the substantive content of an alternate world view. The goal of "awakening in children an awareness of the fact that what we regard as acceptable behavior is a product of our culture" does not succeed because curricular goals were based in considerations about the substantive content of curriculum. They fail to posit any relationship between curricular goals and how the student might accomplish related learning objectives. In short, they avoid dealing with the interactional nature of how learning is accomplished when designing curricular intents.

Ironically, the developers of MACOS do attempt to formulate the relationship of individual personality, social rules and personal actions for the student by drawing on the content of the Netsilik unit. The curriculum
progresses from raising general questions about man's humanity to studying the Netsilik as a group, and finally understanding the actions of two individuals, Itimangnark and Irkowagtok, as a synthesis of individual personality and social rules. The course authors formulate the relationship of society and personality as an interactive process:

...One way of describing it is to say that it constitutes a lifelong process of interaction between the individual and his society and culture. Another form of viewing personality is as a set of motivations, behaviors, and problem-solving techniques. Individuals who share the same culture may exhibit the same behavior, yet do it with different motivations.24

To illustrate this view of personality, MACOS provides the example of the Netsilik hunter Itimangnark piling rocks in the film *Caribou Crossing Place*. Itimangnark piles the rocks in his own style as an activity that is part of the traditional caribou hunt. His actions are explained as cultural traits, as a response to social customs and group needs. MACOS does go one step further by looking at Igi-mangnark and Irkowagtok as individuals with separate personalities, who make different decisions within the social norms and expectations of their culture. When the two are competing in a performance of the drum, the people clap a rhythm for Itimangnark but not for Irkowagtok. Irkowagtok is unpopular because he has not always followed the behavior expected in seal-sharing, because he is
considered lazy, and is not a good hunter. The MACOS teacher manual suggests that the personalities of both individuals can be seen as linked to their life histories. Their individual personalities are the result of the sequence of events in their lives and how they have learned to respond to the circumstances of Netsilik social organization.

MACOS approaches the life history of Itimangnark and Irkowagtok as a way of explaining personal actions as responses to social rules. In this way, it develops for students one more dimension for observing the interaction of culture, social organization and individual personality. But MACOS fails to employ a similar procedure for introducing students as participant-observers into the interaction of Netsilik culture, social organization and individual personality.

For a student to enter a field setting as a participant-observer he must develop more than a sympathetic understanding of the premises for personal actions assumed by the members of that setting. The student's ability to enter a field setting as a participant-observer is largely determined by his understanding of how interaction is accomplished by members of that setting. This notion implies that the student has a knowledge of how meaningful social interaction is accomplished in his own society,
and more specifically, a sense of how he is able to com-
municate successfully in his own surroundings.

MACOS must bring students' own social attitudes and
beliefs into significant encounter with the Netsilik
worldview before it can teach students how it is to live
as a Netsilik. MACOS comes closest to teaching with this
perspective when it deals with Itimangnark and Irkowagtok
as personalities who have been shaped by the norms and
expectations of their culture. If the student develops
some awareness that his own actions and interpretations
are a product of his culture, he can bring this way of
perceiving to his study of a divergent culture like the
Netsilik. To awaken students to an awareness that their
own behavior is a product of their culture calls for a
more personal kind of learning than MACOS intends.

If the elementary student in a social studies curri-
culum is to function as a participant-observer in a field
setting, he must first develop some immediate awareness
of how worldview allows members of that setting to ac-
complish meaningful actions. Before he can comprehend
social organization in a foreign culture he needs to have
some sense of how personal actions result in meaningful
communication in that setting. The learner can then be-
gin to understand a divergent culture like the Netsilik
as its own members do.
The Functions of Student Biography

Life history or personal biography can function on two levels to bring the learner's perspective into contact with curricular intents. It introduces him to the concept of a perceptual horizon and also demonstrates how his own interpretive structures serve as the basis for assigning meaning to human events. By helping the learner develop a sense of his own life history, the curriculum brings the student into contact with the interpretive framework he applies when assigning meaning to the actions of others. In this way, the notion of life history can serve as one basis for reworking the themes of a curriculum like Man: A Course of Study to include the student's intentionality as an important factor in the curriculum design process.

On one level, life history is an archaeology or rediscovery of one's biography as it structures one's view of the social world. It can also serve to illuminate the manner in which these personal biases or blindesses influence one's view of that world.

On a second level, life history helps the student become aware of his ethnocentrism as it determines his interpretations of social organization in a divergent culture like the Netsilik. Reaching the goal of a salient curriculum begins with enlarging the student's self-
understanding. One goal of a salient social studies curriculum is to foster a continuing awareness that the basis of individual worldview is in biography, personality, and social norms and expectations. The concept of life history can be used to reinterpret the organizing themes of MACOS to encourage open-ended learning that has a potential for leading students to self-awareness and self-understanding.

A social studies curriculum whose goal is self-understanding develops the student's sensitivity to worldview in two directions. Life history or personal biography makes explicit the themes a learner uses to organize his world. Second, the student becomes skilled in the method of participant-observation by learning to examine the themes which individuals in divergent cultures use to characterize their world and act in it. In this view, the test of a social studies curriculum is its ability to re-introduce the organizing themes of life in another culture in a way that deepens the student's awareness of his own perceptual horizons.

Summary

One method of gaining knowledge about the organizing themes of life in another culture is to study the practices of individuals for interpreting and acting within
a specific set of social norms and expectations. The overwhelming contradiction in the MACOS curriculum is that students are given an explanation of the Netsilik worldview to understand the actions of individuals, but they are never provided with the tools needed to develop that explanation by observing the interpretive practices of individual group members. The learner is given a perceptual framework for understanding the cultural significance of the Netsilik's actions, yet is never taught how to derive this awareness himself.

Man: A Course of Study approaches the study of a divergent culture in a very skilled way. It aims to develop a number of course themes that not only provide a framework for examining Netsilik culture, but also have some immediate meaning in the student's own life. However, the developers of MACOS were unable to formulate the interaction of curricular intents, student perspective and instructional materials from the learner's perspective. As a result, there is no planned development of the student's self-awareness and no significant encounter between his worldview and that of the Netsilik. By reworking the themes of the curriculum to bring the learner to an awareness that his worldview is culture-specific, MACOS could begin to expand the student's ability to respond to diverse cultural experiences.
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Chapter Five

Guidelines for Selecting Instructional Materials

This dissertation has attempted to show that the design of curricular intents and instructional materials must address the learner's horizon. It proposes a view of curriculum as the interaction of curricular intents, learner horizons, and instructional materials. The basis of this proposal is the need to achieve salience, i.e., a degree of shared meaning between the curriculum and the learner, through instructional acts. By examining the path of research in instruction and curriculum, it attempts to develop a view of curriculum that can guide the design of instructional method and materials to achieve salience in the curriculum.

Chapter Two begins by examining the perspective of mainstream research in curriculum and instruction on interaction in learning environments. The Flanders' model for research in classroom interaction is analyzed as a representative example of mainstream research in curriculum and instruction. Flanders' work has been seminal in the field and the theoretical conceptions behind his model have served as the basis for continuing research.
in classroom interaction. The focus of Chapter Two is on the shortcomings in Flanders' model for integrating the learner's horizon in studying the interaction of classroom events.

The Flanders' model uses a set of low-inference categories to describe the meaning of overt classroom behaviors. By recording behaviors in short, timed intervals the observer gathers an empirical description of classroom interaction for the entire period of observation. The question Chapter Two raises is: to what degree can this empirical description of overt classroom behavior describe how instructional acts come to have salience for students?

Chapter Two asserts that a description of how salience is accomplished through instructional acts requires a method of analysis more subtle than Flanders' low-inference description of overt behaviors. An analysis of how curricular intents, student horizons, and instructional materials interact to achieve salience must include how the intentionality of the learner and the intent of the instructional act affect what is learned.

The separation of student behaviors and instructional acts from the personal or curricular contexts that give them meaning is fundamental to Flanders' model and to most current research in curriculum and instruction. By concentrating on the analysis of instructional acts and their apparent effect on learner variables, research in
instruction has overlooked the context curriculum gives to instructional acts.

The Reconceptualists discussed in Chapter Three are the most notable group in the curriculum field who develop the concept of curriculum as a context for learning. They comb research in the social sciences and in philosophy to find new critical contexts for the study of curriculum. The Reconceptualists have borrowed heavily from the Marxist critical tradition and hermeneutic analysis to develop a method for examining what kinds of learning can occur in the curriculum. In contrast to mainstream research, the analysis in Chapter Three reveals the growing importance of the student's horizon in the Reconceptualists' work. This is particularly true of Huebner's concept of "response-ability" in the curriculum.

Drawing on the Reconceptualists' view of curriculum as a context for examining the possibilities for learning, Chapter Three introduces the concept of curriculum as intent. This concept is designed to bridge the gap between curriculum theory as developed by the Reconceptualists and the design of instructional method and materials. If curriculum theory is a discussion of the kinds of learning experiences possible within a particular curricular context, an analysis of curricular intent moves the implications of that context into the design of instructional method and materials. Chapter Three concludes by
extending Huebner's concepts, as curricular intents, into criteria for the design of curricula that interact with the student's horizon to create self-understanding.

Chapter Four is an analysis of the curricular intents that guided the development of the *Man: A Course of Study* curriculum. MACOS is an example of a curriculum that intended to educate the student from within his horizon but had very limited success in translating curricular goals into the design of instructional method and materials. While the curricular goals of MACOS pay careful attention to the integrity of the student's world view in the learning process, its explanatory instructional stance neglects the importance of the student's horizon.

Where the MACOS curriculum succeeds is in the design of the instructional materials that form the backbone of the Netsilik unit. Despite the instructional method of the curriculum, these materials present the horizon of individuals in another culture. It is, however, doubtful that they awaken students to the cultural basis of their own understanding. Jones discovered this in a study of the MACOS materials in the Newton, Massachusetts, public schools discussed in Chapter Four. Because instruction in the MACOS curriculum was in an explanatory mode, the materials were merely disturbing to the students. In short, the mode of instruction prevented the materials from working in accordance with the goals of the curriculum.
The concept of educating the student from within his horizon has major implications for the selection and integration of instructional materials with the curriculum. MACOS is one example of a curriculum that largely failed to integrate instructional resources with curricular goals. The intent of this concluding chapter is to develop an attitude toward instructional materials selection based in the interaction of curriculum, student horizons, and instructional materials. It suggests that materials specialists develop a sensitivity for two sources of meaning—curricular intents and student horizon—when incorporating materials into a particular instructional sequences.

Guidelines for Curriculum Design

The materials specialist needs a firm understanding of the way curricular intents define the kinds of student-curriculum-materials interaction that are desirable in a particular instructional setting. A list of criteria for the design of curricular intents becomes the basis for guidelines for selecting and integrating instructional materials with that curriculum. A curriculum approach that addresses the student's horizon, like the one proposed in this study, would include the following criteria:
1. As a basis for all curricular decision making, the curricularist must investigate the personal ideologies that impell learners to approach a curriculum environment in a particular way.

2. Rather than focusing exclusively on the scope and sequence of curriculum, the curricularist must analyze curricular intents and instructional materials in the context of students' ideologies.

3. The instructional situation should be viewed as the infiltration of at least two positions of interpretation. One is the set of interpretations the student evolves in making sense of curricular intents and his own relationship to them. The other is the set the curriculum developer evolves in understanding the relationship of the student's interpretive practices to curricular intents.

4. The task of curriculum theory is to elaborate nuances of the relationship of an individual's biography to his interpretive structure. The curriculum developer designs procedures for
leading students to an awareness of this relationship and for integrating these procedures with the ongoing, day-to-day activities of schooling.

5. As one option, the curricularist might focus on the biography of the individual student as the site for initiating his interaction with curricular intents and instructional materials.

6. One aim of a curriculum based in these conceptions is to teach students to investigate how ordinary men create meaning in their lives through interpretive structures. By coming to understand what people actually do in their lives, the student examines his own interpretive structures by seeing how they interface with those of other individuals.

7. The curricularist creates a situation of significant encounter between the student's articulated norms and values and a challenging basis for interpreting individual experience of the public world.
8. He uses the insights students gain from this interface as a springboard for acquainting the student with his own biography as it moves out into the social world.

When the curriculum includes the learner's horizon in the design of instructional method and materials, learning becomes an entirely negotiated process. For materials to communicate within the curricular environment they must represent curricular intent and serve as a facilitator for the student to address curricular aims from a personal stance. In this process-oriented conception of curriculum, it is not enough for materials to explain content; they must facilitate curriculum-student interaction along the lines discussed in Chapters Three and Four.

Contrary to this view of the learner in the learning process, the prevailing attitude in materials development is to build an instructional plan into the materials themselves. Most sets work in an explanatory-technical mode. The recent thrust of commercial materials production is the design of entire course units that are added to the curriculum.

In the alternative view of materials selection and integration suggested here, the materials specialist asks if the item is a practical vehicle for the curriculum.
More specifically, the primary question becomes: how good a vehicle is the item for helping to negotiate curricular intents and student horizons?

Materials selection criteria must be derived from an analysis of curricular intents. In an integrated program of media services, the materials specialist can develop two levels of guidelines for selecting materials that facilitate student-curriculum interaction. As a consultant to curriculum teams, the materials specialist assesses the need for additional materials in a particular area of the curriculum. In developing the overall collection, he needs more general guidelines for selecting materials as vehicles of student-curriculum interaction. These general guidelines would also be useful in making qualitative decisions about materials chosen to support particular areas of the curriculum. This chapter offers examples of both kinds of guidelines for the selection of instructional materials.

Criteria for Media Selection

The following general guidelines offer useful criteria for selecting instructional materials that facilitate student-curriculum interaction.
1. The materials specialist should select items that prompt students to question their basis for interpreting the world in a particular way. This implies an openness on the professional's part to various styles of presentation and diverse content in the materials.

2. The collection should incorporate materials that articulate the student's experience of his community and surrounding culture. Items from the student's experience of popular culture would articulate the way he and his peers live and experience their lives.

3. The collection should include materials that reflect the popular culture of diverse groups in the student's society. These items could serve as a basis for contrasting the student's experience of his community and culture with the way individuals experience other communities and cultures.

4. Materials that study the lives of men and women and their significance could provide important vehicles for the curriculum. Likely
categories of materials would include: biography, critical histories, and studies of groups within a society. The intent of such materials is to introduce a critical perspective to the explanation of human actions and events.

5. Autobiography, oral histories, and personal accounts of experience in general are important materials in the collection. If the curriculum focuses on the student's understanding of his own biography, personal accounts of experiences could offer the student a sense of what autobiography might include. Critical appraisals of personal experience could be especially valuable.

6. Qualitative studies in anthropology and sociology that describe how men assign meaning to experience could show students how men create meaning through interpretive structures. Folklore, studies of life in previous eras, examinations of how scientific concepts were discovered and elaborated, and studies of how technology shapes our lives would offer this viewpoint to students.
Bronowski's film series *The Ascent of Man* is one example of a particularly important resource.

7. Ethnographic field notes, documentary films and photographs, and interpretive studies in general, hold significant potential for challenging the basis of the student's interpretation of human events. In a curriculum that attempts to create encounter between students' values and alternate value systems, it is important to include materials that display similar encounters or are products of them. A collection that held these curricular values would lean toward materials that are concerned with the reality of the image they present. A good example of a resource in this category is James Agee's *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men* accompanied by Walker Evans' photographs of southern sharecroppers.

In selecting materials to support a particular area of the curriculum, cross-cultural education for example, the materials specialist would follow a selection and collection development policy like the following:
1. See that the available ethnic materials are diversified in terms of the nature and quality of the content, the ethnic groups included, and the events or experiences discussed.

2. Include materials about many different ethnic groups that are factually accurate and free of prejudices.

3. Include materials written by ethnic group authors about their own experiences.

4. Include expressive-aesthetic materials that have capabilities of conveying cultural values and perspectives such as music, poetry, folklore, oral histories, and autobiographies.

5. Include non-conventional instructional materials such as items of clothing, comics, popular music, and cartoons.¹

Every curricularist and materials specialist (and there is no clear line that separates the concerns of both) likes to think he participates in the formation of students' values. This dissertation proposes a view of how the student comes to understand the way he values
and interprets human actions. It has attempted to discuss how a regard for the student's value horizon can be incorporated into the design of curricular intents, instructional method, and instructional materials. By examining learning environments as the interaction of curricular intents, student horizons, and instructional materials, the curricularist and materials specialist develop a consistent view of how learning is accomplished in curricular environments. This view of the learner in curricular processes offers new mandates for media collection development and the selection of instructional materials.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study has attempted to bridge the gap between mainstream research in curriculum and instruction and the more traditional study of curriculum as a foundational discipline. By focusing on the salience of instructional acts, this study defines learning as a dialogue between curricular intents and the student's horizon. In this view, curriculum becomes the planned context in which instructional events come to have meaning for students. In actual instructional settings curricular intents become instructional acts that must first be interpreted by students before learning can occur.
A major task of curriculum theorizing is to generate middle-range theorizing that translates research in the human sciences into terms useful for developing curricular intents. Thus far, the Reconceptualists have decided to avoid dealing with issues in instructional design and evaluation, and their decision is a valid one. But there is still a serious gap at the cutting edge of curriculum theory, a gap between curricular intent and the design of instructional method. Whether curriculum theory can inform the design of curriculum and instructional method depends on how carefully it can specify the kinds of learner-curriculum interaction that are desirable goals. Practical metaphors for moving curriculum theory into the design of instructional processes are becoming available within such theorizing.

In forming these metaphors, the critical transition involves moving from the academic pursuit of curriculum theory to curriculum design and development. Specifically, what the curriculum field lacks is a methodology for moving theory into the realm of instructional method. It lacks a method for the systematic study of the interaction between students' horizons and curricular intents.

In curriculum theory, Max Van Manen has done groundbreaking scholarship by examining the implications of
interpretive traditions in the social sciences for curriculum theorizing. By contrasting research in ethnography, ethnomethodology, analytic social inquiry, and constitutive phenomenology, Van Manen reveals the strengths and biases of each approach for investigating how learning is accomplished in curricular environments. Van Manen's contribution to curriculum theory is already apparent; his work focuses on methods of objective inquiry into the structures of subjectivity. It is clearly an attempt to bridge the gap between relativistic methods in curriculum theory like Pinar's and the separation of actions from intentions that characterizes mainstream research in curriculum and instruction. His work is inspired not by mainstream research, but by Continental sources, e.g., Dutch studies of pedagogy.

Ethnomethodology and Curriculum Theorizing

In light of the shortcomings of mainstream research for describing how learning is accomplished in curricular settings, interpretive disciplines in the social sciences hold a largely untapped potential for analyzing educational experience in curricular settings. Of these interpretive disciplines, perhaps ethnomethodology could contribute most to the work of translating curricular intents into the design of instructional methods and materials. It attempts
to specify the external conditions that form our prece-
dents for interpreting the actions of others in a parti-
cular way.

Curriculum theorists need to explore the recipro-
city between curricular intents and educational experience
by examining how these intents are expressed in instruc-
tional acts. Ethnomethodology is a particularly valuable
tool because it provides a method for linking instructional
acts with students' experience of those acts.

For the Instructional Materials Specialist

This study extends a theory of curriculum to include
the selection of media materials as a curricular phenomenon. In this way it offers a conception of the kinds of curri-
cular goals the media program must incorporate into its functions in order to achieve a truly integrated program of services. The implications of this proposal for the role of the materials specialist in the instructional program are numerous. The broadest potential effect is that curriculum designers would regard material resources on a par with human resources as effective agents of in-
struction. The instructional role of the materials specialist would develop accordingly.

There is little research, theoretical or practical, about the integration of media services with the curriculum.
The school media field is beginning to perceive the need for such research and practice. Over the past twenty years the focus of research in instructional media has shifted from the relative effectiveness of various media to matching specific learner characteristics with the design or selection of media materials for instructional purposes. That shift has brought researchers closer to understanding factors that influence achievement, but we must now look for a way to analyze instructional materials within the interactive context that has been the focus of this study.
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