This paper discusses the place of Curriculum Studies in the ‘so called’ disciplines of Education. It begins by providing a discussion of the nature of ‘curriculum’ and the implications this has for the definition of Curriculum Studies. The paper then proceeds to examine whether such a notion of Curriculum Studies fits within the framework of the disciplines of Education. It argues that according to the narrow definition of this concept Curriculum Studies has never been regarded as belonging to the disciplines of Education. However, if the broader definition of discipline as a ‘community of scholars’ is employed, then Curriculum Studies has always been and continues to be one of the major disciplines of Education. It is shared stories that often bind communities together. The main sections of the paper develop this notion and then present a series of storylines that, it is argued, are one way of representing the history and development of Curriculum Studies. Reflected in these stories are changes that have occurred particularly in the last twenty years. They have seen the content of Curriculum Studies move more closely towards the work of teachers and schools. It is these changes that have provided renewed relevance for Curriculum Studies as a major component of teacher education programs.

The concept of curriculum is at least as old as the ancient Greeks, and as Schubert (1986) argues, probably as old as human beings themselves. Most writers (for example, Lovat & Smith, 1995; Schubert, 1986; Tanner & Tanner, 1975; Zais, 1976) would agree that the central and most fundamental question with which the concept of curriculum is concerned is ‘What knowledge is of most worth?’ More recently, with the increasing emphasis on issues of power and privilege involved in any answer to this question, it might also be argued that the question should be, ‘Whose knowledge is of most worth?’.

In identifying these questions as central we are not suggesting that they are the only important questions. Of as much interest are the learning experiences and resources which might provide the optimum opportunity for learners to engage with this knowledge and the manner in which such knowledge, activities and resources can best
be organised, sequenced and structured in units of study, programs and syllabi to maximise student learning. In addition, evaluations of both student learning and the decisions and choices of the teacher as a means of developing information for future decisions are important elements of curriculum work (ACSA, 1992). As well, answering the central curriculum questions involves a consideration of the processes by which they are answered, whether these involve an individual teacher or groups of teachers, bureaucrats, students or parents, or some combination of these. Finally, the contexts in which the processes occur, from individual classroom, through faculty, school, or system at regional, state, national or international level, are also of importance.

The concept of curriculum and the activities that are central to it thus draw upon many areas of knowledge. Certainly, the central questions of curriculum are inherently philosophical questions: questions about knowledge, knowing and proving that we know. Curriculum choices are clearly based upon epistemological (Phillips, 1974) and moral assumptions and positions (Lovat & Smith, 1995; Tom, 1984). Indeed, there are those (Pinar, 1975) who would argue that the central concept of curriculum should be 'currere' or the personal and existential experience of knowing in a particular context. Likewise, curriculum choices are psychological, drawing upon knowledge of motivation and theories of learning. Similarly they are sociological, in the claims made concerning the interrelated matters of race, ethnicity, gender, wealth and other aspects of culture in curriculum decisions, human communication and its construction, group dynamics and their impact upon learning. In addition, any matters of curriculum are directly related to the social organisation and purposes of schools and the institution of schooling in society. Curriculum is also inherently political, concerned with issues of power, access and participation. In addition, the choices concerning whose and what knowledge has worth are constructed at different levels of schooling systems, and an understanding of policy formation as it relates to curriculum work and its interaction with teacher, school and classroom practice, is essential. Thus, because of its interdisciplinary nature, in many synoptic publications of curriculum studies it was, and still is, quite common to find chapters based in educational psychology, philosophy of education and sociology of education.

It is in the identification and complex inter-relatedness of these multiple facets that constitute curriculum and its work that we begin to understand, first, the nature of Curriculum Studies, and second their relationship to the, so called, disciplines of Education. It is not the concept of curriculum, however, with which this paper is centrally concerned, but the area of research, writing and practice that collectively is called Curriculum Studies. In attempting to respond to the questions that have underpinned the papers in this symposium, the current paper is divided into four sections. The first section provides some discussion of the nature of Curriculum Studies and attempts to establish the parameters to be used in the current paper.

The paper then moves to consider the nature of Curriculum Studies with reference to the nature of disciplines and fields of knowledge. We argue strongly that Curriculum
Studies has never been considered to be one of the disciplines of Education, nor has it ever aspired to be such. Increasingly, we argue, it would want to distance itself further from such a claim in the light of the postmodern critique of the notion of disciplines of knowledge.

The third section of the paper, attempts, albeit extremely briefly, to provide some historical overview of the most significant events, ideas and movements that have shaped Curriculum Studies over the last fifty or so years. This is attempted through the identification of some of the most important curriculum storylines. In attempting to do this we have had to be extremely selective. The storylines identified are constructed within our own biographies and subjectivities and the limits of our own ignorance in understanding the field. Other writers would select other stories from their own subjectivities and biographies. Thus section three is a partial, evolving and limited glimpse (Lather, 1991) of the development of the field rather than an attempted synoptic (Schubert, 1986) grand narrative view (if this is even possible) by other authors in the field (for example, Doll, 1989; Schubert, 1986; Tanner & Tanner, 1975; Zais, 1976). In this section, the relationship between the concerns of Curriculum Studies and the traditionally identified disciplines of Education and their cognate disciplines will be illustrated.

The final section of the paper discusses the role of Curriculum Studies in, and the contribution that it might make to programs of effective teacher education. One of the main arguments in this final section, is that Curriculum Studies has undergone some significant changes in direction. It is these changes that have actually moved its ideas and central concerns further towards the work of teachers in schools and classrooms and policy makers in systems and government. We argue that Curriculum Studies has not therefore suffered from the crisis of relevance of other disciplines of Education. Rather, it continues to be centrally relevant to teacher education and teachers’ work more generally.

**THE NATURE OF CURRICULUM STUDIES**

Curriculum Studies may be considered as the collective body of ideas, writing, research, policy and practice that is related in some way to the concept of ‘curriculum’ and the questions, concerns, issues and problems with which it is concerned. One way of conceiving of curriculum practice is as a series of decisions and choices by teachers and students that together construct their experience in classrooms in a multitude of formal and informal contexts. Such decisions are informed within the biographies, subjectivities and sense making of both students and teachers. Some of the decisions and resultant experiences are intentional, some not. Thus there is a dynamic and problematic interaction between intention and actuality (Lovat & Smith, 1995). Many factors, including those associated with, students, teachers (both individually and collectively), schools, parents and communities and the system and government agencies and policy makers impact upon this interaction and the experiences of teachers and learners. Various frameworks and approaches to the phases of planning and developing learning activities, experiencing the activities and evaluating them have been suggested and
developed (Skilbeck, 1974; Stenhouse, 1975; Tyler, 1949; Taba, 1962; Wheeler, 1967). Finally, all of these activities, themselves dynamic, occur within contexts that are also affected by processes of constant change and reform. Curriculum Studies is concerned with ideas, issues, questions, approaches, dilemmas and problems of every one of these different aspects. Such diversity and complexity has both its advantages and disadvantages.

On the one hand Curriculum Studies by its nature is extremely eclectic. It draws upon all areas of knowledge within Education, not only those from the so called disciplines. Thus its brief is extremely wide and encompassing and able to concern itself with a multitude of issues. This is not to assert a superior place for Curriculum Studies but to emphasise its diversity.

However, in the strength of this diversity, also lies its weakness. Its eclecticism, arguably, means that it does not have a single clearly defined focus for its activity, neither does it have clearly established boundaries or parameters. To be an effective academic engaged in Curriculum Studies demands a knowledge of, and immersion in a very broad based knowledge of Education and beyond. In one sense, being in Curriculum Studies means knowing a little about a lot and a lot about very little! There are numerous authors during its history who have drawn attention to this dilemma of focus. Westbury & Steimer (1971), supported by MacDonald (1971) and Foshay (1976), suggested that curriculum was a field in search of its problems. Schwab reechoed these same concerns in his series of important papers on the ‘practical’ in the 1960s and 1970s in which he accused the curriculum field of being moribund and needing to return to ‘practical’ concerns of teachers and classrooms (Westbury & Wilkof, 1978).

A review of the last five years’ content of the Australian journal Curriculum Perspectives would confirm that there are still no clear parameters for Curriculum Studies. First, only very few articles actually contain the word curriculum in their title. Second, the articles range from radical pedagogy, through teacher professionalism and student attitudes to entrepreneurship, diagnostic testing and literacy assessment, embodied learning, boys education, benchmarking and public and private education. There seems little apparent coherence in such a collection of papers, except that their authors have been successful in having their papers published in the same journal. A similar pattern can be recognised in the 2000 and 2001 volumes of the prestigious Journal of Curriculum Studies, although here there are more articles that include the word curriculum in their title. In addition, there is clearly evident in this journal much evidence of the influence of postmodern thinking in curriculum studies. Similar comments could be made of the 1999 volumes of the journal Curriculum and Teaching. Many of the articles could have been printed equally well in journals of educational psychology.

To take one example of the diversity, Curriculum Studies is concerned with both subject general and subject specific matters. Thus there are as many ideas, problems, approaches, questions and issues in each specific subject area that are the concern of Curriculum Studies as there are ones that are common to those subjects. The current paper, while acknowledging the very rich and complex areas of curriculum knowledge in each of the subject areas of History, English, Drama, Maths, the Sciences, the Creative
Arts and so on, does not attempt to address these knowledges. Rather, it confines itself to Curriculum Studies that are concerned with non subject specific or, what Schubert (1986) describes as, general curriculum. In doing this, however, we acknowledge the strong interaction and interdependence of the knowledge generated in both subject specific and general Curriculum Studies.

**CURRICULUM STUDIES’ AND THE DISCIPLINES OF EDUCATION**

The consideration of the nature of Curriculum Studies is clearly a question of the social construction of knowledge and its organisation. As part of the discussion of the organisation of knowledge, authors, certainly in the 1960s and early 1970s, identified ‘disciplines’ (Schwab, 1965), ‘forms and fields’ (Peters & Hirst, 1970) and ‘realms of meaning’ (Phenix, 1964). The burst of discussion concerning knowledge structures that impacted upon most areas of knowledge then also impacted upon Curriculum Studies. The general consensus of writers at that time (for example, Reid, 1973; Zais, 1976), and, we would argue, still, was that Curriculum Studies was not a discipline but a field. To understand these arguments, and in the light of the title theme of the current symposium, while it is acknowledged that the claims made by these authors, are entirely problematic, it is necessary in understanding the nature of Curriculum Studies advanced below, to briefly consider some of that debate.

Disciplines, it was argued had certain characteristics. While these differed from one writer to another, there were some that were agreed as being central. These included, as Schwab (1965) argued:

i) a set of central concepts peculiar to the discipline (substantive structure);

ii) a particular method for investigating problems: a methodology
    (syntactical structure).

These ideas from the United States were reiterated, arguably, by Hirst (1965) in the United Kingdom in his discussion of ‘forms’ and ‘fields’ of knowledge. Hirst, discussing ‘forms’, which Phillips (1974) suggests were a similar concept to the disciplines of Schwab, asserts that they have four aspects:

i) ‘central concepts (categorial) that are peculiar in character to the form’;

ii) which ‘form a network of possible relationships’ ...
    which create ‘a distinctive logical structure’

iii) leading to ... expressions or statements that ... are testable against experience’...

iv) ‘have developed particular techniques and skills for exploring experience and testing their distinctive expressions’ (Peters & Hirst, 1970).

While all of these criteria are highly problematic (Phillips, 1974), if they are used as a basis for defining a discipline, then it is quite clear that Curriculum Studies is not a discipline or a form. As already argued above, Curriculum Studies, even by its adherents was
argued not to possess a clear set of concepts or problems nor a particular methodology to test its claims against experience. About all it could claim was a community of scholars and practitioners, for whom at least concerns and problems were shared. Although for some, (for example, Phillips, 1974) this characteristic itself was sufficient to claim discipline status, if we use the problematic ideas developed by Peters and Hirst (1970), it is more likely that Curriculum Studies can be identified as a ‘field’. It draws upon a number of areas of knowledge and is concerned with problems, which while having inextricably embedded theoretical components, clearly were concerned with issues of practice.

Thus on the basis of epistemological argument it is asserted that Curriculum Studies is not, nor ever has been a discipline. Traditionally it has certainly never been included as one of the disciplines in Education. Further, such theoretical argument was also translated into practical decision making. Well can the male author remember attending a meeting of the postgraduate committee of the then Department of Education at the University of Sydney. The year was around 1973. He was relatively new to the Department, not well versed in its politics and, as a newly appointed lecturer in Curriculum Studies, had had the audacity to suggest that Curriculum Studies should be included in Education foundations course units. He was quite clearly told by the members of the committee, who shall remain nameless, that this was not to be the case. One of them, a philosopher, used all of the arguments outlined above.

Within the postmodern critique, the concept of a generalisable and institutional framework of curriculum is highly problematic (Lovat & Smith, 1995). While the nature of curriculum and curriculum studies within a postmodern context is, and always will be, partial and evolving, Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery and Taubman (1995) would describe curriculum as a phenomenological and deconstructed text: a series of discourses. Curriculum Studies would then, by implication, constitute, an investigation towards the deconstruction of curriculum ideas, approaches and artefacts as socially constructed text, developed by subjectivities in their own biographies and within historical contexts (Pinar & Reynolds, 1992). This would constitute a change from Curriculum Studies having a traditional focus of curriculum development and implementation to a search for understanding and meaning in the discourses about curriculum. Thus as Pinar & Reynolds (1992) assert:

Curriculum...as phenomenological text communicates a story in which quantitative social science is an evil character whose effort to quantify the immeasurable is unethical and epistemologically unsound...Curriculum as deconstructed text acknowledges knowledge as preeminently historical...not ideologically constructed... rather as a series of narratives superimposed upon each other, interlaced among each other, layers of story merged and separated like the colours in Jackson Pollock’s painting’. (pp.1 & 7)

While there are certain tensions between a view of curriculum as phenomenological text and curriculum as deconstructed text recognised by Gough (1994), Pinar, Reynolds and others (1995) represent a fairly radical project. They invite readers to engage their voices
with the voices of their book in exploring a partial evolving map (as opposed to the ladder or a synopsis) of curriculum studies.

We would argue a critical investigation of a series of partial, layered, interlaced and superimposed socially constructed historical narratives is an apt way to conceive of the phenomena that is the focus of Curriculum Studies. It is also the approach taken by the authors in teaching postgraduate courses in curriculum over the last decade. It is a much more effective way to understand the many, both interrelated and conflicting trajectories, themes and approaches that have emerged, gained prominence, and then faded to reemerge at another time and in another context.

The next section of the paper attempts to identify some of the major stories of curriculum over the last fifty years.

**THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM STUDIES**

While it is not possible to identify all of the stories that might constitute Curriculum Studies there have been a number of significant shifts in the ideas and themes of the stories in the last fifty years. Each set of stories is embedded in and reflects the historical, political, social and economic conditions in which it begins and evolves. The stories cross national and international boundaries. They are sometimes dominant, and at other times submerged. Like all stories, character is important to theme and plot. Continuing themes in the stories are those of 'power', 'control', 'access', 'participation', 'centralisation', 'decentralisation', the tension between the interests of the individual learner and the state, and changing levels of state responsibility for funding and supporting all learners and schools.

The stories derive from different origins. Sometimes they are based in a set of ideas, sometimes in a series of events. Sometimes they are dominated by the ideas of one person, sometimes there are many people engaged in the story. What follows are stories about the events and characters engaged in curriculum work. The stories written by those characters themselves (for example, Pinar, 1975) would be even more interesting and insightful. Unfortunately, few of these have yet been written.

**The Objectives and Outcomes stories**

These stories concern the identification of objectives and outcomes as the basis of planning and developing the learning experiences of students. They are stories that arguably begin in the 1930s and 1940s in the United States with what has been termed the ‘objectives approach’ (Tyler, 1949). They continue through into the 1960s with the work of Taba (1962) in the United States, Wheeler (1967) in Australia and Peters and Hirst (1970) in the United Kingdom. They may be described as technical approaches to planning and developing curriculum that have their roots either in rationalist philosophy or in educational psychology (Lovat & Smith, 1995). They also reflect an asserted close relationship between schooling and its outcomes and the economy of the state. Arguably, while the stories receded during the 1970s because of fundamental changes in the economic conditions of developed countries they remained in mastery approaches to
learning (Bloom, 1971) and competency based teacher education, particularly in the United States. They have reasserted themselves in the 1980s and 1990s (Smith, 1993), and continue to be present in a world driven by economic rationalism and the movement toward learning outcomes that are directly related to national economy.

Determining a date for the beginnings of modern Curriculum Studies is contestable. However, many writers have termed Tyler (1949) the father of modern Curriculum Studies, even though writers like John Dewey, were discussing what might be seen as issues related to curriculum in the 1920s. Tyler’s approach, which was influenced by Bobbitt and Chartres (Pinar, 1975) and behaviourist psychology limited curriculum to a process of planning and implementation. It viewed curriculum work as a linear, staged process beginning with the identification of aims and objectives, followed by selecting and organising relevant experiences and concluding with an evaluation of whether or not these ‘consciously willed goals’ (Tyler, 1949, p.3) had been successfully achieved. The attraction of such an approach was, and still is, its asserted sequence and predictability, providing seeming control over the decision making process. Thus the stories of technical approaches are inextricably linked to those of student assessment and testing. The degree of actual control of the technical approaches, however, has always been, and is increasingly problematic (Smith & Ewing, 1997). Other rational approaches (eg Taba, 1962) stressed the transmission and acquisition of knowledge deemed appropriate to students’ age or stage of development. It is interesting that these approaches often conflate knowledge with content.

The stories of the critiques of this approach to curriculum studies (for example, Groundwater Smith et al., 2001; Lovat & Smith, 1995; Pinar, 1975; Stenhouse, 1975) interwoven with the stories of the approaches themselves, have argued that teachers are not always able to plan in such a rational, sequential manner prior to the implementation of learning activities. In addition, the technical approaches conceptualise learners as deficient, needing to be prepared for life through the acquisition of appropriate knowledge (Grundy, 1994). Despite research on teacher thinking and planning, one of the more recent curriculum stories (see below), which demonstrates that teachers often focus primarily on content and learning activities, current curriculum documents still stress the importance of pre-specified often technical outcomes (for example, the New South Wales Board of Studies).

**Sputnik and Curriculum Projects**

These stories are mainly characterized by educational psychologists, particularly those interested in theories of learning. Arguably, it was psychology, along with philosophy that had the greatest influence on Curriculum Studies at least until the 1970s.

In 1957 the USSR launched Sputnik. This single event caused impacts around the world that are still influencing curriculum decisions and syllabus construction. The response from the United States was that their students, particularly in science courses, were obviously not as well schooled as were those in the USSR. Thus began an investigation as to the reasons for this. Jerome Bruner, an educational psychologist, was
requested to convene a conference at Woods Hole, in 1959. The delegates to the conference were either psychologists of learning or recognised experts in subject content disciplines.

A number of outcomes emerged from the Woods Hole conference (Bruner, 1963). One of the most important was the notion that the most effective basis for curriculum development was the conceptual basis of each subject: there was a power that lay in learning about concepts that could be applied to numerous instances as opposed to learning facts which arose from one specific instance and context. Such an assertion began a spate of activity attempting to identify the categorial concepts and the substantive and syntactic structure of school subjects. Thus began a movement in concept-based curriculum that is still prevalent today (see for example current syllabi of the New South Wales Board of Studies). One of the other results of the recognition of the importance of concepts and the challenge of Sputnik was an attempt at wholesale curriculum reform in a range of school subjects (for example, PSSC Physics; CSSC Chemistry; the 'Web of Life' in Biology).

The characters of the curriculum reform stories of the 1960s were not teachers but groups of subject content specialist academics and learning theorists. These groups developed large kits of curriculum resources. Without any attempt at teacher inservice or professional development the kits were dumped in schools and teachers were expected to change their teaching. Of course, as could be predicted, little change occurred. However, a resolution from these stories was that if any effective and long lasting change in curriculum practices is to be realised, the professional development of teachers, and if possible, the active participation by teachers is essential.

Elements of these reform stories continued through the 1970s and have emerged during all periods to the present. They are represented by continuing large scale curriculum projects in the United States, in the United Kingdom, in New Zealand and Australia. Often these attempts at curriculum reform were based in school systems or controlled by national curriculum agencies, such as the Schools Council in the United Kingdom or the Curriculum Development Centre, and more recently, the Curriculum Corporation in Australia. Success or failure often depended more on politics and political relationships within and between states and rations, than on the quality of the curriculum materials (Smith, 1993).

While it was well established that any curriculum change process necessitated resource expenditure to create opportunities for active participation by those who would implement the change, such resource was generally not forthcoming, particularly in times of economic constraint. A singular exception to this, was Bruner’s own curriculum project, ‘Man: A Course of Study’. Although eventually heavily criticised for its ‘unAmerican’ values it did provide within its framework professional teacher-focused education, which, while being attacked by some as elitism, certainly, for some time ensured the project’s success. Certainly in the mid-seventies, pre-service primary
education in Social Studies concentrated heavily on the value of this kind of curriculum approach, with central focus questions guiding the investigation of content. In a similar vein was the Australian package developed by Margaret Simpson, based on Bruner’s ideas, ‘People of the Western Desert’.

The educational psychologists were dominant in the curriculum discourses from the 1940s to the 1970s. The influence of people such as Bruner, Gagne and Piaget were strong. From the 1970s, however, the educational psychologists began to become lesser characters until maybe the 1980s and ‘90s when the influence of Vygotsky and a constructivist approach to learning began to impact on the current curriculum stories.

**The evaluation, assessment and testing stories**

A related set of stories to that of the large scale reform projects are the stories of modern curriculum evaluation. Again, arguably having their roots in the work of Tyler, the need for funding agencies to determine whether expenditure on the large projects was warranted, spawned the development of the field of curriculum evaluation, especially during the 1960s and 1970s. Developments in the United States and the United Kingdom were replicated in Australia. Within this complex and multi-threaded set of stories there are many different themes, plots and characters and the intrigue of politics is never far from the surface. The stories move from emphases on objectives, to a focus on purposes, to one of the portrayal of experience to one, more recently, of negotiation with stakeholders to determine the purposes, data and procedures of the evaluation. Interestingly, like events in *Alice in Wonderland*, often the political decisions that evaluations were meant to inform preceded the completion of the evaluation story.

More recently, and alongside evaluation of major projects, there has been an increasing emphasis on accountability and assessment. While assessment, both formative and summative, is an important component of the curriculum, there has been a tendency for many economically rationalist western governments to blame education for problems in their economies. This has led to the development of competencies and generic skills and attributes (for example, Carmichael, 1992, Mayer, 1992) for school leavers and finally to an outcomes driven approach to both school and industry based curriculum. While the intention of outcomes based education (Spady, 1993) was to help develop transformational learning outcomes for students, systems have tended to interpret an outcomes approach more technically. Students’ experiences and achievements in learning have, in many cases, been reduced to a single, norm referenced test score. It is concerning that the nature of learning has become even more narrowed and controlled by the content in a particular electronically marked standards referenced exam. The assessment ‘tail’ has often been seen to ‘wag’ the curriculum dog. Unfortunately, in many countries of the world this is now the case more than ever. On the other hand, large scale testing of students at various points in their schooling (for example, the Basic Skills and Ella testing in years 3,5,7 and 8 in New South Wales) has led to scrutiny of the ‘value addedness’ of education at particular schools.
Teacher participation and practitioner research

A very significant and continuing set of stories are those of practitioners becoming engaged in researching their own curriculum practice and participating in negotiating curriculum proposals into implemented actuality. Unfortunately, such work, though demonstrated as one of the most important avenues to realise effective curriculum change and change in classroom and school practice, depends upon the provision of adequate resources including time for effective collegial processes. Because of this, these stories while powerful in the hearts, minds and professional lives of those engaged in them, have only occasionally become powerful in their more general impact on schooling system practices.

These stories arguably begin with the work of Kurt Lewin in the United States during the 1940s. The major plot in Education, however, is that connected with Lawrence Stenhouse in England in the 1970s and the continuing legacy he left behind. Stenhouse’s ideas and the experiences that he facilitated for teachers had a powerful effect on curriculum in the United Kingdom in the 1980’s. His work in numerous projects with the United Kingdom Schools Council empowered many including those who carried on his work at the Centre for Applied Research in Education, particularly John Elliot and Barry McDonald. Another of those was Stephen Kemmis who brought his experience back to Australia and along with people such as Robin McTaggart established Deakin as a centre for practitioner research in Australia (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988).

The Americans rediscovered action research much later, in the 1980s. At a recent AERA conference while the authors of the present paper were attending a session, the American academic, who was promoting his recently released book on action research, never once referred to the work of the United Kingdom or Australian academics. In a conversation after his paper, he feigned ignorance of any knowledge of the action research network in the United Kingdom or the work at Deakin. Obviously some stories have difficulty crossing international boundaries!

The expansive influence of Stenhouse’s work continues in the United Kingdom with people such as Jean Rudduck and Jennifer Nias and practitioner research conferences which began in Cambridge but have since been important internationally. In Australia these stories have included strong contributions from Susan Groundwater-Smith and Judyth Sachs. The recently established Centre for Practitioner Research at the University of Sydney is evidence of the increasing importance of these stories. Closely related has been the story constructed over the last few years, initially by the National Innovative Links Project, which joined teachers and schools with universities in working towards education and school reform. Additionally, the sometimes very influential Australian National Schools Network led by Vivienne White comprised teachers, executives and academics working together researching practices towards the improvement of working and learning conditions for teachers and students.
Enter the sociologists

Any discussion of curriculum, as already established, is clearly embedded in sociological issues and contexts. It was not until the 1970s, however, that the sociologists began to replace the educational psychologists as the main characters of curriculum storylines. It was the influence of scholars such as Michael Young (1971) and Basil Bernstein (1971, 1986, 1990) in the United Kingdom and Bowles and Gintis (1976) from the United States that began to shape these stories. Central, was the need to consider the social construction of knowledge through language and its very important implications for the selection and implementation of curriculum. Ideology and its relationship to curriculum became a dominant theme, and so did the characters of Anyon (1980), Apple (1990), Giroux (1981), and others.

The plots of these stories, which continue currently, interweave themes of ‘power’ and ‘control’, ‘access’ and ‘participation’, with those of the interrelated dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, wealth and poverty (Rizvi, 1993). The characters in these stories span the world including the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, France, Germany and Scandinavia, and include scholars such as Bob Connell (1985, 1997) and Robert Young (1989) from Australia.

In some respects, the themes and plots advanced by the sociologists form the most important stories of all. They demonstrate that there are clear and direct implications from the answers to curriculum questions for issues of gender, poverty, race and ethnic diversity to produce explicit results of power, control, access and participation. These stories include the exploration of the impacts on curriculum and classroom work of adopting a structural functionalist, conflict or critical theory approach to schooling and curriculum, as illustrated below.

In the context of the freer society characteristic of the 1960s and 70s with greater freedom in decision making and the ‘open classroom’ movement, curriculum theorists (Blenkin & Kelly, 1987; Bruner, 1963, 1966, 1986; Stenhouse, 1975) argued that the curriculum must be planned with more reference to the students themselves. These approaches have been influenced by constructivist theories of learning. They foreground the experiences of the learner envisaging a lifelong and continuous process in which learning is a problem solving, meaning making activity (Groundwater-Smith et al., 1998; Pinar, 1975). In this approach the teacher is conceptualised as a co-learner who facilitates the learning process rather than transmits expert knowledge. Further, the need for curriculum study to emphasise the relationship between curriculum intention and actuality is clearly reflected in Stenhouse’s words: The central problem of curriculum study is the gap between our ideas and aspirations and our attempts to institutionalise them (1975, p.3).

The differences between the formal, intended or explicit curriculum and what was later termed the ‘hidden’ curriculum (Seddon, 1983) became an important area of curriculum study. The hidden curriculum was shown to be constructed through signs,
symbols, structures, routines and rituals which largely reinforced the ‘status quo’ of cultural capital, power, control and access (Cusworth, 1995, Lovat & Smith, 1995).

The theories of Bourdieu (1984) and Bernstein (1971, 1986, 1990) link the processes and structures of curriculum in western educational institutions with the reproduction of social inequalities within our cultures. Whose ‘cultural capital’ is included and valued by the school curriculum? School knowledge and classroom discourse is likely to be more accessible to those children already oriented to the types of codes typical in educational institutions. Bernstein’s concepts of classification and framing (1986, 1990) demonstrated how boundaries between different curricula areas are defined and communicated, thus controlling learning. Tight teacher control over the selection, organisation, pacing and timing of knowledge in a curriculum area means that the curriculum is strongly framed.

An extension of these approaches can be seen in ‘interactive or dynamic’ models of the curriculum process such as that advocated by Skilbeck (1984), while an emphasis on student negotiation of the curriculum in partnership with teachers was promoted by Boomer (1982, 1992). While rational approaches to curriculum studies emphasise the intentions of the curriculum developer, procedural approaches concentrate on what is involved in the curriculum process itself. A third alternative influenced by critical theory (Habermas, 1974; Young, 1989) sees curriculum as wholistic and resists the temptation to separate theory from practice. Such a broad conception of curriculum demands that the perceptions of teachers and students and their parents participating in the educational activity be more carefully examined. Since the mid 1980s there has been a consequent increase in the focus on teachers’ work, teacher thinking and teachers’ voices especially through narratives (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996). Stories focused around teacher perceptions’ of their work are closely linked in some respects to the stories of student participation in curriculum work.

**Student centred stories**

The roots of these stories were lain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They were written by characters such as Kierkegaard, Montessori and Rudolf Steiner, and by A.S. Neill and John Dewey. The themes of these stories emerge strongly during the 1970s. While their dominance has been submerged somewhat by the increasing emphasis on a technical outcomes-based approach with its underlying purpose of central control, their importance continues in the stories of the growing national and international associations of members of student representative councils (for example, PASTA, 2001). They are stories of student centred learning and decision making. Themes of student power, control and freedom are central.

These stories flourished in the strong economic conditions in the western countries of the 1970s with their attendant permissive social mores and notions of individual freedom. The stories were written in the thousands of alternative and free schools that bloomed (Graubard, 1979) in the United States, in the United Kingdom and in Australia. In Sydney they were in places such as Yinbilliko, Yanganinook, Currumbeena and the
Sunshine School. While many of these contexts have now disappeared in the wake of reasserted centralist government control, the stories continue in the increasing number of Steiner schools, in increased numbers of home-schoolers in Australia and the United States, in the application of student negotiation through the work of Boomer (e.g. 1982, 1992) in Australia and other parts of the world, and maybe even in some of the Charter schools, particularly in some of the most depressed areas of some states in the United States.

**Stories of the professional associations**

Some of the most important stories, even more significant given the lack of government and system support in most contexts over the last fifty years, are those of the professional associations. Some of these are subject specific organisations (e.g. Primary English Teaching Association). Some, like the Association of Curriculum Studies (United Kingdom), the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (United States) and the Australian Curriculum Studies Association (ACSA) are non subject specific. Some stories, like those of the United States have many chapters. Some like ACSA are shorter (Smith, 1993). Some associations were born autonomously. Others were initially written under the umbrella of organizations like the American Educational Research Association, or, in Australia, the Australian Association for Research in Education. Some stories stand alone. Others are intricately tied to stories of teacher unionism.

No matter how long the story or how complex, the plots are carried out usually by thousands of hardworking volunteers, whose main ambition is to somehow improve the conditions of teachers and enhance student learning by providing opportunities for the development of classroom resources and professional learning. These stories interweave with those of practitioner research and classroom - and school-based - change. In many cases, if it were not for the work of the characters in these professional association stories then many other curriculum stories would have terminated. In many ways, it is these professional associations that are the publishers and carriers of curriculum stories, who help to sanction, promote and diminish the themes, plots and characters of the stories of curriculum referred to above and below.

**Beginning to understand what teachers do and the knowledge they use**

These are personal stories for both authors, ones that are part of our own biographies as academics. As a newly appointed Lecturer in Curriculum Studies at the University of Sydney in the late 1970s one of the male author’s first tasks was to provide a lecture concerning curriculum to Diploma of Education students. This of course was not the beginnings of Curriculum Studies at the University or the then Department of Education. A strong tradition of Curriculum Studies had already been established through international scholars such as William McCrae, Bill Connell, Joyce Wylie and more recently David Duffy. These were principally those of the philosophers and educational psychologists who wished to tell teachers how they should approach curriculum work.
But what did they say of any practical reality to the work and world of the practising teacher? This was a period when the curriculum stories were heavy on prescription without knowing anything of teachers’ actual thinking and practice.

In the late 1970s stories of the construction of teacher knowledge and teacher thinking became dominant. The male author engaged in a doctorate investigating teachers’ curriculum practice and decision making space. Initially, and to some extent still, the stories featured educational psychologists like Shavelson & Stern (1981). However, they were, and are increasingly written by others like Clark & Yinger (1979), Collinson (1996), Shulman (1987) and Connelly & Clandinin (1990) who have attempted to understand teachers’ practice through images, metaphors and narratives. One of the important areas of investigation was that related to teachers’ decision making including curriculum decision making (Lovat & Smith, 1995).

From this point on there have been a number of stories interwoven by characters across the world describing teachers’ work and the mental structures and processes that inform it. Maybe for the first time it became possible to pass on to neophyte teachers, stories that provided them with some understanding of the manner in which teachers went about curriculum work and the intellectual dimensions that informed it. These stories were rich in descriptions of context and meaning. They included accounts of beliefs and feelings. The stories have been written by authors such as James Calderhead (1986), Jennifer Nias and Susan Groundwater-Smith (1989), Jean Clandinin and Michael Connelly (1990, 1996), Ivor Goodson (1991, 1992), Mary Beattie (1997), Pat Diamond and Carol Mullen (1999), Ardra Cole and Gary Knowles (2000). They are about the everyday lives and events of teachers at work. Arguably it is these stories that have often provided deeper insights into, and understanding of the complex and multifaceted world of the curriculum work of practitioners. It is these stories and cases that, arguably, provide the insights so essential to beginning teachers.

The research and development stories

The stories of research in curriculum studies, as can be seen from the stories already recounted above, are part of all other curriculum stories. As well as constructing their own discourses they interweave with the other stories, often bringing the themes of those different stories together. Sometimes they are the main plot, as in the practitioner research stories. Sometimes they are simply one of the themes or part of the context in which the story is set.

The research stories in curriculum reflect the plots, themes and characters of the stories of social science research. Initially there is an emphasis from the scientific paradigm and methods of quantitative analysis. Then came the assault by those attempting to develop alternative methodologies, those of the case study and ethnographic researchers. Interwoven with these are the stories of those who would challenge both of these traditions (for example, Pinar, 1975) and, using the ingredients of the discourses of stories and their voices from other fields, attempt to understand curriculum phenomena and work using biographies (for example, Goodson, 1991, 1992),
narratives (for example, Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 1996) and other forms of art informed inquiry (for example, Diamond & Mullen, 1999; Cole & Knowles, 2000). Arguably, in many cases, it is matters of curriculum on which many of these latter inquiries have focused and provided insights that previous investigation failed to reveal (Gough, 1993).

The stories just begun ... or not?

Probably the latest stories, maybe better described as fragments in a kaleidoscope are those of the challenges and disruptions by the voices of those emerging from the ideas of postmodernism. Arguably, many of these ideas surfaced in the radical critiques of traditional curriculum plots and stories provided by Pinar (1975) and his compatriot Reconceptualists of the 1970s. The Reconceptualists, were authors that migrated from other stories and discourses, from linguistics, from critical theory, from existentialism and phenomenology, from psychoanalysis and radical psychology. They brought not only new plots and themes, but new lenses through which to look at the old stories: they brought ideas and questions which disrupted traditional themes and plots, that disturbed dominant characters and began to construct different stories, different biographies, different discourses using multiple voices and perspectives. No longer was there any attempt at a story that was simple, linear and complete. The stories of the postmodernist curriculum writers are partial, incomplete, evolving, fragmented, recursive and reflexive.

These stories no longer strive to provide technical skills for curriculum development and implementation. Rather their concern is to interrogate and deconstruct the curriculum discourses of the past towards deeper and more critical understanding (Cherryholmes, 1988; Pinar et al., 1995). They set out to challenge elements of curriculum so often taken for granted (for example, Cusworth, 1995). While this is certainly an important and valuable goal for Curriculum Studies, it does not necessarily assist the decision with what to do with 7E in History on Tuesday morning! Thus the practical concerns, asserted by Schwab in the 1960s and 1970s are still important issues for curriculum practice and must be informed by other stories, other discourses, as well as those of phenomenological and deconstructed text. It is to the implications of Curriculum Studies for teacher education that we turn in the final section.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF CURRICULUM STUDIES TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Curriculum Studies has always been, and continues to be central to teachers’ work and therefore central to teacher education. In one sense, it could be argued that it is teacher education, and other areas of vocational and professional preparation that provide many of the important contexts for the telling of the curriculum stories themselves. If Curriculum Studies and its stories are attempting to help us understand the work of curriculum practitioners, then one of the key audiences for such stories are the neophyte teachers for whom curriculum will be a central part of their professional life.
Initially and probably up until the 1970s the field of Curriculum Studies was, as argued above, driven by theory that emerged from psychology or philosophy. To a large extent, this meant that Curriculum Studies had very little, and was perceived by teachers to have very little, that was practically useful and meaningful to beginning teachers. It was this abdication from the actual world of teachers and their curriculum work that led Joseph Schwab to write his influential papers that exhorted the adherents of the Curriculum Studies field to return to curriculum as a practical activity. As revealed above, however, such a position is problematic, given the tension between this action world of teachers and classrooms and the notion of Curriculum Studies as suggested by scholars such as Cherryholmes (1988) and Pinar (1995).

The changes that have taken place in Curriculum Studies since the late 1970s and 1980s have re-emphasised the central importance of teachers’ work, and integral to this, curriculum work. From the late 1970s these changes include, as outlined above, the stories of investigation of teachers’ thinking and its relationship to curriculum practice; the structure of teachers’ curriculum knowledge; using action research to investigate teachers’ professional practice and build teachers’ practical knowledge; and, developing narrative and other forms of representing teachers’ curriculum work. Interwoven in these stories have been concerted efforts to facilitate reflective curriculum practice (Calderhead, 1989; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Lovat & Smith, 1995; Smith, 1999).

These changes have brought the central concerns of Curriculum Studies closer to the work and everyday concerns, issues and lives of teachers. Because of this, Curriculum Studies has retained its relevance and its central position in the curriculum of teacher education and the experiences of beginning teachers. This is not to say, however, that it has come any closer to defining its core or boundaries or that the stories it has created are necessarily those that are most appropriate or most useful and informative to beginning teachers. This is the central continuing task for those of us who see our work in the inherent interface between Curriculum Studies and teacher education.

However, arguably, the quest, as Pinar and others describe it, of a critical understanding of the ideas and stories of curriculum as a basis for teachers’ curriculum work is now more imperative than ever. This is particularly the case in a world in which the teacher’s world and work are increasingly dominated by centralised control and attempts to render teachers as technical workers rather than as knowledgeable, competent and critical professionals. In a revised model of teacher education, in which student teacher learning is located more strongly in the contexts of schools and the knowledges of the teachers in those schools, the need and the opportunity to uncover, tell, record, celebrate and understand the curriculum stories of those teachers and schools will be even more imperative. Such opportunities will be enhanced and enriched if there is strong collaborative work between those whose curriculum stories are constructed in schools and those whose biographies and stories are woven between the contexts of schools and those of the academy. The imperative for those of us engaged in writing curriculum stories is to construct and reconstruct the curriculum field so that ideals such as democracy, equity and justice become increasingly the lived daily experience of learners and teachers.
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