The Progressive Legacy of Holism

Joan M. Cady

The relationship of subject matter to teaching methods has been a perennial concern throughout the history of education. Educators seeking the "key" to improving education have oscillated between interest in courses of study and atttention to pedagogical procedures. The folly of this fluctuation was noted by William T. Harris in 1880 when he reminded the educational community that "the what to study [was] as important as the how to study."[1] One hundred and three years later, this same issue was raised by Lawrence C. Stedman and Marshall S. Smith regarding the early 1980s foray into curriculum reform in which they found a lack of consideration for the "how is it taught?" question in many reports.[2] The history of curriculum conceptions has reflected these concerns. When curriculum was viewed as a course of study and teaching was considered a separate entity, the vacillation between subject matter concerns and methodological issues was reinforced. However, when curriculum was conceived in the broader terms of the learner's educative experiences, subject matter and teaching methods became a unified consideration for educational improvement. The conflict between the dualistic and unified conceptions of the curriculum and instruction relationship has formed an ongoing debate in the evolution of curriculum studies. Although Schubert described this debate as one between those who separate the two "for analytic clarity" and those who regard the separation as "superficial since curriculum and instruction are thoroughly intertwined in practice,"[3] other theorists regard this separation as more than just a conceptual distinction. For example, Tanner and Tanner asserted that "the curriculum-instruction dualism has emerged as a veritable doctrine for the curriculum field."[4]

Prior to the 1920s and 1930s, the curriculum was usually defined as the textbook, the course of study, or the guide for instruction.[5] The process of curriculum construction or curriculum building meant writing a course of study to be implemented by teachers and mastered by students. According to this view, curriculum development and instruction were two distinct, albeit related, functions.

Dewey argued that since method is the "arrangement *of* subject matter which makes it most effective in use," the isolation of method from subject matter is irrational.[6] This illogical separation stems from regarding the distinction between subject matter and method "as a separation in experience and not as a distinction in thought [reflected experience]."[7] When subject matter and method are treated as separate in experience, Dewey contended "we make a division between a self and the environment or world. This separation is the root of the dualism of method and subject matter."[8] Dewey delineated the "evils in education" resulting from such subject matter-method dualism:

> 1. The neglect . . . of concrete situations of experience . . . [so that] "methods" have then to be authoritatively recommended to teachers, instead of being an expression of their own intelligent observations.
>
> 2. False conceptions of discipline and interest . . . [are developed through the use of] excitement . . . , the menace of harm to motivate concern with the alien subject matter. Or a direct appeal may be made to the person to put forth effort without any reason.
>
> 3. The act of learning is made a direct and conscious end in itself.
>
> 4. Method tends to be reduced to a cut and dried routine, to following mechanically prescribed steps.[9]

In addition, this dualism leads to divisions in research and to further separation between theory and practice. Dewey predicted the following consequences:

> When we make a sharp distinction between *what* is learned and *how* we learn it, and assign the determination of the process of learning to psychology and of subject-matter to social sciences, the inevitable outcome is that the reaction of what is studied and learned upon the development of the person learning, upon the tastes, interests, and habits that control his future mental attitudes and responses, is overlooked. To that degree the psychological account of the process of personal learning and growth is deficient and distorted. It then deals with a short segment of the learning process instead of with its continuities.[10]
>
> When means and ends are viewed as if they were separate, and to be dealt with by different persons who are concerned with independent provinces, there is imminent danger of two bad results. Ends, values, become empty, verbal; too remote and isolated to have more than an emotional content. Means are taken to signify means already at hand, means accepted because they are already in common use. As far as this view prevails, the work of a science of education is reduced to the task of refining and perfecting the existing mechanism of school operations. . . . But it overlooks a fundamental issue. How far

> do the existing ends, the actual consequences of current practices go, even when perfected? The important problem is devising *new* means in contradistinction to improved use of means already given.[11]

Following in the tradition of Dewey, the state curriculum projects of the late 1920s and early 1930s revised previously dominant interpretations of curriculum. According to Caswell,

> Whereas earlier work accepted the traditional concept of the curriculum as consisting of a group of courses of study, leaders of state programs came to view the curriculum operationally, considering it to be composed of the experiences pupils actually had under the guidance of the school. Earlier efforts were directed primarily to writing consistent, good documents. . . . leaders in state programs became aware that these revised courses of study did not as a rule lead to changes in classroom practice. Courses of study gathered dust on shelves. It became increasingly clear that revision of the curriculum should have the central purpose of modifying instruction, and that curriculum programs must utilize many means to achieve this end in addition to writing courses of study.[12]

Furthermore, it was accepted that

> classroom teachers generally must take a major part in curriculum programs since change in practice depends on their ability and willingness to modify existing teaching procedures.[13]

In addition, the Virginia Project initiated the policy of placing all work related to curriculum and instruction under one administrator.[14] The role of the supervisor changed from that of an inspector to that of an educator—a teacher and guide for teachers.[15]

Thus, in order to realize the educational changes proposed by these state projects, curriculum seemed to evolve naturally from the narrow concept of a document to a broad term which encompassed the course of study as well as its implementation. In addition, teachers were recognized as key players in educational improvement and were increasingly involved in the development as well as the implementation of curriculum. Curriculum was conceived in terms of the curriculum-as-realized in the experience of the learners, was developed through the active involvement of the classroom teachers, and was supervised in conjunction with instruction by one administrator.

Just as practice helped to unify the curriculum-instruction relationship, so did the developing field of curriculum as an academic specialization. According to Cremin, curriculum as a specialized field was created in Denver when classroom teachers participated in the system-wide curriculum reform (1922). Cremin observed:

> Once the Denver pattern caught on, it was obvious that specialists other than the superintendent would be needed to manage the process, and it was for the purpose of training such specialists that the curriculum field was created.[16]

In the mid-1920s, Harold Rugg brought together practicing curriculum specialists for the purpose of preparing a composite statement which would represent curriculum scholarship at that time. In the Preface to the resulting document, the *Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (NSSE), Editor Rugg stated the "great need for a new synthesis, a comprehensive orientation of the relation between the school curriculum and the content of life on the American continent today."[17]

The Yearbook Committee attempted to synthesize from a broad spectrum of opinion, that body of knowledge and skills essential for a curriculum specialist. In the Yearbook, curriculum was defined as "a succession of experiences and enterprises having a maximum of lifelikeness for the learner."[18] The accepted or understood process of curriculum-making unified curriculum and instruction with the following steps:

1. The determination of the ultimate and immediate objectives of education.
2. The experimental discovery of appropriate child activities and other materials of instruction.
3. The like discovery of the most effective modes of selecting and organizing the activities of the grades of the respective schools.[19]

Subsequent to the state curriculum projects and publication of the NSSE yearbook of 1927, additional significant events brought together the work of curriculum and instruction. The formation of the Society for Curriculum Study in 1932 and the establishment of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Columbia University in 1938 contributed to the growing field of curriculum specialization as well as to the unification of curriculum and instruction. In 1943, the Society for Curriculum Study merged with the National Education Association's Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction forming the Association for the Supervision of Curriculum Development. This organization, formulated around a shared understanding—"of the integral relationship of curriculum, instruction, and supervision in concept and practice" represented the awareness of a need for a unified treatment of curriculum and instruction by professional curriculum workers.[20]

In 1933, the Progressive Education Association initiated the Eight-Year Study (1933-41) which applied the parameters of the unified approach to experimental research. As explicated by Giles, McCutchen, and Zechiel, curriculum objectives based on the needs of the learner, society, and subject matter served as the criteria for selecting content and methods. This approach considered the holistic interaction of objectives, subject matter, methods, and evaluation. In his report on the Eight-Year Study, Aikin (1942) observed that:

> Innovations have involved not only the content of the curriculum, but methods of teaching as well . . . What to teach and how to teach—these are the constant concerns of education.[21]

The curriculum field was further strengthened through the development of synoptic texts, anthologies, and publications of professional organizations—documents which synthesized the knowledge base of the field. As defined by Schubert, synoptic texts are "the major kinds of writings that [have] socialized curriculum decision makers (be they professors, administrators, consultants, or teachers) to the work they pursued."[22]

In the first synoptic text, Caswell and Campbell (1935) enumerated the ways in which the process of curriculum making was influenced by conceptions of curriculum; when curriculum is defined as:

> 1. A group of subjects or fields of study arranged in a particular sequence[,] . . . specification of time units and sequences of large segments of subject matter are the principal tasks of curriculum building. . . .
>
> 2. The subject matter or content that is to be employed in instruction[,] . . . Curriculum making . . . consists largely in selecting and arranging topics that are to be taught in the various subjects.
>
> 3. All the content or subject matter that may be employed in experience[,] . . . Pupil interests and activities, aims, method, content, in fact everything that influences the experience of the learner must be considered during the process of curriculum-making.[23]

The third definition of curriculum and corresponding process of curriculum development (which necessarily unified curriculum and instruction with its concern for the what, why, and how questions of education) was supported by Caswell and Campbell.

In the second synoptic text of curriculum, Norton and Norton (1936) defined curriculum as "the sum total of the conscious events which compose a child's life and from which he learns."[24] The authors noted that acceptance of this definition also created "a clear-cut distinction between . . . the courses of study and the curriculum."[25] When curriculum was viewed as a course of study, the following results were typical:

> Curriculum was a finite and relatively fixed body of content. Its boundaries were the covers of the textbooks. The course of study was a blueprint. It indicated by page references the amount of textbook content each grade was to "cover" in a given period. "Covering" this material involved a large element of memorization. When the child could give back, or "recite," the prescribed content, he had completed the requirements of both the course of study and the curriculum.[26]

Another form of curriculum knowledge produced during this era was the text comprised of curriculum readings, selected articles pertaining to curriculum. In the first such text, *Readings in Curriculum Development* (1937) by Caswell and Campbell, A. Gordon Melvin addressed directly the relationship of curriculum and instruction. Melvin stated,

> It is impossible to separate completely the field of curriculum and method. To a certain extent when children learn in a different way they learn different things. When method changes, curriculum must inevitably change. It is in an effort to meet this change in method of teaching that the movement for curriculum revision has found its soundest and most real justification. In other words curriculum revision should not go on in and for itself, but rather to bring the curriculum into line with the needs of an improved method of teaching.[27]

Although acknowledging the relationship, Melvin preferred to equate the curriculum with a "listing of . . . goals and attainments" apart from methodology.[28]

In this same book of readings, Caswell and Campbell quoted Howard K. Bauernfeind, who acknowledged the vital role of the teacher in curriculum development:

> Rather than wrecking the machine, the teachers, in the process of curriculum making, are able to become acquainted with the mechanism which they are called upon to operate, to keep in repair, and to improve.[29]

With the transformation of the curriculum concept, the course of study was, thus, implicitly distinct from the curriculum, and the process of curriculum-making became a more complex and encompassing concern.

Professional organizations such as the American Educational Research Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the National Society for the Study of Education provided significant publication outlets for the growing research of the curriculum field. Their documents included journals, encyclopedias, yearbooks, and dictionaries. The unified, holistic approach to curriculum

development was prominent in The *Review of Educational Research*, the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, ASCD yearbooks, the *Dictionary of Education*, and the *Eight-Year Study*.

Significantly, the first issue of the *Review of Educational Research* in 1931 was devoted to curriculum and thereafter, every three years through 1969. The Introduction acknowledged the experience definition of curriculum: "The scope of this review is based on the conception that the curriculum consists of all the experiences that a pupil has or is likely to have in school."[30] In this same issue, Hopkins supported the views expressed in the synoptic curriculum literature, namely that the "content of subject matter is not an end in itself, but is a means of changing ways of behaving or responding" and that teachers were to perform "the actual work of curriculum construction and installation."[31]

William H. Bristow and O. I. Frederick coauthored the entry on "Curriculum Development" in the first edition of the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (1941). The authors contrasted the transformed, "functional" concept of curriculum with the old, course of study concept:

> As contrasted with a definition as *the subjects taken by a pupil*, a functional conception defines [curriculum] as *all the experiences* which are utilized by the school to attain the aims of education. . . . Curriculum development under this conception involves planning the experiences to be utilized, organizing them into a program, implementing this program, and evaluating the curriculum thus developed. . . . Since about 1930 there has been general acceptance of the democratic ideal as a criterion in curriculum development.[32]

The changes in the purposes, leadership, methods, content, and appraisal of curriculum development from the old to the new conceptions of curriculum were also contrasted by the authors (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Old and New Concepts of Curriculum

	FROM	TO
1. Purpose of curriculum development	Informational and disciplinary	Concern for child growth development; insight into contemporary problems; effective learning; teacher growth
2. Leadership in curriculum development	Subject specialists and college professors	Teachers, supervisors, psychologists, specialists and parents working together
3. Methods	Armchair	Developmental and experimental
4. Content	Subject matter to be mastered	Functional content and activities; subject matter and experiences correlative
5. Appraisal	Subject-matter tests	Consideration of attitudes, appreciations, methods of work and thinking, ability to use facts in relation to behavior

SOURCE: William H. Bristow and O. I. Frederick, "Curriculum Development," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, Walter S. Monroe, Ed., London: American Educational Research Association, 1941, p. 307.

The first edition of the *Dictionary of Education* (1945) echoed the curriculum definitions offered by Caswell and Campbell during the previous decade:

> 1. A systematic group of courses or sequence of subjects required for graduation or certification in a major field of study. . . .
>
> 2. A general over-all plan of the content or specific materials of instruction that the school should offer the student by way of qualifying him for graduation or certification or for entrance into a professional or a vocational field.
>
> 3. A body of prescribed educative experiences under school supervision, designed to provide an individual with the best possible training and experience to fit him for the society of which he is a part or to qualify him for a trade or profession.[33]

The first yearbook of the newly formed Association for the Supervision of Curriculum Development, *Toward a New Curriculum* (1944), described the key changes in the curriculum field:

> From the reorganization of courses and subject matter areas . . . to working with and for people on meaningful and vital problems, from rigidly formulated courses to plans for study developed in classrooms by teachers and pupils.[34]

The acceptance of Caswell and Campbell's third definition of curriculum demanded a new approach to curriculum development. In the *Forty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part I (1945), Hilda Taba described the assumptions of the transformed "techniques of curriculum planning":

> 1. Education takes place in a society. . . .
>
> 2. We educate people by changing them as individuals. These changes involve the so-called academic learnings, the socializing of those individuals, and providing for their personal growth. . . .
>
> 3. All learning experiences take place through some content or subject matter.[35]

Given these assumptions, Taba observed that the problem of curriculum

> is not a simple process of outlining the content of the subject matter to be taught. It involves analysis of important social needs and problems, of the nature, capacities, and needs of the learners, and understanding of the behavior characteristics of the students.[36]

In this view, the process of curriculum-making involves a considered study of society, learners, and subject matter content, and a clarification of philosophical and psychological concepts. Curriculum planners, then, need to formulate objectives which guide the selection of content and behavior reactions to that content; select experiences; organize experiences; and evaluate the outcomes of the process.[37] This new process of curriculum making unites subject matter and method in that "content . . . includes both fundamental knowledge . . . [and] unique intellectual techniques and tools."[38]

Defining curriculum in terms of experience was a common practice in the professional literature of the late 1940s. For example, in the proceedings of the first conference devoted to curriculum theory (1947), Tyler commented on the "surprising amount of agreement" regarding the concept of curriculum; namely, "all of the learning which is planned and guided by the school."[39] These learnings or experiences, according to Herrick, had to include a learner, a purpose, a content, and a process."[40] The nature of experience as used in this conception of curriculum was further explicated by Caswell:

> Pupils, subject matter, and society must be seen in an integral relationship. The source of this relationship, I believe, can be found in the concept of experience. . . . Attention is focused on all the elements of experience—the purposes of the learners and the activities they engage in, as well as the subject matter they use. Concern is present for all the outcomes of the experiences, including the children's attitudes and their methods of work, as well as the knowledge they acquire. . . . [Yet,] because experience is the means of education, it does not follow that all experience is equally educative.[41]

In contrast to the apparent agreement within the professional literature, Alexander noted the difference that existed between the literature and the world of practice:

> Although writers on curriculum now rather uniformly define "curriculum" to include all experiences provided by the school, the profession as a whole does not have a common understanding of this concept. To many who use the term, "curriculum" still means what is taught, that is, subject matter.[42]

The relationships that existed between conceptions of curriculum and efforts to change curriculum were also stressed in the professional literature. In the 1948 *Review of Educational Research*, Mackenzie and Lawler concluded that conceptions of curriculum influenced efforts to change curriculum. If curriculum was viewed in the broad sense of learner experiences, changing curriculum involved "changing the factors which shape or influence the learners' experiences." With a narrow, course-of-study definition, the

focus of change was on modifying or adding courses."[43] Barr and his associates concluded that *courses of study* and *curriculum* could not be used interchangeably in an emergent view of curriculum development.[44]

The experience-based approach to curriculum development was succinctly presented in the publication of Ralph Tyler's syllabus for Education 360—*Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, at the University of Chicago in 1949. Curriculum and instruction development involved the consideration of objectives, content, organization, and evaluation in their organic relationship within the educational situation.[45] An educational program required both "the ends [to] be attained" and "the means . . . educational experiences that are had by the learner."[46]

According to Tyler, teacher participation in this holistic process of curriculum development was essential:

> Unless the objectives are clearly understood by each teacher, unless he is familiar with the kinds of learning experiences that can be used to attain these objectives, and unless he is able to guide the activities of students so that they will get these experiences, the educational program will not be an effective instrument for promoting the aims of the school. Hence, every teacher needs to participate in curriculum planning at least to the extent of gaining an adequate understanding of these ends and means.[47]

This position readily assumed that curriculum improvement was tested by the change in "the instructional practices of teachers."[48] The focus of supervision was on teacher "growth" through curriculum development rather than on teacher "inspection" regarding the implementation of the course-of-study and maintenance of proper pupil deportment.[49]

The holistic approach to curriculum change was consistently supported by the professional literature of the late 1940s. According to this position, curriculum was conceived in terms of learner activities or experiences. Objectives, subject matter, method, and evaluation were considered in their organic relationship for the purpose of extending and enriching the experience of learners. In order to change an emerging curriculum (one that considered the needs of the learner and the needs of society, as well as subject matter concerns), one had to change people, not documents, because ultimately teachers and learners determined the realized curriculum.

Optimism and democracy were the bywords of countless educational articles and books from this period. At the same time, educational literature overwhelmingly supported the holistic conception of the curriculum-instruction relationship. Curriculum development was an emerging process for the improvement of instruction. The teacher was a decision-maker capable of growth, and supervisors were to assist teacher growth through the development of curriculum. This was the forward looking view at mid-twentieth century. New ways of organizing subject-matter invoked new methodologies. Contextual, situational, and holistic views were utilized to judge the merits of a suggested approach. Instruction was a dimension of curriculum; together they shared the goal of improving student learning.

The 1950 NSSE *Yearbook* clearly captured the tone of educational thought at mid-twentieth century:

> Curriculum and instruction are generally understood to be the obverse and reverse of a single educational coin—the means by which learning of pupils is brought about. It is doubtful that the two can be separated in function. However, there seems to have been tendencies in these last years to neglect the interactions of curriculum and instruction. But principles for the curriculum are now emerging which are basically the same as those for improving instruction. As pupils and teachers work together, in thus formulating the dynamic, on-going curriculum, they are actually conducting and experiencing instruction of the highest kind.[50]

During the height of the synoptic texts in the 1950s,[51] the litany of the holistic curriculum perspective resounded from the literature:

- Curriculum evolves through the learner's experience,
- Curriculum and instruction are unified,
- The teacher is a curriculum developer.

In this literature, the unified relationship was championed through the indivisible relationships of curriculum and teaching methods, content and method, curriculum and instruction, subject matter and methods, what and how, or curriculum and teaching. This literature supported the experience-based definition of curriculum and the full participation of the teacher in curriculum development.

Yet, the signs of an opposing, separate view were noted in the professional literature by such scholars as Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1950) and Beauchamp (1956). Smith, Stanley, and Shores defined curriculum as "a set of potential experiences,"[52] and preferred to

> emphasize method and function rather than content—although it must by recognized that, in detail, method cannot wholly be separated from subject matter.[53]

Similarly, Beauchamp pressed for "a distinction . . . between the content itself and the teaching methodology involved in the use of content in the classroom."[54] Curriculum or "the design of a social group" was "a written document."[55]

Through 1956, curriculum-as-experience was substantially supported by the professional literature. In addition, the process of building curriculum included purposes, content, activities, and evaluation. The prevalent view was that the curriculum and instruction relationship must be holistic if the goal was educational improvement. The importance of defining the relationship, however, was acknowledged by Bellack:

> One's point of view concerning the relationship between content and teaching methods exercises a decided influence on the selection and organization of curriculum content.[56]

In contrast to the unified, optimistic tenor of the educational literature, criticisms of education were mounting in the popular press. These criticisms and a series of significant events portrayed the contrasting, separate approaches to the problems of curriculum and instruction. Popular press criticism, the presentation of a taxonomy for curriculum and testing, and the creation of the National Science Foundation offered significant trends/events which signaled the emergence of distinctive approaches to curriculum and instruction during this time period.

The prevalence of the public school criticism in this era has been previously documented by Diane Ravitch:

> In educational journals alone, the number of articles attacking or defending current practice rose from seven in 1948 to forty-nine in 1952; and articles in *Life*, the *Reader's Digest*, the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Saturday Review of Literature*, *McCall's*, and scores of other national publications doubled or trebled the volume of critiques.[57]

Titles such as Mortimer Smith's *And Madly Teach* (1950) were characteristic of the heated attacks on public education. For public school criticism, 1953 was an especially bountiful year, for it produced *The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society* by Robert M. Hutchins, *Quackery in the Public Schools* by Albert Lynd, *Educational Wastelands* by Arthur Bestor, and *Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools* by Paul Woodring. In general, these critics attacked the experience-based approach to curriculum which was anathema to their own subject-matter approach. Teachers were ridiculed for their soft-headedness in that their education consisted of "how-to" courses rather than liberal arts courses. In contrast, the critics held the view that one should teach all children in the same way using the same materials. In the main, this attack came from persons in the academic sphere of the university where the long-festering split between education departments and liberal studies had developed. For academics, subject matter knowledge was sufficient preparation for teaching.

As advocated by the critics of the early 1950s, the schools retreated from the progressive vision of general education to that of an education in basic skills. A chief but hidden factor underlying the back-to-basics retrenchment was reducing school expenditures (in the face of booming school enrollments and rising property taxes needed to support school construction and operation). Furthermore, the impact of censorship led the schools to accept the safe function of basic skills.

In 1956, the *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain* was published under the leadership of Benjamin Bloom. The *Handbook* represented the work of a committee of psychologists which had been charged by the 1948 American Psychological Association (APA) national convention to develop "a theoretical framework which could be used to facilitate communication among [educational] examiners."[58] Since educational objectives formed the basis of building curriculum and tests, objectives became the focus of the Committee. The resulting taxonomy identified "a classification of the student behaviors which represent the intended outcomes of the educational process."[59] Chairperson Bloom described the purpose of the Taxonomy:

> We are not attempting to classify the instructional methods used by teachers, the ways in which teachers relate to students, [and] the different kinds of instructional materials they use. We are not attempting to classify the particular subject matter or content. What we are classifying is the *intended behavior* of students.[60]

Thus, the Taxonomy was developed apart from subject matter, apart from methodology and materials, and apart from affective and psychomotor concerns.

The last vestige of a formal progressive movement disintegrated with the demise of the Progressive Education Association in 1955 and the outcry against life adjustment education. With a sigh of relief against all the "foolish talk" of curriculum-as-experience and student needs, Bestor proposed to "restore learning" in the schools through a curriculum centered on subject matter (the essential studies) and a process of teacher education based on the liberal arts.[61]

A concurrent event was the establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1950, which funded the Physics Science Study Committee (PSSC) project at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 1956 for the purpose of improving the teaching of physics in American high schools. The motivation was to bolster flagging enrollments in physics and to incorporate new knowledge about physics. This important project was approached as a course-of-study in physics by academic specialists in physics, without the involvement of classroom teachers or curriculum specialists.

At the conclusion of this decade, the concept of a unified relationship of curriculum and instruction had dominated the literature of education, and in particular, the curriculum field. Educators, who had devoted their professional careers to the improvement of education, realized the greatly-improved condition of public school education from the late 1800s through the mid-twentieth century both in terms of numbers of students educated and education quality. They had guided this growth in educating students and, as a result of their knowledge and experience, had acquired the conviction that a holistic, inclusive approach was the only way to improve day-to-day instruction in classrooms. The teacher needed to be a participant in both the determination and implementation processes for truly meaningful change.

As with any emergent situation, problems are endemic to education. The progressive legacy was that if a democratic problem-solving approach was used (incorporating the widest number of persons and the best available evidence), positive and workable solutions would be generated.

Yet, despite the fact that education had developed into a field of study with its own specialized literature, public education was viewed as the legitimate object of criticism for any person educated in or out of public schools. Unfortunately, the schools, because of their ubiquity, were a readily available source of blame for all problems in a society which faced enormous economic and social transformations, conflicts, and confusion after World War II. The schools were deemed poor because they had allegedly neglected to teach the basics. The teachers were to blame because of their "fake" education, because they were not "tough" enough regarding discipline, and because they were not "smart" enough.

In the main, this criticism was based on a subject-matter definition of curriculum at the expense of methodology and student interest or on levels of cognitive objectives apart from content or attitudes. These forces implicitly distinguished curriculum from instruction.

According to the holistic perspective, curriculum meant the experiences of the learners, and instruction referred to either the guidance of learning or modification of behavior in response to curricular transactions. When curriculum was viewed as experience, development consisted of changing all the factors that contributed to that experience and the subsequent growth of student learning. A course of study definition, in contrast, led only to a modification of courses of study. Because the definition or conception of curriculum determined specifically the nature of curriculum change, curriculum and course of study were not interchangeable terms.

Thus, this period began and ended with the educational literature supporting the holistic approach. In contrast, forces outside of the educational establishment began this period with increasing demands on the schools and ended with a devastating diatribe against the earlier educational initiatives. These attacks were falsely centered on a dualistic attention to subject matter apart from all the related factors for meaningful change—methodology, the teacher, the child, and society. Moreover, the very nature of knowledge, contended Dewey, is centered on methods of inquiry (e.g., we cannot have science without the methods of science-scientific inquiry).

Summary

A unified treatment of curriculum and instruction suffused the professional literature from the late twenties through the late 1950s. During this thirty-year period, professional texts and professional reference materials supported the holistic conception of the relationship. The generally-accepted view of curriculum was that it guided the learning experiences of the learner in the classroom. Curriculum was thus an encompassing term which represented curriculum and instruction.

The legacies of this viewpoint were that a broad conception of curriculum resolved planning-implementation problems, portrayed the teacher as a professional curriculum developer, and adhered to a problem-solving approach for building curriculum. This approach was generated by the educative situation and integrated the needs of specific learners, the requirements of a democratic society, and the suggestions of subject matter specialists. Attention was directed to the concept of general education—the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are needed by all citizens irrespective of individual differences and interest—which provided a common bond of understanding, respect, and conversation in our society.

Current educational researchers, policy makers, and educators would be well-served to review the legacies of the past that supported a holistic perspective as well as the forces that worked to thwart consensus-building initiatives for educational progress.

The history of the curriculum-instruction relationship appears to be an evolutionary process akin to pendulum swings. We swing back and forth between a unitary, but messy reality and a tidy, but artificial dualism. Since we live in a probabilistic and extraordinarily complex world of social beings, conclusive demonstration of the truth or falsity of a theory is almost never possible. Thus, the fads and swings are likely to continue.

Given this reality, Ralph Tyler reminds us that the important factor in education "is what kids are learning." The unified treatment of curriculum *and* instruction considers the why, what, how, and how well questions of that learning process.[62] An education which expands and enriches the lives of our children and extends the wealth and opportunities of our society to all people demands a holistic consideration of curriculum and instruction.

As Dewey reminds us, a dualism divides two things which are related in experience. The curriculum-instruction dualism divides subject matter from methods [although subject matter is the outcome of method] and ends from means [although ends shape means]. When the divisions are taken to be divisions in reality rather than distinctions in thought, the consequences, according to Dewey, are that learning becomes segmental rather than continuous, learning becomes detached from life and has to be made palatable through outside rewards, and teaching becomes a drudgery of perfecting techniques and responding to new directives. Rather than viewing education as a complex social problem, the tendency is to strive for the final answer to the educational problem. In the search for that key, we become influenced by conflicting prescriptions for reform, rather than viewing education as a broad and complex social/cultural problem requiring the serious and continuing attention of all citizens in a democratic society and the professional participation of teachers and supervisors.

Notes

[1] William T. Harris, "Textbooks and Their Uses," *Education, I* (September 1880): 9.

[2] Lawrence C. Stedman and Marshall S. Smith, "Recent Reform Proposals for American Education," *Contemporary Education Review, 2* (1983): 95.

[3] William H. Schubert, "Curriculum Research," in Harold E. Mitzel, Ed., *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 5th ed., (New York: Free Press, 1982), I: 424.

[4] Daniel Tanner and Laurel N.Tanner, *Curriculum Development: Theory Into Practice*, 2nd ed. (NewYork: Macmillan, 1980), p. 30.

[5] John K. Norton and Margaret Alltucker Norton, *Foundations of Curriculum Building* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1936), p. 547.

[6] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, (New York: The Free Press, 1916/1966), p. 165.

[7] Ibid., p. 167.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., pp. 168-169.

[10] Ibid., p. 62.

[11] Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[12] Hollis L. Caswell, "Emergence of the Curriculum as a Field of Professional Work and Study," in *Precedents and Promises in the Curriculum Field*, Helen F. Robison, Ed., (New York: Teachers College, 1966), pp. 2-3.

[13] Ibid., p. 10.

[14] Ibid., p. 3.

[15] Frances S. Bolin, "Perspectives and Imperatives on Defining Supervision," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 2 (Summer 1987): 368-373.

[16] Lawrence A. Cremin, "Curriculum-Making in the United States," *Teachers College Record, 73* (December 1971): 213.

[17] Harold O. Rugg, "*Preface,*" *Curriculum-Making: Past and Present, in Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, pt. 1 (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1927), p. viii.

[18] Ibid., p. 18.

[19] Ibid., p. 14.

[20] O. L. Davis, Jr., "ASCD and Curriculum Development: The Later Years," *ASCD in Retrospect* (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986), p. 84.

[21] Wilford M. Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), p. 77.

[22] William Henry Schubert, *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1980, p. 77.

[23]Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, *Curriculum Development* (New York: American Book Company, 1935), pp. 65-66.

[24] Norton and Norton, *Foundations of Curriculum Building*, p. 547.

[25] Ibid., pp. 447-448.

[26] Ibid., p. 548.

[27] A. Gordon Melvin, "The Curriculum Conceived as Desired Learnings," In *Readings In Curriculum Development*, Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, Eds., (New York: American Book Company, 1937), p. 154.

[28] Ibid., p. 155.

[29] Howard K. Bauernfeind, quoted in Hollis L. Caswell, "The Relation of the Curriculum and the Course of Study," in *Readings in Curriculum Development*, Caswell and Campbell, Eds., p. 74.

[30] Committee on the Curriculum, "Introduction," *Review of Educational Research, 1* (January 1931): 3.

[31] L. Thomas Hopkins, "Curriculum Making: General" *Review of Educational Research, 1* (January 1931): 5-8.

[32] William H. Bristow and O. I. Frederick, "Curriculum Development," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, Walter S. Monroe, Ed., (London: American Educational Research Association, 1941), p. 307.

[33] Carter V. Good, *Dictionary of Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1945.

[34] Gordon N. Mackenzie and J. Cecil Parker, "Toward a New Curriculum—An Introduction," *Toward a New Curriculum*, 1944 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1944), p. 4.

[35] Hilda Taba."The General Techniques Of Curriculum-Planning," pp. 82-83.

[36] Ibid., p. 113.

[37] Ibid., p. 85.

[38] Ibid., p. 87.

[39] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Organization of Learning Experiences," in *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*, Virgil E. Herrick and Ralph W. Tyler, Eds., (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 59.

[40] Virgil E. Herrick, "The Concept of Curriculum Design," in *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*, p. 38.

[41] Hollis L. Caswell, "Sources of Confusion in Curriculum Theory," in *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*, p. 113.

[42] William M. Alexander, "The Role of Leadership in Curriculum Planning," in *Toward Improved Curriculum Theory*, p. 100.

[43] Gordon N. Mackenzie and Marcella R. Lawler, "Curriculum: Change and Improvement," *Review of Educational Research, 18* (June 1948): 274.

[44] Barr et al., *Supervision: Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Learning*, 2nd ed., p. 865.

[45] Ralph W. Tyler, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), 1949, p. 1.

[46] Ibid., p. 63.

[47] Ibid., p. 126.

[48] Ibid., p. 38.

[49] Ibid., p. 595.

[50] F. G. Lester Anderson, Gertrude Whipple, and Robert Gilchrist, "The School as a Learning Laboratory," *Learning And Instruction*, in *Forty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, pt. 1(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 342.

[51] Schubert, *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years*, p. 130.

[52] B. Othaniel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores, *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development* (Yonkers-on-the-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1950), p. 4.

[53] Ibid., p. 741.

[54] George A. Beauchamp, *Planning the Elementary School Curriculum* (New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1956), p. 195.

[55] Ibid., p. 41.

[56] Bellack, "Selection and Organization of Curriculum Content," p. 103.

[57] Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983), p. 73.

[58] Benjamin S. Bloom, Ed., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain* (New York: David McKay and Company, 1956), p. 4.

[59] Ibid., p. 12.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Arthur Bestor, *The Restoration of Learning* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1956).

[62] Ralph W. Tyler, "Recollections of Fifty Years of Work in Curriculum." *Journal of Thought, 21* (Spring 1986) p. 73.

Joan M. Cady is Associate Professor of Education at the University of St. Thomas is St. Paul, Minnesota. She currently chairs the department of undergraduate education and teaches courses in elementary and K-12 curriculum.