The Achievement of Hilda Taba¹

William F. Pinar https://edcp.educ.ubc.ca/william-pinar/

A scientific attitude toward curriculum making should at least cultivate a greater respect for the task and a greater humility in the face of it, to prevent such thoughtless and wild swings of the pendulum as seem to be characteristic of American curriculum development.

Hilda Taba (1962, 420)

Introduction

The work by which Hilda Taba is most remembered – her 1962 *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* – represents a remarkable and lasting achievement in curriculum studies. It comes near the end of her long career but abbreviated life, and contains within it traces of her varied and voluminous earlier work, including an important essay published in 1945 elaborating the "General Techniques of Curriculum Planning" as well as residues of her strongly theoretical 1932 book *The Dynamics of Education*. In what I am presenting today – part of a larger project on reconstructing the canon of curriculum studies in the United States – I will outline this achievement and sketch Taba's theory's location within the intellectual history of U.S. field, within her own intellectual history, and within the historical moment in which it was produced. For the former I will focus on that 1945 essay – published in the forth-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education - as it implies her theoretical relationship with Tyler as well as the shifts in her own intellectual history. For the latter I will acknowledge those moments in which the 1962 statement – and

its 1945 predecessor – are made, e.g. the Sputnik-stimulated national curriculum reform undertaken by Kennedy Administration.

In the United States Hilda Taba is remembered for her sophisticated extension, indeed complication, of the Tyler Rationale². This "extension" is acknowledged to be not only theoretical but impressively practically, informed by Taba's extensive professional experience in curriculum development. (In contrast to Tyler focused first on quantitative studies of college teaching³ on evaluation and test preparation.⁴) Taba's formulation of curriculum change⁵ includes attention to the classroom teacher, evidenced by the presence of an entire chaptered devoted to the development of a teaching-learning unit (chapter 20). At one point Taba asserts this unit as the first, not last, step in curriculum development, an important if not altogether convincing point to which I will return later. Not only in that chapter are also included illustrative courses of study, exemplary for their "balance"⁶ – one of Taba's keywords – and detail.

Undermining this affirmation of the teacher's pivotal position in curriculum development is Taba's elaborate and systematic specification of the close and logical relationship between her theory and the practice of curriculum development. The latter is illustrated in the aforementioned courses of study. The former Taba delineates carefully and in detail as rationales for sequenced steps in curriculum making, steps that are related to each other as well as to teaching and learning in actual schools. Taba's curriculum theory and practice is highly systematized, rationalized, specified. In her integrated system there is no gap between theory and practice; in Taba's formulation they are explicitly interwoven.

Also distinctive is Taba's emphasis upon the foundations of curriculum development. Before she begins to discuss "objectives" – what is for Tyler the first "principle" – Taba provides, in effect, an entire foundations textbook, focusing on the function of the school in society, the analysis of society and culture as source of educational objectives, an overview of various learning theories, the last topic of which leads her to analyze the very concepts of development, intelligence and mental development, the transfer of learning, social and cultural learning, the extension⁸ of learning, and the nature of knowledge (chapters 1-12).

In Part Two Taba (1962) focuses on what many misunderstand as Tyler's four questions. Taba's discussion of "objectives" requires separate chapters (13-16) on the types of behavioral objectives and the question of diagnosis in curriculum development (including the use of informal diagnostic devises). Taba positions diagnosis – and specifically teachers' identification of their classroom problems – as prior to objectives in significance and sequence. Then Taba grapples with the selection of curriculum experiences – what becomes Tyler's second question - wherein she discusses (chapters 14-18) the organization of curriculum content and learning, requiring attention not only to "content" but to "social realities" and the "needs and interests of students" as well.9 Out of step with Tyler's yet-to-be-stated "principles" she moves next to the evaluation of outcomes, the chapter (19) which precedes the aforementioned chapter theorizing and illustrating the development of a teaching-learning unit. For Taba, it becomes clear, evaluation is not necessarily the final step in a lock-step sequence, as it appears to be in Tyler's scheme. In fact, evaluation – and it is in Taba broadly conceived - can inform the very design of the curriculum, analysis

of which she locates in Part II in two separate chapters (21-22). The first surveys "current patterns" of curriculum organization and the second offers a "conceptual framework" for curriculum design, the chapter in which she acknowledges past efforts and dwells on the distinctiveness of hers, characterized by its "comprehensiveness."

In Part Four Taba (1962) focuses on curriculum change, with one chapter devoted to "strategy" which leads to the final chapter on working with groups. This ending implies a more teacher- and student-centered process of curriculum development. Despite its systematicity, Taba's theory installs opportunities for teachers to reconstruct the curriculum according to the singularities of their own classrooms and schools.

While Taba never formally abandons the procedural rationality Tyler's four questions will later enforce, she does extend and complicate these questions well beyond Tyler's economical formulation to reflect her wide-ranging professional experience informed as well by what I take to be common sense, for Taba associated with scientific reasoning, as well as her earlier and extensive theoretical research, the latter revised by thirty years of experience. What Taba had to offer was a breadth of experience, erudition, and vision that could not be contained on a napkin (where, presumably, Tyler's sketched his questions). Indeed, the intricacy and detail of Taba's formulation complicates Tyler's conception beyond its capacity to incorporate. Despite this apparent ambivalence, Taba ties everything to what she construes as a rational conception of curriculum that may reflect Tyler's influence on her thought. Or is it hers upon his? As we see in section I, the four questions Tyler lists in 1949 were already elaborated in 1945 by Hilda Taba.

Throughout the 1962 book¹² Taba acknowledges the intensifying criticism of U.S. public schools that began in the 1950s, referencing Sputnik on two occasions. There are also references to specific curriculum reforms of the Kennedy era, impressive given how early into the reform this book appeared. There are other "timely" acknowledgements as well. For example there is regular referencing of racial¹³ and other ethnic issues (especially as they pertain to curriculum problems and design), and even an assumption that ethnocentricity¹⁴ is an educational problem to be overcome. What would become keywords thirty years later – multiculture¹⁵, cosmopolitanism¹⁶, technology¹⁷ – show up in the *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice.* There is acknowledgement of action research¹⁸, a topic that becomes trendy decades later. Taba even quotes the great Frankfurt School theoretician Theodor Adorno¹⁹, whose work would very much inform the so-called "critical pedagogy" movement that would emerge in the 1980s. While there is a breath of scholarly – including historical²⁰ - reference, Taba's erudition is clearly derived from experience as well as academic study (and, specifically, her commitment to science). Indeed, the two are intertwined, as her critique of the so-called experience curriculum, her citation of Dewey²¹, and emphasis upon scientific curriculum development reference.²² The former structures her overall "system of thinking" about curriculum development while the latter becomes registered in the teaching-learning unit.

I

1945

In accordance with common usage, I employed the phrase (see above) – the Tyler Rationale - but after studying Taba's work it is clear to me that it is

inaccurate. Taba (1962, vi) contests it herself in the opening pages of Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice, in words no doubt carefully chosen. "The idea that there must be a system of thinking about curriculum planning," she tell us, "occurred to Dr. R. W. Tyler after a rather confusing meeting on curriculum planning in the 1930s in which conflicting proposals for curriculum designs were being debated." It occurred not only to Tyler, as Taba adds in the next sentence: "Following this meeting: Dr. Tyler and the writer began to elaborate a scheme for a sequence of questions to be asked and an order of steps to be taken in planning curriculum" (1962, vi, emphasis added). The reference to the "confusing meeting" is temporally ambiguous; it could refer to the luncheon referenced in endnote 2. But "following" and "began" imply an extended conversation, perhaps occurring over years, a durational period Taba herself invokes when she follows the above sentence with "over a period of years, working as a curriculum consultant in several school systems and teaching courses in curriculum development, the author has continued testing and refining the scheme and building a theoretical rationale for it" (1962, vi). That "testing and refining," it turns out, occurred during her extensive work on what was then termed "human relations."

Tyler's Rationale was published in 1949. In 1945 Hilda Taba presents questions that address the coming post-war situation in the United States, one that anticipates the militarized situation during which she completed the 1962 book. That is the year of the Cuban Missile Crisis, five years after Sputnik, and one year into the Kennedy Administration's national curriculum reform that conflated military with educational and athletic vulnerabilities (Pinar 2012, 102-132). Seventeen years earlier – given the lag between composition and

publication Taba's earlier essay may have been written during 1944, making its prescience even more pronounced – Taba (1945, 80) foresaw that "wartime" developments in "technology" had been registered the teaching of science and mathematics. Systematic revisions in the teaching of these subjects – as well as the inflation of their curricular significance – were undertaken during the 1960s and continue today with the emphasis STEM.²³

The question of "human relations" also weighs on Taba's sense of life after World War II. She points to demographics – relocation but also cultural shifts that she will acknowledge throughout the 1962 book – in producing a greater heterogeneity among students" a development that requires educators to become more sensitive to addressing "personal" as well as academic "needs" (1945, 81). There are other factors that accompany the war's disruptions, among them premature economic and moral "independence," returning soldiers and warindustry workers whose emotions educators cannot fully anticipate, implying that past patterns of "discipline" and "motivation" can't be counted on (1945, 81). Much of Taba's time during the postwar period will be focused on exactly these issues, publishing several titles on human relations with the American Council on Education. That "intergroup" work also informs her theory of curriculum development that receives such extensive formulation in the 1962 book.

These profound shifts in society will require extensive curriculum change, Taba is sure. Acknowledging that public schools are "often criticized" for their "ineffectiveness," Taba points out (1945, 81) that nonetheless education is expected to play a "major" role in "reorienting" American to a peace. She is thinking here not only shifts in the economy (and the work opportunities those will provide), but the cultivation of "intelligent international viewpoints," and

specifically – her own Estonian years must weigh heavily if silently here – "rebuilding attitudes" toward "nations" and "people" (1945, 81).

Such a scale of aspiration²⁴ is admirable but incurs promises no profession could keep. For Taba in 1945, what is clear was not the impossibility of their scale, but their pace. These challenges, she writes, force themselves upon schools "too rapidly" for the "usual processes" of curriculum revision to be "effective" (1945, 81). Those "usual processes" – what she describes as the "slow sequence" of "shifting ideas" from "experts" to textbook writers and "national curriculum groups" to teacher training institutions, and finally to teachers – will have to be not only accelerated but restructured. In the postwar period, Taba announces in 1945, curriculum revision will be conducted "increasingly" by those "in charge" of school "programs" – teachers, supervisors, and administrators (1945, 81). Moreover, curriculum revision will be forced to become a "continuous process" rather than the "earthquake' method" of undertaking revisions once in a decade" (1945 81). In 1945 teachers, supervisors and administrators still enjoyed jurisdiction over the school curriculum; it was they who are responsible for the "functioning" curriculum. In 1945 curriculum development as a professional obligation, not political opportunity for politicians²⁵ eager to appeal to their constituencies or to profiteers who wish to privatize public budgets.²⁶

Significantly – not only in terms of democratic theory but also presaging her emphasis in the 1962 book – curriculum development is "democratic" in the sense that it is to be local, not federal, as it would become after the election of John F. Kennedy in 1960. "[I]t is clear," Taba (1945, 81) states as prediction but perhaps also as preference, that "increasingly local adaptations" in content as well as in the "procedures" of teaching will be common, if the present "trend"

toward "community" and "individualization" (for Taba programs that serve the "needs" of specific populations) continues. There is systematicity implied in that statement – specifically in the phrases "local adaptations" (which must be of something standard) and "trends" (implying curricular alignment with society, an ambivalent and dangerous game as Bobbitt's embrace of "adult activities" made clear²⁷) – and that systematicity becomes encoded in the questions Taba will ask and Tyler will repeat four years later as his own. These questions become full-blown chapters in the 1962 book.

In 1945, Taba (1945, 82) is asking: "Under such circumstances²⁸, how can a sound curriculum and an adequate general education be assured? How can thoughtless, trivial, and hasty responses to pressure and fads be prevented?" It turns out they could not, but even in the 1962 book – with the aftermath of Sputnik still underway – Taba cannot conceive curriculum development as other than a thoughtful, systematic, scientific enterprise. In part that is her scientific commitment, and in part it might be response to wartime experience which, she tells us, "illustrated the dangers of hasty and thoughtless innovations" (1945, 82). She cites "defense and victory programs" (1945, 82) in health, nutrition, physical education, mathematics and science that overlapped existing programs and thereby disrupted "continuity" (1945, 82). That same simplistic association of physical and mental "rigor" would be in play in Cold-War curriculum reform (Pinar 2012, 124-132). Taba (1945, 82) also cites new programs on Latin America and the United Nations, inattentive to "maturity level" or "learning principles." These considerations - emphases upon developmental readiness and the psychology of learning more generally - will be featured even more prominently in the 1962 book.

Taba's commitment to systematicity is expressed in questions that sequence processes of curriculum development as an organizational undertaking.²⁹ The key curricular question – what knowledge is of most worth? – she construes as requiring a standardized answer, one she then rejects, writing that postwar difficulties cannot be addressed by a "standard curriculum" but by practice of the "techniques of curriculum-making which assure soundness as well as flexibility, validity as well as imagination" (1945, 82, emphasis added). That specifying the techniques of curriculum-making amounts to standardization seems to escape her. "Flexibility" as well as the "imagination" can somehow be assured through standardization which, by definition, inhibits each. Eschewing the canonical question – what knowledge is of most worth? - the committee³⁰, Taba (1945, 82) reports, "realizes" that "means" must be established to ensure that "new knowledge" and "research" will "flow" into curriculum development without dictating the exact pattern of either the "selection" or the "organization." This sounds like the work of a committee alright, appearing everyone by stripping out the key questions, privileging process over product.

Presumably, academic knowledge is qualifies as "new knowledge" but note that its point is "curriculum construction" not, say, congruence with the latest scientific or humanistic thinking. For Taba, this will mean diagnoses of society, learning theory, and information regarding the specific students being taught are included in "knowledge" and "research" that is "basic to curriculum construction." Given the progressive emphasis on "doing" – not unconnected with the emphasis on "behavior," if expansively defined – that she shared academic knowledge sometimes seems subsidiary.

The second move Taba – representing, apparently, the committee – makes is to abstain on the question of curriculum design: core, broad fields, activity or experience. Remaining focused on ensuring "flow" the committee proposes not to outline a curriculum in the "new fields," but to emphasize the "techniques" and "procedures" of curriculum "thinking" and "planning" (1945, 82). In this scheme, then, the committee not emphasized procedural rather than substantive issues, it also continued the historical split between "what" and "how." While endorsing "new knowledge," Taba will position its importance as "promoting … changes in individuals" (1945, 83) or contributing to "essential" ideas and concepts that underlie the "details" of "content." Determined to vanquish any curriculum comprised of facts – "useless and trivial learning" – Taba relegates academic knowledge to a something like a special-interest group, content specialists (see 1945, 90).

The province of curriculum development is now reduced to protocol. Taba (1945, 82) will "outline" the "general techniques," "principles," and "procedure" of curriculum construction regardless of subject area or the maturity of the students. Professionalism has devolved into proceduralism. The conviction that the curriculum expresses the erudition and intellectual independence of the individual teacher in complicated conversation with her field and her students remains segregated in universities. Taba repositions questions of intellectual substance as "essential" ideas and concepts that underlay facts, concepts that committees will ascertain and teachers reconstruct when they devise their teaching-learning units. As we will see, in position Taba accords (in the 1962 book) to teaching-learning units, she tries to protect teaching from its collapse

into implementation – its fate in the Tyler Rationale – but remains faithful to proceduralism.

The relationship between school and society is the first consideration the Taba Rationale. In asserting it as a relationship of service (see Taba 1945, 83), she has rejected Counts' insistence that schools should reconstruct society. For the Taba of 1945, the key question is keeping the relationship "up-to-date" and thereby serving social "needs" no longer extant or "perpetuating values" no longer relevant (1945, 83). This relationship between school and society means continual curriculum "change," a vacuous term that will become the mantra of curriculum development for decades to come. "Second," Taba (1945, 83) continues, to educate means "changing" people as "individuals." To change people we must know what makes this tick, and so, she adds, it is "therefore important" in curriculum development to employ "all available knowledge" about the "nature" of the "learners" and the "learning processes." In 1945 this conclusion must have still sounded progressive, as professing concern for the flesh-and-blood creatures in classrooms, repudiating that model of curriculum that concerned itself, presumably, with only transmission of facts. But today – in an era when privacy is imperiled, when suspicions of surveillance are common – this "scientific" interest in students sounds definitely not democratic, even authoritarian and. If professionalism has devolved into "procedures" then intellectual independence can only be "noise" in a smoothly functioning system.32

Taba (1945, 83) acknowledges that "all learning experiences take place through some content or subject matter, whether this content is taught as an end in itself or as a means of promoting other desired changes in individuals." The

main thing is change, not content, "how you know" not "what you know," each domain distinct from the other.³⁴ The nineteenth century embrace of ancient languages has vanished, replaced by a "democratic" embrace of anything, as long as "change" is the consequence. Whatever produces "change" constitutes the "essential ideas" and "concepts underlying the details of any content," and it is the analysis of these concepts – including determining their curricular relevance – that represents the professional jurisdiction and obligation of curriculum-makers (1945, 83). It is this second task that becomes specifies in protocol.

What is the first step in curriculum development? Given the structuring status of the school-society relationship, it is unsurprising Taba starts with studies of "society" (1945, 85) which in this essay is historical and not only sociological as it would later become. 35 In discussing consumer education, she references wartime practices such as rationing and price controls, as well as black markets and labor shortages, all of which suggests to her that "skills" are needed in "wise consumership" as well as "changes" in consumer "attitudes" and "ethics" (1945, 85). Here we see that the school-society relationship – recall she casts it as one of "service" - does include elements of "reconstruction" by another, perhaps less controversial, concept, "change," including here "change" in "attitudes and ethics." The emphasis upon "skills" over "knowledge" (the latter concept absent here) reflects the "progressive" transposition of knowledge into skills. No longer does it matter what you know but what you can function. Mindless memorization may be banished, but contentless and compulsively purposive behavior is on its way.

The final "progressive" point Taba makes is the de-emphasis upon a "personal, individualistic" conception of "freedom" – perhaps one associated with the child-centered wing of progressivism – and an affirmation of "economic" conceptions of "democratic equality," supplementing "political" ones (1945, 86). Taba then references World War II and the shifting demographics the war has brought, as well post-war aspirations for peace.³⁶ Taba's attunement to the historical moment is, it seems to me, rare among progressive thinkers, who tended toward presentism³⁷. She follows it specific acknowledgement of the increasing curricular importance of "international" and "interracial" relations. This suggests a cosmopolitan dimension Taba's thinking, a term she employs the term throughout the 1962 book (see note 15).

These are not the only references to the historical moment in this NSSE Yearbook chapter. Taba anticipates the "pressures" that will accompany the "great" society, the latter a phrase U.S. President Lyndon Baines Johnson would make his own. Her example – "conservation" of human and natural "resources" (1945, 87) – seems prescient as well, not only in anticipating what is now a compelling challenge of all societies: sustainability. The former phrase anticipates the triumph of human capital theory³⁸ that now dominates schooling globally (Spring 2007, 72, 77). Her point here, however, is that societal concerns are also local concerns, concluding that it is insufficient for curriculum developers to know the relevant research or even the analyses of "frontier" thinkers (1945, 87). Curriculum developers in the postwar period must also know their local communities if they are to "uncover" the "unique" problems facing education there (1945 87). Taba's declaration of responsibility to the local would be mirrored in curriculum development projects in Mexico (see Pinar 2011a, 232).

Supplementing studies of society must be, she asserts, studies of learners.³⁹ These are pertinent in two ways. Curriculum developers need to know "how" learning occurs, including its prerequisite "conditions" (1945, 87).

Secondly, to establish conditions favorable to "effective growth," curriculum developers must become aware of the "basic needs, concerns, motivations, and ambitions of the individual learners" (1945, 87). In light of current concerns for the lack of privacy, this ambition seems excessive. Then it was no doubt innocent and born of determination to address students as individuals. Taba's commitment planning also becomes evident here; one of her illustrations of the importance of learning theory⁴⁰ is unanticipated or "negative learnings" (1945, 87) that can occur while teachers are focused on other objectives.⁴¹ "It is therefore important," Taba (1945, 87) concludes, "to examine the desirability of all these outcomes and to plan for multiple desirable outcomes so as to avoid negative learning." This systematicity structures Taba's professional ethics.

The third source of "educational objectives" and the "selection" and "organization" of "learning experiences" – what will become Tyler's second and third questions: see endnote 1 - derives from studies of subject-matter content. The status of subject-matter content seems subsidiary, as it is linked to "objectives" and to "learning experiences," reduced in scale (it is one of three concepts) and stripped of any intrinsic importance. "Any content in any subject matter," Taba (1945, 89) declares, "includes both fundamental knowledge which consists in the main of basic concepts, generalizations, and principles, and the details which, while useful in acquiring these more permanent values, are not themselves worth acquiring permanently." Facts have been reduced to "details" whose significance is their utility in acquiring "concepts, generalizations, and

principles." Evidently there can be no facts – even the Holocaust? - of enduring significance. We have entered the empty space of "skills," a fundamentally behavioral concept stripped of subjective or conceptual content and the learning of which can be measured by standardized exams. Taba seems no fan of standardized exams⁴², but her participation here in the ongoing "progressive" assault on "traditionalists" – who valued facts and insisted on recitation and memorization – will produce in the U.S. unanticipated results, what we might, borrowing her own phrase, call "negative learning," namely *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to the Top* with their contentless emphasis upon "skills."

After dismantling the "fact" as a fundamental unit of curriculum organization, Taba hunts even bigger game, the school subjects that house facts. Recall that on the page preceding she has posited "concepts, generalizations, and intellectual techniques⁴³" (1945, 90) as the true "essentials" of education⁴⁴, and so school subjects too slip in their enduring significance. "Whether these concepts, generalizations, and intellectual techniques are taught within conventional subjects, or whether they are used in some other organization," Taba (1945, 90) explains, "care must be taken to preserve their unique features and, thereby, their real contributing to the training of mind and feeling." This is a reference to the notion then current that each of the school subjects disciplined the mind in "unique" ways, but Taba has shifted the emphasis from the distinctiveness of each school subject as important in itself to, instead, its "disciplining" potential, e.g. its value for learning "concepts, generalizations, and principles or intellectual techniques." The demotion for the school subjects and their defenders becomes complete when, rather patronizingly, she allows that:

Content specialists can be useful in determining what these essentials are and how they can contribute to general education. They can give suggestions regarding the permanent ideas and values of a given field. (Taba 1945, 90)

No longer the monarch, the school subject is another servant to the court that is learning linked to the world "around" us. 45 Almost as an afterthought, she invites content specialists to "suggest which intellectual skills a given field can contribute to general education and in what unique ways the study of that field may serve to enhance knowledge of the world about us" (1945, 90). Even this diminished role 46 is undermined, as Taba (1945, 90) cautions her readers that subject-matter specialists may suffer a "distorted perspective caused by 'occupational incapacity', that is, by the inability to see education as a whole." If there is an epistemological failure in Taba's thinking, it is this fantasy that she – or anyone – can "see education as a whole."

Taba emphasizes that curriculum development demands "summary" and "translation" prior to the program's "wide application" (1945, 90). She assigned these tasks – "summary" and "translation" - to research and planning groups; I assign them to curriculum studies professors (Pinar 2001, 2006a,b). In Taba's scheme not only subject matter is to be summarized and translated, so are "social analysis" and research on "child development," so that we might construct a "coherent theory of curriculum construction" (1945, 90). Formulating a coherent theory is hardly the final phase of our professional calling as she quickly cautions that our work will surely fall on "deaf ears" if we fail to engage "school groups" in their own "research" and "experimentation" – however "modest" – so that teachers and other school personnel may come to appreciate how scholarship can

enable them to solve educational problems (1945, 90). In my terms, Taba is emphasizing that teachers must answer for themselves the canonical curriculum question: what knowledge is of most worth? In Taba's terms, she is positioning school personnel not as consumers but as producers of curriculum as they take these summaries and translations into their classrooms. Absent in Tyler, this move – according agency to teachers – Taba will emphasize in the 1962 book in the teaching-learning unit, as we will see.

After studies of society, learners, and subject matter, we are ready to formulate objectives. In language that anticipates Tyler's (see 1949, 33), Taba (1945, 90-91) reminds readers that the "direction" in which education is expected to "change people" is indicated in its "objectives." The objectives, she emphasizes, "usually" determine curriculum and instruction (1945, 91). Because objectives "guide" the selection of content, as well as specify "behavior reactions" to that content, statements of objectives must be "clear" (1945, 91). Here we have what Tyler later claims as his questions. He link between objectives and outcomes (in Taba's phrase "behavior reactions") is now iron clad. Teaching is recast as the implementation of objectives and the production of outcomes.

In her discussion of objectives, it becomes clear that the content objectives specify is not facts but "behavior," an expansive concept (as it will be in Tyler: 1950, 5) that includes "mastery of knowledge, thinking, attitudes, interests, and skills" (1945, 91). Distinguishing among these is important, Taba allows, "because types of behavior require different types of experiences for their achievement" (1945, 91). "All-around growth" is evidently the aim of education to which the curriculum contributes (see 1945, 92, 95), requiring curriculum

developers "to think through its possible contribution to a variety of desirable objectives: information to be mastered, generalizations to be developed, types of critical evaluation of ideas needed, attitudes to be developed, and concerns, interests, and skills to be fostered" (1945, 92). I am struck by the sheer scale of such a scheme: test scores seem rather specific, incapable of corresponding to "concerns, interests, and skills to be fostered." One could devise tests that measure that "information to be mastered" or those "generalizations to be developed." ⁵¹

Despite her criticism of an interest-based curriculum, Taba preserves the concept as a kind of developmental consideration, asserting that "learning experiences" should be "appropriate" given the "interests" and "needs" of children (1945, 95).⁵² She knows this is easier said than done, as she adds: "Somehow sound education must build a bridge between existing motivation and concern of the learner and the essentials of education" (1945, 96, emphasis added). Good luck with that. Seriously, I would suggest that it is through the "complicated conversation" that can occur in the classroom that such "bridges" are to be built, but for Taba would seem too improvisational, too risky of "negative learnings." Taba would want bridges to be constructed in advance and auditioned in those teaching-learning units, coordinated with the overall curriculum as planned. In declaring that "learning experiences" must provide for "continuity" and "sequential development" (1945, 96), Taba (1945, 97) is also complaining that it is the "lack" of continuity that mars present-day programs. Such programs resemble a "mosaic" of "separate units" rather than "patterned, continuous design."53 For me, patterning and continuity occur within the person through study and so "mosaic" would do. 54 Taba would not disagree, and she

would insist that the "pattern, continuous design" also be evident in the plan and its constituent teaching-learning units.

Continuity is not something constructed along the way, let alone a retrospectively (as I would emphasize), but plotted carefully and systematically from the outset. First, Taba insists there must be continuity within subject matter itself, "providing a reasonable, logical basis for moving from one idea to the next one" (1945, 97). In fact, the "greater the relationship between concepts, ideas, and skills in successive topics or content, the greater is the possibility of a cumulative development of basic concepts. This applies to the sequence of subjects, as well as to the sequence within a subject (1945, 97). Everything must be related to everything else, and these interrelationships must be planned in advance.

Recall that for Taba the educational point of new knowledge – of "learning experiences" generally – is its contribution to "growth," and that conviction is clear when she aligns "continuity" with the "sequence of growth toward the generally recognized educational objectives." She continues: "To develop skills in thinking, desirable work habits, and appropriate attitudes requires a psychological sequence of experience to be carried out over long periods. The development of effective habits and techniques of investigating

and communicating ideas illustrates the need for such a cumulative plan" (Taba 1945, 97). Note that "skills", "habits" and "attitudes" in "development" over time are indications of "development" and "growth." Note too the confidence that these can be engineered through the sequenced interrelatedness of learning experiences, not only "horizontally" (e.g. during the school day⁵⁵), but "vertically" (in the future). Here Taba is emphasizing duration, "experience to be carried out over long periods."⁵⁶

Continuity also requires attention to what today would be called developmentally appropriate practice, but for Taba (1945, 98) the "adaptation of teaching techniques to maturity levels is not sufficient to meet the problem." Rather than the more expansive concept of "practices," Taba is focused here on the conceptual difficulty of the curriculum-as-planned: "Topics and content must be assessed also according to their maturity level and be selected and placed accordingly" (1945, 98). This seems like a more complex and specifically curricular version of Hollywood's rating systems: this lesson is PG13 in developmental terms. Taba is worried not about litigation or moralism but the complexity of the classroom, attributing the importance of such developmentally variegated content to concern for "the diversity of the backgrounds" (1945, 98). The greater the diversity of the students' backgrounds, she adds, the more crucial this consideration. And in the postwar period, Taba expects educators to face greater diversity than ever before, so that the problem of "placing curriculum experiences so as to provide appropriate maturity sequence for all groups is going to be vital, indeed" (1945, 98). And entirely impossible, I would add.

We can see that Taba's fidelity to the earlier progressive affirmation of child-centeredness and to students' interests is conveyed in these considerations of curricular continuity. She wants to know not only who will be her school colleagues' classroom but, as we say, where they're coming from. Taba is likewise loyal to the progressive idea that "learning experiences should have maximum relationship to life and living" (1945, 98), not always or even obviously a philosophical problem but also (as our Brazilian colleagues might say: Pinar 2011b, 206-209) a question of the quotidian, and for Americans in 1945,

surely a vocational-economic one. Taba (1945, 99) remains encompassing, not specific, in her assertion that "relating curriculum to life has always been considered the major function of education. Note it is not "a" function but "the" major function of education, so we cannot be surprised when she posits that consideration as directing and justifying the selection of "curriculum experience," (1945, 99). But in the next sentence this entirely Deweyan phraseology (1968, 91) slides slightly in a Franklin Bobbitt direction, as she allows that the selection of "behavior objectives should be guided by what is thought to be the important characteristic skills and abilities for adequate living" (1945, 99). As did Bobbitt and many others, here she risks demoting education to preparation for life and not life itself (Dewey 1968, 24, 34, 60). This expansive view led some into teaching "dating" and other "life" activities that made the influential U.S. historian Richard Hofstadter critical (Pinar 2012, 185).

The question of transfer – a long-standing and crucial curricular question – concerns Taba. Still moving away from "traditional" emphases upon subject matter as intrinsically important, she acknowledges that "expectations of automatic transfer from academic learning situations to situations in which learning is to be used have been grossly overestimated" (1945, 99). I think this must have reference to Thorndike's⁵⁷ disproving of transfer's effect, a move against nineteenth faculty psychology with its emphasis on recitation and memorization.⁵⁸ While "facts" were the casualty – for transfer to occur the facts must be specific to the new situation – evidently "ideas" remain transferable, although it is not evident to me how the two can exist independently of each other.⁵⁹ Taba (1945, 99) allows that the "significant ideas" about "race relationships," about "natural resources," about "democratic government" and

"scientific phenomena" are "general enough" to transfer to a "variety of specific contexts." (Note that Taba's topics of illustration remain today important subjects. (Note that Taba's topics of illustration remain today important subjects. The trick of transfer, she seems to be implying, is to link "details" with their "life meaning" (1945, 99) through teaching students how to "make life applications," "permanent" and "general learning" will not be jeopardized. The care with which she has navigated the topic of transfer implies it remained a contentious topic at that time.

For Taba, the question of transfer is answered in the organization of learning experiences, the planning of which includes attention to scope and sequence. Many of the concepts she has presented earlier in the essay – objectives (here cast as "the organizing focus" [1945, 102]) for instance – show up in her discussion of scope and sequence. Continuity is key – recall Taba rues the fragmentation of the postwar curriculum – and the "sequential development of basic ideas and concepts is one of the aspects of curriculum continuity" (1945, 104). But continuity is not confined to conceptual elements but is extended to developmental considerations, both cognitive and psycho-social, as she asserts that the "provision for growth in the complexity and maturity of the reactions required is another aspect of sequence" (1945, 104). Here Taba acknowledges the canonical concern for curricular sequencing from the "concrete and familiar to the abstract and remote, from the emotionally and it intellectual acceptable to the emotionally and intellectually new or foreign" (1945, 104). Curricular breath is the question of scope, and Taba extends the concept well beyond the cognitive to include – referencing the publications of the Commission on the Secondary-School Curriculum of the Progressive Education Association – the personal, social, civic, and economic (1945, 105). Taba (1945, 106) wants to plan a

"sufficient variety of learning experiences and reactions, academic as well as nonacademic, in as well as out of school," a noble aspiration perhaps but in principle impossible. In its comprehensiveness it risks creating the "total institutions" prisons are construed to be, invoking what decades later would be termed "governmentality."

Taba backs off from this totalizing vision and returns to more practical questions of organization, emphasizing "horizontal continuity," the bookends of which are "specialization" and "integration" (1945, 106). Having criticized participants in the Eight-Year Study for their "organizationalism" (Pinar 2011c, 191), I was surprised to see that Taba too critiques "organizational reshuffling" (1945, 107). And evidently even the "reshuffling" was somewhat haphazard, as, she declares, the main options of curriculum organization - by subjects, by broad fields, correlation of two or more subjects, and by the core or unified curriculum - "do not exist in pure form anywhere" (1945, 108). This fact supports her endorsement of flexibility, allowing "a variety of specific approaches to curriculum and teaching" (1945, 108). With flexibility, Taba has set the stage for the centrality of "specific units of study" (1945, 108) which, in the 1962 book become "teaching-learning units" or, even more centrally, the "functioning curriculum" (1962, 9) itself.64 In contrast to Tyler and to her sequencing here, in the 1962 book Taba will endorse reversing the sequence in the curriculum development. First there is not the formulation of objectives but an invitation to teachers to experiment with specific aspects of curriculum and then, on the basis of these experiments, [developing] a framework" (1962, 9). If so, Taba (1962, 9), suggests, "curriculum development would acquire a new dynamic." I will return to this key point – one that Urve Läänemets and Katrin Kalamees-Ruubel (in press) make – but in 1945 Taba is laying the groundwork for it.

Taba outlines the "steps" and "tasks" in planning "specific units of study," the first of which is surveying the "needs" and "problems of life" of the students (1945, 108). Here Taba points to "specific community needs" as well as the "needs" of the "particular groups of learners" (1945, 109). After determining these, the second step is their incorporation into a "special series of learning experience" (1945, 109). Formulating "unique objectives" from these is crucial (1945, 109). Notice we are back to Tyler (as in "back to the future") now: after formulating objectives is selecting "experiences appropriate for attaining these objectives" (1945, 109). Taba (1945, 109) reminds that in the past there has been a "hiatus between the general objectives and the particular experiences designed to attain them." After taking these two steps, she concludes, "it is possible to start sketching out the learning activities to be included in the unit" (1945, 109). Taba wants the move from "general" objectives to classroom activities to be as seamless as possible.

Showing her systematicity, Taba pauses – after "outlining the ideas and the activities" (1945, 110) – to "check the consistency of these with the objectives and with the problems and needs which lie at the base of the unit." As she underscores earlier, the "functioning the curriculum must represent an integration of content, objectives, life needs, and pupil needs" (1945, 110). That is quite a conception, and one with which one plans, not retrospectively judges, an educational event. Somehow it does not strike Taba as impossible as it so obviously is. Instead, she is ready to proceed: "Planning the actual teaching sequence is the next step" (1945, 111). Here she relies not on subject matter nor

outcomes but on the psychology of learning, invoking (as she has earlier) "such general psychological principles as preceding from the concrete to the more abstract, from the personal and immediate to the impersonal and remote, from the practice of already mastered skills and techniques to new ones" (1945, 111). From these, she tells us, "it is possible to work out a general scheme for a sequence of teaching in any unit" (1945, 111). Systematicity trumps specificity.⁶⁶

"The "final step in planning" is to ascertain the "types" of "evidence" required to "appraise" "effectiveness," Taba (1945, 112) concludes. In this assertion of assessment as the culminating activity of curriculum development, Taba has provided what Tyler four years later claims as his own "principles of curriculum and instruction." As it will be for Tyler (see 1949, 105-109), for Taba (1945, 112) assessment is broadly defined and begins by "planning what evidence to gather and how to go about it." She points out that there many "sources of evidence" in addition to "standardized or teacher-made tests" (1945, 112), perhaps an indirect rebuke to Tyler who had spent the last twenty years manufacturing standardized tests. Anticipating the emphasis upon student portfolios that came to dominate discussions of evaluation decades later, Taba (1945, 112) points out that "the work of students, such as their writing, reports and discussion, can be preserved and analyzed, and records can be kept of reading one, of projects, or of significant behavior incidents." "69

Despite this openness to documentation of different kinds, Taba ensures that assessment occupies a crucial position in curriculum development protocol, one that would later enable policymakers to install the (standardized) test-driven curriculum. Here Taba is emphasizing not "accountability" but the alignment of objectives with teaching and learning, the latter indicated by assessment. "Of

utmost importance," Taba (1945, 112-113, emphasis added) underscores, "is an agreement by *all* teachers regarding the *objectives* they are pursuing and regarding the *behaviors* which indicate achievement toward them. Without such agreement even the most efficient and comprehensive evidence will yield little that is helpful to the guidance of students or of teachers."

"Comprehensive evidence" informs assessment and its positioning as the final step, and one aligned with the first step (objectives), requiring the "agreement" of "all" teachers, ensures that those teaching-learning units constitute implementation not creativity and originality. Now even "objectives" recede in importance, as all follows from assessment. Perhaps the proceduralism of Taba and Tyler are not to blame for the nightmare we face today; perhaps policymakers and profiteers would have turned their predatory gaze toward schools without the enabling work of Taba and Tyler. Taba and Tyler were, I suspect, not looking ahead but at the past, working to ensure the fact-filled curriculum – learning by memorization and recitation – would have no leg to stand on. They accomplished that objective, but left us – their professional progeny – without legs either.

How progressives must have hated the "traditionalists." How they must have yearned to make school interesting, even noble, extending that institution's aspirations to society and, astonishingly, to "life" itself. How progressives prized the students, wanting to promote them from being receptacles of useless knowledge – what Freire (1970, 58) would condemn decades later as "banking" education – to producers of their own knowledge that would improve their lives and, in the process, the lives of others and the nation. "Curriculum-making," as Taba (1945, 113) concludes her 1945 chapter, "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." She has here directed curriculum development toward society through addressing students' needs and attending to their everyday as well as long-term behavior. The curriculum is no longer subject matter but the matter of subjects, human subjects freed from war, challenged by peace, challenged to solve social problems while creating citizens capable of democratizing society. But in only one sentence – an innocent sentence conveying Taba's systematicity and I suppose her determination, as well as pounding the last nail on the coffin of traditionalists – all this expansiveness evaporates. Taba concludes: "Whatever content is included in the curriculum must serve the ends revealed by the above analysis" (1945, 113). No longer a passage to the world where problems can be solved or to a future we can only imagine, curriculum is but a tunnel, the means to ends others have specified. In the Taba book-length elaboration of these ideas that appears fifteen years later, the tunnel narrows and its walls thicken.

II

1962

In *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*, Hilda Taba is at the top of her game. The systematicity of her conception seems fully formulated. Her attunement to the historical moment is audible; her commitment to democracy is clear. There are numerous references to topics and concepts that will become central in the decades following, among them references to race, to what were

then termed subcultures, to technology and cosmopolitanism. All of these are incorporated in her theoretical formulation of curriculum development. In the preface she underscores the centrality of theory, lamenting that too many consider it "strong" and that any "difficulties" occur in the translation of theory into practice (Taba 1962, v).

Taba's judgment of strength is informed first by independence and interdependence. Early in the preface (see 1962, v) she asserts the importance of being open to concepts from other fields (as she will be, especially from anthropology) while realizing that such imported knowledge cannot itself – that is, without translation - solve the distinctive problems curriculum developers face. This is a statement of interdisciplinary disciplinarity. Taba acknowledges the intersection of present circumstances – within the field, in the nation and the world – with intellectual histories. She notes that many ideas current in the public discussions of education derive from scholarly work conducted in the 1930s, a problem not only in historical amnesia - and a problem that has only intensified in the decades following Taba's death - but an evisceration of enlivened national conversation concerning curriculum. "If a bridge can be found between the presumably new ideas and former ideas that have not always been kept in clear focus," Taba (1962, v) realizes, "it may be possible to take a step toward an intellectual revival in educational thinking and to correct the unfortunate chasm between those who today are called 'educationists' and scholars in other fields."

Here Taba is referencing the criticism that had been intensifying since the end of World War II, one I attribute in part to the G.I. Bill, which allowed tens of thousands of veterans access to university classrooms, veterans who had not

been enrolled in high school curricula for college preparation. Their professors recoiled from the challenges public school teachers have always faced – unprepared and multiply motivated students - and blamed their colleagues in schools. "Since World War II," Taba (1962, v) notes, "two developments have lent urgency to such a re-examination. First, there has been a wave of sharp criticism of the schools and their programs from the lay public as well as from scholars in the various disciplines."

After claiming co-authorship with Tyler of the questions he made famous, Taba positions *practice* as the other major concept and calling of curriculum development. She acknowledges her own professional experience, making clear that she worked from that "scheme for a sequence of questions to be asked and an order of steps to be taken in planning curriculum" (1962, vi). Evidently excited, Taba (1962, vi) "tried these out in the next workshop held by the Eight Year Study." Evidently encouraged by this experiment, "over a period of years, working as a curriculum consultant in several school systems and teaching courses in curriculum development, the author has continued testing and refining the scheme and building a theoretical rationale for it. A real chance at a large-scale application of the idea came in connection with the project on Intergroup Education, which the writer directed" (Taba 1962, vi). At that time – the postwar period – there were "no traditions" and "few precedents" in curriculum development in human relations. Moreover, Taba tells us that teaching human relations required a "theoretical framework"71 from which to work because intergroup education "could not be contained in any one single subject or in anyone particular type of experience" (1962, vi).

Subsequent opportunities - curriculum consultantships in California's Yolo and Contra Costa Counties and especially in the latter - provided Taba with "prolonged" and "systematic" experience in curriculum development. The relationship between theory and practice is key in understanding Taba's positioning of the teaching-learning unit as central in her scheme. As noted earlier, Urve Läänemets and Katrin Kalamees-Ruubel (in press) argue that Taba's scheme is inductive, that it proceeds from experience, in contrast to Tyler's whose protocol proceeds deductively, from the scheme to experience. Clearly, the latter claim is accurate, but the former seems more muddled. Taba (1962, 7) underscores that the "many decisions which shape the functioning curriculum⁷² are made by local schools and by teachers, either in groups or individually." But this fact – the pivotal place of agency (for teachers, for students) in the curriculum - is quickly eclipsed by her assertion that: "If the curriculum development is to be adequate, all these decisions need to be made competently, on a recognized and valid basis, and with some degree of consistency" (1962, 7). Rather than an opportunity for encouraging a diversity of professional practice, Taba is cautioning teachers to temper their primary positions in the curriculumas-enacted. All teacher decisions must be made "competently" (who had suggested they were not?), on a "recognized" (by whom?) and "valid" (presumably after having going through the steps Taba has specified) basis, and with "consistency" (no friend of innovation or creativity). That confinement of teachers' autonomy is confirmed in the following statement of the work that is to be done, e.g. the formulation of a "clear-cut methodology⁷³ of thinking and planning" (1962, 7). Without such clarity, "the curriculum tends to become a hodgepodge⁷⁴" (1962, 8).

This tension between theory and practice⁷⁵ Taba appears to resolve procedurally, by reversing the sequence of the questions she and Tyler had devised. Possibly reflecting on his 1949 book as well as on the school practice in which she has participated widely and over three decades, Taba (1962, 9) suggests that the "usual method" of curriculum revision starts with the "framework" then proceeds to experimentation with the "functioning curriculum," which she defines not as "lived" but as "teaching units on specific grade levels."76 Against this "usual" (Tyler's?) method, she asserts that "only on this functioning level can new possibilities be created and tested" (1962, 9). "[I]f the sequence in the curriculum development were reversed,"⁷⁷ Taba (1962, 9) suggests, "if, first, teachers were invited to experiment with specific aspects of curriculum and then, on the basis of these experiments, a framework were to be developed – curriculum development would acquire a new dynamic." The reference to "dynamic" recalls Taba's 1932 book wherein she forefronts "phenomena which emerge and manifest themselves chiefly in processes and inter-relations, and which are not statically final, but are becoming in their nature" (1932, 53). The contrasts between Taba's first and final statements close this consideration of the achievement of Hilda Taba.

Construing curriculum as designed "so that students may learn" (1962, 12), Taba appears to position *planning* over the spontaneity of everyday life in classrooms (see Pinar 2011b, 206-209).⁷⁸ "To the extent that learning activities are used to implement some objectives," Taba (1962, 13) appreciates, "the planning of learning experiences becomes a part of a major strategy of curriculum building instead of being relegated to incidental decisions made by the teacher at the

moment of teaching." Is there here a reluctance to relinquish control? Is it a distrust of teachers' judgment? Planning becomes primary in "developing a strategy for curriculum change" (1962, 13). She continues: "Perhaps one way to solving the problems inherent in either designing or changing the curriculum is to ask proper questions in a proper sequence, so that working at curriculum

change becomes a systematic enterprise to be broken down into smaller enterprises, which are considered one at a time."Never mind the vagueness of modifier "proper," Taba has here abandoned the dynamism reversing the sequence might have institutionalized. Now we are set for bureaucratic protocol, one of the three key problems Kliebard (1975) saw as facing the field of curriculum. "Curriculum development," Taba (1962, 13) concludes, "thus can be undertaken as a series of steps." Proceduralism predominates.

2012

Despite asserting the reversal of the Tyler Rationale, Taba's Rationale is not so simple. Yes, it establishes a moment of relative autonomy for teachers but that occurs in a highly systematized system of curriculum development. In practical terms proceduralism and systematicity would seem to be "scientific," recalling the epigraph at the outset of this essay. That association derives from her conception of educational psychology, elaborated in detail in the 1932 *Dynamics of Education*. Critical there of Thorndike (especially) and Watson, Taba nonetheless accepts "behavior" as the fundamental unit of human psychology, although not atomized or linked to "stimuli" (as in Thorndike and Watson) but embedded in and even structuring of social life, an always shifting pattern of

complexity that recasts ends as means, enables one aim to morph into another, and privileges dynamism over proceduralism (Taba 1932, 249-250). What happened over those thirty years we may never know, unless a diary chronicling Taba's intellectual history becomes available. What I suspect is that some combination of two factors forced Taba toward systemization in which she relegated the dynamism of classroom life to one – albeit important – position in a procedure of curriculum development.

The first factor might have been the experience of the Eight-Year Study, an exciting – perhaps at times an excessively exciting – national curriculum experiment that favored the *reorganization* – what Taba (1945, 107) termed the "organizational reshuffling" - of the existing curriculum over its intellectual reconstruction, although the two concepts and practices are not always entirely distinct (Pinar 2011c, 77-91). Further research might well focus on Taba's role in the Study, her collaboration with Tyler specifically, and her participation in the 1942 report on the Eight-Year Study summarizing the work of the curriculum consultants (Giles, McCutchen, and Zechiel 1942). My suspicion is that the collaborative character of this work functioned to defuse the dynamism Taba embraces in the 1932 statement.

The second factor could be the politically polarizing atmosphere of post-World War II America. While the Cold War has not yet been declared, it is clear from Taba's 1945 essay that the situation in many schools was uncertain, if not chaotic. Bringing order to the school in this rapidly shifting situation – recall that in the epigraph recall Taba alludes to "thoughtless and wild swings" suffered by curriculum development – might have encouraged that self-enclosed systematicity expressed in sequential steps to be taken by everyone everywhere.

Unlike Tyler, however, Taba does not disappear into abstraction absent concrete context; regularly she references the historical moment. 80 Perhaps this is one legacy of her Estonian upbringing, perhaps it is sheer intelligence and sensitivity, but whatever its source Taba is quite clear that the domain of curriculum development is informed, indeed threatened, by history and society. Instead of expunging these from her rationale – as Tyler does – Taba positions their analysis at the forefront of her procedure. Recall that it is "diagnoses" of society from which curriculum developers derive their objectives. 81 This step is not only reasonable – she presents it as a self-evidently rational step to take – but it is also, I suspect, defensive. If the sound of critics⁸² grows louder, and wartime experience shows professionals cannot control what they teach⁸³, one recourse is to insist on a separate and specialized domain of curriculum development which only those highly trained in the relevant concepts and procedures may direct. That Hilda Taba did, and no one did it more systematically or thoughtfully. It is Hilda Taba, not Ralph Tyler, whose work forms the foundation of the field we inherited. That is no small achievement.

References

Aoki, Ted T. 2005 (1990]). *Sonare* and *Videre*: A Story, Three Echoes and a Lingering Note. In *Curriculum in a New Key: The Collected Works of Ted T. Aoki*, edited by William F. Pinar and Rita L. Irwin (367-376). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Baker, Bernadette M. 2001. *In Perpetual Motion: Theories of Power, Educational History, and the Child.* New York: Peter Lang.

Banchero, Stephanie. 2012, March 8. Teacher Evaluations Pose Test for States. *The Wall Street Journal*, Vol. CCLIX (No. 5), A2.

Berliner, David C. and Biddle, Bruce J. 1996. *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud and the Assault on America's Public Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Bobbitt, Franklin. 1918. *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bode, Boyd H. 1938. *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*. New York: Newson.

Bode, Boyd H. 1940. How We Learn. Boston, MA: D. C. Heath.

Cremin, Lawrence A. 1961. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education*, 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Dewey, John. 1938. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, John. 1968. *The Child and the Curriculum* [1902]. *The School and Society* [1900, rev. 1915, 1943]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Evans, Richard J. 2012, October 11. The Truth About War World II. *The New York Review of Books* Vol. LIX, No. 15, 52, 54-56.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. [Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. Foreword by Richard Shaull.] New York: Herder and Herder.

Gardner, Howard. 1983. Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intellligences. New York: Basic Books.

Giles, H. H., McCutchen, S. P., and Zechiel, A. N. 1942. *Exploring the Curriculum: ThemWork of the Thirty Schools from the Viewpoint of Curriculum Consultants*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums*. New York: Anchor Books.

Hirsch, Jr., E. D. 1999. *The Schools We Need: And Why We Don't Have Them.* New York: Anchor Books.

Johansson, Ulla. 2003. Frame Factors, Structures, and Meaning Making: Shifting Focus Of Curriculum Research in Sweden. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (575-598). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum.

Judd, Charles Hubbard. 1936. *Education as the Cultivation of the Higher Mental Processes*. [With the co-operation of Ernst R. Breslich, J. M. McCallister, and Ralph W. Tyler.] New York: The Macmillan Company.

Kliebard, H. (1975). Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists* edited by William F. Pinar (51-69). Berkeley, CA:

McCutchan. [Reissued in 2000 as *Curriculum Theorizing: the Reconceptualization* by Educators International Press.]

Läänemets, Urve and Kalamees-Ruubel, Katrin. in press. The Taba-Tyler Rationales. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*.

Levin, David Michael. 1993. Introduction to *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*, edited by Dvid Michael Levin (1-29). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lewin, Tamar. 2012, July 30. Senate Committee Report on For-Profit College Condemns Costs and Practices. *The New York Times* CLXI (55, 848), A12.

Kridel, Craig. 2002. And Gladly Would Whe Learn: Margaret Willis and The Ohio State University School. In *Founding Mothers and Others: Women Educational Leaders During the Progressive Era*, edited by Alan R. Sadovnik and Susan F. Semel (217-235). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kridel, Craig, and Robert V. Bullough, Jr. 2007. *Stories of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining Secondary Education in America*. Foreword by John I. Goodlad. Albany: State University Of New York Press.

McWhirter, Cameron. 2012, April 6. Tennessee Is Lab For National Clash Over Science Class. *The Wall Street Journal* Vol. CCLIX, No. 80, A3.

Pinar, William F. 2001. The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America. Lynching, Prison Rape, and the Crisis of Masculinity. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, William F. 2006. The Synoptic Text Today and Other Essays: Curriculum Development after the Reconceptualization. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, William F. 2007. Curriculum Leadership Then and Now. In *Approaches to Educational Leadership* edited by William Smale and Kelly Young (110-125). Calgary, Alberta: Detselig.

Pinar, William F. 2009. *The Worldliness of a Cosmopolitan Education: Passionate Lives in Public Service*. New York: Routledge.

Pinar, William F. 2011a. Ed. Curriculum Studies in Mexico: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F., ed. 2011b. *Curriculum Studies in Brazil: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. 2011c. *The Character of Curriculum Studies*: <u>Bildung</u>, <u>Currere</u>, and the Recurring Question of the Subject. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. 2012. What Is Curriculum Theory? [Second Edition.] New York: Routledge.

Pinar, William F. 2013. Curriculum Studies in the United States. Present Circumstances, Intellectual Histories. New York: Palgrave Pivot.

Ravitch, Diane. 2000. *Left Back: A Century of Battles over School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Reese, William J. 2000. Public Schools and the Elusive Search for the Common Good. In *Reconstructing the Common Good in Education: Coping with Intractable Dilemmas* edited by Larry Cuban and Dorothy Shipps (13-31). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Salvio, Paula. 1998. On Using the Literacy Portfolio to Prepare Teachers for "Willful World Traveling." In *Curriculum: Toward New Identities*, edited by William F. Pinar (41-74). New York: Garland.

Saul, Stephanie. 2011. December 13. Profits and Questions at Online Charter Schools. Parents Get to Choose, but Standards Slip and Scores Suffer. *The New York Times* Vol. CLXI (55, 618), A1, A18-A19.

Spring, Joel. 2007. A New Paradigm for Global School Systems: Education for a Long and Happy Life. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Taba, Hilda 1932. *The Dynamics of Education. A Methodology of Progressive Educational Thought*. [With a foreword by William Heard Kilpatrick.] New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Taba, Hilda. 1945. General Techniques of Curriculum Planning. In the National Society for the Study of Education, *American Education in the Post War Period: Curriculum Reconstruction*. Forty-fourth Yearbook, Pt. 1 (1945), Ch. 5, 80-115.

Taba, Hilda. 1957. Problem Identification. In *Research for Curriculum Improvement* edited by Arthur W. Foshay and James A. Hall (Eds.), (42-71). Washington, DC: ASCD.

Taba, Hilda. 1962. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Tanner, Daniel and Tanner, Laurel N. 1988. The Emergence of a Paradigm in the Curriculum Field. A Reply to Jickling. *Interchange* 19 (2), 50-58.

Tomkins, George S. 1986. *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall. [Reprinted in 2008 by Pacific Educational Press.]

Tyler, Ralph W. 1949. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weber, Everard. 2002. Shifting to the Right: The Evolution of Equity in the South African Government's Development and Education Policies, 1990-1999. *Comparative Education Review* 46 (3), 261-290.

Yates, Lyn and Grumet, Madeleine. eds. 2011. Curriculum in Today's World: Configuring Knowledge, Identities, Work and Politics. London: Routledge.

Endnotes

¹ This paper was presented to the Conference on Hilda Taba in commemoration of her one-hundredth birthday, December 7, 2012, held in Tallinn, Estonia. ² It almost goes without saying that Tyler's Rationale consists of "four fundamental questions which must be answered in developing any curriculum and plan of instruction. These are: 1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? 2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? 3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? 4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?" (Tyler 1949, 1). What does requiring saying is that the Rationale is not Tyler's. The evidence for that I will report during the course of the essay. ³ See Judd 1936, 6-17. Chapter II is entitled "The Relation Between Recall and Higher Mental Processes" by Ralph W. Tyler, Ohio State University.

⁴ See Pinar 2011c, 194 n. 13.

⁵ See Taba 1962, chapter 21.

⁶ Taba (1945, 84) cautions against a "one-sided" curriculum, the outcome of "exclusive attention" to "social needs" or "personal growth" or "conventional content."

⁷ "[T]ransfer," Taba (1962, 320) tells us, is "the heart of effective curriculum and teaching."

⁸ Distinct from "transfer," this concept includes considerations of human potential, learning as experience and discovery, direct and indirect learning, and group dynamics (see chapter 11). On one occasion "extension" denotes "cumulative" learning (1962, 384).

⁹ In reasserting the concept of "needs," Taba is ignoring Boyd Bode's earlier criticism of the concept: "needs is a weasel word" (quoted in Kridel 2002, 221). See also Bullough and Kridel 2003, 167; Kridel and Bullough 2007, 130. ¹⁰ Kridel and Bullough (2007, 94) tell us: "Tyler lore describes a lunch occasion" in the 1930s when "Mike" Giles, Hilda Taba, and Tyler were discussing curriculum development and the 1949 Rationale's legendary questions were conceived by Tyler and written on a napkin." Taba (1962, vi) remembers events differently, as we will see. I will offer my own answer to this contested question at the conclusion of the essay.

¹¹ Where did Taba obtain them? Perhaps from the Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, which she references in *The Dynamics of Education:* "[T]hat part of the curriculum should be planned in advance ... includes, (1) a statement of objectives, (2) a sequence of experiences shown by analysis to be reasonably uniform in value in achieving the objectives, (3) subject matter found to be reasonably uniform as the best means of engaging in the experiences, (4) statements of the immediate outcomes of achievements to

be derived from the experiences" (Twenty-sixth Yearbook, 19-20; quoted in Taba 1932, 246).

- ¹² And not only in the 1962 book does Taba reference the historical moment in which she working; she does so in the 1945 essay as well. For the specific Sputnik references, see Taba 1962, 2, 265.
- ¹³ See Taba 1962, 48, 50, 72, 73, 218,
- ¹⁴ See Taba 1962, 73, where she posits the cultivation of "crosscultural sensitivity" as "one of the tasks of the school."
- ¹⁵ Actually using that word on one occasion (1962, 266), Taba also references "diverse cultures" within American society and the educational challenge of "intercommunication" among them (see 1962, 36).
- ¹⁶ See Taba 1962, 46, 60, 61, 73, 194, 223, 273.
- ¹⁷ See Taba 1962, 1, 3, 5, 10, 16, 24, 25, 31, 35-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 54, 63, 64, 69, 70, 75, 177, 185, 189, 195, 264, 273, 274, 279, 346.
- ¹⁸ "Action research," Taba (1962, 239) notes, "is essentially a method of systematically diagnosing the practical problems of curriculum." See also 1962, 451, 492.
- ¹⁹ See Taba 1962, 218.
- ²⁰ There is not only regular reference to the historical moment (to World War II in the 1945 essay and to Sputnik and the Kennedy's Administration's national curriculum reform in the 1962 book), but to the intellectual history of the field (for example, see 1962, 446-448). As we see in the next section, Tyler looms large (1962, vi, 12, 266n., 279, 312, 343, 420, 422, 448), but - in sharp contrast to Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction - there are references as well to key figures and events in the field, establishing the historicity of Taba's conception. Indeed, Taba (1962, 4-5, 43, 285) complains about the ahistoricality of public education debates. Like Tyler, the Eight-Year Study is referenced early on (1962, 3, 208-209, 286, 319), as are behavioral objectives (1962, 3). Other figures cited include Harold Alberty (1962, 409), Arthur Bestor (1952, 20), Franklin Bobbitt (1962, 83, 447), Boyd Bode (1952, 285), Theodore Brameld (1962, 43, 274), Jerome Bruner (1962, 270, 272), John Childs, (1962, 25), James Conant (1962, 18, 385), George Counts (1962, 288), Lawrence Cremin (1962, 23), Lee Cronbach (1962, 387), Alexander Frazier (1962, 441), John Goodlad (1962, 416, 428, 442), Sidney Hook (1962, 384), Robert Hutchins (1962, 18, 264), Marcella Lawler (1962, 481), Horace Mann (1962, 23), Harold Rugg (1962, 8, 30, 394), B. Othaniel Smith (1962, 26, 391, 424-425, 478), Whitehead (1962, 198, 390), For references to Dewey, she footnote 20. There are regular references to non-specialist figures, including, remarkably, Gertrude Stein (1962, 418). These are but a few of Taba's extensive referencing: see the index and bibliography for the entire list.
- ²¹ "Most vital learning," Taba (1962, 152, italics added) asserts at one point, "is experiencing *of a sort*." That last phrase qualifies the endorsement, and is reflected in her reference of Dewey: "neither Dewey's followers nor his critics … bothered to take seriously the fact that Dewey saw overt experience as only the first step in the learning sequence and that 'the next step is the progressive development of what is already experienced into a fuller and richer and also a more organized form, a form that gradually approximates that in which subject matter is presented to the skilled, mature person'" (1938, 87-89; quoted in Taba

1962, 404; see also 1962, 405). Referencing the Dewey Laboratory School as the first example of an experience-based curriculum (see 1962, 401 footnote), Taba (1962, 406) allows that "activity or experience design has made perhaps two lasting contributions to the curriculum. One is the recognition of the role of active learning through manipulation, expression, construction, and dramatization.... The second is the impetus it has given to studying child development, the principles and sequences of growth, and an effort to consider these sequences in the planning of the curriculum sequences." The first accords with Taba's statement with which I opened this endnote and with references to Dewey affirming improvisation (1962, 405; see also Aoki 2005 [1990], 367-368), agency (1962, 405), creativity (1962, 151), and knowledge as inquiry (see 1962, 271) and discovery (1962, 126). The second "contribution" accords with Taba's conviction (1962, 406) that "curriculum developed on the basis of immediate interests was bound to leave hug gaps in the experience of the children." This theoretical tension between spontaneity and structure, between planning and improvisation, constitutes a sort of "fault-line" in Taba's thinking. In the earlier work (1932), she resolves the tension in favor the first (dynamism), and in the last work (1962) in favor the second (planning). In another sense she is affirming social reconstruction over "inner growth" (see 1962, 28), if in a politically denuded and psychological even almost "social-efficiency" sense. The first accords with Taba's statement with which I opened this endnote and with references to Dewey affirming improvisation (1962, 405; see also Aoki 2005 [1990], 367-368), agency (1962, 405), creativity (1962, 151), and knowledge as inquiry (see 1962, 271) and discovery (1962, 126). The second "contribution" accords with Taba's conviction (1962, 406) that "curriculum developed on the basis of immediate interests was bound to leave hug gaps in the experience of the children." This theoretical tension between spontaneity and structure, between planning and improvisation, constitutes a sort of "fault-line" in Taba's thinking. In the earlier work (1932), she resolves the tension in favor the first (dynamism), and in the last work (1962) in favor the second (planning). In another sense she is affirming social reconstruction over "inner growth" (see 1962, 28), if in a politically denuded and psychological even almost "social-efficiency" sense. ²² Citing Dewey and Kilpatrick, Taba (1962, 25) affirms early that "scientific attitudes [are key] in understanding and solving human and social problems." ²³ The Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education Coalition supports STEM programs for teachers and students at the U.S. Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies that offer STEM related programs. The STEM Education Coalition sectors of the technological workforce – from so-called knowledge workers, to educators, to scientists, engineers, and technicians. Accessed on November 25, 2012 from: http://www.stemedcoalition.org/

²⁴ In the 1946 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, declared that postwar education in America must be focused on "lasting peace" (see Pinar 2007, 111).

²⁵ One recent example in the U.S. concerns legislation passed in Tennessee "requiring that public schools allow science teachers to discuss purported weakness of theories such as evolution and global warming in their classrooms"

(McWhirter 2012, April 6, A3). The echo of the 1925 "Scopes Monkey Trial" is loud. Louisiana and Mississippi have passed similar legislation; state science standards in seven other states now allow teachers to question evolution (McWhirter 2012, April 6, A3).

- ²⁶ K-12 Inc. is one example of private corporations attempting to close "brick-and-mortar" schools and move curriculum online (see Saul 2011, December 13). The same cannibalization of public funds occurs in higher education in the U.S. as well: U.S. taxpayers spent \$32 billion in 2011 on companies that operate forprofit colleges and universities, from whom a majority of students leave without a degree, half of those within four months (Lewin 2012, July 30, A12).
- ²⁷ "Although play has its place in the process," Bobbitt (1918, 18) asserted, "education aims at preparation for the serious duties of life: one's calling, the care of one's health, civic cooperations and regulation, bringing up one's children, keeping one's language in good form, etc. educational experience upon the work-level is intended to prepare consciously for the efficient performance of these and all other serious duties." This is no narrow vocationalism but does align curriculum with society broadly conceived. Bobbitt (1918, 42) defines the concept of curriculum as "that series of things which children and youth must do and experience by way of developing abilities to do the things well that make up the affairs of adult life; and to be in all respects what adults should be."
- ²⁸ In the specification "circumstances" Taba grounds her questions historically as I insist in my elaboration of disciplinarity (2012b, xx) but the question is not the canonical curriculum question what knowledge is of most worth? but one gesturing toward the assessment of a systematized, if professionally generated, curriculum. in retrospect, efforts toward assurance seems unrealistic, but encourages schemes of accountability.
- ²⁹ In my critique of the Eight-Year Study I distinguish between "organization" scheduling, recasting content into different designs: e.g. reorganizing "learning experiences" and "reconstruction," which might include alternations in school structure but emphasizes instead intellectual sophistication of the complicated conversation in which teachers and students are engaged as they study that academic knowledge that enables them to understand and thereby become ethically engaged in the world: Pinar 2011c, 87-88).
- ³⁰ The Society's Committee on Curriculum Reconstruction was composed of W. W. Charters, Prudence Cutright, Henry Harap, Ernest Horn, Maurice F. Seay, Ruth Strang, Hilda Taba, and Ralph W. Tyler, Chair.
- ³¹ Tyler (1949, 5) repeats Taba's definition almost verbatim and to the same conclusion: "When education is viewed in this way [as changing behavior], it is clear that educational objectives, then, represents the kinds of changes in behavior that an educational institution seeks to bring about in its students. A study of the learners themselves would seek to identify needed changes in behavior patterns of students which the educational institution should seek to produce."
- ³² "In a democratic society," Taba (1945, 85) writes, "it is both undesirable and impossible to have a standardized concept of educational and social values. The danger lies not so much in honest differences on values as in the failure to give conscious consideration to these in curriculum development and to weigh their

relative significance." How Taba – and Tyler and others of this field-founding generation – could fail to see that their specification of "essential ideas" of curriculum development represents "a standardized concept" is not obvious to me. In that second sentence, it is clear that "honest differences" become absorbed (and thereby dissipated) in bureaucratic procedure.

- ³³ These are not the only two choices, as the word "or" implies. The insight that educational experience occurs through subject matter disappears in the false choice she sets up. That knowledge is important in itself enables subjective and social reconstruction; in teaching from ethical conviction one does not instrumentalize knowledge as a means to an ends.
- ³⁴ Change is cognitive of course, but it is also social and psychological, dimensions long-standing in American progressive thought. "Attention to any one of these elements to the exclusion of others," Taba (1945, 84) cautions, "usually results in a one-sided curriculum. Thus, exclusive attention to social needs and demand easily produces a curriculum deficient in personal growth and inappropriate for effective learning. Concentration of conventional content alone without reference to the psychological or social values and needs, produces a curriculum which is out of step with life's needs and the concerns and demands of young people." Imagining that one can "balance" these possibly conflicting concerns in advance (through planning) as well as during classroom instruction requires a confidence only a god might feel.
- ³⁵ "A continuous awareness of the problems of society is needed in curriculum construction for a realistic perspective of its objectives," Taba (1945, 86). Those objectives are not only or even primarily vocational but, as we see, also ethical, and historical as well as sociological.
- ³⁶ World War I, Richard Evans (2012, 52) points out, is remembered for its horrible trench warfare on the Western Front, its senseless slaughter of a whole generation of young men, and its catastrophic consequences in Europe, including the rise of fascism and communism and the triumph of Hitler. In contrast, he continues, World War II is remembered as the "defeat of dictatorship by democracy, racism by tolerance, nationalism by internationalism, extremism by moderation, evil by good" (2012, 52). While now contested in his essay Evans discusses why this version of the war is suggested in Taba's characterizations of the problems American society and its public schools face in the postwar period.
- ³⁷ Presentism disables us from appreciating the past that informs the present or what the present foreshadows about the future. Historicity indeed, temporality disappear in a consuming preoccupation with the present.
- ³⁸ In his critique of government policies in South Africa, Weber (2002, 283) notes that while early research supported human capital theory, there is now "considerable empirical evidence" from both industrialized and developing countries that "question the assumptions of human capital theory." Summarizing studies of the relationships between labor markets and education, Weber notes that factors like job satisfaction can increase productivity despite education, and that despite increased levels of education income inequalities have widened. "The lesson learned," Weber (2002, 283) concludes, "was that its [education's] relationship to the labor market and economic development was

more complex than human capital theory supposed." Tragically, Weber (2002, 284) continues, the African National Congress (ANC) "embraced" human capital theory, ignoring the critiques made of it since the 1970s. "The interwar years," Tomkins (1986, 204) suggests, were the period "when the 'human capital' argument, based on the assumed economic benefits of education, was being proclaimed more insistently." Regarding the U.S., see Reese 2000, 22; Berliner and Biddle 1996, 141.

- ³⁹ Tyler 1950, 5) includes "studies of learners" as well, and he seems to think "all children have the same needs" (1949, 7)!
- ⁴⁰ Another illustration of learning theory's contribution to curriculum development is the alignment between teaching and learning. "Several studies," Taba (1945, 88) tells us, "have demonstrated also that the effectiveness of learning is increased when a clear and reasonable relationship exists between the goals of learners and their learning activities." Another use Taba makes of learning theory is to dismiss what she terms the "extremes" in the controversy between those who advocate "interests" as the organizing concept of curriculum and those loyal to "essential" facts. Taba pronounces a plague on both your houses, asserting that learning theory establishes that "general concepts and ideas, which are the 'essentials' of education can be achieved by many alternative concrete learning experiences" (1945, 89). Taba's confidence in learning theory to settle curriculum controversies wanes in the 1962 book, as her survey of its importance also undermines that importance. On one occasion Taba 1(962, 78) observes that "learning theorists may be deceiving themselves by looking for common laws to explain processes which may have little in common." Such skepticism suggests an intellectual sophistication Tyler did not share.
- ⁴¹ Without attribution Tyler (1949, 40) tells us: "One of the most important psychological findings for the curriculum maker is the discovery that most learning experiences produce multiple outcomes."
- ⁴² See Taba (1945, 112). Taba's insistence on supplementing such tests with other sources of assessment may have been another possible point of tension with Tyler who spent much of career producing them.
- ⁴³ Note that "principle" has here become "intellectual technique" here, a slippage, I surmise, toward what becomes the now ubiquitous concept of "skill." ⁴⁴ "Knowledge is one type of "curriculum experience," but it can be "justified" only if it "permanent," and/or contributes to achieving "objectives of general education" or meets the "demands of living" (1945, 94). Taba also justifies "curriculum experiences" if they comprise the "necessary background or prerequisite for understanding something else or for achieving some other ends.... Thus, a study of simple machines in elementary schools is supposed to prepare for the later under standing of the principles of modern technology" (1945, 94).
- ⁴⁵ This is a telling construction, installing a split between "us" and the "world." At least the world is present. In our time schooling is solely about schooling, as Yates and Grumet (2011, 239) lament: "high stakes testing, was turning schools away from the worlds that surround them, preoccupying them with the machinations of student and teacher evaluation and competitive evaluation." They remind us "the purpose of schooling should not be about schooling, but

about participation in the world" (2011, 239). It is also about the world's "participation" in us, in our formation as human subjects.

- ⁴⁶ "May" and "enhance" position the school subjects as only potentially and partially contributing to our "knowledge of the world." There is "direct experience," but aside from that what else provides knowledge of the world except the academic disciplines and their stepchildren, the school subjects.
- ⁴⁷ This is another telling word choice, this time implying someone presumably Taba herself can see education "as a whole." Certainly the scale of systematicity evident in the 1962 book testifies to that faith.
- ⁴⁸ Even the concept of "screen" prominent in the Tyler Rationale (1949, 33-43) as it filters out "unimportant" and "contradictory" objectives shows up in Taba's 1945 chapter. Criteria of selection, Taba (1945, 93) explains, "constitute, in a sense, successive screens assuring that only experiences that are valid in terms of all pertinent considerations find their way into the curriculum."
- ⁴⁹ These canonical questions are not Tyler's alone, if we can believe Taba's claim of co-authorship (see 1962, vi; 1962, 12). Nor can we credit the "paradigm" as Daniel and Laurel Tanner (1988, 57) call it, claiming credit for themselves while acknowledging its historical precedents to those working in the Eight-Year Study, although, as Tanner and Tanner (1988, 52) remind, the four topics not yet sequenced as questions but "interactive"- are sketched in Giles, McCutchen, and Zechiel. In their graph (1942, 2) "objectives" and "subject matter" and "methods and organization" and "evaluation" are drawn as equal in significance and interactive with each other. The Tanner's location of the paradigm in Dewey seems suspicious, as I will elaborate later.
- ⁵⁰ While it's true that Taba's emphasis upon the teaching-learning unit (1962, chapter 20) preserves a relative autonomy for the practicing teacher, it occurs within this larger determinative procedural scheme and the unit is coordinated with objectives linked to outcomes. Whether the prominence of teaching-learning unit justifies the characterization of Taba's theory as "inductive" in contrast to Tyler's as "deductive," as Urve Läänemets (in press) does is not obvious. The unit occurs within a formal, abstract, sequenced set of steps from which it may not be deduced, but it hardly occurs as an individually independent act outside the sequence.
- ⁵¹ The question behind this question is why is assessment so important in K-12 education. Since at least the Eight-Year Study and Tyler's employment by testing companies its role has been inflated. Like the Reichsmark in the Weimar Republic, it takes more and more to purchase less and less.
- ⁵² The concept is no static one, however. In fact, Taba (1945, 96) points out that "the needs and interests of learners are not beyond the power of education to change. Changing them is one of the important tasks of teaching."
- ⁵³ Taba (1945, 97) blames the war for curricular discontinuity, and worries that postwar programs will only make the problem worse.
- ⁵⁴ I endorse the affiliated concepts of montage and collage as patterns of a cosmopolitan curriculum (2009, 187 n. 36), but the teacher can make no claims as to outcomes; those occur within students through study (2012a, 6-8).
- ⁵⁵ Even within one lesson continuity becomes enshrined. Evident of the excess to which Taba takes the concept, at one point she asserts: "Students habituated to

textbook assignments would surely be defeated by a sudden shift to the use of pamphlets, magazines, and first-hand sources" (1945, 97). Why? This micromanaging of students' experience is no doubt well-intended, but in its panopticism (Pinar 2001, 991) it risks authoritarianism (see Pinar 2012a, 2-3). ⁵⁶ Durational issues become subsumed in critiques of "intensification." In their critique of school reform, Berliner and Biddle (1996, 184) note that "other intensification proposals have called for extending the length of the school day or the school year. Such proposals are based on the assumption that students will learn more if only they are exposed to more classroom hours. Moreover, this assumption seems to be supported by two kinds of 'evidence.' First, American schools are open for only an average of 180 days per year, while students in other industrialized countries – Japan, Germany, South Korea, or Israel, for example – are required to attend school 200 or more days during the year.... Second, studies of the effects of classroom instruction have found that students learn more when teachers spend more 'time on task'." While Taba is working in very different circumstances, in 1945 she has anticipated the schemes others will devise decades later as "solutions" to a "manufactured" educational crisis." ⁵⁷ See Cremin 1961, 110-113; Bode 1940, 100, 105; Ravitch 2000, 63, 64. E.D. Hirsch (1999, 114) summarizes: "[E]ducational opponents of Latin and other traditional subjects, using the research of Edward Lee Thorndike as a battering ram, rejected mental discipline as scientifically disproved. Thorndike had shown that skills are not transferred from one domain to another. Learning Latin did not 'teach you think,' it just taught you Latin." Thorndike was "more influential in Canada than either Dewey or James," Tomkins (1986, 106) remarks. "Thorndike's view of education as a scientific means of social improvement marked him as a true progressive even as his social philosophy marked him as a conservative. His social conservatism and scientific progressivism was consistent with a Canadian educational tradition that could be traced to Ryerson's time" (1986, 106). ⁵⁸ In the 1962 book Taba makes this explicit: "While transfer is not unlimited or automatic, as was assumed by the faculty psychology, it is general. The main road to transfer is via gasping the essential principles of a problem, a subject, or a situation, or by evolving an approach to and a method of viewing situations which can be applied to the next situation" (1962, 82). Whether such a conceptual structure can so function I doubt. Like "generalization," transfer is a necessary but dangerous game, but Taba (1962, 121) insists on playing: "The problem of transfer is central to all education."

⁵⁹ Against Thorndike, Charles Judd (1936, 198) blame lack of transfer to "doctrine that mental life is made up of aggregations of simple units or bonds." He continues: "Why anyone should expect detached experiences to contribute to general mental efficiency is hard to understand" (1936, 198-199). The problem disappears when one abandons that doctrine: "When the mind analyzes a situation, selects important factors through abstraction, and generalizes by discovering the same important factors in other situations, something is happening which is wholly different from that which is characteristic of the lower forms of conscious experience. At the higher levels transfer is typical not exceptional" (1936, 200). Judd as the number system in mind as illustration, but

this capacity for abstraction and generalization also occurs in the formal of racial prejudice and stereotypes generally as well.

- ⁶⁰ Not does Taba seem prescient in illustrative subjects, she anticipates the interest in so-called learning styles and multiple intelligences decades before Howard Gardner (1983) popularized them and E.D. Hirsch (1999, 104) condemned them: "In recent years, a new 'scientific' validation of Romantic individualism has generated a lot of interest in the schools the 'individual learning styles' movement, together with its most recent variant, the 'multiple intelligences' movement." "We know that different individuals learn through different media with varying degrees of success," Taba (1945, 100) wrote. "One student may successfully master generalizations about health or growth of plants from a book, another one may get the same thing more effectively from observation and experimentation." Moreover, she continued, "Different individuals also need different types of learning activities for their self-development" (1945, 100). Discussing the development of teaching-learning units, Taba (1962, 364) reminds that "care must be taken also to include a variety of ways of learning." Taba's prescience is among herachievements.
- ⁶¹ Now, of course, at least in the U.S., "transfer" seems assumed, as test scores on standardized exams presumably document that useful "skills" have been learned (or not). The problem of transfer has not be solved, and justifying certain subjects or teaching strategies for their utility in other contexts remains more an expression of faith than fact.
- ⁶² It was Goffman (1961, 4-5) who characterized prisons as "total institutions" whose "encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to departure that is often built right into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wires ... [and is] organized to protect the community against what are felt to be intentional dangers to it, with the welfare of the persons thus sequestered, not the immediate issue." Taba is not constructing a curricular prison of course, but laboring to leave as little to chance as possible, but in doing so recreates a total system escape from which becomes unlikely, and not only for the students but for the teachers as well, despite their moment of relative freedom, the teaching-learning unit (to be discussed later).
- 63 Recall that Foucault discerned associations among the modern hegemony of vision, modern technology, and modern forms of "governmentality." For Foucault, Levin (1993, 6) summarizes, "the enlightenment project constitutive of our modernity has been increasingly double-crossed by the panopticism of its technologies. Whether these be the technologies of production, the technologies of sign systems, the technologies of power, or the technologies of the self, in each of these economies Foucault sees an increasingly dangerous tendency dangerous, but nevertheless resistible pointing us toward conditions of totalization, normalization, and domination." This tendency antedates the establishment of the public school in America. For Foucault, Baker (2001, 308, emphasis added) points out, "the obsession with sexual intercourse as the marker between the child and the adult was a function of an emergent 'governmentality' in the *eighteenth century* and its associated "populational reasoning." In particular, the nervousness emanating from sexual intercourse as

a newfound power of the body was propped up by racializing discourses." An even "longer view" is provided by Hardt and Negri (2000, 88) "Medieval society was organized according to a hierarchical schema of degrees of power. This is what modernity blew apart in the course of its development. Foucault refers to this transition as the passage from the paradigm of sovereignty to that of governmentality, where by sovereignty he means the transcendence of a single point of command above the social field, and by governmentality he means the general economy of the discipline that runs throughout society." Referencing curriculum research in Sweden, Johansson (2003, 588) concludes that "the central state was the purchaser and receiver of research results, and the whole system was based on the governmentality defined by the Tyler Rationale."

- ⁶⁴ This no vulgar sense of functionality, but one rooted in the "dynamic psychology" Taba discusses in detail in the 1932 book.
- ⁶⁵ This old progressive phrase seems odd to us now, perhaps because the boundaries between work, including schoolwork, and life seem entirely blurred. Odd too because even Taba's phrasing as did Dewey's before her implies "life" as timeless and universal, which in its structures (aging, dying, eating etc.) it is, but not in its thematic or existential specificity. And Taba imports the progressive concept of "needs" to her discussion, despite its problematic history (see Pinar 2011b, 77).
- ⁶⁶ Thus Taba's insistence that she has "reversed" the sequence of curriculum development by starting with teachers in classrooms seems overstated, if not self-contradicted.
- ⁶⁷ Tyler too takes an broad view of what can be included in evaluation. (In the 1949 book, Tyler prefers the term "evaluation."), including "observations, interviews" and scrutinizing students' library cards, as "books withdrawn from the library may provide some indication of reading interests" (1949, 108). Such snooping is only for teachers but for the public, as Tyler anticipates the accountability craze with its pandering to the public-as-consumer. "We hear about the number of persons rejected because of lack of reading ability or lack of physical health in connection with Selective Service," Tyler (1949, 125) writes (mixing patriotism with resentment), "but we have no means of tracing those cases back to particular schools." Now "outcomes" are traced not only to individual schools but to individual teachers who, on occasion, suicide when they are judged to have failed.
- ⁶⁸ See Berliner and Biddle 1996, 320; Salvio 1998, 41; Banchero 2012, A2.) The idea is not new of course. Evaluators in the Eight-Year Study, Kridel and Bullough (2007, 67, 68) tell us, "preserved for each student information kept cooperatively by teachers, parents, the pupils, and even the pupil's friends.... They assumed that future teachers, as well as students and parents, would want a log a portfolio of this development as a basis for effective guidance and as an educational memoir." (See also Kridel 2002, 223, 226.) In his diatribe against "undying" progressivism, Hirsch (1999, 181) mocks "such modern terminology as 'narrative report cards' and 'portfolios,' and through new-age techniques such as videotapes that can provide parents with 'greater insight into what their children are learning'."

⁶⁹ Despite the significant differences with Tyler, Taba does rely on the concept of "behavior," one that imports with its an emphasis upon the observable and measurable. In retrospect, it seems an error, but hardly the only one. The emphasis upon "objectives" instrumentalizes "behavior" so that end-means rationality triumphs. Despite her appreciation for creativity and teacher initiative, Taba was not adverse to protocol as it ensured systematicity.

⁷⁰ Teachers and education professors are scapegoated, but there is also a tale of culpability. See Pinar 2006, 118.

What Taba means by "theory" is informed by science, not the humanities; it constitutes "a rationally planned diversity, a scientifically calculated way of meeting and dealing with heterogeneity of individual talents and social backgrounds" (1962, 4). If "diversity" is rationally planned, how diverse can it be? And "scientifically calculated way of meeting and dealing with heterogeneity" will require necessarily restructure heterogeneity into homogeneity, e.g. the scheme itself- with its "general aims" for schools and "specific objectives" for instruction (1962, 6) - with attendant emphasis upon monolithic categories such as "behavior."

 72 This is Taba's version of Aoki's curriculum-as-lived, but the terminology matters enormously, as Taba's functionality – a view she links to science's understanding of "dynamic systems" (1932, x), a view Doll (2012) takes up decades later – risks instrumental rationality, an end-means thinking always at odds with the organicism of experience, an organicism she had embraced in 1932 (p. xx).

⁷³ At least in Taba's early work, "method" enjoyed an expansive meaning. Quote from '32 book.

⁷⁴ Obviously a derogatory judgment, "hodgepodge" means a "heterogeneous mixture" (see Webster's *New Collegiate Dictionary*, 544). While such a curricular structure could prove challenging in a society and at a historical moment where heterogeneity seems excessive, it is in general to be encouraged and no only from the point of view of academic freedom, e.g. intellectual independence. Even in developmental schemes "cognitive dissonance" is prerequisite to "development" (see Trueit 2012, p.x). That Taba is thinking in terms of the synonym the Dictionary offers - "jumble" – is confirmed in judgment that generations of "tinkering" have produced a curricular "patchwork." Given the standardization we suffer today, a "patchwork" and a "jumble" seem preferable.

⁷⁵ The "separation" of scholars from practitioners is "perhaps more prevalent" in education, Taba (1962, 6) suggests, than in other applied fields.

⁷⁶ For Aoki, "as lived" emphasized the curriculum as experience, as undergone by teachers and students, incorporating the phenomenological adjective to contrast this phase with curriculum-as-planned. Taba's "functioning" also denotes the "lived," but derives not from phenomenology but from a "dynamic" view of reality as always becoming (see 1932, xxx).

⁷⁷ It is this statement, surely, that provides the justification for Urve Läänemets and Katrin Kalamees-Ruubel to characterize Tyler's rationale as "deductive" and Taba's as "inductive." If Taba stopped here, they would be right, but she continues, undermining this dynamic view by repositioning it in the sequence that structures the 1962 book. "A curriculum usually contains a statement of aim

and of specific objectives; it indicates some selection and organization of content; it either implies or manifests certain patterns of learning and teaching, whether because the objectives demand them or because the content organization requires them. Finally, it includes a program of evaluation of the outcomes" (1962, 10). Not a page after she has turned this sequence on its head, she turns it back, and without comment.

- ⁷⁸ The emphasis upon "learning" condemns Taba to an emphasis on outcomes, however expansive her sources of evidence. Substituting "communication" for "learning" installs complicated conversation, not testing, as the structure of curriculum (Pinar 2012, 47, 175-177, 235-236).
- ⁷⁹ The preoccupation with "change" provides a contrast with Canada, where it is juxtaposed to "stability." See Tomkins 1986 [2008].
- 80 See Taba 1945, 80-82
- ⁸¹ This is the case in 1945 as well; see Taba 1945, 83, 85, 86.
- 82 See Taba 1945, 81; Taba 1962, v, 1, 2, 16, 221, 265, 284
- 83 Taba 1945, 80.