

statement of curriculum policy which designates long term aims (such as good citizenship) and principles which are not to be infringed (such as equal access to educational opportunities).

Robinson's position incorporates and yet supercedes both of these. Robinson sees teachers as critical decision-makers, that is, people who reflect on and evaluate their actions and the bases for them. To critique intelligently requires knowledge and skill. Robinson puts forward a well-justified case for what counts as the most appropriate and valuable knowledge and skill required by teachers for intelligent curriculum decision making. The expectation is that teachers will utilize this knowledge because of its inherent worth, namely its power to stimulate learning in students. Similarity in practices across teachers is anticipated, not because it is expected by outside-the-classroom facilitators and not because inside-the-classroom differences have been eradicated, but because there is a "best practice," which intelligently critical teachers will choose.

I hope through this brief analysis to have hinted at the richness of the studies included in this book. In particular, Robinson's articles outline a way of approaching curriculum comprehensively and practically that is novel in the curriculum literature. Curriculum scholars of all persuasions, both academics and practitioners, can expect to find something of benefit in this collection of studies. The book is not only, as Leithwood had hoped, an important contribution to studies of curriculum decision making, but it is also an important addition to our practical knowledge about intervening in such decision making.

Notes

- ¹ The "short answers" to the questions posed at the beginning of this review are the following:
1. The strongest influence on teachers' curriculum decisions are teachers' past experiences of what holds student interest and leads to student satisfaction and learning.
 2. Teachers' assessment practices correlate highly with their personal beliefs, and the most influential factor is ability of the students.
 3. In their daily practices, the strongest needs teachers strive to fulfill are needs for students to be interested, to understand and enjoy classroom activities; and concomitant needs for independence, freedom and flexibility in deciding which classroom activities to pursue.
 4. The principal can influence teachers' curriculum decisions through exerting formal authority, manipulating outside-the-classroom and inside-the-classroom rewards, molding the norm structure of the school, encouraging teacher participation in school-wide curriculum decision making, and being supportive in personal interactions with teachers, but usually he does not take advantage of these opportunities.
 5. The primary contributions of university-based change agents to innovations in schools are their ability to conceptualize the problem(s) represented by the innovation, to provide a wide array of information for solving the problem(s), and to instruct in problem-solving procedures.
 6. Most teachers are "moderately autonomous" in translating ministry guidelines into daily plans, that is they operate within general program outlines set by the school board and specific course outlines developed by the school.

Antoinette A. Oberg,
University of Victoria

Schubert, William Henry. *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1980. xviii, 389 pp. \$23.50 (U.S.) cloth; \$14.00 paper.

William Schubert has provided the curriculum field with an invaluable service: he has not only given it a comprehensive list of more than 1100 curriculum books published in the English-speaking world, but he has also provided a decade-by-decade account of the trends in this writing. The book contains,

as far as I know, the most complete listing of books in the field, and as such it is of interest not only to curricularists (as Schubert calls them), but to all those giving leadership in education.

However, before rushing off to the nearest bookstore or library, be aware of two caveats. First, the book is *not* a history of curriculum but a historical guide to curriculum books. In fact, it is not even a bibliography of books and documents that have *influenced* curriculum, but is limited, by and large, to curriculum books *per se*. Harold Shane surveyed the 135 members of the so-called "Professors of Curriculum" in 1980 about writings that they believed most influenced North American curriculum, and listed the top fourteen in the *Phi Delta Kappan* of January 1981. Of these fourteen documents, only half appear in Schubert's book. That is not so much a criticism of Schubert as it is a revelation of the fact that many of the works that have most influenced curriculum are not, strictly speaking, books about curriculum. Examples that the "Professors of Curriculum" give are James' *Pragmatism*, Thorndike's *Educational Psychology*, the Progressive Education Association's *1919 Platform Statement*, Havighurst's *Developmental Tasks and Education*, and Maslow's *Motivation and Personality*.

Secondly, the list is comprehensive but not complete. Of the thirty-odd curriculum books in my personal library that were published before 1980, eight are missing from Schubert's list. Most of the latter are books whose titles do not reveal that their content deals mainly or exclusively with curriculum (e.g., Fuller's *Schools and Scholarship* [Yale U.P., 1982], The Schools Council's *British Primary Schools Today, Volume 1* [Macmillan, 1971], and the *National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education* [McGraw-Hill, 1973]). Furthermore, Schubert deliberately excludes all journal articles, dissertations, curriculum syllabi, and most publications involving specific subject areas. Nevertheless, Schubert's book reflects a prodigious amount of research and will prove to be a helpful companion as one travels through the highways and byways of curriculum literature.

One key question that Schubert faced when his work began was that of defining curriculum. If he took the view that curriculum is what happens in the school, as some scholars are apt to do, his job would have been nigh impossible. Not only would he have had to include an enormous number of general education books (e.g., Weingartner and Postman's *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, Highet's *The Art of Teaching*), but he would also have been hard-pressed to exclude a number of works in philosophy, psychology, and sociology: the extent of his work would have become mind-boggling. On the other hand, if he defined curriculum very narrowly, he might have felt forced to exclude such seminal works as Dewey's *Democracy and Education* or Whitehead's *The Aims of Education*. Schubert has chosen a middle course, leaning — probably wisely — somewhat to the narrow side when he says that curriculum is "the substance or subject matter of educational activity," qualifying this further by adding that it deals with how it is determined *what* to teach. His choice of titles more than adequately reflects his definition.

It is not that Schubert is not concerned about the wider context of education. Quite the contrary, in fact. When he asks the questions, "What do students need? Why do they need it?", his concerns go much beyond specific planning of classroom activities. He regrets, for instance, that curriculum writers have limited their attention to schooling rather than addressing education as it pervades culture. For every decade during this century, he gives political, socio-cultural, and scientific background vignettes. He effectively defends the position that to be "ahistorical" is indefensible: curriculum scholars need to see themselves as part of a broadly-based historical context, since "to create one's origins is to know one's present and to be able to create one's future." He recognizes that schooling and curriculum are influenced by the wider societal context and he does not just want to give an annotated bibliography that could imply that curriculum has been a world of its own, on its own.

Yet it is on this point that Schubert is least convincing. He gives copious factual details of what happened each decade in the political, literary, artistic, and scientific arenas — and says that these must have influenced curriculum thought and practice. However, the readers is left wondering: But *how*? Societal developments are given in the first part of each chapter; curriculum developments in the second. There is an implication of a separation just in the way each chapter is organized, and Schubert provides few stepping stones for bridging the gulf between the two parts. The mass of details about

what is happening in society is not drawn together into coherent themes, and little evidence is given as to how societal trends influenced education in general, and how this, in turn, is related to curriculum development. Worse, curriculum thought seems to be left swaying loftily from a high ceiling in an ivory tower: one is left with the feeling that curriculum is what curriculum professors do — with little reference to actual practice. This is not Schubert's intent, I am sure. Yet he could have improved the book by outlining major themes in the history of thought as well as societal trends, and by showing how these have interacted with both curriculum thought and with practice in the schools.

To his credit, Schubert is more successful in tracing the major themes evident *within* curriculum literature. He classifies it into three major streams: the social behaviorist, the experientialist, and the intellectual traditionalist. While he says himself that this classification is not sacrosanct, it does provide an adequate framework for his discussion of the outworkings of general orientations. He can show, for instance, how the social behaviorist influence diminished during the 1930s, and how eclecticism became popular, especially in what Schubert calls the synoptic texts, in the 1950s. The latter, as he correctly points out, reduced the "perjorative tendency to myopically cling*" to one school of thought or another," but also resulted in undue simplification of difficult curriculum issues. Where the classification tends to break down is in his description of the 1970s. Many of the newer movements seem to defy exact pigeon-holing to one of the three streams. Where would one place Schwab's *The Practical: A Language for Curriculum?* or Apple's *Ideology and Curriculum?* or the writings of the reconceptualists? Schubert mentions Eisner and Vallance's five-category classification, and Orloski and Smith's four-category system. He makes the point that there is a measure of similarity between all categorization schemes. While that is true, he should have considered more seriously whether we have moved beyond the three orientations he uses to discuss curriculum writings: perhaps we are, to use Kuhn's term, on the threshold of a new curriculum paradigm that will take its place beside the others — or perhaps even replace one of them.

An interesting exercise is to categorize the books Schubert lists not by orientation but by the scope of their content. For example, there were several books relating philosophy and curriculum in the 1920s and '30s, almost none in the 1940s and '50s, with the great bulk of such books appearing in the late 60's and 1970s. There were more books dealing with high school curricula than with elementary ones in the 1940s and '50s, but the reverse was true during the past twenty years. Most curriculum books dealing with the junior high curriculum were published in the 1920s when such schools were starting to become popular. There was much writing about the project or activity approach in the 1920s and '30s; very little at all relating curriculum with methodology in the 1950s; and more emphasis on the psychology of learning as it relates to curriculum in the 1960s and '70s. Book titles involving such terms as innovation, change, improvement, revision, and reform occurred in more than ten percent of the titles in the 1960s and early 1970s. An interest in curriculum leadership and curriculum evaluation started to emerge in the 1950s. The core curriculum was written about in the 1950s and '60s, but had become passé by the '70s. There are explanations for all of these trends, of course, and Schubert deals with many of them. However, someone interested in trends such as the "rise and fall" of the core curriculum, or in the century-old quest for "general" education, or in the concept of integration as it relates to curriculum development will have to search through the chronologically-arranged chapters. It might have been helpful for Schubert to give a thematically-arranged cross-reference of this entries, with a brief description and analysis of each theme.

In the May 1981 issue of *Educational Leadership* Ralph Tyler wrote an article called *Curriculum Development Since 1900*, a brief overview of the history of curriculum. This article contrasts with Schubert's book in several ways. First, it manages to pick out major societal trends and how they influenced curriculum without becoming bogged down in a morass of details. Second, while it refers to reports such as the *Eight-Year Study*, it fails to give a single reference to any books that were written on curriculum or that influenced curriculum. While we should not overestimate the importance of curriculum books as they relate to classroom practice, I cannot see how one can do justice to an historical overview of curriculum without at least referring to *some* of the seminal works. Tyler neglects all the work done at the universities (including his own famous "rationale"!). Schubert, on the

other hand, does little to show how the practitioner can use the literature to help his practice, or even how curriculum writings and practice influenced each other. In order to bridge the gap, perhaps persons like Tyler and Schubert need to take note of each other. Moreover, it is to be hoped that someone in the near future will write a history of American curriculum that considers all the facets and their complex web of inter-relations: intellectual history, societal trends, curriculum writings, curriculum research, curriculum materials and resources, classroom practice.

Notwithstanding these comments, it is worthwhile adding Schubert's book to one's personal library, as I have done. The summary overviews of the development of curriculum thought are helpful, succinct statements. The lists of books are useful both for finding books by specific authors or on certain topics, and for getting a feel of the types of books published during various decades. For curricularists, it is a book that on occasion will save several hours of library searching. For practitioners, it is a guide to the most significant books and a checklist on books dealing with specific topics. Come 1990, we can only hope that Schubert will provide us with a supplement to cover the present decade.

* The many split infinitives in the book are only one example of the lack of proper editing from which the book suffers. However, because of the nature of the book, this is not a major drawback — it is still useful for its intended purposes.

Harro VanBrummelen
University of British Columbia

Raymond, James C. (Ed.). *Literacy as a human problem*. University: The University of Alabama Press, 1982. 206 pp. \$16.50 (U.S.) cloth; \$6.95 (U.S.), paper.

The title of this collection of essays may strike the reader as a bit pedantic, if not strictly redundant, because one may, upon encounter, retort: "Well, whose problem could literacy be? The animals'?" Perhaps at this point, this may be a rash judgment to make. Looking at the contents, we find an introduction by the editor, and three parts dealing with the major issues of the problem of literacy, namely, (I) Law, Linguistics and the English Language, (II) Testing: Art or Illusion? and (III) Literacy, Culture and Human Consciousness.

First, a word about the Introduction. The editor presents a clear, concise introduction to the anthology, identifying the problems inherent in the linguistic, phenomenological, and psychological perspectives on literacy. He is correct in saying that the linguists have a totally different interest in language as empirical data from the journalists' or the English teachers' concern, i.e. the precise, refined and effective use of the language. Their interest, however, does not completely separate them from the realm of pragmatics. In fact, it is primarily their view on language and dialects that forestalls our respect and regard for differing linguistic groups. The linguist has shown that each dialect, irrespective of the socio-economic status of its speakers, is comparable to every other dialect in its basic structure and primary function. This notion could lead to an attitude of equal respect towards the speakers of different dialects. To a large extent, this is the essence of granting a speaker (being a person) of one dialect the same worth or value as any other speaker of another dialect or language. With this view, coupled with his recognition of the varying functions of language, the linguist cannot be completely noncommittal on the question of which dialect of English is to be preferred for the purpose of promoting literacy. It may be safe to venture that his/her preference will be no different from the dialect that the non-linguists in the subsequent essays appear to agree on.

Part I consists of four essays as follows: (a) Thomas H. Middleton, Don't Grammar Count?, (b) Vivian I. Davis, Literacy: A Human and a Legal Problem, (c) John Simon, Why Good English Is Good for You, and (d) Elisabeth McPherson, Language: Unites or Divides? The Students' Right in Retrospect. It is a treatment of the controversy over standard English and minority dialects. Middleton and Simon are the outright sponsors of teaching standard English in the classroom, be it loosely defined as the English of educated users of the language or the 'good English' wherein a listener or reader is not