

Chapter 1 : Staff View: Handbook of research on curriculum :

The Handbook of Research on Curriculum (), edited by Philip Jackson, was a project of the American Educational Research Association. This handbook and its successor *The SAGE Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* () are the principle resources for comprehensive research reviews of curriculum studies.

Resources for Admitted Students Handbook Overview The Handbook brings together in one volume the major research and scholarship related to multicultural education that has developed since the field emerged in the s and s. Research is broadly defined in this Handbook. It includes discussions and summaries of research using experimental and quasi-experimental designs, historical and philosophical inquiry, ethnographic studies, survey research, scholarship broadly defined, and insights gained from practice. Each chapter, which is written by a leading authority, critically discusses and summarizes the research on a specific topic, as well as describe the implications of the discussion for further research, policy, and practice. The Handbook is divided into 12 parts. Part I describes the nature, history, goals, and status of the field. The major purpose of the chapters in this section is to provide readers with a description of the way in which the field has developed historically and of its various components and dimensions. Several salient issues, trends and developments that have significant implications for teaching and learning in a multicultural society are described in Part II. The issues discussed are access and achievement in math and science; assessment, standards and equity; and multiracial families and children. Part III focuses on research and research issues in multicultural education. The chapters in this part describe examples of research in multicultural communities and classrooms as well as guidelines for conducting sound research in the field. The ways in which knowledge is constructed is a major research topic in both feminist and ethnic studies scholarship. Part IV focuses on knowledge construction and critical studies. Critical multicultural education, which is discussed in Chapter 13, has emerged as a notable trend in the field. The chapters in Part V examine ways in which researchers have described various ethnic groups in past and contemporary research and publications. A persistent tension has existed between providing cultural freedom for immigrants and shaping a national civic culture with shared values and democratic ideals. The tension between pluribus and unum that has existed since the United States was established still exists today. The three chapters that constitute Part VI describe the historical factors related to immigration and education in the United States, and the demographic, social, and psychological factors that influence the education of immigrant students. The challenges and opportunities of educating specific ethnic groups is the focus of Part VII. The chapters in this part describe the research, issues, and guidelines involved in educating ethnic groups of color in the past, present, and future. Effective ways to educate language minority groups and to help all students acquire second language competencies is becoming increasingly important as the percentage of students who speak a first language other than English increases in U. The chapters in Part VIII examine the research on second language teaching and learning and describe its policy implications. The chapters in Part IX examine, summarize, and derive policy implications from the research regarding ways to increase the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, ethnic, language, and social-class groups. An important aim of multicultural education is to help all studentsâ€” including White mainstream studentsâ€”to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and values needed to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society. The chapters in Part X focus on intergroup education and intercultural relations. Part X opens with a chapter on the history of intergroup education in the United States. Institutions of higher education, in part because of the increasing numbers of women and students of color that have entered their doors since the s, are facing tremendous challenges and opportunities in their efforts to respond effectively to these population groups and to deal with intergroup relations on campus. Many individuals in the United States think of multicultural education and interracial problems as unique to the US. Yet multicultural education is an international discipline and field of study. It takes unique forms in each nation, yet it shares a number of overarching issues, concepts, and paradigms cross-nationally. The chapters in Part XII describe the historical development and current status of multicultural education research and developments in Australia, the United Kingdom, and South Africa.

Chapter 2 : Handbook of Research on Curriculum

*Handbook of Research on Curriculum: A Project of the American Educational Research Association [Philip W. Jackson] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Thirty-six essays on 29 nations—plus four essays of introduction—provide a panoramic and, for several nations on which there are multiple essays, an in-depth view of the state of curriculum studies globally. There is, to my knowledge, no other such volume, at least not in English. As a library, personal, and pedagogical resource, I know it will be of use to scholars and students worldwide. This text may usefully serve as a supplemental textbook in general curriculum courses and as the main text in courses devoted exclusively to internationalization, globalization, and curriculum studies. For prospective and practicing teachers in the United States and elsewhere, it contextualizes national school reform efforts. The collection contributes, I trust, to the complicated conversation that is the internationalization of curriculum studies and the formation of a worldwide field. As this collection testifies, curriculum studies is a field that straddles the divide between contemporary social science and the humanities. Research in the field is sometimes quantitative, often qualitative, sometimes arts-based, and sometimes informed by humanities fields such as philosophy, literary theory, and cultural studies. It is influenced as well by social science fields such as psychology, political and social theory, and, not only in the United States see, e. As the field moves toward formalization within and across national borders, disciplinary infrastructure is being put into place. By the use of that term I intend to draw our attention to the interconnected character of intellectualization and institutionalization. I am thinking not only of those institutions with which we are preoccupied—schools—and how they structure our research; I am thinking of those institutional structures now in place and those we must build to support the academic field of curriculum studies, including professional and scholarly associations and societies, scholarly journals, and conferences, all of which support the intellectual and archival labor necessary for a field of study to come into self-conscious being. As a consequence, there are language constructions that may seem peculiar to those for whom English is their first language. However, these are always decodable and, moreover, often offer novel and instructive conceptualizations. Although we—both at LSU and at Lawrence Erlbaum—have worked to make the English accessible, we have decided to leave some unusual, but informative, conceptualizations unedited. Moreover, Naomi supported the German didaktik book project mentioned in the introduction and cited in the references. As well, Naomi has pledged her support for future projects in which curriculum studies around the world will be described in book form. I am grateful to you, Naomi. I wish to acknowledge two LSU graduate assistants without whose labor this handbook would not have come to form. Seungbin Roh worked on the project in its early phases, and Nicholas Ng-A-Fook brought it to conclusion, reading the entire manuscript and making editorial suggestions. Thank you, Nicholas and Seungbin, very much. My thanks go as well to Professor Hongyu Wang for her editorial work on the essay on China. Miller for suggesting the names of possible contributors. Pinar Louisiana State University This is, I believe, the first international handbook of curriculum studies. As such, it represents the first move in postulating an architecture of a worldwide field of curriculum studies. By worldwide, I do not mean uniform. This fact is evident in the chapters comprising this handbook. The point has a political dimension; it may work against the cultural and economic imperialism associated with the phenomenon known as globalization. In the preamble to the recently established spring International Association for the Advancement, that point was prominent: The Association is established to support a worldwide—but not uniform—field of curriculum studies. At this historical moment and for the foreseeable future, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders, often informed by governmental policies and priorities, responsive to national situations. Curriculum study is, therefore, nationally distinctive. The founders of the IAACS do not dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens. Nor are we unaware of the dangers of narrow nationalisms. Our hope, in establishing this organization, is to provide support for scholarly conversations within and across national and regional borders about the content, context, and process of education, the organizational and intellectual center of which is the curriculum. At the LSU

conference, the organizational meeting was held and the Committee of formed which led to the eventual establishment of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. I chaired that organizational meeting, held on April 30, 1963, in Pleasant Hall on the LSU campus at which the Committee of constituted itself. I served as secretary. During the final 4 months of 1963 and the first 4 of 1964, the committee met and formulated a constitution to propose to the Committee of 1964. That proposed constitution was presented in March 1964 and ratified in April 1964; nominations were made and elections held during May-July, after which the Provisional Executive Committee disbanded and a new administration to serve until 1965 moved into place to lead the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies IAACS. At the LSU meeting in April 1964, informal agreement was reached regarding future meetings: The October meeting will be held in Shanghai, the meeting in Europe perhaps Finland, the meeting in Africa perhaps South Africa, the meeting in South America, and in 1966, the organization returns to North America. Proceedings from each meeting may be published, both in book form and in the IAACS scholarly journal. As well, I foresee handbooks, subsequent to this one, to be published perhaps every 10 years. As the first such handbook, the present volume bears a heavy burden. Although I worked for as comprehensive a coverage as possible, I failed to secure chapters describing the history and present state of curriculum studies in a several important countries, perhaps most conspicuously Germany. Part of the difficulty I faced had to do with the lack of infrastructure, a difficulty future handbook editors should not face. Despite this limitation, there are significant, even ground-breaking, chapters from several contributors. All the chapters provide provocative glimpses into scholarly activity of those committed to the advancement of curriculum. This is not to say that those nations with one chapter and those nations not represented at all do not enjoy productive fields. Considerations of space forbade inviting multiple chapters from all nations with well-established and active fields. I believe readers will agree that sophisticated and sufficiently detailed portraits were achieved. My thanks to each of the contributors for their intellectual labor and commitment to the project. These essays treat issues that traverse national boundaries. First, David Geoffrey Smith elaborates issues concerning the globalization of curriculum studies. Smith discusses the historical evolution of the term and, in so doing, explores several implications of globalization for the field of curriculum studies. He argues that there are three forms of globalization operating in the world today: Globalization One, Two, and Three. President Ronald Reagan and U. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s. Globalization Two refers to the various reactions around the world to Globalization One, reactions spanning the spectrum from accommodation to resistance. Globalization Three refers to those conditions that may now be emerging to support a new global dialogue regarding sustainable human futures. As becomes clear, globalization no longer refers only to such matters as trade between peoples and groups or even to various intercultural exchanges. As a species, we may be imagining ourselves in new ways, especially with respect to issues of identity and citizenship. It is within these crises of identity that Smith finds vexing questions for curriculum studies, questions about epistemological authority, about how knowledge is produced, represented, and distributed, and questions too about the nature of curriculum work. How much is knowledge worth? This question, Smith continues, begs another question: Is knowledge to be the ultimate arbiter of worth? The key, Smith argues, is to find ways through complicity through the complexity of globalization to change the thinking that constructs it. This essay helps us do that and, in fact, furthers one strand of international conversation by asking: How do we understand curriculum in terms of politics, culture, economics, identity, and history? Smith provides initial answers to these questions in his considerations of effects of Globalization One on curriculum reform developments in North America, Singapore, South Africa, Japan, the Caribbean region, and Mexico. In the second essay introducing the collection, Noel Gough thinks globally about environmental education, focusing on the implications of such intellectual labor for the internationalization of curriculum studies. Despite its somewhat marginal status in the field of curriculum studies, environmental education is, Gough argues, a significant site for understanding curriculum internationally for at least two reasons. First, international organizations such as the United Nations and its agencies e. The global character of many environmental issues certainly implies that environmental educators should know how to think globally. In so doing, he continues, environmental educators have tended to assume that Western scientific understandings of global

environmental problems and issues provide an adequate basis for thinking globally. Environmental educators are not alone in making such assumptions, and Gough suggests that implications for other forms of curriculum work might follow from examining the limits to thinking globally in environmental education. Gough recalls a number of studies in the history and sociology of scientific knowledge that demonstrate that Western science is a specific way of thinking locally, and that recognizing its local rather than global character enhances, not diminishes, its potential contribution to international knowledge generation and utilization. Gough suggests that understanding Western science as one among many local knowledge traditions might enhance its contribution to understanding and addressing the global environmental crisis. Additionally, understanding Western epistemologies as just some among many local knowledge systems that can be deployed in curriculum work might enhance their contributions to understanding curriculum internationally. These educators still insist on a project of homogeneity, normalization, and the production of the socially functional citizen. One consequence of this self-isolation from critical scholarship has been the undertheorization of concepts such as culture and identity—concepts Matus and McCarthy note, that are integral to curricular projects such as multiculturalism. Matus and McCarthy problematize how the field has addressed the topics of cultural identity, cultural difference, and cultural community, concepts of striking educational significance during this period of rapid globalization. They read mainstream i. Such issues of cultural identity and the organization of knowledge in schooling are pivotal, Matus and McCarthy argue, during this time of deepening cultural balkanization and curricular insulation in educational institutions—an insulation they argue is indeed precipitated by that proliferation of difference accompanying globalization. In the final essay introducing the handbook, we return to matters of infrastructure for internationalization. My request for the meeting was, in part, a matter of deference: Professor Overly had long been associated with that group, and I did not want the association I had in mind to be competitive with WCCI. Although he expressed no resistance to my idea, he was not enthusiastic about the prospects for an international curriculum conversation. Professor Overly made two points. First, he warned that currency exchange problems make the matter of dues complicated. As a consequence, administrators—often with budgets for such professional opportunities—are able to join the association and attend international meetings. Dues would mean that junior faculty could not easily join and attend meetings. I kept this warning in mind as the Provisional Executive Committee and I worked during fall and spring to formulate a constitution. We agreed to charge no dues to individuals; we did agree to ask affiliating organizations to make a donation. Any funds that accrue, I hope, can begin to form a scholarship fund for travel to IAACS meetings, especially for graduate students and junior faculty, especially those working in nations and regions where currency exchange rates make international travel especially expensive. Rather than focusing on issues concerning curriculum studies. Overly reports, a number of WCCI members and conference participants, over the years, had used those opportunities not to discuss and debate curriculum matters, but instead to imagine themselves as representatives of their respective nations and carry on often aggressive attacks on 6 INTRODUCTION curriculum scholars from other nations, whom they imagined, evidently, to be diplomatic representatives of those nations.

Asserts that many educators do not hold curriculum studies in high regard. Reviews the "Handbook of Research on Curriculum," published by the American Educational Research Association. Concludes that the volume will serve the interests of researchers but not other constituents within the curriculum.

Carr and Douglas E. Harris Table of Contents Thinking About Curriculum Everywhere today, curriculum planners are being asked to determine how to implement state standards and other issues when addressing their curricula. But how to go about that? The intent of this revised introductory chapter is to provide an overview of curriculum, so that the subject-specific chapters that follow can be viewed from a broader perspective. The chapter begins by providing a knowledge base for the process of developing curricula. The chapter also analyzes curriculum work at the state, school district, school, and classroom levels. An additional section, Putting Standards to Work in Schools, has been included in this revised chapter to outline the ways in which standards can be incorporated into curricula see pages Curriculum Concepts While curriculum planners have tried for decades to define curriculum—often with very little guidance—two approaches can resolve the debate. The first is to use a simple definition that reflects how most educational leaders use the term: Curriculum is the skills and knowledge that students are to learn. A more complex approach is to analyze the several sources of curriculum; from this perspective there are eight different kinds: The recommended curriculum derives from experts in the field. Almost every discipline-based professional group has promulgated curriculum standards for its field. A Compendium of Standards and Benchmarks for K Education, 2nd Edition is an excellent compilation of these standards. The written curriculum is found in the documents produced by the state, the school system, the school, and the classroom teacher, specifying what is to be taught. At the district level, the documents usually include a curriculum guide and a scope-and-sequence chart; many school systems make their curriculum documents available through their databases and the Internet. The written curriculum also includes materials developed by classroom teachers. The tested curriculum is the one embodied in tests developed by the state, school system, and teachers. The term "test" is used broadly here to include standardized tests, competency tests, and performance assessments. The taught curriculum is the one that teachers actually deliver. The learned curriculum is the bottom-line curriculum—what students learn. Clearly it is the most important of all. Two other types of curriculum—although not explicit and visible in school curriculum documents, materials, and tests—are also worth noting: It includes such elements as the use of time, allocation of space, funding for programs and activities, and disciplinary policies and practices. Eisner terms this the "null curriculum," since it is not readily apparent. Gehrke, Knapp, and Sirotnik point out that the excluded curriculum is "powerful by virtue of its absence" p. Interactions of Curriculum Types How do these curriculum types interact? The research literature and experience working with education leaders and school systems on curriculum development suggest the following: The recommended curriculum in general has little impact on the written curriculum and perhaps less of an effect on the classroom teacher. The recommendations of subject matter experts and policymakers regarding curriculum content usually have had little influence on schools. A notable recent exception are the recommendations offered by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, which seem to have influenced the mathematics curriculum of many school systems and have been positively received by most math teachers. The written curriculum has only a moderate influence on the taught curriculum. Most experienced teachers review the curriculum guide at the start of the year and then put it aside as they weigh other factors in deciding what to teach. The tested curriculum seems to have the strongest influence on the curriculum actually taught. In an era of accountability, teachers are understandably concerned about how their students perform on tests. Much classroom time is spent on developing test-wisness and on practicing questions similar to those that will appear on district, state, and national tests. And in almost every class, students ask the perennial question: Gooding determined that teachers using performance assessments incorporated the use of research-based teaching behaviors more frequently than those relying on traditional forms of evaluation. Note, however, that a recent study concluded that students in states with mandatory high

school graduation tests achieved less on a test of academic performance than students in states with lower-stakes test programs Neill, The supported curriculum continues to have a strong influence on the taught curriculum, especially for elementary teachers, who teach four or five subjects. The textbook is often their major source of content knowledge. There is a significant gap between the taught curriculum and the learned curriculum; students do not always learn what they are taught. Several factors account for the gap: Every day students are exposed to the hidden and excluded curriculum and internalize their messages. Although all these types of curricula are important, curriculum leaders should focus on the learned curriculum, emphasizing the importance of implementing the written curriculum and helping teachers close the gap between the taught and the learned curricula. Curriculum Quality What constitutes a high-quality curriculum? In one sense the question cannot be answered empirically, since the question is value-laden. If curriculum leaders believe a narrowly focused curriculum that deals only with the "basics" is most desirable, then they will argue for the merits of such a curriculum. On the other hand, if they believe in a comprehensive curriculum that deals broadly with life-related issues, then they will advocate such an approach. This division cannot always be reconciled by turning to the research. Putting the value issue aside, here are several research-based guidelines for developing a high-quality curriculum. Structure the curriculum so that it allows students and teachers to study in greater depth some of the most important topics and skills. Several studies conclude that focusing in depth on a smaller number of skills and concepts will lead to greater understanding and retention and will better support efforts to teach problem solving and critical thinking. Structure the curriculum so that it calls on students to use various learning strategies to solve problems. Note that this does not mean having students learn generic thinking skills. Although the initial interest in critical thinking led many innovators to teach isolated "thinking skills," research in cognitive psychology now indicates clearly that such skills are better learned and retained when they are embedded in units that deal with complex meaningful problems in a particular context. Structure and deliver the curriculum so that all students acquire both the essential skills and knowledge of the subjects. For many years educators foolishly argued about the primacy of content versus process. Recent advances in cognitive psychology indicate clearly that such a dichotomy is dysfunctional. Students can solve complex problems in science, for example, only when they are given access to the knowledge required to solve them. Cognitive psychologists distinguish between inert knowledge—knowledge that is not used—and generative knowledge, which is used in solving meaningful problems. For example, if students learn where the capital of Pennsylvania is and keep that in memory, it is inert knowledge. If they learn where the capital is and use that knowledge to write to the governor, then it becomes generative. Generative knowledge is called to mind when it is used in solving problems. Three types of responsiveness are recommended. First, the curriculum should use varied modes of representation—the ways people display or transfer knowledge. Most educators emphasize verbal modes. Some innovative educators add visual means such as flow charts and web diagrams. The curriculum also should be organized so that the teacher can provide a high degree of structure at the beginning of the year by giving cues, suggestions, and explanations. Then, as the year progresses, the teacher can let students solve problems on their own. Finally, the curriculum should recognize the multiple intelligences students have, rather than stressing only the verbal and mathematical. Organize the curriculum so that it provides for multiyear, sequential study, not "stand-alone" courses. Emphasize both the academic and the practical. Johnson makes this point about the science curriculum: Experience is the application of understanding" p. This linking of academic and applied knowledge should occur throughout the curriculum, not just in "tech prep" courses. Selectively develop integrated curricula. Numerous studies have concluded that the use of integrated curricula has resulted in better achievement and improved attitudes toward schooling. The principal and the teachers together can decide the type and extent of curriculum integration for their school, using guidelines provided by the district. For further analysis of integration, see Putting Standards to Work in Schools on page Focus on the achievement of a limited number of essential curriculum objectives, rather than trying to cover too many Cotton, Keep in mind the importance of depth. Maintain an emphasis on the learned curriculum. As Schmoker notes, school leaders should be primarily concerned with results—improved learning for all students. The written curriculum—whether integrated or subject-focused—is only a means to an end: Many

developments and trends in K-12 education are altering the landscape for curriculum work. Although history shows that it is often hard to predict which changes will have a substantial impact on schools and which will turn out to be nothing more than fads, it is worthwhile to assess current trends as part of curriculum renewal. Following are some of the major trends that can influence curriculum, based on history and current literature. As part of your curriculum work, you may want to create your own list of current trends, paying particular attention to trends in your area.

Increasing Importance of National and State Standards At the time of this writing, there is considerable debate about national standards. Although almost all national organizations representing the various subject areas have issued voluntary content standards, policy battles over the proper federal role have stalled some of the most ambitious plans for implementing them. Continuing dissatisfaction with student achievement, especially as reflected in the news media, is likely to result in more discussion of the proper role of national standards. Advocates, they say, assert that standards will ensure that all citizens will have the shared knowledge and values needed to make democracy work. Result in greater efficiency, since all 50 states can draw upon the national standards. Encourage state and local boards to raise their standards. Improve the quality of schooling. Ensure a large measure of educational equity. That variation in consistency is probably one of the factors accounting for international differences in achievement. Still, Smith and colleagues note several disadvantages emphasized by the critics of national standards:

Chapter 4 : SAGE Reference - Handbook of Research on Curriculum, The

Curriculum research in writing and reading / Judith A. Langer, Richard L. Allington Literature and the English language arts / Arthur N. Applebee, Alan C. Purves Problematic features of the school mathematics curriculum / Thomas A. Romberg.

Chapter 5 : SAGE Reference - International Handbook of Curriculum Research

PREFACE This international handbook of curriculum research reports on scholarly developments and school curriculum development initiatives worldwide. Thirty-six essays on 29 nations plus four essays of introduction provide a panoramic and, for sev-

Chapter 6 : Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education | UW College of Education

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Chapter 7 : Table of Contents: Handbook of research on curriculum :

This work provides a comprehensive overview of what is currently known about a wide range of curricular issues affecting pre-collegiate education and contains a wealth of current major findings and suggestions about how curriculum can be reshaped.

Chapter 8 : International Handbook of Curriculum Research by William F. Pinar

Get Textbooks on Google Play. Rent and save from the world's largest eBookstore. Read, highlight, and take notes, across web, tablet, and phone.

Chapter 9 : Thinking About Curriculum

Geoffrey Milburn Geoffrey Milburn is a professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, Western Rd,

London, Ont., Canada N6G 1G7.