



The History of Curriculum or Curriculum History? What *is* the Field and Who Gets to Play on it?

Bernadette Baker

To cite this article: Bernadette Baker (1996) The History of Curriculum or Curriculum History? What *is* the Field and Who Gets to Play on it?, Curriculum Studies, 4:1, 105-117, DOI: [10.1080/0965975960040106](https://doi.org/10.1080/0965975960040106)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965975960040106>



Published online: 11 Aug 2006.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 12886



Citing articles: 5 View citing articles [↗](#)

The History of Curriculum or Curriculum History? What *is* the Field and Who Gets to Play on it?

BERNADETTE BAKER

University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA

ABSTRACT The field of curriculum history is a relatively recent phenomenon in the study of education. How the genesis of the field has been reviewed and constructed by historians is reflective of the ways in which the field constructs the objects of study that comprise its content and emphases. This paper explores some of the tensions inherent to labelling and describing the construction of the curriculum history field within the contexts of Australian, English and New Zealand academies. I argue that while tensions exist within the ways in which curriculum history has been constructed in different national contexts, these tensions contribute to similar erasures of who and what is studied through the historical lenses employed. Attention to these blindspots that currently characterize the field requires a *methodological shift in historiography that combines the multiplicity of perspectives that some poststructural theories enable with structural concerns over traditional and continuing forms of group oppression.*

Introduction

Identifying a field of study which is referred to today as 'curriculum history' was not a plausible task 30 years ago (Goodson, 1987; McCulloch, 1987; Popkewitz, 1987; Musgrave, 1988, Kliebard, 1992a). In Western contexts of schooling and studies of schooling the emergence of such a discipline had much to do with processes that pervaded the academies of countries like England, the United States of America (USA), Canada, Australia and New Zealand (NZ). The generation of a new academic discipline, the creation of paradigms for study in and through it and the labelling of the field itself has incorporated struggles which are in some ways reflective of the struggles over mass education which currently dominate much of the agenda in curriculum history studies.[1]

Dominant definitions of the field in North America and Britain in the 1980s pointed to the newly emerging recognition of the relationship

between history and curriculum studies. Goodson (1988), for example, positioned the role of historical methodology and historical data as an important means to understanding relationships between the state and public schooling in different locales and time periods. This recognition was not simply an additive one though, where curriculum studies and history were neatly joined as equal partners in explanatory endeavours. The primacy given historical methodology (as opposed to what Goodson calls 'raids' on historical data) reflected a qualitative shift in the analysis of curriculum. Goodson (1983) argued, for instance, that the emphasis on the centrality of socio-historical approaches to curriculum studies enabled a consideration of the complexities of curriculum from a less universalising point of view. As such, the concern of researchers was not so much to provide a general explanation but to raise issues and generate insights about past and current work which does seek to provide such explanatory theory (1983, p. 3).

Popkewitz (1987) argued similarly for a central role of history in understanding curricula. In this role, history is adopted as a lens on the present. Rather than seeing this lens on the present as providing a chronicle of the development of schooling, though, Popkewitz argued that:

The problem of study is to subject the traditions and customs of everyday life to scrutiny. It is to make problematic the everyday language and practices of schooling in order to consider how schooling is possible as a social reality ... To recognize that the present as a moment of tradition is a reversal of much of our logic about social life and schooling. Our efforts to improve the quality of schooling cannot resist the residues of our past values, remnants in the very patterns that we institute as school change. (1987, p. 2)

Kliebard (1992b), in reviewing the field of curriculum history in the USA, argued that it was less an area with clearly defined boundaries and checkpoints and was characterised more by 'controlling tendencies'. These tendencies were manifested mostly as a concern with what was accepted as knowledge in certain times and places as well as a concern with persons and society generally (1992b, p. 158). Kliebard argued that these concerns have generated a multiplicity of interpretations that speak to the complexities binding knowledge, social groups and schooling and, as such, the contribution of the history of education to understanding what was taught in schools and why is the underscoring of the importance of *context*.

These characterisations of the field that I have briefly alluded to here represent in many ways Foucault's observation concerning the establishment of new disciplines. Foucault (1984) argued that the establishment of a discursive field in a discipline sets not only a new discourse that is generative of categories with which people in the future think about and classify their work, but it also spawns the limits of its

opposite, its *difference*, and hence what is considered appropriate or inappropriate, imaginable or unimaginable to pursue in the field.

The works of key definers of the field in different contexts can provide a lens through which to see what priorities and possibilities are spawned and not spawned by these discursive limits. What I explore below is how two key definers of the curriculum history field in Australia and New Zealand have presented the rise of the field during a period (the 1980s) where academic literature on curriculum history was burgeoning in other countries. In popular culture, Australia and New Zealand are sometimes thought to suffer from both a 'cultural cringe' (a belief in the inferiority of anything that is produced from these cultures) and a 'cultural lag' (a belief that what is produced elsewhere takes a long time to reach Australia and New Zealand). My task here is not to weigh such beliefs. Rather, I will examine the discursive constructs used in the description of the curriculum history field to understand how dominant conceptualisations of the field within Australia and New Zealand have simultaneously reinforced and mutated those that have been used to define the field elsewhere.

Within this context, the works of P.W. Musgrave, 'Curriculum history: past, present and future' and Gary McCulloch, 'Curriculum history in England and New Zealand' have provided some insights into these dimensions and processes which have underpinned the genesis of the curriculum history field in Australia, England and New Zealand specifically.[2] While I have chosen to concentrate on only two particular authors my focus and energies are not concerned so much with who wrote what. Instead, I am concerned with the nature and structure of discourse available with which to reason, to explore and to describe the curriculum history field. My comments, while referring to Musgrave and McCulloch individually for ease of reference, are intended more as a pointer to the broader discursive constructs and iterations that structure the field. As such, I have two particular foci. First, I wish to consider what insights these accounts of curriculum history's construction (as opposed to its 'evolution') reveal about the nature of the field in different contexts. And secondly and related, I will consider what insights this discourse on the genesis of the field obscures through the priorities and categories that construct the controlling tendencies of the field in Australia and New Zealand especially. In short, I wish to review the structures that define what the field is, who gets to play on it and why.

What's in a Name?

How a new academic discipline is labelled can reflect, like syllabi, the "not very tidy compromise" achieved between groups with different interests vying over its definition (Kliebard, 1986, p. 27). Asking whether a field concerns itself with history of curricula or curriculum history is not a pedantic academic exercise. It points to the priorities and emphases that a label implies. How, then, did 'curriculum history' come

to be in Australia and New Zealand and what can Musgrave and McCulloch tell us of the label in different contexts?

How Musgrave and McCulloch tell the story of curriculum history is indicative not only of the methodological diversity which characterizes the field but provides insights into the very problematic and central role of discursive limits in researching and constructing any historical account (Milburn et al, 1989). Musgrave, in discussing the Australian context, for instance, argues that in order to understand how history can contribute to curriculum theory and development, scholars must first distinguish between different views of history and different views of curriculum theory (1987, p. 5). From this positioning, Musgrave gives an account of the changing meaning of both curriculum and history since the advent of mass schooling.[3]

For Musgrave, definitions of curriculum in Australia were rather similar from the beginning of mass schooling until 1970. Curricula were seen as statements of aims, subject matter and sometimes, teaching methods (p. 2). They were predominantly secondary school-based and academically oriented where "neither the framework used nor the nature of the social structure was made clear" (p. 2).

From 1970 onwards a major shift in curriculum definition occurred in Australia which partially followed events in the USA in the 1960s, and later, in England. Here, there was a consideration not only of the elements of subject matter, but of *student learning* as well. To this end, the formal characteristics of curricula (i.e. official content) were supplemented by the informal learnings generated through 'the hidden curriculum' of schooling and the associated morality of these.

By the 1980s Musgrave argues that the influence of the New Sociology had become visible in dominant conceptions of curriculum in three ways:

- (1) the emphasis on moral dimensions of curricula,
- (2) an increasingly practical focus, and
- (3) "an open and deeper conceptualization because of the pressures felt by academics to be more accountable to their political masters".

In short, Musgrave argues that "curricular reality rather than the rhetoric involved" became the dominant focus (p. 3).

The different views of history that Musgrave sees as relevant to understanding the dimensions of the curriculum history field tend to follow a similar pattern. Again, homogeneity in method and style are seen as existing until 1970. Pre-1970 history was the seeking out and presentation of evidence, document-based and a commonsensical account of events (p. 3). Post-1970 has seen a more explicit statement of the conceptual framework used and a more reflexive questioning of dominant terms of organization, like 'progressive'. In addition, a wider variety of sources has been drawn upon so that observation, oral

accounts, ethnographies and other non-documentary evidence has been incorporated into the methods.

Musgrave uses these metatheoretical accounts to explain how, amongst other things, curriculum history has come to be a product of both curriculum studies and historiography. For example, Musgrave argues that on the one hand, history as applied to curriculum studies has been conservative in approach generally in Australia but that had concepts like Gramsci's hegemony been used more frequently the dominant structural-functionalist framework could have been replaced sooner (p. 11). On the other hand, because "the curriculum is a major point of tension between the interests of the individual and society" social historians have much to gain from studying the curriculum in relation to changing ideas and knowledge (p. 11). Consequently, Musgrave's positioning of the curriculum history field is in some ways, representative of a *dialectical* and interactive analysis – a look at how originally separate paradigms and theories were combined and impacted each other.

In contrast, McCulloch is, as Musgrave actually notes (p. 1), less explicit in the analytic bases of his work. Despite this, McCulloch's construction of the curriculum history field can be seen in some ways as different to that of Musgrave's. While both authors appear to agree about the major theoretical shift in curriculum studies since the strong influence of the New Sociology, the rise and predominance of subject social histories in the secondary school curriculum and about the recent burgeoning of curriculum history literature in Australia and England, the similarities do not extend to how they perceive the *interaction* between paradigms of curriculum study and theories of history. McCulloch's work, for instance, takes as its centrepiece how historical and social theoretical paradigms have contributed to curriculum studies. Not only is the reverse not centrally considered, but the centrality of the curricula dimension is rarely questioned. This is because the insights that historical, social and political analysis have provided are always positioned as 'add ons' to curriculum theory. Take these explanations of the formation of the field:

The darkening vision [of lack of curricular change] led in turn to the adoption of various new approaches to the study of the curriculum, including an increased emphasis on its social and historical aspects. (p. 301) (emphasis added)

Socio-historical treatments of the school curriculum were further encouraged by the new interest among historians of education in the relations between education and society. (p. 303) (emphasis added)

The relationship between education and politics in the 1970s also influenced the trend towards awareness of the historical character of curriculum. (p. 304) (emphasis added)

My point here is not to dispute the validity of McCulloch's assertions with regards to each statement nor to contest the details of sentences quoted without a fuller context taken into consideration. Rather, it is to emphasise that in defining the field of curriculum history both Musgrave's and McCulloch's perceptions have led to a differential positioning, description and hence understanding of how 'curriculum history' came to be. For Musgrave, it was primarily through struggles over definitions of curriculum and definitions of history and how different players combined and utilized them to generate a field which appeared as it did in 1988. While curriculum study *was* centrally positioned in the argument, Musgrave does note that differences exist over *how* history has been used to create curriculum history, such as, as a means of simply explaining an event, or, to develop and test a theory (p. 6). For McCulloch though, curriculum history came to be as a process of curriculum *plus* history – simply an increasing awareness on the part of curriculum specialists of the importance of history to understanding change. In short, McCulloch's account appears to have asked what has history *contributed* to curriculum studies whereas Musgrave seems to query what has a combination of curriculum studies and historiography *produced*. Thus, the label 'curriculum history' not only masks to some extent the diverse practices and interpretations which are performed under its title, but also points to the problematic nature of attempting to construct the boundaries of a field across different national contexts.

What's the Field Like Today?

While Musgrave's and McCulloch's construction of curriculum history's history may differ, their presentation of its current characteristics are ironically and remarkably similar in some ways. The dimensions of the curriculum history field described seem fairly constant, for example, across Australian and English contexts, but not so much New Zealand. Both authors agree that the field at the time they were writing was generally characterized by culturally contextual analyses, an emphasis on the social histories of secondary school subjects, a concern with the complexity of social and political structures, the difficulty with generating curriculum change both in the past and present and by increasingly diverse accounts of history such as oral, visual, life, comparative, ethnographic and phenomenological styles.[4] In many ways this concurs with much of the work undertaken in US contexts as well (e.g. Kliebard, 1986, 1992a, b; Popkewitz, 1987).

Despite these common assertions of the centrality of cultural sensitivity, contextuality and the interplay of social and political structures to the shaping of the curriculum history field, there appears to be some contradictory claims *within* the analyses of the field as to what the field is and should be in different countries. Musgrave, for instance, argues that the framework curriculum history should be placed in is a very wide one particularly within the sociology of knowledge (p. 11).

Interestingly, though, it is the lack of a specifically *curricular* focus in the work of some theorists that is later admonished. Musgrave states, for instance, that American revisionist historians' focus on equality in curriculum studies "has led them to consider the political and administrative rather than the curricular elements in schooling" (p. 4). It is tempting to ask here both what the implicit conception of curriculum actually is within this reasoning and how one can consider these elements separately, or, *if* one should when they exist, in context, together. In addition, if the framework recommended is said to be 'wide' why urge a distillation of only certain parts of a picture – a picture that, in context, is bigger, messier and more complex than the arbitrary labels we create in order to section pieces of it off for analysis? As Kimball (1989, p. 8) notes, such an atomistic view makes it very difficult to put Humpty Dumpty back together again.[5] It seems, then, that the language available with which to view such complexity in some ways has forced an atomising of concepts through which to view the emergence of curriculum history and the tasks undertaken beneath its rubric. These divisions within the analytical frameworks of the emerging curriculum history field of the 1980s can be seen to reflect similar divisions within the institution of schooling towards which it was focused.

Similarly, McCulloch identified the 'necessary attributes' (p. 314) of curriculum history if it was to emerge in New Zealand as it did in England as a new discipline. McCulloch asserts that while curriculum historians must interpret the curriculum as a social and political construct, New Zealand curriculum historians do not necessarily need to stress the "complexity, failure and disappointment" that has characterized much English work (pp. 314-315). Not only does this deny the history of the field's genesis outlined earlier (i.e. the use of historical theory to understand the *lack* of curricular change and its complexity) but it also denies two other important factors. The first is that if social and political constructions of curriculum are *not* considered complex then this comes dangerously close to inviting simplistic and reductionist visions of what occurs in schooling specifically and society more broadly. Complexity would seem not merely a 'necessary attribute' of work done in the curriculum history field, then, but an *inherent and intrinsic* part of who and what is being studied.

Secondly, if failure and disappointment regarding curriculum change are not central one is forced to ask *why* curriculum history exists in the first place? Towards *what purposes* is curriculum history directed? As part of what broader social context does 'it' exist? Why would history contribute to 'better understandings' in curriculum study and theory if not directed towards ideals of change, whatever these may be? In short, what are the rules of reasoning underlying McCulloch's discourse? Does it imply a notion of history simply as story telling? Does curriculum history become positioned more as just an academic exercise? One is forced to consider to what use people may put the knowledge generated through curriculum history. Recommendations to avoid considerations of

failure, disappointment and complexity in any new field must beg the question, 'Why?'

On this count, Goodson (1985) argued that historical studies of the evolution of school knowledge had three major contributions to make:

- (1) to improve our knowledge of the school curriculum through elucidating the changing human process behind the definition and promotion of school subjects,
- (2) to explain the dominant anti-research tradition among teachers, and
- (3) to inform and influence policy and practice through an awareness of historical precedents (pp. 6-7).

It is directed towards, in Shuker's words, "not so much the past, but rather with the relationship between past and present" (1985, p. 54). McCulloch's characterization of 'necessary attributes' of the field and Musgrave's implicit segregation of curricular from political and administrative aspects of schooling, though, appear to imply, consciously or not, more a concern with gaining academic status as a separate field of study in tertiary institutions than to notions of *improving* schooling for pupils and teachers.

So far I have outlined insights that the authors have generated regarding the formation of the curriculum history field, differences in their construction of it in different contexts and similarities and contradictions that exist within the discourse available regarding what the curriculum history field was in the 1980s or should be like in the future. I wish to now focus on how such conceptualisations of curriculum history can promote a reading of *absences* that make contradictions *present* given the characteristics and imperatives of the field argued for in Australia and New Zealand.

Who's Playing?

Primarily, the accounts given of the history of a relatively new field reflect what is commonly referred to under poststructuralist theorizing as 'grand narratives'. The effects of this are several. Because the accounts are presented intentionally or not as 'THE' story of curriculum history, a homogeneity in discourse and description of events prevails in each. These generalizations are particularly noticeable in assertions like those of Musgrave's that between the introduction of mass schooling in Australia and the 1970s there was hardly any change or variety in the theory of curriculum or history. Thus, the history of the field appears as somewhat generalized, universalistic, ahistorical and unidimensional. Given the many struggles between *different* interest and power groups over the curriculum like those identified in the works of Goodson (1983, 1988), Popkewitz (1987), and Kliebard (1986, 1992a,b) it seems odd that such contestation would be absent from the establishment of curriculum history as a subject area in Australia and New Zealand and absent from the methodologies pursued to explain its emergence.

Another function of the grand narrative generated by such discourse is the exclusion of specific interest groups that seem to fall outside of the historical lenses employed. In mainstream analyses of curriculum in the past the absence of racial and gender dynamics has also been indicative of how the field was defined and who has been playing on it since. With regards to Anglo-feminism and the curriculum, for instance, there are many historical accounts in England and Australia of how the curriculum has been constructed with regards to the gender of pupils, the predominantly female gender of the workforce, the struggle by women to gain access to university study and the masculine biases in the sociology of knowledge of the 1970s, the Frankfurt school in general and more recently, critical pedagogy (see for example, Grumet, 1989; Gore, 1990; Ellsworth, 1992; Luke, 1992; Walkerdine, 1992). Despite the plethora of this evidence, and the prolific literary output of first and second wave feminism on the curriculum which was available by the late 1980s, little of it has made its way into the accounts of curriculum history's birth in Australia and New Zealand. Not surprisingly, this has contributed to a definition of 'mainstream' curriculum history as a field by Anglo-Western men about Anglo-Western men with issues of race and gender being confined and *contained* within recent 'revisionist' and critical historical work only. As Luke (1992) observes of the history of educational rationality on the American scene,

Appeals to education's 'greats', such as John Dewey and George Counts, revalorize an early 20th-century vision of a "democratic tradition" from which American education is currently judged to be in retreat ... Dewey was quite clear on who his object of study was, on the separation of the private and the public: "When men act, they act in a common and public world" ... Without an acknowledgement of the deeply embedded masculinist standpoint in Dewey's democratic vision or, for that matter, of Frankfurt School's theoretical world view, their incorporation into the critical pedagogy text of the 1980s is no more than a dangerous extension – a dangerous memory – of conceptions of male individualism, power, and public speech disguised in the rhetoric of universalized self- and social empowerment.
(1992, p. 133)

Related to this is the way in which absences of analyses of curriculum and curriculum history based on racial power relations have also defined the field. Interpretations of 'curriculum' and 'history' differ according to the cultural interests of those doing the interpreting. Yet in their analyses, Musgrave and McCulloch seem to have neglected the experiences and analyses of curricula provided by the dominant racial and ethnic minorities of England, New Zealand and Australia such as West Indian, Indian, Pakistani, Maori, Koori, Greek, Italian and Chinese accounts.

In addition to these absences of race and gender in the historiography of curriculum history, treatments of class have also been problematic. Why curriculum history emerged as a new discipline at the tertiary level in a historical period when history in general has been the *unfavoured* discipline in a society favouring technical proficiencies has not been explored. In Australia, for instance, high school teachers in the 1980s had to justify why the subject should *not* be excluded from the curriculum in some states at the same time that curriculum history was burgeoning in the literature of the academies. The vested class interests of employers in centrally positioning the 'needs', of a technically competent workforce, the consequent class implications of this in curriculum matters and its relationship to the concurrent rise of curriculum history as a field have not been thoroughly explored in the history of curriculum history.

Thus, despite claims of social and political analyses which embodied cultural contextuality and complexity it appears that much of what has been performed under the rubric of 'curriculum history' was a certain type of class-based analysis that has tended to homogenize people both between and within different classes. The impact of claiming more through a discourse than the reality of research practice had delivered has been to perpetuate exclusivist notions of who 'key' historical actors have been and *whose* type of thought, theory, history and versions of curriculum 'matter'.

Lastly, the construction and definition of the field in the 1980s not only marginalised or co-opted the histories of women and girls, the males and females of oppressed racial and ethnic groups and some aspects of class structures, but has also ignored the evidence of children – the very pupils for whom curricula were initially constructed. While calls within critical and revisionist accounts of late for 'student voice' are now seen as problematic given the narrow conception of 'student' that has predominated historically as white, male and able-bodied, evidence or accounts that draw on the concerns of different pupils in relation to the curricula they help to construct has tended to characterize the curriculum history field by their absence (Orner, 1992). While there has been some pathbreaking work on the history of childhood related to schooling in other settings like that of Finkelstein (1975) in the USA, the 1980s saw little emphasis within curriculum history specifically upon children's activities. Instead, the field appeared to be primarily teachers', administrators' and academics' accounts of other teachers, administrators and/or academics in the past. This would seem to be a somewhat glaring omission if curriculum history is to genuinely seek out the complexities associated with curriculum change. Changing who? For what? Why them? And why in that way? The erasure of pupils in curriculum history studies, especially in subject social histories of secondary curricula, contributes to an evasion of these questions which in the long term must surely be addressed if the epistemological bases of the curriculum history field are to be made more explicit and democratic.

Conclusion

It seems then that Musgrave's and McCulloch's works have provided some insights into the history and nature of the curriculum history field in different countries. The discourse such accounts draw upon illuminate both the style of reasoning which was available in the 1980s to discuss the field and the limitations that reiterations of such reasoning hold. While this has itself helped to define the field and who the current players are, it also suggests a way for the future which I believe is somewhat different to that suggested in each version of its growth.

Apart from utilising a diverse array of sources in order to 'develop or test a theory' or 'explain events' related to curricula, I would argue that different frameworks have to be utilised in the first place so that the evidence collected does not merely continue to reinforce the same absences in a richer way. Frameworks where the sensitivity of poststructuralist concerns for multiple perspectives combine with the foundationalism of frameworks which centre the structures of race, gender and class oppression have been used since the 1980s, albeit not in the mainstream and not always by authors specifically undertaking curriculum history work.[6] Not only may such a methodological shift allow a curriculum historian to confront their own embeddedness in these structures but it also forces a consideration of *what purpose(s)* the study is being conducted for. In addition, it would enable the visibility of different *pupils* in the process of curriculum history's construction as opposed to study simply based on the next academic trend. As Scott (1992) argues, though, in discussing histories of difference which frequently invoke a concern to report the 'experience' of groups who are presently marginalized or oppressed, there is a danger in naming the categories without understanding what the conditions of existence for the construction of those categories have been:

It is precisely this kind of appeal to experience as uncontested evidence and as an originary point of explanation – as a foundation upon which analysis is based – that weakens the critical thrust of histories of difference. By remaining within the epistemological frame of orthodox history, these studies lose the possibility of examining those assumptions and practices that excluded considerations of difference in the first place. They take as self-evident the identities of those whose experience is being documented and thus naturalize their difference. They locate resistance outside its discursive construction and reify agency as an inherent attribute of individuals, thus decontextualizing it. (1992, pp. 24-25)

The path that Scott suggests is just one possible path for the future of curriculum history which may help to illuminate the blind spots which have characterized the birth of the field. It may contribute to a more

BERNADETTE BAKER

genuine and frank understanding of why change is so difficult and enable a fresh look at who and what the problems are and have been.

Acknowledgement

I thank Herb Kliebard for his feedback on earlier drafts of this paper.

Correspondence

Bernadette Baker, Room 144E, Teacher Education Building, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 225 N. Mills Street, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

Notes

- [1] I refer to curriculum history as a field of study and a discipline despite Goodson's (1985) observation that in the 1980s it was pre-paradigmatic. This is primarily because authors and academics involved in the area not only self-title what they are studying as 'curriculum history' but can also point to curriculum history associations, major journals for curriculum history literature and the publication of books in several different countries on topics that are, again, self-labelled as curriculum history.
- [2] See References that follow for full citations of Musgrove and McCulloch's papers.
- [3] In Australia, there were large discrepancies between states as to the dates for the introduction of compulsory mass schooling. In addition, these times differed for the different levels of schooling and for different groups of people.
- [4] Musgrave's and McCulloch's writings were published in 1987 and 1988. I would argue though that while seven and eight years later some of their observations may still stand, my later criticisms are not intended to take full cognisance of subsequent developments. This paper is directed toward a review of what insights these particular accounts provide of the *genesis* and *construction* of the field in the countries studied.
- [5] As Kliebard (1992a,b) notes, however, the function of theories, frameworks or metaphors is to grasp something that is complex so that it can be analysed and understood. The very nature of this task will ultimately alter how something is seen or appears.
- [6] See for example, C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds) (1992) *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

References

- Ellsworth, E. (1992) Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy, *Harvard Educational Review*, 59, pp. 297-324.
- Finkelstein, B. (1975) Pedagogy as intrusion: teaching values in popular primary schools in nineteenth-century America, *History of Childhood Quarterly*, 2, pp. 348-378.
- Foucault, M. (1984) What is an author?, in P. Rabinow (Ed.) *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Goodson, I. (1988) *The Making of Curriculum*. London: Falmer Press.
- Goodson, I. (Ed.) (1987) *International Perspectives in Curriculum History*. London: Croom Helm.
- Goodson, I. (Ed.) (1985) *Social Histories of the Secondary Curriculum: subjects for study*. London: Falmer Press.
- Goodson, I. (1983) *School Subjects and Curriculum Change*. London: Croom Helm.
- Gore, J. (1990) What we can do for you! What can 'we' do for 'you?': struggling over empowerment in critical pedagogy, *Educational Foundations*, 4(3), pp. 5-26.
- Grumet, M. (1989) Feminism, and the phenomenology of the familiar, in G. Milburn, I. Goodson, & R. Clark (Eds) *Re-interpreting Curriculum Research: images and arguments*, pp. 87-101. London: Falmer Press.
- Kimball, R. (1989) The problems in writing about higher education, in C. Kridel (Ed.) *Curriculum History: conference presentations from the society for the study of curriculum history*, pp. 48-65. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Kliebard, H. (1992a) *Forging the American Curriculum: essays in curriculum history and theory*. London: Routledge.
- Kliebard, H. (1992b) Constructing a history of the American curriculum, in P. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*, pp. 157-184. New York: Macmillan.
- Kliebard, H. (1986) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Luke, C. (1992) Feminist politics in radical pedagogy, in C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds) *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*, pp. 25-53. New York: Routledge.
- Luke, C. & Gore, J. (Eds) (1992) *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- McCulloch, G. (1987) Curriculum history in England and New Zealand, in I. Goodson (Ed.) *International Perspectives in Curriculum History*, pp. 297-327. London: Croom Helm
- Milburn, J., Goodson, I. & Clark, R. (Eds) (1989) *Re-interpreting Curriculum Research: images and arguments*. London: Falmer Press.
- Musgrave, P. (1988) Curriculum history: past, present and future, *History of Education Review*, 17(2), pp. 1-14.
- Orner, M. (1992) Interrupting the calls for student voice in 'liberatory' education: a feminist poststructuralist perspective, in C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds) *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*, pp. 74-89. New York: Routledge.
- Popkewitz, T. (Ed.) (1987) *The Formation of the School Subjects: the struggle for creating an American institution*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Scott, J. (1992) 'Experience', in J. Butler & J. Scott (Eds) *Feminists Theorize the Political*, pp. 22-40. New York: Routledge.
- Shuker, R. (1985) Review essay: history, theory and Birmingham, *History of Education Review*, 14(2), pp. 53-60.
- Walkerdine, V. (1992) Progressive pedagogy and political struggle, *Screen*, 27(5), pp. 54-60.