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ABSTRACT
CURRICULUM THEORIZING/CURRICULUM MODELLING AND THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM: DEVELOPMENT OF A
THEORETICAL MODEL FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND/OR
CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT

MACHINSKI, JAMES CHARLES. University of Nevada, Las

Curriculum projects generally take place within a
particular school system or district with the express
purpose of meeting the needs of the students, community,
and schools within that system. The Roman Catholic
school system employs methods similar to those used in
the public school system insofar as a curriculum
theory/model may be adapted to meet its needs.

It was the allusions to known curriculum
theories/models which did not address the needs of the
Roman Catholic school system in dealing with the process
of curriculum development/improvement, the lack of
comprehensive curriculum theories/models dealing
exclusively with the Roman Catholic school system, and
the importance of faculty involvement in the process of
curriculum development/improvement around which this
historical study took shape. The purpose of the research
was one of synthesizing known curriculum theories/models
which led to the presentation of a new curriculum
theory/model stressing the involvement of faculty for
particular use in the Roman Catholic school system. The
study examined the curriculum theories/models of John
Dewey, Ralph Tyler, and Jerome Bruner: (1) in light of
their efficacy in addressing the needs of a public school
system and the Roman Catholic school system involved in
the curriculum development/improvement process; and (2)
in light of their ability to provide for the direct
involvement of the faculty of a school in the process of
curriculum development/improvement.

The literature indicated that the Roman Catholic
school system was different from the public school system
and that the teacher in the Roman Catholic school system
was expected to possess the same qualities as those
expected to be possessed by a teacher in the public
school system as well as additional qualities. The
curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner
possessed certain elements which addressed both the needs
of the public school system and the Roman Catholic school
system. In regard to values, it was found that the
curriculum theory/model of Dewey addressed this issue.
Those of Tyler and Bruner did not. The theory/model of
Dewey was found to have addressed the question of direct
faculty involvement. Those of Tyler and Bruner did not.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Working as a Curriculum Coordinator in a Roman Catholic high school, this writer has had the opportunity to work closely with the administration and staff on a number of curriculum projects. In order to accomplish the many tasks necessary to bring several of these projects to their conclusion, it has been necessary to employ many of the strategies as outlined by a number of leading curriculum theorists. While achieving success in many areas by using the work of curriculum writers such as Ralph Tyler (1949), Peter Oliva (1982), Jerome Bruner (1960, 1977), Joseph Schwab (1970, 1978), Albert Oliver (1977), J. Galen Saylor and William Alexander (1954, 1974), Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner (1980) as well as publications of the National Catholic Educational Association ([NCEA], 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985); this writer has recognized that the known curriculum theories/models do not address the particular needs of the Roman Catholic school system. It has also been recognized that there are no comprehensive curriculum theories/models that deal exclusively with the processes of curriculum development and curriculum improvement in the Roman Catholic school system.
Over the many years that curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement has been viewed as an integral process in the life of any school district and, more importantly, in the life of the individual school most writers have intimated that faculty involvement is a most valued and valid component of the success of the process itself and only those who wish to see failure of curriculum renewal programs would be so callous as to ignore staff involvement (Beane, Toepfer, & Alessi, 1986). One cannot pick up a curriculum theory book or article without becoming aware that the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process is not to be viewed as an isolated activity to be carried out by the administrators of a school, curriculum coordinators employed by the school district, or outside curriculum consultants contracted by the school district (Doll, 1978, 1982; Oliva, 1982).

The role of the faculty member in the Roman Catholic school system is decidedly different from that of his/her public school colleague. While one may believe that a teacher in one school system may have the same or similar role in another system, this belief does not hold when comparing the role of the instructor in the Roman Catholic school system with the role of the instructor in the public school system. The teacher in the Roman Catholic school system sees
his/her role as both educator and minister. Teaching is seen as not simply a profession but as a viable extension of the ministry of the Roman Catholic Church (Raferty, 1985; Nouwen, 1981).

Statement of the Problem

Curriculum projects generally take place within a particular school system or district with the express purpose of meeting the needs of the students, community, and schools within that system. The Roman Catholic school system employs methods similar to those used in the public school system insofar as a curriculum theory/model may be adapted to meet its needs.

It was the recognition that known curriculum theories/models which did not address the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement (e.g., Tyler, 1949; Oliva, 1982; Bruner, 1960, 1977; Schwab, 1970, 1978; Oliver, 1977; Saylor & Alexander, 1954, 1974; Tanner & Tanner, 1980); the lack of comprehensive curriculum theories/models dealing exclusively with the Roman Catholic school system (NCEA, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985); and the importance of faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement around which this study took shape. The purpose of this research...
was one of synthesizing known curriculum theories/models leading to the presentation of a new curriculum theory/model stressing the involvement of faculty for particular use in the Roman Catholic school system. The aforementioned synthesis of known curriculum theories/models examined a number of curriculum theories/models: (1) in light of their efficacy in addressing the needs of a school system involved in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process in general and the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in particular; and (2) in light of their ability (explicit or implicit) to provide for the direct involvement the faculty of a school in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement.

Research Questions

In order to define the scope of this study the following questions emerged:

1. In what ways was the Roman Catholic school system similar to the public school system?
2. In what ways did the Roman Catholic school system differ from the public school system?
3. What influences impacted both the Roman Catholic school system and the public school system in the United States?
4. What unique influences impacted the Roman Catholic school system to set it apart from the public school system?
5. What similarities were shared by the faculty of the Roman Catholic school system and the faculty of the public school system?
6. What differences were there between the faculty of the Roman Catholic school system and the faculty of the public school system?
7. In what ways did known curriculum theories/models address the needs of a public school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?
8. In what ways did known curriculum theories/models fail to address the needs of a public school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?
9. In what ways did known curriculum theories/models address the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?
10. In what ways did known curriculum theories/models fail to address the needs of the
Roman Catholic school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

11. In what ways did known curriculum theories/models explicitly address direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

12. In what ways did known curriculum theories/models fail to address direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

Significance of the Study

It was considered of great importance for the Roman Catholic school system to reap the benefits of this type of research in order to fulfill its goals and objectives in the highly competitive field of education (NCEA, 1984). The effects of direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development might be instrumental in the Roman Catholic schools' ability in keeping their present staffs and attracting new members to their ranks. Kealey (1985) has stated that

No matter how well the school community works together to develop the school curriculum, no matter how clear is the written listing of learning objectives, no matter how interrelated are the learning objectives, the materials, and the activities, the success of the school's program depends on the individual teacher in each
classroom. Unless the teacher internalizes the school's philosophy, the program is a shell without substance. Unless the teacher actively implements the school's learning objectives, the goals of the school are not achieved. Unless the teacher fosters the implementation of the program, the learnings are diverse and uncoordinated. The classroom teaching minister remains the most essential element in the curriculum development process. (p. 35)

Satisfaction in employment has become a critical factor in the Catholic school's maintaining a highly qualified faculty in light of pay scales which were reported as generally lower than the public school systems and significantly lower than noneducational (e.g., legal, financial, medical, technical, governmental) institutions (NCEA, 1985). Raferty (1985) addressed the reality of maintaining quality staff when she said:

In the Catholic school, with so many engaged in the mission, it is a paradox and tragedy that Christian educators feel separated from the community. It might be said that identification with and involvement in the efforts of the faith community might help address the national teacher turnover rate....It is naive to think that the chief factor in this turnover rate is salary. Although salary is critical, a sense of belonging is important in addressing this factor. (p. 30)

In 1983 George Beauchamp indicated that there was a definite need for curriculum theorizing/modelling in general when he said:

It is sad to say that...there appears to be no well-developed curriculum theory. Development of curriculum theory appears to be shackled by problems of concept and definition, lack of recognized knowledge in the field, and by the paucity of theory-oriented research. (p. 25)
Assumptions

Basic to this research were several assumptions about the Roman Catholic school system in the United States both as an entity in its own right and in its approach to the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. The most important of these assumptions was that the mission of the Roman Catholic school system in the United States was different from the mission of the public school system. From this assumption was generated another which contended that, while not totally unaffected by many of the same sources which influenced the public school system, the Roman Catholic school system was affected by influences (psychological, social, historical, and philosophical) which did not impact the public school system. Another assumption was that, although the basic structure(s) of the Roman Catholic school system appeared to mirror the basic structure(s) of the public school system, the basic structure(s) of the Roman Catholic school system was (were) different from the public school system. Essential to these assumptions was the overreaching assumption that, because of differences between the Roman Catholic school system and the public school system, known curriculum theories and curriculum models based upon known theories, did not address the special/specific needs of the Roman
Catholic school system in its attempts to deal with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement.

While the basic assumptions about the Roman Catholic school system in the United States were an integral part of this study, basic to this research as well, were assumptions about known curriculum theories/models. It was assumed that known curriculum theories/models, while alluding to the fact that faculty involvement was a valued and valid component of the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process, did not adequately address the direct participation of the faculty of a private or public school in this process. Ultimately it was assumed that curriculum theories/models must address direct faculty involvement in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process in a private or public school.

Delimitations

The delimitations of the study were as follows:
1. The proposed study applied historical inquiry research methodologies.
2. Recreation of this study in exactly the same manner will be mitigated by the use of historical inquiry research methodologies.
3. The curriculum theories/models selected for analysis reflected those most often referred to or used as resources.

4. No attempt was made to analyze all existing curriculum theories/models.

5. The analysis and synthesis of the of the selected literature reviewed was limited to the parameters established by the research questions raised earlier in this proposal.

6. The intended audience for the proposed theoretical model for curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement was the Roman Catholic school system.

Methods, Analysis and Synthesis of Literature Reviewed

The specific methodology to be employed in this proposed study were those prescribed by the methods of historical research. Best (1970) has stated that the methodology of historical research "...includes the delimitation of a problem, formulating hypotheses or generalizations to be tested or questions to be answered, gathering and analyzing data, and arriving at probable-type conclusions or at generalizations based upon deductive-inductive reasoning. (p. 100)

Definition of Terms

In order to clearly communicate the essential ideas of this study it was necessary to define those
relevant terms which were unique and/or study specific. **Private school.** The term private school was sometimes used interchangeably with the terms parochial school and diocesan school. For the purposes of this study the term private school was used to describe any nonpublic school which generates its revenue from sources other than the local tax base, i.e., tuition, endowments, etc. (NCEA, 1985).

**Curriculum theory.** For the purposes of this study the term curriculum theory was drawn from the work of Beauchamp (1975). His definition stated that a curriculum theory might be considered as "a set of related statements that give meaning to a school's curriculum by pointing up the relationships among its elements and by directing its development, its use, and its evaluation" (p. 60).

**Curriculum model.** Curriculum model and curriculum theory were considered synonymous terms for the purposes of this study (Beauchamp, 1983).

**Roman Catholic school system.** According to Canon Law all schools within the geographical bounds of a diocese were subject to the bishop's jurisdiction (Taylor, 1965). A diocese was, for the purposes of this study, equated with the public school system's term school district.
Influences on curriculum. Influences on curriculum in this study were the following: psychological, social, historical and philosophical.

Curriculum. The definition of curriculum used in this study was that offered by J. Galen Saylor and William M. Alexander (1974) which defined "curriculum as the plan for providing sets of learning opportunities to achieve broad goals and related specific objectives for an identifiable population served by a single school center" (p. 6).

Organization of the Study

The organization of the study was as follows: Chapter I included the Introduction; Statement of the Problem; Significance of the Study; Assumptions; Limitations/Delimitations; Methods; Definition of Terms; and Organization of the Study. Chapter II included Review of Literature. Chapter III included Methods, Analysis and Synthesis of Literature Reviewed. Chapter IV included A Theoretical Model for Curriculum Development and/or curriculum improvement. Chapter V included Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Further Study.
Chapter II: Review of the Literature

A study of curriculum theorizing/modelling and the Roman Catholic school system and the direct involvement of faculty in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement led to a discussion of several pertinent ideas. Chapter II, therefore, concentrated on the areas of: (1) a definition of curriculum, (2) faculty involvement in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process, (3) the Roman Catholic school system in the United States, and (4) curriculum theorizing/modelling.

A Definition of Curriculum

Surveying the field of curriculum writers one found that there were apparently many diverse definitions of curriculum. The definitions might have varied in length and emphasis, but upon close examination one discovered that the definitions were not quite so removed from one another. In essence, the definitions had much more in common than one would at first have expected.

J. Galen Saylor and William M. Alexander (1954) have stated:

The school curriculum is the total effort of the school to bring about desired outcomes in school and in out-of-school situations. The curriculum is the sum total of the school's efforts to
influence learning, whether in the classroom, on
the playground or out of school. (p. 4-5)

In 1974 they refined their position by offering the
following definition of curriculum which was in some
respects much more global in its application. The
major difference from their earlier definition was in
the identification of curriculum as a plan as opposed
to an effort: "Specifically, we define curriculum as
the plan for providing sets of learning opportunities
to achieve broad goals and related specific objectives
for an identifiable population served by a single
school center" (p. 6). This writer feels that the
second definition of Saylor and Alexander (1974) was
the definition of curriculum which best represented the
status of the field of curriculum for research and
study.

Carter V. Good (1973) has defined curriculum in a
much narrower manner than Saylor and Alexander (1974)
when he characterized curriculum as "a systematic group
of courses or sequences of subjects required for
graduation or certification in a major field of study,
for example, social studies curriculum, physical
education curriculum" (p. 157). Hollis L. Caswell and
Doak S. Campbell (1935) stated the curriculum was "all
the experiences children have under the guidance of
teachers" (p. 66). Their definition was not so
encompassing as the Saylor and Alexander definition since it spoke of the student-teacher relationship only. In some respects the definitions of Good and Caswell and Campbell were closely aligned to the curriculum's being associated with certain subjects and/or the instructors. Both definitions appeared to be deficient in their scope and magnitude in attempting to define curriculum.

Hilda Taba's (1962) definition of curriculum was short and to the point. She identified curriculum in much the same manner as Saylor and Alexander (1974) when she said: "A curriculum is a plan for learning" (p. 10). Her brevity was explained by the basic assumptions she postulated in regard to all curricula. Since there were many things which each curriculum must have, regardless of its design, Taba did not feel the need to include those assumed elements in the definition. This author had difficulty with the practice of assuming certain things to be universally accepted. It would, in this writer's opinion, have been better to verbalize than to assume. In 1982 J. Galen Saylor offered his own definition of curriculum which was not so far removed from that of Taba. His thoughts at that time were that curriculum was "a plan providing sets of learning opportunities for persons to be educated" (p. 1).
Ronald C. Doll's (1978) definition of curriculum was not unlike the Saylor and Alexander definition of 1954. He defined curriculum as "the formal and informal content and process by which learners gain knowledge and understanding, develop skills, and alter attitudes, appreciations, and values under the auspices of that school" (p. 6). A definition of curriculum which was closer to that of Ronald C. Doll than to Saylor and Alexander (1974) was that of Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner (1980). "The authors regard curriculum as that reconstruction of knowledge and experience, systematically developed under the auspices of the school (or university), to enable the learner to increase his or her control of knowledge and experience" (p. 43).

Albert I. Oliver (1977) has described curriculum as "(1) the program of studies, (2) the program of experiences, (3) the program of services, and (4) the hidden curriculum" (p. 8). This author felt that the definition of Peter F. Oliva (1982) was linked to that of Oliver. Oliva has stated that curriculum was "all the experiences a young person encounters under the direction of the school" (p. 81).

One could easily recognize from the several definitions presented here the similarities were more important than the differences. Each definition was an
attempt to get at the truth behind the question of curriculum. As noted earlier, this author favored the definition of Saylor and Alexander which dated from 1974. The primary strength of the definition was in the notion that the curriculum was a plan. The second strength of the definition was that curriculum was seen in terms of the achievement of goals and objectives. This author felt it was necessary to specify the population(s) to whom the curriculum was directed. According to Saylor and Alexander the delivery of the curriculum was to "an identifiable population served by a single school center" (p. 6) this undoubtedly covered teachers, parents, and the immediate community. Thus students were not the only individuals who were affected by the curriculum.

Faculty involvement in curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement

A major consideration in the process of the curriculum development that has come to be discussed in the literature was the role of the classroom teacher in the determination of the direction which the curriculum would ultimately follow. Curriculum--curriculum in a broad sense--considered total education. The intended scope of curriculum, then, included all learning experiences planned and guided by the school (Reck, 1981). While many theorists acknowledged the necessity
for instructor inclusion in the process in order for the curriculum to have been eventually implemented, few have drawn any conclusions about the teacher's gains from having been a part of the process.

Several theorists have stated quite forcefully that the role of the teacher could neither be eliminated nor dismissed if the curriculum were to be successfully implemented in the classrooms. Beane et al. (1986) concluded that the most logical group of individuals to work on any changes in the curriculum were the classroom instructors themselves. Without teacher input into the development of the instructional materials, etc., implementation became a chance event not one that was predictable with any degree of accuracy. Oliva (1982) stated that curriculum change resulted from changes in individuals and that "curriculum improvement is effected as the result of cooperative endeavor on the part of groups" (p. 37).

Hilda Taba (1962) has long upheld the idea of the teacher as the fundamental agent of change in the development of curriculum. Her theory posited the teacher in the primary position for a bottom-up curriculum strategy. A recent study funded by the Exxon Foundation (Mann, 1982) created a program in which teachers exchanged methods and materials in an effort to effect change in curriculum on a local,
classroom level. The findings of the study indicated that there were significant changes in the instructional procedures after participation in that program and that general attitudes toward teaching improved. The study did not investigate the degree to which the teacher became more accepting of the total curriculum development process of the school nor did it investigate attitudinal changes regarding job satisfaction in the workplace.

Gilchrist and Roberts (1974) have developed some rather humanistic statements about persons and how they worked together for change and concluded the following:

1. Movement toward change can begin within the present system, among the present staff.
2. It is assumed that curriculum is determined by people and that people desire to improve their work.
3. Democracy, despite its sometimes limited successes, is still the most effective means for coping with the change demands of societies and individuals.
4. Frameworks of structure symbolize the community within which people function....All members are equal even though they perform different tasks.

Zander (1971) came up with similar conclusions by citing that a group's performance will be better if a number of things happen: if members are aroused to have strong desire for the group success, if each new goal is placed moderately higher than the past level of successful performance, if members are aware that the group needs each person's best effort. (p.202-203)
According to Wolfson (1986) students and teachers pursued self-actualization in social contexts. A phenomenological perspective was most likely to be expressed in process terms; communicating and creating personal meaning were considered paramount. Sharing personal perspectives served to increase awareness of other people's perspectives and of the multiplicity of viewpoints in the world. Persons were viewed as active in constructing their world and in making choices. Curriculum emerged from personal interests and biographical experiences in interaction with the cultural setting. Curriculum was seen to be a matter of possibilities.

What sorts of activities could we engage in to open communication? For one, practitioners and academics could work collaboratively on jointly defined problems. This work would be helpful to practitioners by creating a situation that would support their own elaboration and understanding of their theories of action. Collaboration would also increase their sense of professionalism, of belonging to the enterprise of curriculum work. And it would facilitate learning research skills which could be useful in other situations as well, for example, documenting what students were learning, the difficulties students encounter with a particular subject, and so forth. Academics would benefit from the experience by understanding more fully the nature of practice and the sorts of problems teachers and administrators face, as well as what they consider important and influential. As a result, we could develop grounded, practical theories to help understand such matters as the context of teaching, its problematic and tentative nature, and the mix of values and ideas about what was important to include in the curriculum (McCutcheon, 1986, p. 51).
Aside from speaking to the value of teacher involvement from the standpoint of working in a group and the benefits of the curriculum from such involvement other theorists concluded that teacher efficacy was enhanced through the designing of curriculum and collective decision-making (McNeil, 1985). Likewise, a Rand Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977) concluded that teacher efficacy was one of the results of curriculum change. Teachers played a central role in the process and did better when they were actively and seriously involved in researching and designing the program. They took it more seriously when it was their program, not something imposed on them, and they enjoyed knowing that it was the product of their own experience and a reflection of their power to think and create (Schwebel, 1985). Many curriculum scholars called for teachers to be involved in curriculum reform, but few teachers reported they were vitally interested in it (McCutcheon, 1986).

Steller (1983) pointed out, however, that not all curriculum theorists believed that the classroom instructor should be involved in the curriculum development process. In their opinion massive involvement led to frustration. In fact, some curriculum writers, believing that extensive involvement of the classroom instructor could not be
well managed, have preferred indirect instructor participation. William Walker put it this way:

The effort to involve teachers in curriculum development began in earnest about 50 years ago. Great faith was put in the idea of teachers as professionals who could and would redirect and rebuild education. Little else but faith, however, was ever really given them. No real consistent, substantive help in their monumental task was provided by institutions of teacher preparation or school administrators at any level. Countless thousands of teachers have eventually become discouraged, angry, and depleted by having to stand alone and try to fulfill an unrealistic role as a developer of curriculum (cited in Steller, 1983, p.80)

Lorraine Sullivan felt the same way:

Teachers at the local school level, in many cases, are not ready to accept responsibility for all instructional decisions. They have had little experience with decision making in curriculum development for which they will be held accountable. They vary in the quality of their preparation and experience for writing curriculum. It has been traditional for teachers to let others make instructional decisions about what will be taught (cited in Steller, 1983, p. 80).

This last thought has unsettled some writers, like David Selden who believed teachers should be treated as professionals capable of contributing to curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. "Teachers must be involved in curriculum development and revision as a professional right and obligation....Teachers are professionals, or aspiring professionals, at least (cited in Steller, 1983, p. 80).

As Boyer (1983) pointed out teachers in most settings had little say in the selection of textbooks
they had to use. Seventeen states, most in the South or Southwest, had a centralized system for the selection of textbooks for students in all schools and all grades. In four more states, multiple textbook series were adopted by the state, and local districts could choose from as many as six alternatives in any one discipline. But, again, that decision was usually made in the central office and not by teachers in a particular school. At the extreme, in one of the schools studied by the Carnegie Foundation, teachers not only were told what textbooks to use, but also were handed a detailed lesson plan for each day. That they lacked much commitment to teaching or curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement is understandable.

Given teachers' lack of control over so many factors crucial to instruction, it was perhaps little wonder that few viewed themselves as professionals with professional responsibilities. And, given the heavy load and tyranny of time, it was hardly surprising that most teachers fell back on fairly standard procedures: lecturing, question-and answer, recitation, seat work, and homework. After all, these were the practices that teachers were familiar with from their own school days, and they demanded little imagination. The National Education Association (1985) believed that the job of
teaching must be made manageable. They believed this required, at least, that teachers be ensured the professional authority and the academic freedom to make decisions about what to teach, how to teach, and how to evaluate their students. Further, as many teachers told the Carnegie Foundation researchers, "there is no expectation that we do much more" (Boyer, 1983).

Surveys, according to Boyer (1983) revealed that teachers were deeply troubled, not only about salaries, but also about their loss of status, the bureaucratic pressures, a negative public image, the lack of recognition and rewards. To talk about recruiting students into teaching without first examining the current circumstances that discourage teachers was simply a diversion. The push for excellence in education must begin by confronting those conditions that drove good teachers from the classroom in the first place.

The Carnegie Foundation (Boyer, 1983) offered recommendations with the conviction that teachers were professionals. If reforms such as those outlined were in place, teachers would have been regarded as professionals, they would have been treated as professionals, and they would have considered themselves professionals. Above all, they would be better teachers and the quality of the school would be
enhanced. Loucks-Horsley and Hergert (1985) stated that:

In the ideal situation, your school improvement effort will never end. Instead, it will keep recycling itself into new spheres and new areas. The school should become a self-renewing system. Your goal may have started as a limited one to solve a particular problem, but ultimately your goal may expand to establishing a professional climate where everyone constantly strives for improvement. Such a school is not only better for students, but it is also an exciting and stimulating place for staff to work. (p. 68)

In describing the goals of education in his book, Rogers (1983) stated:

It aims toward a climate of trust in the classroom in which curiosity and the natural desire to learn can be nourished and enhanced...a participatory mode of decision-making in all aspects of learning in which students, teachers, and administrators each have a part...helping students to prize themselves, to build their confidence and self-esteem...uncovering the excitement in intellectual and emotional discovery, which leads students to become lifelong learners...helping teachers to grow as persons, finding rich satisfaction in their interaction with learners.--Even more deeply, it aims toward an awareness, that, for all of us, the good life is within, not something which is dependent on outside sources. (p. 61)

Several renowned educational reformers (Bell, Boyer, Coleman, Goldberg, & Lundeen, 1985) had the following statements to make in regard to teachers' involvement in the school environment:

Goldberg: I want to make one point related to the question about salaries for teachers. You can't just address salaries without addressing the status of the profession, the respect that teachers have in their schools, the relationship between teachers and the curriculum and the
textbook-selection process. It's not going to take money alone to do it.

Boyer: I agree. Our site visits led me to conclude that salaries, while important, were not the critical issues with teachers. Their frustrations had to do with day-to-day conditions in which they felt that more responsibility was being imposed on them. One very modest suggestion is that every school should have a discretionary fund in which teachers, perhaps on a competitive basis, could be given grants to work on their own class and curriculum and school improvement. I believe that this would start the process of building morale, of feeling that they matter, that they're a part of the solution and not the problem. It's the attitude of feeling that 'I am powerless in this operation' that's causing good people to leave, not the fact that they're not getting paid as much as Dow Chemical pays. (p. 443-444)

The Roman Catholic School System

"Today's Catholic schools are called to renewal, to excellence and to accountability. This threefold call comes from religious and professional commitments. It has a special pertinence for those committed educators who are the teachers and administrators of Catholic schools" (NCEA, 1983, p. v.).

In their Self-Study Guide for Catholic High Schools, which follows a format similar to the National Study of School Evaluation's Evaluative Criteria, the NCEA (1983) has characterized the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement as a journey to the inner school. Despite the fact that most teachers were said to insist that they knew what was going on in the school, they were characterized as
being unaware that the true center of the Roman Catholic secondary school was the experience it provided within the life of each student. The curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process of a school was said to require, then, the improvement in the quality of the day-to-day experience(s) which the students would encounter within the school. A productive curriculum process would lead to an examination of those experiences and point to ways to improve upon them.

This is especially true of Catholic secondary schools. Revelation, faith, and Christian service are daily experiences for Catholic secondary school students. In order for the school to succeed in its mission, these experiences must be meaningful and profound. The only way to be certain they are is to examine them from within. (NCEA, 1983, p. 2)

The curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process could not completed by an individual. It would have to be a joint effort on the part of the faculty, administration, students and parents (NCEA, 1983).

Greeley and Rossi (1966) noted that the element of the American educational system which was most often overlooked by observers is one truly unique characteristic: of all modernized countries, the United States is the only one which maintains an exclusive denominational school system financed by nongovernmental sources. To be sure, there are other denominational school systems with extensive
coverage in other countries, but none is financed almost entirely through tuition and private contributions as is the large and complex system of schools administered by the American Roman Catholic Church. (p. 1)

As early as 1964 D. J. Callahan had some very important comments on the Catholic schools and their existence. He also had some rather turgid comments as to the future of the entire system.

There can be no doubt that at this moment the very existence of the Catholic school system as traditionally conceived is threatened. The words 'traditionally conceived' are important. Catholic schools traditionally have been in a very true sense public schools. They have drawn their student bodies from the entire enrollment economically by the establishment of high standards for admission. (p. 64)

In a landmark study completed in 1985 entitled The Catholic High School: A National Portrait, the NCEA emphasized the need for sound decisions to be made in regard to Roman Catholic education.

The 1980s represent a crucial decade as Catholic high schools try to come to terms with hard financial realities, the increasing presence of laity in administrative and teaching positions, and a rapidly changing society that has led some to question the mission and purpose of educational institutions. It is also a decade in which general and state policies toward nonpublic education are being reviewed. Tuition tax credits, vouchers, government aid for nonpublic school programs are currently under debate in a number of legislative agencies. It is a time of decision making for leaders inside the Catholic school community as well as for those outside it --decision-making that requires a systematic understanding of the nature and scope of Catholic high schools. (p. 1)
Wojcicki and Convey (1982) uttered the same sentiment nearly three years prior to the NCEA:

In the 1980s, a general trend exist toward garnering more certainty for the future existence of Catholic schools. In many schools, the major organizational efforts such as establishing working relationships with local boards and the new composition of the faculty have already been hammered out. With the growth of the local school board movement and increasing efforts to foster the full involvement of the parents, the school's energies and programs have been appropriately varied in seeking to involve a broader spectrum of the outside Christian community. (p. 8)

One might have wondered why this crisis seemed to be rising in the 1980s. Callahan (1964) pointed out that there seemed to be four peculiar problems that appeared to have created the crisis: (a) the unprecedented demand for Catholic education, (b) the expansion of knowledge, (c) the rising standards in education, and (d) the teacher shortage. The NCEA (1985) compiled a significant number of statistics in regard to the faculty of the Catholic school.

Faculty turnover is relatively high; about half of the teachers in the average school have been on the staff for less than five years—about a third of them for two years or less....In 1962 the faculty was predominantly female—about two-thirds women to one-third men. Women still predominate, but the proportion of men to women is more nearly equal now, with 53 percent women and 47 percent men....The faculty is generally younger now. In 1962, 63 percent of teachers were 44 or younger; now 73 percent are under 45. The number of teachers over the age of 65 has dropped from 5 percent to 3 percent. (p. 38)
The most significant change in the makeup of the faculty in the Roman Catholic schools was in the area of the proportion of lay and religious teachers. "Today, all religious...make up 23 percent of Catholic high school teachers. The percentage of laymen teaching in Catholic high school is more than twice that of 20 years ago, and the percentage of laywomen teaching has tripled" (p. 39). This change has, of course, forced the faculties and administrators to rethink many of the traditional components of the Roman Catholic school system.

By the 1970s...Catholic educators were in dialogue, they were sharing values. They were asking questions about such aspects of school life as grading, competition, testing; they were using the discovery method, personalized instruction, experimental learning in a changing society. Administrators and teachers felt free and trusted when they examined the schools' structures and offered alternative forms of governance, supervision and evaluation. Teachers rekindled a fire of enthusiasm for teaching in a Catholic school and called it their teaching apostolate, their mission in the Church, their service to the people of God. (McDermott, 1981, p. 57)

Greeley and Rossi (1966) indicated that Catholic education persists and grows because of a number of reasons: (a) American Catholics are a very religious group, and (b) Roman Catholic schools have neither developed into a very expensive type of private education, for the most part, nor provided second-class education for their students. (p. 4)
The indictment of American secondary education presented by the recent National Commission on Excellence in Education does not appear to apply to Catholic high schools. It cannot be said that the Catholic high school curriculum lacks purpose; it clearly emphasizes college preparation and faith development. It cannot be said that students in Catholic high schools have migrated to a general track, when only 9 percent are enrolled in this kind of program. It cannot be said that Catholic high school students avoid taking rigorous, advanced courses when relatively high percentages of students take calculus and a third year of language (NCEA, 1985, p. 57).

In a statement issued by the Washington Symposium on Catholic Education (1969) the involvement of the Church in education became clear. "Even when education is understood in a narrower, more formal sense and apart from specifically religious formation, it concerns the Church because it affects man's understanding of himself and of the meaning of life" (p. 308). The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education (SCCE) (1977) reiterated the Church's responsibility in regard to education.

At great cost and sacrifice our forbears were inspired by the teaching of the Church to establish schools which enriched mankind and responded to the needs of time and place. While it recognizes its own inadequacies, the Catholic school is conscious of its responsibility to continue this service today as in the past. (p. 19)

As Taylor (1965) pointed out, the ultimate responsibility for the success or failure of Catholic education in an archdiocese or diocese rested with the local Ordinary.
The chief school officer for the diocese is the bishop in whom the authority for the control of education resides, according to canon law. Ordinarily he delegates this responsibility to an assistant known variously as secretary for education or superintendent of schools. All schools within the geographical bounds of a diocese are subject to the bishop's jurisdiction, even those maintained by religious orders. Hence, officially the Catholic schools of a given diocese constitute those which have been authorized and recognized by the bishop. (p. 90)

Curriculum Theorizing/Modelling

In attempting to define curriculum theory one was forced to consider many variant points of view and wade, as best one could, through the rough terrain of semantics. Many curriculum workers, researchers and theorists have written a great deal about the complexity of the field. It was this author's intent to review some of the more important viewpoints from the literature.

In 1969 Joseph Schwab took an important stand in regard to the status of the field of curriculum theorizing calling for a moratorium on theory. Naturally his proposal caused more than a little stir
within curriculum circles. Schwab's position at the time was that curriculum theory was in dire need of focusing on the educational institutions and practices of the time as opposed to plotting schemes for entirely new and wholly different schools. Because of his esteem within the field of curriculum, many listened to his attack on the one-sidedness of curriculum theory and began serious consideration of curriculum theory as a means to truly bring about a renaissance in American education.

Glenys Unruh (1975) defined theory "as a set of propositions derived from data and creative thinking, from which constructs are formed to describe interactions among variables to generate hypotheses. Theory describes, explains, goes beyond the data, and leads to new knowledge" (p. 64). Arnold M. Rose (1953) defined theory "as an integrated body of definitions, assumptions, and general propositions covering a given subject matter from which a comprehensive set of specific and testable hypothesis can be deduced logically" (p. 52). Fred N. Kerlinger (1973) defined theory "as a set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomenon by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting phenomena" (p. 10). These three definitions
of theory aided curriculum researchers and planners in seeing that the definition of curriculum theory put forth by George Beauchamp (1975) was not without its strong foundations in the social sciences. Beauchamp's definition stated that a curriculum theory might be considered "a set of related statements that give meaning to a school's curriculum by pointing up the relationships among its elements and by directing its development, its use, and its evaluation" (p. 60).

On the other side of the spectrum one saw that in 1983 Beauchamp had the following to say in regard to the subject of curriculum theory:

> It is sad to say that...there appears to be no well-developed curriculum theory. Development of curriculum theory appears to be shackled by problems of concept and definition, lack of recognized knowledge in the field, and by the paucity of theory-oriented research. (p. 25)

The fact that the current curriculum theory was not so well-developed as one might have hoped was not cause for great concern. If one believed, as James B. Macdonald (1967), that "curriculum theory should be committed to human fullness in creation, direction, and use" (p. 169) the concern expressed by Beauchamp was well taken but not disconcerting. Macdonald seemed to imply that curriculum theory was going to be changing just as the human changed; therefore, the theory was going to be in process at any given time.
This train of thought seemed to be consistent with Glenys Unruh's (1975) discussion of researchers applying the scientific theory to social theory. There were those who questioned the applicability of the scientific theory to theory in education. On the other hand Unruh stated:

There is substantial support for the view that the mode of inquiry developed in these sciences can be transferred smoothly to the social fields of inquiry including education. An important difference requiring caution is stressed, however: social theories deal with humanistic or "raw" content, while biological and physical theories deal with symbols. (p. 67)

George Beauchamp (cited in Unruh, 1975) has provided some clear and concise rules for curriculum theorists to follow:

1. Define the technical language, including unique or specialized terms, and use those definitions consistently throughout the theoretical work.
2. Identify the principle ingredients essential to the field of concern; that is, classify the accumulated information and describe the circumstances and conditions under which the sets of events occur.
3. Identify relationships among the various parts or the theoretical statements, and explain the character of those relationships. Defining, describing, classifying, and relating are fundamental to the more general process of explanation, which is essential in theory building. (p. 72)

Beauchamp (1983) reminded curriculum researchers that the term model was frequently used interchangeably with theory. A model, however, was an analogy whose construction was a way of representing given phenomena
and their relationships, but the model was not the phenomena. Models were useful tools, and theorists used them extensively. The use of a model and the apparent interchangeability of the term related to what Unruh (1975) referred to in the discussion regarding the functions of theory. "Coordinating many clues, findings, educated guesses, segments of information, and insights of distinguished analysts and writers into a reliable, comprehensive whole from which new knowledge may be generated is an important function of theory" (p. 72). One might also choose to use theory as a guide to choices of actions, as a guide to the collection of facts, or as a guide to new knowledge by suggesting testable hypotheses and inspiring further research.

Despite the incompleteness of contemporary theory (Schwab, 1970), the fragmentation of the current status of curriculum theory (Schwab, 1970; McCutcheon, 1985), and the apparent lack of development of curriculum theory (Beauchamp, 1983) work in the field of curriculum theory was progressing. Because of the intense concern for education that has been coming to the attention of the American public in the recent past, work in the field of curriculum theory would become increasingly more important and demanding.
Summary

In summary it was to be noted that there existed a viable field of work in the study of curriculum theorizing and curriculum modelling. In the case of the curriculum development process it has been alluded to that one of its prime side components was a resultant change in individual as well as group attitudes on a variety of issues. It was also seen that there was an important alternative educational system in the United States today that might readily be identified as the Roman Catholic school system. Reflecting upon the work of Beane et al. (1986), Oliva (1982), Taba (1962), McCutcheon (1986), McNeil (1985), Berman and McLaughlin (1977), Schwebel (1985), and Selden (cited in Steller, 1983), it was seen that curriculum theories/models which reflected the direct involvement of faculty members in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process were needed. One could further realize that, because of the particular characteristics of the Catholic school community (NCEA 1983, 1985; Greeley & Rossi, 1966; Callahan, 1964; Wojcicki & Convey, 1982; SCCE, 1977; and Taylor, 1965), there existed a need for curriculum theories/models that addressed the special/specific needs of the Roman Catholic school system.
Chapter III: Methods, Analysis and Synthesis of Literature Reviewed

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to synthesize known curriculum theories/models: (1) in light of their efficacy in addressing the needs of a school system involved in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process in general and the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in particular; and (2) in light of their ability (explicit or implicit) to provide for the direct involvement of the faculty of a school in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement.

Methods

The specific methodologies employed in this historical study were those described by Best (1970) wherein the delimitations of the problem were presented, questions to be answered were posed, information from selected literature reviewed was gathered and analyzed, and conclusions and generalizations based upon deductive-inductive reasoning were reached.

Once the literature available for inclusion in this study had been identified the following criteria,
based upon the work of Van Dalen (1966) were used to determine the credibility and worth of the author's work in its applicability to this study:

1. Was the author accepted as a competent observer by other authorities in his special field?
2. Was the author accepted as a reliable reporter by other authorities in his special field?
3. Were his facilities, technical training, and location favorable for observing the conditions he reported?
4. Did he report in direct observations, hearsay, or borrowed source materials?
5. Did he have biases concerning any nation, region, race, religion, political party, social or economic group, professional body, period of history, teaching method, or educational philosophy that influenced his writing?
6. Did anyone finance his research work with the hope of securing a report favorable to a specific cause?
7. Did the author write under any economic, political, religious, or social condition that might have caused him to ignore, misinterpret, misrepresent certain facts?
8. Was he motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?
9. Was his objective to win the approval of some group?
10. Was his objective to antagonize some group?
11. Did the author distort or embellish the truth to achieve colorful literary effects or to support his premise(s) and/or conclusion(s)?
12. Did the author contradict himself?
13. Do accounts by other independent, competent observers of different backgrounds agree with the report of the author? (Van Dalen, 1966)

As Van Dalen (1966) has indicated, an author's work being reviewed did not have to meet all thirteen criteria, but must at least have met those identified in numbers one (1), two (2), twelve (12), and thirteen (13) in order to be considered credible sources. Of
the remaining nine criteria, Van Dalen indicated that numbers eight (8), nine (9), and ten (10) should be chosen to aid further in the determination of the credibility and worth of an author's work being reviewed. In order to determine the credibility and worth of the author's work reviewed for inclusion in this study, the works reviewed were examined by answering the questions posed in numbers one (1), two (2), eight (8), nine (9), ten (10), twelve (12), and thirteen (13).

Selection of Curriculum Theorists

In selecting the work of curriculum theorists to be analyzed in this study no attempt was made to analyze all existing curriculum theories/models. The curriculum theories/models selected for inclusion in this work reflect those most often referred to in secondary resources and those most often cited, once again by secondary sources, as being used as resources in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process.

Ravitch (1983) noted that John Dewey was a prolific author whose prose style was at times, "dense and difficult" (p.47). She went on to say that this apparent "inaccessibility as a writer did not prevent him from attracting followers and disciples...for he understood better than anyone else...that education was
changing decisively, both in its pedagogy and in its social function" (p. 47). Glatthorn (1987) said of Dewey that "In a sense...it is fallacious to identify Dewey as a leader of this period [progressive functionalism], since his career as a philosopher and an educator spanned the eras both of academic scientism and progressive functionalism" (p. 40). Miller and Seller (1985) stated that Dewey's work "provides the philosophical underpinnings of inquiry approaches to curriculum [development and/or curriculum improvement]" (p. 62). Beane et al. (1986) indicated that "many educators readily admit their allegiance to Dewey's ideas" (p. 81) particularly those who believe in child-centered and/or interest-centered education. One deduced, then, that John Dewey was regarded as a leader of his time (Glatthorn, 1987; Ravitch, 1983); that his work has had an impact on the field of curriculum inquiry (Miller & Seller, 1985); and that his work has continued to be an influencing factor for educators today (Beane et al., 1986).

Beauchamp (1975) said of Tyler's work that it was "probably the most frequently quoted curriculum rationale" (p. 155). Beane et al. (1986) noted that "the curriculum field generally acknowledges the work of Ralph Tyler as foundational in the area of [curriculum] theory development" (p. 65) and "since it
has guided the majority of curriculum plans over the past three decades, Tyler's rationale has probably been the most influential collection of curriculum planning theories" (p. 65). McNeil (1985) pointed out that "since [1949] nearly 90,000 copies of Tyler's rationale have been sold, and it is regarded as the culmination of one epoch of curriculum making" (p. 344). Benjamin Bloom (1981) spoke of Tyler's work as "pioneering" (p. 210). He believed that as a result of Tyler's efforts "the development of evaluation procedures for specific types of educational objectives has moved with careful research and experimentation until it has reached the steps of what might be termed technology" (p. 210).

Tanner and Tanner (1980) affirmed

Tyler is generally credited with having identified three key sources of educational objectives: (1) studies of the learners themselves, (2) studies of contemporary life outside the school, and (3) suggestions about objectives from subject specialists. (p. 59)

The impact of Tyler's work, therefore, upon curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement can be seen in his perception of being foundational (Beane et al., 1986; Tanner & Tanner, 1980); pioneering (Bloom, 1981); and most frequently quoted and read (Beauchamp, 1975; McNeil, 1985).

Glatthorn (1987) stated that Bruner's impact was strongly felt for a period of at least ten years and
that "his ideas on transfer, structure, discovery, and readiness were to play a key role in almost every major curriculum [development and/or curriculum improvement] project supported by federal fund" (p. 62). Beauchamp (1975) noted that "Bruner's book The Process of Education touched off a great deal of dialogue about fundamental educational operations and conditions" (p. 48). Rowntree (1982) claimed that Bruner was "renowned for his assertion that children of almost any age and level of ability can develop a grasp of the nature of a discipline, provided the emphasis in teaching is not on isolated facts but on the fundamental concepts unifying principles of the subject" (p. 70-71). Noll (1987) counseled that Bruner "became a guru of the education reform movement of the day" (p. 215). Tanner and Tanner (1980) commented that his notions of the "'spiral curriculum'...attracted wide interest among educators" (p. 416). Like Dewey and Tyler before him, one saw that Bruner had influenced the work in the field of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. One deduced that he has had an impact on educators (Tanner & Tanner, 1980); educational reform movements (Noll, 1987); federally funded curriculum projects (Glatthorn, 1987); and perceptions of learners (Rowntree, 1982).
Establishing Inclusion of Work in This Study

In order to determine the credibility and worth of the work of John Dewey and its applicability to the study the following primary and secondary sources were consulted:

Primary sources

Dewey (1902) *The Child and the Curriculum*
Dewey (1916) *Democracy and Education*
Dewey (1938) *Experience and Education*
Dewey (1909) *Moral Principles in Education*
Dewey (1929) *My Pedagogy Creed*
Dewey (1900) *The School and Society*

Secondary sources

Beane, Toepfer, & Alessi (1986) *Curriculum Planning and Development*
Glatthorn (1987) *Curriculum Leadership*
Golby, Greenwald, & West (1975) *Curriculum Design*
Miller & Seller (1985) *Curriculum Perspectives and Practices*
Noll (1987) *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Educational Issues*
Tanner & Tanner (1980) *Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice*

A careful reading by this author of the primary sources yielded the following information based upon the criteria established by Van Dalen (1966):

8. Was Dewey motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?

No evidence was found to indicate that he was so motivated.

9. Was Dewey's objective to win the approval of some group?

No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

10. Was Dewey's objective to antagonize some group?

No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

12. Did Dewey contradict himself?

No evidence was found to indicate that he contradicted himself.

A careful reading by this author of the secondary sources yielded the following information based upon the criteria established by Van Dalen (1966):

1. Was Dewey accepted as a competent observer by other authorities in his special field?
Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that he was accepted as a competent observer in his field.

2. Was Dewey accepted as a reliable reporter by other authorities in his special field?

Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that he was accepted as a reliable reporter in his field.

8. Was Dewey motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?

No evidence was found to indicate that he was so motivated.

9. Was Dewey's objective to win the approval of some group?

No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

10. Was Dewey's objective to antagonize some group?

No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

12. Did Dewey contradict himself?

No evidence was found to indicate that he contradicted himself.

13. Do accounts by other independent, competent observers of different backgrounds agree with the report of Dewey?

Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that other observers agreed with his reports.
Based upon the findings of the aforementioned criteria, this author determined John Dewey's work to be credible and of worth in its applicability to this study.

In order to determine the credibility and worth of the work of Ralph Tyler and its applicability to the study the following primary and secondary sources were consulted:

**Primary sources**

- Tyler (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*
- Tyler (1958) "Curriculum Organization"
- Tyler (1968) "Purposes of Our Schools"

**Secondary sources**

- Beauchamp (1975) *Curriculum Theory*
- Bloom (1981) *All Our Children Learning*
- Eisner (1985) *The Educational Imagination on the Design and Evaluation of School Programs*
- Glatthorn (1987) *Curriculum Leadership*
- Kliebard (1970) "The Tyler Rationale"
- Macdonald (1966) "The Person in the Curriculum"
- McCutcheon (1986) "Curriculum Theory/Curriculum Practice: A Gap or the Grand Canyon?"
A careful reading by this author of the primary sources yielded the following information based upon the criteria established by Van Dalen (1966):

8. Was Tyler motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?

No evidence was found to indicate that he was so motivated.

9. Was Tyler's objective to win the approval of some group?

No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

10. Was Tyler's objective to antagonize some group?

No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

12. Did Tyler contradict himself?

No evidence was found to indicate that the contradicted himself.
A careful reading by this author of the secondary sources yielded the following information based upon the criteria established by Van Dalen (1966):

1. Was Tyler accepted as a competent observer by other authorities in his special field?
   Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that he was accepted as a competent observer in his field.

2. Was Tyler accepted as a reliable reporter by other authorities in his special field?
   Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that he was accepted as a reliable reporter in his field.

8. Was Tyler motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?
   No evidence was found to indicate that he was so motivated.

9. Was Tyler's objective to win the approval of some group?
   No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

10. Was Tyler's objective to antagonize some group?
    No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

12. Did Tyler contradict himself?
    No evidence was found to indicate that the contradicted himself.
13. Do accounts by other independent, competent observers of different backgrounds agree with the report of Tyler?

Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that other observers agreed with his reports.

Based upon the findings of the aforementioned criteria, this author determined Ralph Tyler's work to be credible and of worth in its applicability to this study.

In order to determine the credibility and worth of the work of Jerome Bruner and its applicability to the study the following primary and secondary sources were consulted:

**Primary sources**

Bruner (1965) *"The Act of Discovery"

Bruner (1967) *On Knowing*

Bruner (1960, 1977) *The Process of Education*

Bruner (1971) *"The Process of Education Revisited"*

Bruner (1971) *The Relevance of Education*

Bruner (1963) *"A Theory of Instruction"*

**Secondary sources**

Beauchamp (1975) *Curriculum Theory*

Costa (1985) *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*

Glatthorn (1987) *Curriculum Leadership*
Macdonald (1963) "The Nature of Instruction: Needed Theory and Research"
Morris & Pai (1976) *Philosophy and the American School*
Noll (1987) *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Educational Issues*
Oliva (1982) *Developing the Curriculum*
Rowntree (1982) *Educational Technology in Curriculum Development*
Tanner & Tanner (1980) *Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice*

A careful reading by this author of the primary sources yielded the following information based upon the criteria established by Van Dalen (1966):

8. Was Bruner motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?
   No evidence was found to indicate that he was so motivated.

9. Was Bruner's objective to win the approval of some group?
   No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.
10. Was Bruner's objective to antagonize some group?
No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

12. Did Bruner contradict himself?
No evidence was found to indicate that he contradicted himself.

A careful reading by this author of the secondary sources yielded the following information based upon the criteria established by Van Dalen (1966):

1. Was Bruner accepted as a competent observer by other authorities in his special field?
Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that he was accepted as a competent observer in his field.

2. Was Bruner accepted as a reliable reporter by other authorities in his special field?
Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that he was accepted as a reliable reporter in his field.

8. Was Bruner motivated to write by malice, vanity, or a desire to justify his acts?
No evidence was found to indicate that he was so motivated.

9. Was Bruner's objective to win the approval of some group?
No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.
10. Was Bruner's objective to antagonize some group?
   No evidence was found to indicate that this was his objective.

12. Did Bruner contradict himself?
   No evidence was found to indicate that he contradicted himself.

13. Do accounts by other independent, competent observers of different backgrounds agree with the report of Bruner?
   Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that other observers agreed with his reports.

Based upon the findings of the aforementioned criteria, this author determined Jerome Bruner's work to be credible and of worth in its applicability to this study.

Collection of Information from Selected Literature Reviewed

In order to analyze and synthesize the literature reviewed the following research questions were used to define the scope of this study:

1. In what ways was the Roman Catholic school system similar to the public school system?
2. In what ways did the Roman Catholic school system differ from the public school system?
3. What influences impacted both the Roman Catholic school system and the public school system in the United States?

4. What unique influences impacted the Roman Catholic school system to set it apart from the public school system?

5. What similarities were shared by the faculty of the Roman Catholic school system and the faculty of the public school system?

6. What differences were there between the faculty of the Roman Catholic school system and the faculty of the public school system?

7. In what ways did the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner address the needs of a public school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

8. In what ways did the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner fail to address the needs of a public school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

9. In what ways did the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner address the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in
dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?'

10. In what ways did the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner fail to address the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

11. In what ways did the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner explicitly address direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

12. In what ways did the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner fail to address direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement?

Questions one through six were dealt with in pairs: one and two; three and four; five and six. The information collected from the selected literature reviewed in response to these questions was considered foundational to an analysis and synthesis of the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner in light of their efficacy in addressing the needs of a school system involved in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process in general and
the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in particular. Questions seven through twelve were dealt with as a unit. The information collected from the selected literature reviewed in response to these questions dealt with the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner in order to analyze them in light of their efficacy in addressing the needs of a school system, and the Roman Catholic school system in particular, in light of their ability (explicit or implicit) to provide for the direct involvement of the faculty of a school in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement.

Questions One and Two

In November 1884, 71 bishops of the Catholic Church in America met for the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. The hierarchy of the Catholic Church directed that a parochial school should be maintained in each parish and maintained forever. Thus, less than a century ago, the humble beginnings of the Roman Catholic school system in the United States were set in motion. (Buetow, 1985)

Traviss (1985) clearly stated that "the Church has a vision of the Catholic school as a place for helping students toward a 'responsible and coherent way of life'" (p. 11). In agreement with the statement of
Traviss, one found the document *The Catholic School* (SCCE, 1977) which said:

The Catholic school loses its purpose without constant reference to the Gospel and frequent encounter with Christ. It derives all the energy necessary for its educational work from Him and thus "creates in the school community an atmosphere permeated with the Gospel spirit of freedom and love"...Education is not given for the purpose of gaining power, but as an aid for the fuller understanding of, and communion with, man, events and things. (p. 20)

Traviss (1985), moreover, affirmed that Catholic school educators might very well accept the assertion of John Dewey (1902) when he said, "The child's moral character must develop in a natural, just and social atmosphere. The school should provide this environment for the child's moral development" (p. 43).

McDermott (1985) contended that the uniqueness of the Catholic school lay in its very nature of being a religious community of believers within an academic community. He went on to say:

As a school it is a community of learners and teachers, administrators and parents, staff and resource people. At the same time, it is a faith community of young Christians and adults who come together to make Christ present among them in a special way. There is always a twofold purpose in a Catholic school: learning and believing. To be an exemplary Catholic school, there must be the proper blend of learning and believing. (p.11)

A document presented by the SCCE (1982) entitled *Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith* has
described the school in virtue of the Church's salvific mission on earth in the following manner:

The school must be concerned with constant and careful attention to cultivation in students the intellectual, creative, and aesthetic faculties of the human person; to develop in them the ability to make correct use of their judgment, will, and affectivity; to promote in them a sense of values; to encourage just attitudes and prudent behavior; to introduce them to the cultural patrimony handed down from previous generations; to prepare them for professional life; and to encourage the friendly interchange among students of diverse cultures and background that will lead to mutual understanding. (p. 9-10)

Erickson (1981), a renowned researcher in private education, summarized the differences between public schools and private schools as drawn out of the material presented in the Coleman report. Erickson noted that the Coleman report pointed to facts that indicated that the teachers in private schools were more committed to insuring that their pupils learned. He affirmed that more time was spent on instruction in the essential academic curricular offerings. It was also noted that problematic behavior was less prevalent in private schools. Erickson went on to say:

Though the discipline was more strict, and though "student rights" were not guaranteed by many legal safeguards that apply to public schools, the private school students felt they were treated more fairly and had a greater sense of control over their own destinies. Students were absent less. More homework was assigned, more was done, and less time was spent in staring at television. Parents were more supportive. (p. 5)
Erickson (1981) asserted that private schools possessed a superior social climate. In their work *Characteristics and Relationships in Public and Independent Schools* Erickson, MacDonald, Manley-Casimir, and Busk (1979) illustrated this point in a conceptualization of a school with a superior social climate with what was called a "Gemeinschaft Model" which had the following four characteristics: (a) a higher commitment from teachers, students and parents to ensure the school's success: financially, academically and morally; (b) a community in which one typically found mutual support, appreciation, trust, caring, justice, and social homogeneity (i.e., cohesion); (c) the achievement as a school community of an element of consensus on goals, objectives and priorities recognized by teachers, parents and students; (d) the exhibition of a certain amount of exceptionality as shown in its mission and/or philosophy.

McDermott (1985) demonstrated that the Catholic schools did indeed exhibit the characteristics of the Gemeinschaft Model because of their ability to operate in the following manner:

First, the Catholic school can be straightforward and aboveboard in proposing Christian values as part of the schooling because parents and students have chosen the Catholic schools for their stated values. Secondly, they can avoid the pitfalls of
heavy-handed indoctrination or a hidden (and therefore, irrational) curriculum. Thirdly, the Catholic school will not be expected to be neutral on critical issues as are the public schools, or to steer clear of moral topics. (p. 29-30)

Kealey (1985) presented seven characteristics of the Catholic school which he believed to be factors that set the Catholic school apart from other schools: (a) sponsorship (direction and support of the school); (b) philosophy of education (elucidation of gospel values); (c) goals (specific answers to the questions: What is the message? How do students grow in their sense of a faith community? What service activities do the students provide? How do they express their faith through worship?) (National Conference of Catholic Bishops [NCCB], 1972); (d) total education program (growth in all areas of learning: academic, affective, social, and physical); (e) academic quality (superior critical evaluation, reasoning and judgment skills); (f) values development (the values contained in the gospels); (g) teaching ministers (performance of what has been identified as a sacred ministry in the Catholic Church) (p. 11-15).

One saw that Kealey's (1985) seven characteristics were supported by and support characteristics of Catholic and private education as affirmed by Erickson et al. (1979), Erickson (1981), McDermott (1985),
Traviss (1985), the SCCE (1977, 1982), and the philosopher Harry Broudy (1954) who said:

The good life is the ultimate aim of education and for each pupil this means to determine himself, realize himself, and integrate himself through the habits of acquiring, using and enjoying the truth. The good life makes a claim upon the individual. Everything depends on whether the school can persuade him to acknowledge this as a moral claim, i.e., as a demand that if he judges he ought to satisfy. (p. 37)

Questions Three and Four

Four major influences upon curriculum have been identified as being the most important for consideration by curriculum designers and planners (Beane et al., 1986; Doll, 1978, 1982; Firth, 1973; Johnson, 1968; McNeil, 1985; Morris & Pai, 1976; Venable, 1958; and Wrinkle & Gilchrist, 1942). The influences considered here are the psychological, social, historical, and philosophical.

Psychological Influences

In order to discuss the psychological influences upon curriculum one must first have considered the definition of psychology and the psychological foundations of curriculum. Johnson (1968) has defined psychology as "the study of individual human behavior...[which] can be broadly interpreted to include a vast array of factors such as the relationship of physical development to behavior, motives, attitudes and abilities" (p. 39). He went on
to define the psychological foundations of curriculum as

Those understandings gained from psychology which have a bearing on the learning process. Psychological foundations consist of the accumulated knowledge which guides the learning process and allows the teacher who is executing the curriculum to make intelligent decisions regarding the behavior of the learner. (p. 39)

The four major theories of learning, mental discipline, or faculty psychology; connectionism; behaviorism; and Gestalt psychology have played a considerable role in the development of curriculum. These theories, of course, have gained prominence in the twentieth century as the field of psychology has become a respected discipline.

According to Venable (1958), the mental discipline, or faculty psychology theory, stated the mind was said to be made up of a series of faculties, each of which was related to a particular function or ability of the mind. Learning was thought to be the exercising of the various faculties regarded as muscles which needed exercise to grow. Since memory was considered one of the faculties, faculty psychology was the prevailing theory during the long period when rote memory was the primary learning process.

Connectionism as a theory of learning placed emphasis on drill and repetition. Effort was made to select experiences for which the child was ready, or on
the basis of their securing a satisfying reaction from the learner. Thorndike was a leader in the field of connectionism. He, according to Venable (1958), believed that learning was accomplished through drill and practice as the basic element of learning. He also believed that learning was accomplished through trial-and-error experience. From his studies, Thorndike developed three laws of learning: readiness, exercise, and effect. The law of readiness held that learning was impossible until the organism was mature enough to accomplish the learning and until the individual had cause to learn. The law of exercise placed emphasis on drill or practice as the means of learning; while the law of effect held that the organism repeated those responses which gave it a pleasing feeling.

Another American psychologist, J. B. Watson, went back to earlier experiments by Pavlov to conclude that behaviorism was the more acceptable learning theory. Behaviorism differed little from connectionism. Drill remained an important and prominent method of teaching and experiences selected were such as to produce conditioned responses. The conditioned response came about when two stimuli were paired so as to produce a primary reaction to the secondary stimulus. In
adapting these principles to include all learning,

Watson (cited in Venable, 1958) believed that

[Man is] born with certain basic or inborn behavior patterns. All other behavior is but the compilation or modification of these original reflexes through conditioned response...learning is possible...provided the conditioned response pattern is properly arranged and practiced. (p. 31)

Wolfgang Kohler, according to Venable, (1958), discovered that, in his experiments with apes, learning came suddenly, without drill or practice. From this discovery he developed his theory that learning came through insight. This gestalt theory led to the development of a curriculum that offered the learner an opportunity to discover processes and relationships. Emphasis was placed upon perceiving a whole in order to understand the importance of a specific. Generalities and principles were emphasized in preference to isolated facts and meaningless drill. Gestalt psychology put emphasis on discovery of patterns or fields into which the learner fitted the individual item.

Social Influences

Gerald R. Firth (1973) pointed out that the characteristic social forces that have had an influence on curriculum development "include church-state relations, patterns of living, minority groups, communications, media, custom and convention, and
culture, beliefs, and values" (p. 130). Each of these social forces has exerted its influence to varying degrees at different times in the history of American education.

The separation of church and state has never been fully implemented, although it was agreed upon in principle by the citizens of the United States. Religious sentiments which prevail in some communities and states have affected the kinds of educational experiences provided by the school system. One could readily see this in school programs for the major holidays of Christmas and Easter which reflected the prevailing and dominant Christian orientation of American society. Central to many curriculum decisions were value judgments as to content and materials that have been influenced by religious beliefs. Discussions of evolution and creationism reflected the profound affect of religious groups on specific content in the teaching of science and social science courses involving questions of man's supposed or real origins.

Patterns of living in the United States have had an overall effect on the school and have also influenced decisions about the curriculum to be offered. The program of the school reflected the needs of the students and those of the society that supported it. The family's stability or lack of stability has
been a tremendous influence on the curriculum. Shifting patterns in male and female roles have not been without their effects. No longer were males channeled into predetermined vocational tracks or college-preparatory studies while the females were assumed to be homemakers in need of sewing, cooking, and cleaning skills. The changes of society have demanded a response from the educational institutions. (Firth, 1973, p. 130-132)

Minority groups have traditionally exerted minimal influences on the curriculum of the school. This has had to change in response to civil rights legislation which has led to desegregation of schools. Schools have had to respond in light of legal pressures which have been directly or indirectly responsible for the cessation or continuation of funding for programs. Minority language groups have placed pressure on the schools to develop programs which responded to a group of individuals for whom English was a second or third language. Women as a minority group have had an impact on the curriculum as a result of legislation such as Title IX.

Mass-media communication also acted as a social force on the school's curriculum. It was a well-accepted fact that the youth of today were much more oriented to the television set than they were to
the printed page of books. A statement (attributed to Marshall McLuhan) indicated that by the time a student was graduated from high school he or she has had about 12,000 hours of classroom experience and approximately 15,000 hours of television viewing (Firth, 1973).

Custom and convention, and culture, beliefs, and values were seen to be closely tied. One readily acknowledged that the school in America was charged with the responsibility of helping to transmit the culture of society. This implied that it was not knowledge alone, but also values, which provided a framework for living in a democracy. The mores of a culture directly influenced the expectations of what should be included in the appropriate educational program offered by the schools.

As with the influence of religious sentiments, the values of a community affected overall program determination. It could not be dismissed that the values of an individual teacher determined to a degree which topics would be selected for study in a particular subject area or classroom.

**Historical Influences**

Johnson (1968) has defined the historical foundations of curriculum as "the formulations of the school program in the past which have persisted until the present or which have an influence on the present"
(p. 7). In dealing with the historical foundations one could cite instances of influence which begin with prehistory, dealing with the Greek, Roman and early Christian systems of education, continuing with an explanation of the education during the Renaissance and the Reformation. In order to focus the historical influences on the American educational system, this writer concentrated on American education since 1635.

Tom C. Venable (1958) divided the history of American education into four periods each with its specific motive guiding the principle of education: (a) the Religious Motive (1635-1750); (b) the Political Motive (1750-1850); (c) the Utilitarian Motive (1850-1920); (d) the Mass Education Motive (1920-present). (p. 10-17)

During the earliest period of time, according to Venable (1958), the period of the Religious Motive, the pattern of early education was established as being definite in its religious orientation. The colleges fit into this pattern of domination by religious purposes since the first colleges were for the preparation of ministers. The secondary school of the period was seen as the intermediary between the popular elementary schools and the colleges. The most common institution was the Latin-grammar school. The curriculum was rigid in that the chief subject studied
was, naturally, Latin. Other subjects such as literature, philosophy, ethics, and history were studied, but only through the reading of Latin and for the purpose of a thorough grounding in that language.

The second period of development, which Venable (1958) saw as that directed by the Political Motive, was the result of the growth of nationalism. The school was viewed as one of the institutions which would give American citizenry the national fidelity and pride which were needed to keep the new nation growing and vital. As frontier life, which many of the colonists led as a new and different way of life, persisted, there was a demand for skills that neither their past lives nor their educations had endowed in them. They began to demand a new type of secondary school more adapted to the needs of their life styles. In response to these new voices the academy was established. The academy attempted to meet the needs of that group which was not interested in the college-preparatory curriculum. Courses such as commerce, surveying and navigation were taught to give a more practical education. The academy was hailed as an American contribution to education. The institution was also regarded as the means whereby patriotism could be instilled in every student.
The public high school came into existence during that period of development characterized by what Venable (1958) has called the Utilitarian Motive. It was during this time that the decisive Kalamazoo Decision of 1874 established the legal precedent for public secondary education's being funded by tax money collected in the community. The new type of school was in response to the demands of the public who were seeking an institution which would be capable of not only training an individual for college but would also give the student the training for a means of livelihood. Vocational education became the point of emphasis in the public high school. By 1920 a national survey found that 156 different courses were being taught in the American high schools. In the early years of the twentieth century the junior high school became an accepted part of the public school system ostensibly to keep children in school.

According to Venable (1958), the present period in the development of secondary education, the Mass Education Motive period, has been marked by the vast increase in the number of students attending secondary school. From 1890 to 1940 the secondary school population doubled every ten years. The public high schools rallied to the challenge and attempted to meet the needs of the youth in each period. The modern high
school attempted to provide vocational skills of the sort that would equip each individual to adapt to the constantly changing economic world. The courses offered have been reduced in number, but each course attempted to give the student a broader understanding of the life for which he was preparing.

**Philosophical Influences**

The philosophical influences upon curriculum depended upon those values and concerns that were held dear to a group of individuals. The philosophy that one held would determine all of the other beliefs and practices which one held. In educational philosophy one was concerned with those philosophic problems which dealt with the value of what one tried to do in the schools.

According to Ronald Doll (1982) there were four sources leading to philosophies of education. He identified the predominant sources as science, society, eternal verities, and Divine Will. In order to better understand the philosophies themselves, it was be important to review these four sources.

**Eternal verities**

In reviewing the influence of eternal verities of the past one realized that the most acceptable philosophical position was that espoused by the Perennialist movement. The philosophical tenets of
this movement have not been readily accepted by educators in twentieth-century America. There have been, however, certain exceptions, as in the case of Robert M. Hutchins. (Doll, 1978, 1982)

The acceptance of eternal verities as a source would dictate certain rigid approaches to the curriculum. One would, for example, have a tendency to depend upon those ideas which had been stated in the past. It would be no surprise to find the curriculum centered around the study of "Great Books", since the literature of the past was held in great esteem. If one were to consider any change within this type of curriculum, one would by necessity be called upon to reorder ideas in the so-called hierarchy of truths as Doll (1982) called them. He has stated:

Since these truths are considered eternal, they need not be found in new experiences; therefore, reordering them would not involve reflective or creative thinking about present and current phenomenon but intuitive and deductive thinking for discovery of first principles, the status of which is allegedly fixed and invariable in any age. (p.160)

Difficulties arising from the rigid approach of the Perennialists, the individuals most likely to have relied on eternal truth as a source for their philosophical consideration, have prevented eternal verities from man's past from being widely accepted by
those who were in positions to make choices in regard to elementary and secondary curriculums.

Divine Will

Just as unbending in its approach to the sources of knowledge and reality was that which has been identified as Divine Will. The only tenable position of those who accepted this point of view was to acknowledge that God has revealed all that was His Will to human beings through the Bible. One found that most Christian schools, many parochial schools, certain other private schools, and even a number of Jewish schools as well as the schools of some religious groups which did not fall into the Judeo-Christian category considered this to be one of the most important sources for the curriculum and the basis of philosophy. (Doll, 1978, 1982) Because of the interpretation of the tenets surrounding the separation of church and state, Divine Will as a curriculum source was not available to the public high school systems of the United States because of the legal sanctions against its use. (Hendersen, 1978)

The curriculum developed along the lines of Divine Will as the chief source of philosophical belief would place a heavy reliance upon moral, religious, and ethical teachings whether their source was the religious writings of the sect or specific church
doctrine. According to Doll (1982) "persons who used Divine Will as a curriculum source held that God's Will encompassed study of secular content so that learners might be prepared to fulfill His Will in their future lives" (p. 161).

As one could see, aside from the religious schools' usage of Divine Will as a source of curriculum, it was not available to the greater population because of legal proscriptions against it. As has been noted, Perennialism, which would be the philosophy most dependent upon eternal verities as a source, has not been widely accepted by the American people as a viable means of education for the majority of students. Logically, then, one concluded that science and society were the major sources of ideas leading to philosophies of education.

Science

If one considered the tremendous impact of science upon the philosophy of Progressivism, then one saw the powerful influence science has had on American education in the twentieth century. The Progressivists borrowed from the sciences incorporating the scientific method into their curriculums. (Dewey, 1916) It was the Progressivists who believed that the scientific method was the most reliable means of establishing truth. To achieve this end, it was the Progressivists who
believed that students should be taught to solve all problems in terms of scientific procedures and that all questions in regard to curriculum improvement were to be approached scientifically. As Doll (1982) pointed out, "science as a source of ideas for the curriculum and its improvement enjoys much prestige in an era and [with] a society in which science is assigned so much credence and respect" (p. 159).

Theodore Brameld (1971) mentioned that the four sciences of biology, anthropology, psychology, and physics were those which have most contributed to science's being a tremendous influence upon educational philosophy.

Biology--because man is seen as an evolving, struggling organism interacting with his animate and inanimate environment. Anthropology--because man is also an organism with a very long history of interactions with his fellows living together in cultures. Psychology--because man is a behaving-thinking animal, subject not less than other animals, to experimental understanding. And physics--because by means of this and allied sciences, man has proved his astonishing capacity to come to grips with nature. (p. 94-95)

Society

Doll (1982) believed that "society may be regarded as the ultimate source from which ideas about the curriculum are to be derived" (p. 159). Brameld (1971) implied that this was true when he stated that "all philosophies are, directly or indirectly, interpretations of culture" (p. 449). He also went on
to state that "the supreme justification of formal education [is that it is] an institution of culture" (p. 449).

The question which most seemed to surface in regard to society as a source of ideas was one's interpretation of the term society itself. Some have interpreted society and the desires of society as being easily ascertainable by gathering a consensus of what people were thinking. (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985) Others still have chosen to think of government as the agent and determiner of society. (McLaren, 1986; Kozol, 1985) There were those who have assumed that society was what the schools and the students have determined it to be. (Freire, 1986; Illich, 1970) The most extreme view of society was that held by the Reconstructionists who view that society was to be remade—whatever and wherever that society is. There was still the determination as to whether one thought in terms of the national society or international society when considering the source of ideas. Obviously the society was becoming more and more global as the world "shrunk" due to the effects of technology. (Bellah et al., 1985)

After having considered the four major sources leading to a philosophy, the next logical consideration is that of the five major areas of educational
philosophy which were represented by the Perennialist, the Idealists (often grouped with the Realists and renamed Essentialists), the Realists, the Pragmatists (Progressivists), and the Reconstructionists. Each group held to philosophical tenets which directly affected the choices in regard to all phases of curriculum building.

Perennialism

Perennialism was basically the point of view which held that the proper goal of education was the "possession of everlasting, timeless and spaceless principles of reality, truth, and value" (Brameld cited in O'Neill, 1981, p. 2). As such it was the most conservative, traditional, or inflexible of the five philosophies. For the Perennialist, reality was a world of reason. They believed that education was a constant like human nature. Education for the Perennialist was a preparation for life, and students should have been taught the world's permanence through structured study.

The contemporary Perennialist, according to Oliva (1982), "in the tradition of Plato, Aristotle, and the scholasticism of the Catholic thinker, St. Thomas Aquinas, ...sees the aims of education as the disciplining of the mind, the development of the ability to reason, and the pursuit of truth" (p. 186).
Believing that truth was eternal, everlasting and unchanging, the Perennialist advocated a highly academic curriculum with emphasis on grammar, rhetoric, logic, classical and modern languages, mathematics and the great books of the Western world. It was in the great books of the past where one found truth which, according to the Perennialist was the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

Robert M. Hutchins (1936) was perhaps the best known proponent of the philosophy of Perennialism in America. Hutchins and several other Perennialists were not interested in the needs of learners, specialized education, and vocational training. Hutchins made these points clear when he stated: "The ideal education is not an ad hoc education, not an education directed to immediate needs; it is not a specialized education, or a preprofessional education; it is not a utilitarian education. It is an education calculated to develop the mind" (p. 18).

**Idealism**

Idealism was a philosophy that espoused the wisdom of men and women that has been refined. Wiles and Bondi (1984) have pointed out that to the Idealist "reality is seen as a world within a person's mind. Truth is to be found in the consistency of ideas. Goodness is an ideal state, something to be strived
for" (p. 51). O'Neill (1981) added dimension to this definition of Idealism when he stated:

Idealism is one of the conventional "systems of philosophy," ordinarily defined as encompassing all of those philosophies which accept the first principle that mind (as opposed to matter) is ultimately the only thing that can be known for certain and that it is, therefore, also the first thing to be known and the ultimate basis for all knowing whatsoever. (p. 387)

The Idealists would see the function of schools as being to sharpen intellectual processes, to present the great wisdom and knowledge of the ages, and to present models of behavior which are exemplary. The students in the schools would have a relatively passive role. For the most part they would receive and memorize the reporting of the teacher. Change in the program would not be welcomed since it would be viewed as an intrusion into the orderly process of educating.

The curriculum of the Idealist school, as Herman Harrell Horne (1931) pointed out, was seen "as [the] means to the great end of living completely through understanding life. Information will become knowledge, books will become tools, and the best ideas will become ideals" (p. 120). Necessarily, then, the curriculum of the school revolved around and was principally interested in those subject matters which dealt with the mind, that is, studies whose content consisted of ideas. Worthy ideas were drawn from the past and were
recorded in books with emphasis placed on history and literature as the source of ideas. Idealism allowed for broad instruction in liberal and vocational education.

Realism

O'Neill (1981) spoke of Realism as one of the philosophy systems "ordinarily defined as encompassing all of those philosophical positions that accept the fundamental principle that there is a real world that exists independent of being known, that an objective reality exists independent of subjective processes of consciousness" (p. 396). Morris and Pai (1976) agreed with the definition of O'Neill but also believed that Realism "posits a rational and ordered nature that provides direction" (p. 231).

The world, for the Realist, was as it was, and the job of the schools would be to teach students about the world. Goodness would be found in the laws of nature and the order of the physical world. Truth would then be the simple correspondence of observation.

For the Realist the curriculum would favor a school situation in which the dominant subjects were of the here-and-now world. Mathematics and science would figure strongly in subject-matter considerations, and the students would be taught factual information for mastery.
The teacher would impart knowledge of this reality to students or display such reality for observation and study. Classrooms would be highly ordered and disciplined, like nature, and the students would be passive participants in the study of things. Changes in school would be perceived as a natural evolution toward perfection of order. (Wiles & Bondi, 1984, p. 52)

Less emphasis would be placed on language and more emphasis given to mathematics which was considered symbolic language so essential to accurate description of the universe. According to Harry S. Broudy (1954) "the objectives of the curriculum are habits or tendencies to acquire, use, and enjoy truth...It is suggested that the way to form these habits is by mastery of organized subject matter" (p. 181).

Pragmatism

O'Neill (1981) defined Pragmatism as the philosophy which "holds that an idea is 'true' if (and to the extent that) it leads to effective consequences when applied to the solution of a real (practical) problem" (p. 393). For the Pragmatists, the world was an ever-changing place. Reality was what was actually experienced, and truth was what functioned at the "present moment". Unlike the Perennialists, Idealists, and Realists, the Pragmatists openly accepted change and continually sought to discover new ways to expand and improve society.
To the Pragmatists the school existed to improve practical intelligence, to make the child more effective in solving problems presented within the context of normal experience. They would favor a school with heavy emphasis on social subjects and experiences. Learning would occur through a problem-solving or inquiry format so often alluded to by John Dewey (1938).

Pragmatism did not, according to Johnson (1968), presuppose the absolute existence of a body of knowledge that must be mastered by each student in order to be educated. He stated:

The focal point of organizing the curriculum is the interests of children rather than the traditional subject matter organization. This is not to say the subject matter has no place in the curriculum, but it means that subject matter is used in relation to the needs and interests of the learner at a time when it can make a contribution to his experience in solving problems. (p. 37)

Emphasis was placed on method and approach to learning in the Pragmatist's curriculum planning. Organized knowledge from the disciplines was used and considered as a tool in the curriculum. Since one did not adhere strictly to the distinct disciplinary lines, knowledge was used and related in ways that were understood to the learner. Education, for the Pragmatist, was a continuing search for truth utilizing whatever sources were needed to discover that truth.
Reconstructionism

Reconstructionism held that the school should be "dedicated to the attainment of a worldwide democratic order...[and] that theory is ultimately inseparable from its social setting in a particular historical era. Thinking, then is the product of living in a particular society at a particular time" (O'Neill, 1981, p. 12). The Reconstructionist saw the world as "one personal subjectivity, where goodness, truth, and reality are individually defined. Reality is a world of existing truth subjectively chosen, and goodness a matter of freedom" (Wiles & Bondi, 1984, p. 52).

Schools to the Reconstructionists, if they were to exist at all, would be places that assisted students in knowing themselves and learning of their place in society. If subject matter existed, it would be a matter of interpretation such as the arts, ethics, or philosophy. Interaction among teachers and students would center around assisting students in their personal learning journeys. Change in school environments would be accepted and encouraged by the Reconstructionists as necessary and natural.

Branching from John Dewey's philosophy, the Reconstructionists, according to Peter Oliva (1982), followed a path that led them to propose using the school to achieve what they considered to be improvements in society. In essence,
Reconstructionism holds that the school should not simply transmit the cultural heritage or simply study social problems but should become an agency for solving political and social problems. (p. 185)

Some educators agreed that young people should consider pressing social, economic, and political problems and even attempt to reach consensus on possible solutions. By placing such great emphasis on controversial social issues and having as its major premise making the school a primary agency for social change, Reconstructionism has not made great inroads into our largely middle class, politically middle-of-the-road schools.

Questions Five and Six

The SCCE(1982) spoke of the Catholic school educator from the standpoint of one's vocation as it related to the Catholic school, the Church and society:

The vocation of every Catholic educator includes the work of ongoing social development: to form men and women who will be ready to take their place in society, preparing them in such a way that they will make the kind of social commitment which will enable them to work for the improvement of social structures, making these structures more conformed to the principles of the Gospel....The Catholic educator, in other words, must be committed to the task of forming men and women who will make the "civilization of love" a reality. A school uses own specific means for the integral formation of the human person: the communication of culture. It is extremely important, then that the Catholic educator reflect on the profound relationship that exists between culture and the Church. For the Church not only influences culture and is, in turn, conditioned by culture; the Church embraces everything in human culture which is compatible with revelation and which it
needs in order to proclaim the message of Christ and express it more adequately according to the cultural characteristics of each people and each age. The close relationship between culture and the life of the Church is an especially clear manifestation of the unity that exists between creature and redemption. (p. 13-14)

Barnes (1981), in his research, has examined a series of professional qualities that have been reported as being effective in the evaluation of any teacher. These qualities or teacher behavior characteristics included the following: (a) learning environment (warm and supportive); (b) classroom management (well organized); (c) classroom instruction (work oriented); (d) productive use of time (brisk pacing); (d) specific behaviors include: gaining students' attention, clear presentation, practice of new skills, monitoring, providing feedback, assigning individual work, evaluating student responses (p. 122).

In a joint publication prepared by the Chief Administrators of Catholic Education (CACE), the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU), and the NCEA entitled The Preservice Formation of Teachers for Catholic Schools (NCEA, 1982) the relational and personal qualities expected of the teacher in the Catholic school and the professional qualities (cognitive abilities and facilitation skills) were listed very specifically and clearly as follows:

Relational Qualities: "The effective Catholic educator relates well with students, parents and
colleagues and works collaboratively with others in a variety of situations." More specifically, she/he
--demonstrates a commitment to lifelong development and achievement of satisfying relationships; witnesses to a vital personhood that is alive and growing;
--recognizes and believes in the potential of others and communicates this belief; views others in a positive way--sees possibilities as well as problems;
--relates in a respectful manner; assists students to develop a sense of self-worth and responsibility as a Christian, helping them to make decisions and to solve problems from a Christian perspective;
--listens perceptively to students' concerns and communicates genuine love, warmth and respect while challenging them to become their best selves;
--recognizes, respects and encourages parents in carrying out their role as significant educators of their children; views parents as partners in the teaching-learning process
--maintains a mutual respect for alternative points of view; is sensitive and respectful to value differences, especially regarding individuals from different cultural and religious backgrounds;
--acknowledges and appreciates the abilities and contributions of others; cooperates rather than competes and willingly shares ideas, talents and resources.

Personal characteristics: The effective Catholic school educator
--is committed to personal, professional and spiritual growth for self and others; views self as an ongoing learner;
--demonstrates understanding and acceptance of the philosophical assumptions and values which underlie the school's Christian approach to education;
--is committed to the stability and long-range continuity of Catholic education in general and of own Catholic school in particular;
--is accountable and accepts professional evaluation of own performance; reflects on own performance for purposes of self-improvement;
--abides by the legal responsibilities and professional standards of the teaching profession...
Cognitive abilities: The effective Catholic school educator
--demonstrates understanding of the broad vision needed to advance the ministry of the Church through the unique processes of Catholic education;
--demonstrates understanding of the purpose and ministry of the Church in education and recognizes the distinctive mission and role played by Catholic schools, both in the Catholic community and American society in general;
--demonstrates religious literacy and is especially knowledgeable about religion in general and the Catholic religion in particular (including the major statements of the Church regarding one's own professional area of expertise);
--demonstrates understanding of the contemporary social teaching of the Church and the importance of developing Christians with the perspective and desire for service (including a personal commitment to action for justice, mercy and peace);
--demonstrates understanding of how young people develop religiously and the role that teachers play in this development.
Facilitation Skills: The Catholic school educator
--motivates others through own enthusiasm and commitment for growth in the Christian life;
--models the abilities and attitudes that students are expected to learn;
--guides student learning of concepts, abilities and attitudes needed to recognize and confront problems of injustice in our pluralistic society;
--provides learning experiences enabling students to related Christian principles and values to life situations;
--fosters the service consciousness of students by encouraging experiential learning activities that permit students to give witness to Christian justice and love;
--stimulates analysis and critical thinking through effective questioning skills; interacts dynamically with students, challenging them to higher levels of cognitive awareness;
--views each learner as an individual and demonstrates awareness of the individual progress of each learner toward the development of a Christian perspective;
--demonstrates understanding of own professional limitations and makes appropriate referrals for the benefit of the student;
--is creative and resourceful in using appropriate school and community resources to facilitate optimal learning for all students. (p. 6-7)

Upon examination one could see that the professional qualities and or teaching behaviors cited by Barnes (1981) and those relational, personal and professional qualities identified by the CACE et al. (NCEA, 1982) had much in common. The elements clearly missing from the work of Barnes were those dealing with values and the ministry of teaching.

Raferty (1985) contended that the term ministry as proposed by Nouwen (1981) as making the presence of God in one's life visible to others was the focus of the very nature of the commitment to Catholic education made by every Catholic educator. Kealey (1985) has stated that "The teacher is not merely a teacher, but a minister performing a sacred ministry in the Church. St. Paul has discussed the variety of ministries in the Church. Teaching is one of them" (p. 15).

The SCCE (1982) has stated that:

The work of the lay educator has an undeniably professional aspect; but it cannot be reduced to professionalism alone. Professionalism is marked by, and raised to, a supernatural Christian vocation. The life of the Catholic teacher must be marked by the exercise of a personal vocation in the Church, and not simply by the exercise of a profession. (p. 24)

McDermott (1985), in light of the exhortation of the SCCE (1982), contended that teachers in Catholic
schools needed to be reminded that they had a calling to personal holiness and to the furthering of the apostolic mission. He continued by saying that teachers "have a right to expect preservice training in spiritual formation from bishops, diocesan offices, pastors and religious leaders" (p. 47). McDermott also recognized the need to further the consciousness of their vocation through regular in-service programs and that personal consciousness raising was a daily exercise best accomplished through quiet moments of meditation.

Questions Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven and Twelve

Boyer (1983) pointed out that early in the twentieth century, secondary schools began to feel the impact of John Dewey most notably with the publication of The Child and the Curriculum. Dewey, according to Boyer, as the father of the progressive movement was alarmed at the extent to which industrialization and urbanization were eroding the traditional American institutions--the home, the community and the church. Dewey (1900) felt that the schools must educate the whole child, filling in where other institutions had failed. According to Noll (1987) Dewey "suggests a reconsideration of traditional approaches to schooling, giving fuller attention to the social development of the learner and the quality of his total experience"
(p. 14). McNeil (1985) cited that Dewey introduced manual training, shop work, sewing and cooking into his own laboratory school at the University of Chicago on the ground that "the traditional curriculum no longer met the needs of the new society created by the forces of industrialism. He wanted the school to take on the character of an embryonic community, active with occupations that reflect the life of the larger society" (p. 332).

In *My Pedagogic Creed*, Dewey (1929) made it clear that he saw the school as an agency for socializing the student:

I believe that all education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race...the school is primarily a social institution. Education being a social process, the school is simply that form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated...[the school] is also a social necessity because the home is the form of social life in which the child has been nurtured and in connection with which he has had his moral training. It is the business of the school to deepen and extend his sense of the values bound up in his home life. (p. 3-6)

Ravitch (1983) emphasized the remarks of Dewey (1929) when she commented that from the standpoint of his philosophy of education the school took on many social functions that had once been performed by the home, the community and the church. He believed that the school had the capability of becoming a driving force behind the movement for social progress because
of its ability to improve the quality of life for individuals and the larger society (p. 47). Miller and Seller (1985) proposed that Dewey believed the school to have a threefold function: to simplify, purify, and balance the cultural heritage in a democracy. Identification of the essential elements of the culture for students to study was the idea behind simplification. Purification would allow the school to stress those elements of the cultural heritage which led one to positive advancement and to eliminate those which hindered such growth. Through the integration of all aspects of experience into one homogeneous whole schools would be able to help their students to balance their personal heritage (e.g., familial, religious) with the cultural heritage. (p. 64)

Tanner and Tanner (1980) have indicated that John Dewey's comments on the importance of philosophy of education in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process stem from his belief "in the need to develop and conceive of the various studies as a vital part of the reflectively formulated race experience" (p. 16). Dewey (1902) declared that this was absolutely necessary since the students "embody the cumulative outcome of the efforts, the strivings, and the successes of the human race generation after
generation" (p. 8-9). Therefore in Dewey's conception of philosophy of education it

is not an external application of ready-made ideas to a system of practice having a radically different origin and purpose; it is only an explicit formulation of the problems of the formation of the right mental and moral habitudes in respect to the difficulties of contemporary social life. The most penetrating definition of philosophy which can be given is, then, that it is the theory of education in its most general phases. (p. 386)

Golby, Greenwald and West (1975) reminded all that Dewey (1916) spent an entire chapter speaking of aims (goals) in education. As Golby et al. pointed out Dewey believed "that aims belong within rather than without the educational process" (p. 303) and that aims were neither to be confused with ends (terminations, completions), nor results (representations of stages achieved in a continuous activity). Dewey (cited in Golby et al., 1975) insisted that an aim was "a foreseen end and gives direction to the activity" (p. 303). Golby et al. affirmed Dewey's counsel on the care which one must take in the writing aims in education to ensure that:

(a) The aim is relevant to the situation. There is no point in assuming "ends lying outside our activities; ends foreign to the concrete make up of the situation; ends which issue from some outside source."
(b) The aim is flexible and capable of being changed. Aims are "tentative sketches", in which "the act of striving to realize it tests its worth". If an aim is useful, nothing more is necessary. If it is not useful, then it must be
rewritten or scrapped. This is why aims that are externally imposed can be unhelpful. Their very rigidity is at odds with the flexibility that an aim implies.

(c) The aim should encourage a freeing of activities. An aim does not represent the process of doing something, it represents only the end-in-View. It does not directly dictate activities, but frees them so that the end is reached. Nothing static, nothing fixed, nothing frozen is intended as far as activities are concerned. (p. 151)

According to McNeil (1985), Dewey believed that subject matter was to be selected based upon the present experience of the learners not on the basis of what adults thought would be useful for the learner at some future time. Dewey did not believe that the goal of any curriculum was simply the acquisition of facts, dates, etc. It was his belief that organized subject matter become a tool for understanding and intelligently ordering one's experience(s). Dewey, McNeil continued

generated many of the fundamental questions that guide current inquiries. What is the best way to relate the natural view of the child and the scientific view of those with specialized knowledge? How can knowledge become a method for enriching social life? How can we help learners act morally rather than merely have ideas about morality? How can the curriculum best bring order, power, initiative, and intelligence into the child's experience? How can the teacher be helped to follow the individual internal authority of truth about a learner's growth when curriculum decisions are made by external authority above the teacher? (p. 334-335)

To meet the needs in a society demanding democratic education, Dewey (1938) observed that the
process of curriculum engineering would best be served by placing the educational experiences of the student in a spiral. He maintained that the learner's experience was the essential point at which his or her spiraling of learning began. Dewey (1929) had previously asserted that there was no succession of studies in the ideal school curriculum. It was inconceivable to believe that at one level the learning activities could be simply reading and writing, and that at a later level, literature, or science, or mathematics might be introduced. The progress, according to Dewey was in the development of new attitudes toward, and interests in, experience not in the succession of studies.

Dewey (1916) expressed his community-centered beliefs on curriculum in the following manner:

The schemes of a curriculum must take account of the adaptation of studies to the needs of existing community life; it must select with the intention of improving the life we live in common so that the future shall be better than the past. Moreover, the curriculum must be planned with reference to placing essentials first, and refinements second. The things which are socially most fundamental, that is, which have to do with the experiences in which the widest groups share, are the essentials. (p. 191)

Later Dewey (1929) reiterated his emphasis on the community's role in education when he pointed out that the community's duty to education was its paramount moral duty. Dewey (cited in Miller & Seller, 1985)
stated that "through education society can formulate its own purposes, can organize its own means and resources, and thus shape itself with definiteness and economy in the direction in which it wishes to move" (p. 76). In such a community, Glatthorn (1987) pointed out, "the emphasis is on social interaction, cooperation, and communication" (p. 42). According to Dewey (1916) the true measure of excellence in education was directly related to the extent to which a sense of community had been achieved: "the measure of the worth of the administration, curriculum, and methods of instruction of the school is the extent to which they are animated by a social spirit" (p. 358).

Dewey (1929) clearly stated how he perceived the teacher to fit into the school in light of his or her responsibility to the community and the larger society outside the immediate community. It was his belief that the teacher was primarily engaged in the formation of proper social life, not merely in the training of students as individuals. Likewise, he believed that the teacher should recognize and realize the dignity of the pedagogical calling and that the teacher was a servant of society with the responsibility for maintaining social order. Dewey affirmed that, seen in this light, the teacher was truly a prophet of the true God instrumental in ushering in the true kingdom of
God. As such the teacher was not in the school to impose his or her own personal system of beliefs or to form certain habits in the child which stemmed from personal beliefs and/or biases.

Dewey (1909) has pointed out that the role of education was to build character in the individual. The type of character desired as a result of passing through the educational system was one that insists on carrying out good intentions, not simply having them. The individual must have the power to take a stand in life's conflicts. "He must have initiative, insistence, persistence, courage, and industry. He must in a word have all that goes under the name of 'force of character'" (p. 50). Dewey (1929) added later that "moral education centers upon this conception of the school as a model of social life, that the best and deepest moral training is precisely that which one gets through having to enter into proper relations with others in a unity of work and thought" (cited in Miller & Seller, 1985, p. 71).

McNeil (1985) referred to Tyler's rationale as the best-known rational model for answering questions about formulating educational purposes, selecting, and organizing educational experiences, and determining the extent to which purposes are being attained. It is called an ends-means approach because the setting of purposes or objectives as ends influences the kinds of activity and organization most likely to assist in reaching the goal. (p. 99)
According to Gail McCutcheon (1986), Tyler described a "technical, rational approach" (p. 50) to curriculum theory. Elliot Eisner (1985) believed that Tyler's monograph was to some degree oversimplified, but once learned hard to forget. Glatthorn (1987), on the other hand, stated that

The Tyler model has several advantages. It is relatively easy to understand and apply. It is rational and systematic. It focuses attention on curricular strengths and weaknesses, rather than being solely concerned with the performance of individual students. And it emphasizes the importance of a continuing cycle of assessment, analysis, and improvement. (p. 273)

Doll (1982) stated that

the sensible, systematic nature of [the Tyler] model attracted potential users so that it has become in many planning centers the plan for designing curriculum...For example,...[many curriculum developers] consider it the model used by most school districts, consciously or unconsciously. (p. 167)

Miller and Seller (1985) reflected upon Tyler's model as having been strongly influenced by John Dewey in the delineation of three broad sources of educational objectives. They also saw an influence of both Bobbitt and Thorndike in Tyler's conception that the purpose of education was essentially identified as bringing about change in student behavior. In later work Tyler (cited in Doll, 1982)

summarized the aims of American schooling as the development of self-realization in individual learners, the making of literate citizens, provision of opportunities for social mobility in
the population, preparation for the world of work, preparation for making wise choices in nonmaterial services (education, health, recreation, and so on), and instruction in learning how to learn. (p. 171)

Tyler, according to McNeil (1985), assumed that anyone participating in the process of curriculum improvement and/or curriculum development must try to answer the following questions:

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, p. 1)

McNeil (1985) believed that Tyler "attempted to reconcile the conflict between those who favored one or another as the most important factor and to formulate a consensus that would allow individuals with divergent goals to work together in developing curricula" (p. 346) in prescribing three sources from which objectives could be derived: the student, the society, and the subject. He added the following points to illustrate how one following the Tyler model might derive objectives from data provided by the different sources:

1. Learners. In order to derive objectives from this source, one would study learners in terms of their deficiencies with respect to knowledge and application of a broad range of values in daily living; their psychological needs for affection, belonging, recognition, and a sense of purpose; and their interests.
2. Social Conditions. Facts about the community—local, national, or world—must be
known and taken into account if what is to be taught is to be made relevant to contemporary life. Again, one needs to make a value judgment in deciding what kinds of facts to collect.

3. Subject Matter Specialists. In rational curriculum making, scientists and scholars, the discoverers of knowledge, are consulted in order to find out what the specialist's subject can contribute to the education of the intended learners.

Tanner and Tanner (1980) interjected that

if these sources are seen as mere components rather than as organically interacting factors in curriculum development, their treatment too often becomes mechanical and the task of curriculum development tends to be regarded as merely technological, as evidenced by the earlier efforts in activity analysis and the more recent work on behavioral objectives. Moreover, the so-called "sources" identified by Tyler and others are not merely sources as such but also are influences that affect not only educational objectives but the structure and content of the curriculum per se. (p 61-62)

After having derived the objectives, Tyler (1949) discussed four ways that instructors stated objectives.

Objectives were:

(a) things that the instructor will do; (b) topics, concepts, generalizations, or other elements of content that are to be dealt with in the course or courses; (c) generalized patterns of behavior that fail to indicate more specifically the area of life or the content to which the behavior applies; (d) terms that identify both the kind of behavior to be developed in the student and the content or area of life in which this behavior is to operate. (p. 44-47)

Oliva (1982) noted that "of the four types of objectives outlined by Tyler, the fourth is preferable" (p. 352). He interjected that those who supported the use of behavioral objectives did so because this
approach to learning and instruction "forces the
teacher to be precise about what is to be accomplished;
enables the teacher to communicate to pupils what they
must achieve; simplifies evaluation; makes
accountability possible; makes sequencing easier"
(p. 352).

Tyler (1949) enjoined teachers, administrators and
curriculum developers in a particular school to
formulate an educational and social philosophy which
could operate as a screen for the selection and the
elimination of educational objectives. He entreated
them to outline their values emphasizing the following
four democratic values as important to effective
and satisfying personal and social life...(1) the
recognition of the importance of every individual
human being as a human being regardless of his
race, national, social or economic status; (2)
opportunity for wide participation in all phases
of activities in the social groups in the society;
(3) encouragement of variability rather than
demanding a single type of personality; (4) faith
in intelligence as a method of dealing with
important problems rather than depending upon the
authority of an autocratic or aristocratic group.
(p. 34)

Likewise Tyler (1949) recounted the necessity for
teachers, administrators and curriculum developers in
an individual school to become knowledgeable in the
area of the psychology of learning. He declared that
what was known about the psychology of learning served
as a second screen through which suggested objectives
should be passed in order to establish further criteria
for their selection or elimination. Tyler explained the significance of the psychology of learning screen in the following manner:

a knowledge of the psychology of learning enables us to distinguish changes in human beings that can be expected to result from a learning process from those that cannot...a knowledge of the psychology of learning enables us to distinguish goals that are feasible from those that are likely to take a very long time or are almost impossible of attainment at the age level contemplated.... Psychology of learning gives us some idea of the length of time required to attain an objective and the age levels at which the effort is most efficiently employed.

Beauchamp (1975) asserted that Ralph Tyler had long been concerned and identified with curriculum organization. In order to best organize the learning experiences of the students, Tyler (cited in Beauchamp, 1975) identified as organizing elements for a curriculum the concepts, skills, and values cited as behavioral objectives for pupils. Specific subjects, broad fields, core lessons, topics, or units he referred to as organizing structures. Organizing principles called for use of chronological order, extension outward from pupils' lives, the use of concrete materials and ideas prior to abstraction, and increasing the breadth and application of knowledge. (p.119)

Tyler (1949) believed that after the objectives had been selected student learning experiences needed to be developed that would attain the specified objectives. Tyler defined a learning experience as the "interaction between the learner and the external conditions in the environment to which he can react" (p. 41).
Important in the Tyler model was the evaluation of the effectiveness of the learning experience(s) against the original objective(s). Evaluation, according to Tyler (1949, 1958), should focus on changes in student behavior. Miller and Seller (1985) stated that "pretests should be used, so that teachers can determine whether student performance improves in the designated areas. In the Tyler model, data is collected through tests, observation, interviews, questionnaires, and actual student products" (p. 213).

As one of the earliest evaluation models, Glatthorn (1987) stated that the Tyler approach to curriculum evaluation moved systematically through several related steps:

1. Begin with the behavioral objectives which have been previously determined. Those objectives should specify both the content of learning and the student behavior expected.
2. Identify the situations which will give the student the opportunity to express the behavior embodied in the objective and which evoke or encourage this behavior.
3. Select, modify, or construct suitable evaluation instruments, and check the instruments for objectivity, reliability, and validity.
4. Use the instruments to obtain summarized or appraised results.
5. Compare the results obtained from several instruments before and after given periods in order to estimate the amount of change taking place.
6. Analyze the results in order to determine strengths and weakness of the curriculum and to identify possible explanations about the reason for this particular pattern of strengths and weaknesses.
7. Use the results to make the necessary modifications in the curriculum.

McNeil (1985) indicated that the role of values and bias was not highlighted in the Tyler model. "Values and bias operate at all points in the rationale—in the selection of particular data within the sources, in drawing inferences from the data, in formulating the objectives, and in selecting from among the objectives" (p. 102). He went on to state that "the model tends to lock curriculum making into the 'top-down' tradition, with those at the top setting the purposes and functions that narrow the school's objectives; the objectives, in turn, control classroom instruction" (p. 102). Macdonald (1966) felt that statement of expected behavioral outcomes violated the integrity of learners "by fragmenting their behavior and manipulating them for an end that has no present worth for them" (p. 4). Kliebard (1970) was critical of Tyler's approach to evaluation since it was so closely aligned to the original statements of objectives that there was no opportunity to identify outcomes which were not anticipated. He believed that this method of evaluation did not allow the teacher or evaluator to identify the overall effects of the course or curriculum. The evaluation narrowly focused on how
the learning experiences fulfilled the stated objectives.

According to Glatthorn (1987), Bruner was a noted psychologist from Harvard University who was selected to serve as spokesperson and chairman "of a conference composed chiefly of scientists, mathematicians, and psychologists and convened at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, by the National Academy of Sciences" (p. 61-62). The chief purpose of this conference was, in light of the Soviet Union's successful launching of Sputnik, to improve the science and mathematics curricula of the nations elementary and secondary schools. Noll (1987), referring to Bruner, said that though he was not trained in child development or in education, became a guru of the education reform movement of the day. His totally unsubstantiated claim that "you can teach any child any subject matter at any age in an intellectually honest way" became a touchstone of the new conception of the "competent infant". (p. 215)

Bruner (1960, 1977) spoke of the process of American education and schooling when he said

We may take as perhaps the most general objective of education that it cultivate excellence; but it should be clear in what sense this phrase is used. It here refers not only to schooling the better student but also to helping each student achieve his optimum intellectual development. Good teaching that emphasizes the structure of a subject is probably even more valuable for the less able student than for the gifted one, for it is the former rather than the latter who is most easily thrown off the track by poor teaching. (p. 9)
In 1963 Bruner addressed the national conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) on the subject of the theory of instruction. Later, in an adaptation of that address published in the official ASCD journal, Bruner (1963) proposed four aspects of a theory of instruction.

1. First, a theory of instruction should concern itself with the factors that predispose a child to learn effectively.
2. It should concern itself with optimal structuring of knowledge.
3. A third aspect of a theory of instruction deals with the optimal sequence that is required for learning.
4. Finally, a fourth aspect of a theory of instruction should concern itself with the nature and pacing of rewards and punishments and the successes and failures. (p. 523-532)

Beauchamp (1975) noted that, whether Bruner was or was not the cause of what followed his address to the ASCD in 1963, "a flurry of activity under the general category of theories of instruction followed his presentation" (p. 48). Macdonald (1963) argued for a clarification of terms associated with instruction. As a departure point, he suggested that a distinction be made among curriculum, instruction, and teaching. One deduced, therefore, that, because of a general lack of clarification and distinction among the terms, Bruner truly represented an influential force in curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement.
According to Morris and Pai (1976), the first element in Bruner's theory of instruction, predisposition toward learning, was concerned with specifying those conditions that predispose a child to learn effectively.

Bruner explains that the teaching-learning situation is a dynamic process in which two or more individuals are involved. Hence, if a child is to cope with school and engage in learning, he or she must have minimal mastery of social skills in order to maintain many different kinds of relationships with others. Among other important factors such as cultural background, social class, and sex, the way in which the child explores different alternative courses of action directly affects learning and problem solving (p. 379).

With the second element of his theory of instruction, concern with the optimal structuring of knowledge, Bruner (1960, 1977), asserted that "any idea or problem or body of knowledge can be presented in a form simple enough so that any particular learner can understand it in a recognizable form" (p. 44). In other words, according to Morris and Pai (1976) any complex problem (or discipline) can be analyzed into a set of basic elements that can be dealt with in even simpler and more elementary operations. Therefore, knowledge about anything can be divided into fundamental ideas and principles for children to grasp. The structure, fundamental concepts, principles, and form of knowledge become indispensable in Bruner's theory of teaching. (p. 379)

Bruner (1960, 1977) implied that the best sequencing began with the presentation of materials that were familiar to the learner's sensory experiences and
activities and then eventually moved to more abstract materials.

The fourth aspect of the theory of instruction, concerning itself with the nature and pacing of rewards and punishments and the successes and failures, were, according to Bruner (1960, 1977) important in learning since, as Morris and Pai (1976) have indicated "they are often children's means of knowing the results of their activities in seeking a goal. Therefore, teaching should be carried on in such a way that learners can receive corrective information at the most appropriate time and place" (p. 380).

As to sources of curriculum objectives, Oliva (1982) pointed out that one major source was needs derived from the subject matter or, as Bruner (1960, 1977) would say, from "the structure of a subject" (p. 6).

Bruner refers to the structure of a subject as the "basic ideas" (p. 12-13) or "fundamental principles" (p. 25). "Grasping the structure of a subject," said Bruner, "is understanding it in such a way that permits many other things to be related to it meaningfully. To learn structure, in short, is to learn how things are related" (p. 7). (Oliva, 1982, p. 224)

Wulf and Schave (1984) pointed out that Bruner perceived the learner as an active processor of information. The learner, therefore, should be allowed to formulate problems or goals and search for
alternative solutions instead of looking for externally designated answers as put forth by behaviorists. The teacher was, in his or her role, to guide meaningful inquiry and to present material in an understandable manner which allows the student to learn from personal experiences. These perceptions of the learner were behind Bruner's belief in discovery learning and in the conception of learning experiences being organized in a spiral curriculum.

Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) contended that Bruner believed that learning through discovery was necessary for the retention of knowledge and that this process had many benefits. Bruner (1965) stated that discovery is "in its essence a matter of rearranging or transforming evidence in such a way that one is enabled to go beyond the evidence so reassembled to additional new insights" (p. 607-608). He also believed that an increase in intellectual potency was the primary benefit derived from discovery learning. Practice in discovery trained one to acquire information in ways that make solving problems easier. A second benefit, according to Darkenwald and Merriam "involves bringing about a shift from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation. Rather than learning for external rewards, the individual sees discovery as a reward in itself and is thus motivated to further learning" (p. 103). The
third benefit of discovery learning as outlined by Bruner (1967) was that it led one to learn how to discover and improve in the art and technique of inquiry. Finally, it was asserted that discovery learning facilitated remembering. Bruner (1971) added that

Discovery teaching generally involves not so much the process of leading students to discover what is "out there," but rather, their discovering what is in their own heads. It involves encouraging them to say, "let me stop and think about that"; "let me use my head"; "Let me have some vicarious trial and error." There is a vast amount more in most heads (children's heads included) than we are usually aware of, or that we are willing to try to use. You have to convince students (or exemplify for them, which is a much better way of putting it) of the fact that there are implicit models in their heads which are useful (cited in Costa, 1985, p. 100).

The idea of the spiral approach to curriculum organization could be attributed, in part, to the work of Jerome Bruner who based his ideas upon the notion of the spiral curriculum developed by John Dewey. In order to explain the rationale of the spiral curriculum Bruner (1960, 1977) stated

If one respects the ways of thought of the growing child, if one is courteous enough to translate material into his logical forms and challenging enough to tempt to advance, then it is possible to introduce him at an early age to the ideas and styles that in later life make an educated man. We might ask, as a criterion for any subject taught in primary school, whether, when fully developed, it is worth an adult's knowing, and whether having known it as a child makes a person a better adult. If the answer to both questions
is negative or ambiguous, then the material is cluttering the curriculum. (p. 52)

Wulf and Schave (1984) intimated that the spiral curriculum of Bruner "can present concepts in ways that are matched with the learner's cognition stage and thus maintains the interest of the learner" (p. 103). Tanner and Tanner (1980) asserted that "Bruner's conception of the spiral curriculum thus fitted his conception of the learner as an embryonic version of the advanced scholar on the forefront of his discipline. (p. 429)

According to Glatthorn (1987), Bruner called for a moratorium on developing structure-based curricula. Bruner (1971) stated, "We might better concern ourselves with how those (societal) problems can be solved, not just by practical action but by putting knowledge, wherever we find it, to work in these massive tasks" (p. 21). Glatthorn pointed out, however, that for a period of more than ten years "his [Bruner's] ideas on transfer, structure, discovery, and readiness were to play a key role in almost every major curriculum project supported by federal funds" (p. 62).

As to who should develop the curriculum, Bruner (1960, 1977) was quite specific. "Only by the use of our best minds in devising curricula will we bring the fruits of scholarship and wisdom to the student just
beginning his studies" (p. 19). Glatthorn (1987) supported Bruner's assertions when he stated, "If the structures of the discipline were to be mastered through scientific discovery, then obviously the scholars of that discipline were in the best position to provide leadership in the development of those curricula" (p. 62).

Bruner's (1960, 1977) ideas on evaluation were likewise succinct:

Many curricula are originally planned with a guiding idea...But as curricula are actually executed, as they grow and change, they often lose their original form and suffer a relapse into a certain shapelessness. It is not amiss to urge that actual curricula be reexamined with an eye to the issues of continuity and development....One cannot predict the exact forms that revision might take; indeed, it is plain that there is now available too little research to provide adequate answers. One can only propose that appropriate research be undertaken with the greatest vigor and as soon as possible. (p. 54)

Analysis and Synthesis of the Literature Reviewed

Questions One and Two

The analysis of the literature reviewed indicated that there were ways in which the Roman Catholic school system is similar to the public school system and that there were ways in which it was different. In the work of McDermott (1985) one saw that he described the Catholic school as a religious community of believers within an academic community. One deduced from his statement that, as an academic community, the Roman
Catholic school system was similar to the public school system and that, as a religious community of believers, it was different. With Kealey's (1985) seven characteristics one saw that there was both a secular and religious element to each with the obvious exceptions of values development and teaching ministers. Values development and teaching ministers clearly pointed to the uniqueness of the Roman Catholic school system.

Questions Three and Four

The analysis of the literature reviewed on the four major influences upon curriculum development and/or improvement (psychological, social, historical, and philosophical) indicated that the impact of these influences upon the Roman Catholic school system appears to be neither more nor less than the impact of these influences upon the public school system. The theories of Thorndike, Watson, and Kohler and their impact on theories of learning are felt equally in both school systems. The social influence, as with the psychological, impacted both systems equally as well. As has been pointed out, the total separation of church and state has remained an ideal but not a reality. While the Roman Catholic school system actively pursued a program of religious values development, the same type of program was pursued in some communities and
states indirectly through the whim and/or wishes of special interest groups. History impacted all citizens regardless of their beliefs. The impact of the historical influence cannot be said to have been felt in one school system more than another. Since the philosophical influences upon curriculum depended upon those values and concerns that were held dear to a group of individuals, the influences of philosophy would be felt to the same degree in the Roman Catholic school system as in the public school system.

**Questions Five and Six**

From the literature reviewed one readily deduced that there were significant differences between the expectations of the professional staffs of the Roman Catholic school system and the professional staffs of the public school system. To be sure, as Barnes (1981) pointed out, there were certain qualities one would expect of a teacher in any school. Professionalism, integrity, and knowledge were but some of the attributes expected of all professional educators. But, as Kealey (1985), Raferty (1985), and Nouwen (1981) indicated the distinctive quality of the Catholic school educator was that he/she performed as a teacher-minister. The SCCE (1982) clearly stated that the Catholic school educator possessed a calling to
personal holiness and to furthering the apostolic mission.

Questions Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven, and Twelve

The selected literature reviewed on curriculum theories/models indicated that the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner did in fact address the needs of a school system in dealing with the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. As Miller and Seller (1985) noted, Dewey's work "provides the philosophical underpinnings of inquiry approaches to curriculum" (p. 62). Tyler's work, of course, as Beane et al. (1986) elaborated, "guided the majority of curriculum plans and projects over the past three decades" (p. 65). Bruner's ideas, as characterized by Glatthorn (1987), "were to play a key role in almost every curriculum project supported by federal funds" (p. 62) for a period of over ten years.

The literature indicated that Dewey (1909, 1929) saw the school as an agency for socializing the student and that the role of education was to build character in the individual. Tyler (1968), on the other hand indicated that the school's function was "the development of self-realization in individual learners...and instruction in learning how to learn" (cited in Doll, 1982, p. 71). Miller and Seller (1985)
asserted that Tyler saw the purpose of education as bringing about change in student behavior. Bruner (1960, 1977) believed that the aim of education was "that it cultivate excellence" (p. 9). None of these concepts of the general aims of education was inconsistent with either the public school system or the Roman Catholic school system. The literature indicated however, that the three curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner did not address the aims of the Roman Catholic school system which make "constant reference to the Gospel" (SCCE, 1977, p. 20).

The literature indicated that the treatment of goals and objectives in the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner addressed the needs of both the public school system and the Roman Catholic school system. Dewey (cited in Golby et al., 1975) affirmed that goals (aims) were "relevant to the situation...flexible...[and] encourage a freeing of activities" (p. 151). Bruner, according to Wulf and Schave (1984), indicated that the student should be allowed to formulate his or her own problems or goals. He believed that this was a superior approach to looking for answers which had been externally predetermined by behaviorists. Bruner (1960, 1977) believed that the major source for curriculum
objectives was needs derived from "the structure of a subject" (p. 6). Objectives, as the literature has indicated, were Tyler's (1949) strong point. In his work he emphasized the sources for writing objectives as the student, the society, and the subject.

The literature indicated that the organization of the curriculum, i.e., of the student's learning experiences, in the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner addressed the needs of both the public school system and the Roman Catholic school system. As has been seen, Dewey (1938) believed that the students would best be served by placing the educational experiences of the student in a spiral. Bruner (1960, 1977) believed in the same approach to the ordering of a student's learning experiences. Tyler (1949), on the other hand, simply stated that learning experiences needed to be developed that would attain the specified objectives.

The literature indicated that the treatment of philosophy, psychologies of learning and evaluation in the curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner addressed the needs of both the public school system and the Roman Catholic school system. Dewey (1902) referred to a philosophy of education as a "theory of education in its most general phases" (p. 386). Tyler (1949) entreated teachers, administrators
and curriculum developers to formulate an educational and social philosophy to aid in the selection and elimination of educational objectives. Likewise, Tyler deemed it necessary for the same groups of individuals to become knowledgeable in the area of the psychology of learning. Bruner (1960, 1977) introduced his conception of a psychology of learning with his emphasis on transfer learning, structure of the disciplines, discovery learning, and readiness. Dewey, according to McNeil (1985), best summed up his thoughts on the psychology of learning by having generated thought which served as the basis for the following question: "What is the best way to relate the natural view of the child on the scientific view of those with specialized knowledge?" (p. 334) One deduced from Dewey's (1916) statements in regard to the true measure of excellence in education that evaluation of the effectiveness of a curriculum was "the extent to which [it is] animated by a social spirit" (p. 358). Tyler (1958), on the other hand, believed that focus on changes in student behavior by evaluating the learning experience(s) against the original objective(s) was the best means of evaluation. Bruner (1960, 1977) argued that "curricula be [evaluated] with an eye to the issues of continuity and development" (p. 54).
The selected literature reviewed in regard to values indicated that the curriculum theory/model of Dewey addressed the needs of the Roman Catholic school system but did not address the needs of the public school system if the concept of separation of church and state were in fact a reality and not merely an ideal. The literature reviewed indicated that the curriculum theories/models of Tyler and Bruner addressed the needs of the public school system but did not address the needs of the Roman Catholic school system. Dewey (1929) made it clear that "it is the business of the school to deepen and extend [a] sense of the values bound up in [the] home" (p. 6). Likewise, Dewey asserted that the teacher was truly a prophet of the true God instrumental in ushering in the true kingdom of God. Dewey (1902) had earlier expressed that education was essential in the "formation of the right...moral habits in respect to the difficulties of contemporary social life" (p. 386). McNeil (1985) pointed out that Dewey was concerned with the manner in which one could help learners act out morally rather than merely have ideas about morality (p. 335). McNeil pointed out that the role of values was not highlighted in the work of Tyler. Since no mention of values was found in either the primary or secondary sources dealing with the curriculum.
theory/model of Bruner, it can be inferred that the role of values did not impact upon his curriculum theory/model.

The literature clearly indicated that the curriculum theory/model of Dewey explicitly addressed direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement in a positive manner, while the curriculum theories/models of Tyler and Bruner did not. McNeil (1985) contended that Dewey believed that the teacher could not follow the individual internal authority of truth about a learner's growth when curriculum decisions are made by external authority above the teacher. Tyler, on the other hand, according to McNeil, "tends to lock curriculum making into the 'top-down' tradition, with those at the top setting the purposes and functions that narrow the school's objectives; the objectives, in turn control classroom instruction" (p. 102). Bruner, according to Wulf and Schave (1984), believed that the role of the teacher was to guide meaningful inquiry and to present material in an understandable manner. As to the development of curriculum, Bruner (1960, 1977) was very specific. "Only by the use of our best minds in devising curricula will we bring the fruits of scholarship and wisdom to the student just beginning his studies" (p. 19). Bruner's use of the term "best
"minds" (p. 19) has been interpreted by Glatthorn (1987) as "scholars of [the] discipline" (p. 62).

Summary

In this chapter specific methodologies regarding analysis and synthesis of the literature reviewed were presented as was the specific manner in which author credibility was established. The selected literature reviewed was collected in response to the twelve questions which defined the scope of this study. The first six question were presented, analyzed and synthesized in pairs since the information gleaned from the responses was considered foundational to a discussion of the remaining six. The last six questions were dealt with as a single unit since they dealt with the specific curriculum theories/models being scrutinized. The curriculum theories/models were analyzed (1) in light of their efficacy in addressing the needs of a school system involved in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process in general, and the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in particular; and (2) in light of their ability (explicit or implicit) to provide for the direct involvement of the faculty of a school in the process of curriculum development and/or improvement.
Chapter IV: A Proposed Theoretical Model for Curriculum Development and/or Curriculum Improvement for Use in the Roman Catholic School System

The purpose of this chapter was the presentation of a theoretical model for curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement for use in the Roman Catholic school system. A special emphasis of this curriculum theory/model was the direct involvement of the faculty of a particular school in the process of curriculum development and/or improvement. Oliva (1982) counseled that individuals either choosing or designing a new model would certainly agree that the model should exhibit the following characteristics:

1. major components of the process;
2. customary, but not inflexible, "beginning" and "ending" points;
3. the relationship between curriculum and instruction;
4. distinctions between curricular and instructional goals and objectives;
5. reciprocal relationships between components;
6. a cyclical rather than a linear pattern;
7. feedback lines;
8. the possibility of entry at any point in the cycle;
9. an internal consistency and logic;
10. enough simplicity to be intelligible;
11. components in the form of a diagram or chart.

(p. 167-168)

In keeping with the definition of Beauchamp (1975), this author proposed that the theory/model presented in this chapter be considered "a set of
related statements that give meaning to a school's
curriculum by pointing up relationships among its
elements and by directing its development, its use, and
its evaluation" (p. 60).

Figure 1 portrays the proposed model for
curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement
for use in the Roman Catholic school system. This
model was derived and built using the synthesized
review of the literature and the responses to the
twelve questions that delimited the study.
The Proposed Model for Curriculum Development and/or Curriculum Improvement in the Roman Catholic School System

1. Identification of needs in general of the Roman Catholic Church
2. Determination of the needs of the diocese or archdiocese
3. Synthesis of religious community objectives
4. Synthesis of archdiocesan/diocesan or parish directives
5. Synthesis of church documents, encyclicals, decrees, etc.
6. Identification of needs in general of society
7. Identification of needs in general of the students
8. Determination of the needs of the community
9. Determination of the needs of the students
10. Determination of the needs of the faculty

Mission statement

Statement of philosophy
Delineation of preliminary curriculum objectives

Determination of needs of a particular school community

Steps 4 & 5

Delineation of preliminary curriculum goals

Delineation of preliminary curriculum objectives

Needs assessment continued

Revised curriculum goals

Revised curriculum objectives

The Model (Continued)
The Model (Continued)
The Model (Continued)
The Model (Continued)
Discussion of the Proposed Model

In this model needs are determined, identified, and/or addressed at Step 1 (Identification of Needs in General: of Society, of the Roman Catholic Church, and Students), Step 2 (Determination of Needs: of the Community, of the Faculty, of Students, and of the Archdiocese or Diocese), Step 6 (Determination of Needs of a Particular School Community), Step 9 (Needs Assessment Continued), and Step 17 (Needs Assessment Continued as a Check). Kathleen M. Wulf and Barbara Schave (1984) have stated that

A needs assessment can be the most democratic way to select content. A needs assessment gives the curriculum personal relevance for the participants. It is a public process of interviewing teachers, administrators, experts, parents, students, politicians, and community leaders about how they would attack the problem that needs to be solved. After collecting information from all of these groups, the consensus is determined, values listed in priority, and important aspects of the content are specified (p. 31).

Kaufman (1983) has stated that a needs assessment is "a process that consists of the determination of gaps in results between 'what is' and 'what should be,' placing the gaps in priority order for closure ('meeting the needs'), and selecting the gap in results of the highest priority for closure" (p. 54). Likewise, Kaufman and English (1979) spoke of a needs assessment as
a tool which formally harvests the gaps between current results (or outcomes, products) and required or desired results, places these gaps in priority order, and selects those gaps (needs) of the highest priority for action, usually through the implementation of a new or existing curriculum or management process. (p. 3-4)

If one is to effectively deal with needs assessment one must keep in mind that it identifies programmatic needs that must be addressed by curriculum planners.

Lewis (1983) spoke of the characteristics of a needs assessment when he said it

1. Tends to focus on the instructional program to the exclusion of other critical, areas of the school district, such as financial resources and capital facilities.
2. Major key result areas of a school district have not been defined.
3. Focuses most often on strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program
4. Tends to focus on factors involving the internal school environment. (p. 32-33)

In Step 1 (Identification of Needs in General: of Society, of the Roman Catholic Church, and Students) of the proposed model the needs dealt with are a departure point and are general needs in these three areas. The information gleaned at this step allows the curriculum planners an overview of existing condition outside of the specific environment of the school and/or school system in order to move from the general to the local environment. The important element included in the model at this point is, obviously, the identification of needs of the Roman Catholic Church in general. This
immediately shows that this model's audience is the Roman Catholic school system.

Step 2 (Determination of Needs: of the Community, of the Faculty, of Students, and of the Archdiocese or Diocese) moves from the overview of existing conditions outside of the specific environment to the local environment. One determines needs of the community in which the school exists, the needs of students in that community, the needs of the faculty involved in the schools of the community, and the needs of the archdiocese or diocese. The important elements at this step of the model are: (1) that this model begins to address the needs of the faculty as an integral component of the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process (i.e., direct faculty involvement in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process is initiated at this step and continues through Step 23); and (2) that this model addresses the needs of the archdiocese or diocese to which the school belongs.

Oliva (1982) stated that

A needs assessment is also not time-specific in that it takes place only at the beginning of a comprehensive study of the curriculum. A needs assessment is a continuing activity that takes place (a) before specification of curricular goals and objectives, [and] (b) after identification of curricular goals and objectives. (p. 229)
Therefore, it is most appropriate that this model reflect the needs assessment as a continuing activity as seen at Step 6 (Determination of Needs of a Particular School Community), Step 9 (Needs Assessment Continued), and Step 17 (Needs Assessment Continued as a Check).

At Step 3 (Synthesis of: Religious Community Objectives; Archdiocesan, Diocesan or Parish Directives; Church Documents, Decrees, Encyclicals, Etc.) of the model the curriculum planners must consider several elements which are unique to the Roman Catholic School system. Since many communities of religious men and women have had, and continue to have, education as a part of their apostolic witness, and since many religious communities have founded and continue to staff schools, established objectives by the religious communities in regard to education are to be synthesized. Likewise, directives promulgated by the archdiocese or diocese and the local parish (should the school in fact be parochial) in regard to education are to be consulted at this time. The importance of consulting Church documents was underscored by Kealey (1985) when he said

The Catholic school curriculum committee should reflect on several documents before arriving at answers to these questions: the gospels; Declaration on Christian Education; To Teach as Jesus Did; Teach them; Sharing the Light of Faith.
Lay Catholics. These [documents] will introduce the committee to the most recent thinking on Catholic education. (p. 18)

Such a synthesis of religious documents in regard to education reflects several of the cognitive abilities (see pages 86 and 87) determined necessary for the educator in the Roman Catholic school system by the CACE et al. (NCEA, 1982).

The generation of the Mission Statement (Step 4) is another element of the model which points to its use in the Roman Catholic school system. The SCCE (1977) has said

The specific mission of the [Catholic] school, then, is a critical, systematic transmission of culture in the light of faith and the bringing forth of the power of Christian virtue by the integration of culture with faith and of faith with living. Consequently, the Catholic school is aware of the importance of the Gospel-teaching as transmitted through the Catholic Church. It is, indeed, the fundamental element in the educative process as it helps the pupil towards his conscious choice of living a responsible and coherent way of life. (p. 14-15)

The specific Mission Statement of a Catholic school will include statements to reflect those of the SCCE based upon the information obtained in Steps 1, 2 and 3.

Most curriculum theories/models recognize the place of the Statement of Philosophy (Step 5) in curriculum planning. Kealey (1985) stated "A school philosophy sets the tone for the school. Everything
flows from this clear statement. All the parts of the school program are in harmony with this statement" (p. 18-19).

Delineation of Preliminary Curriculum Goals (Step 7), Revised Curriculum Goals (Step 10), and Specification of Departmental Curriculum Goals (Subject Matter Phase, Step 12) refer to the students and indicate their development at the end of their educational experience. Curriculum goals are, in this model, derived from Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Oliva (1982) stated that "A curriculum goal is a purpose or end stated in general terms without criteria of achievement. Curriculum planners wish students to accomplish it as a result of exposure to segments or all of a program of a particular school or school system" (p. 252). He offered the following characteristics one might expect of curriculum goals:

1. They relate to the educational aims and philosophy.
2. They are programmatic.
3. They refer to accomplishments of groups rather than the achievement of individual students.
4. They are stated in general terms that provide directions for curriculum development.
5. They are broad enough to lead to specific curriculum objectives. (p. 264-265)

Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1978) insisted that "Goals must be stated specifically so that the public can tell whether they have been achieved" (p. 15). Likewise,
they mentioned that it is important that a goal statement meet the following conditions:

1. Its meaning should be clear to the people involved.
2. It should be agreed upon by the program planners and funders.
3. It should be clearly identifiable as dealing with either ends or means.
4. It should be realistic in terms of time and money available for achieving it. (p. 16-17)

Step 12 of the model refers to the curriculum goals established by each academic department within a school.

At Step 12 the model identifies a phase which is truly unique to the Roman Catholic school system: the establishment of a faith community (Faith Community Phase). This phase refers to the entire school community not to the students alone. "It is a tremendous accomplishment to operate a good school of any kind; it is especially noteworthy to operate successfully a school with the challenging and unique aims of Catholic education, as expressed in the bishops' documents on Catholic education since Vatican Council II " (Wojcicki & Convey, 1982, p. 20). In their pastoral To Teach as Jesus Did (NCCB, 1972), the American bishops had stated:

More than any other program of education sponsored by the Church, the Catholic school has the opportunity and obligation to be unique, contemporary, and oriented to Christian service: unique because it is distinguished by its commitment to the threelfold purpose of Christian
education and by its total design and operation which foster the integration of religion with the rest of learning and living; contemporary because it enables students to address with Christian insight the multiple problems which face individuals and society today; oriented to Christian service because it helps students acquire skills, virtues and habits of heart and mind required for effective service to others. All those involved in a Catholic school—parents, pastors, teachers, administrators, and students—must earnestly desire to make it a community of faith which is indeed living, conscious, and active....Building and living community must be prime, explicit goals of the contemporary Catholic school. (p. 29-30)

The United States Catholic Conference (1979) reiterated this statement by declaring "It is...widely recognized that Catholic schools are to be communities of faith in which the Christian message, the experience of community, worship, and social concern are integrated in the total experience of students, their parents, and members of the faculty" (p. 5). Wojcicki and Convey concluded that "the idea that Catholic schools should be communities of faith is hardly new, nor is there much dispute philosophically among the leadership of Catholic education that the schools should be communities of faith" (p. 7).

Unlike curriculum goals, curriculum objectives are stated in terms which are both specific and measurable. Delineation of Preliminary Curriculum Objectives (Step 8), Revised Curriculum Objectives (Step 11), and Specification of Departmental Curriculum Objectives (Subject Matter Phase, Step 13) are derived directly
from the curriculum goals and relate to the Mission Statement (Step 4) and the Statement of Philosophy (Step 5). The established curriculum objectives refer to the specific accomplishments of students. According to Tuckman (1985) "objectives of the program...must be operationally defined in behavioral terms....This step, therefore, involves identifying and specifying behaviors that the program in question is intended to produce" (p. 156). As with the goals specified in the Faith Community Phase of the model, these objectives refer to the entire school community, not to the students only.

The Organization and Implementation of the Curriculum (Subject Mater Phase, Step 14) leads one to choose among the available options for organizing and implementing the students learning experiences. In current practice there are six patterns which are followed for the structuring of the curriculum. One may choose from among the following: (a) subject-centered curriculum, (b) broad-fields curriculum, (c) spiral curriculum, (d) core curriculum, (e) correlated curriculum, or (f) fused curriculum. (for discussion see Wrinkle & Gilchrist, 1942; Oliva, 1982; McNeil, 1985; Tyler, 1949) If the model is used for curriculum development, it will be necessary to investigate and choose from among the six patterns for
the structuring of the curriculum. If, on the other hand, the model is used for curriculum improvement, this step will function as a review of a curriculum pattern or curriculum patterns already in use.

Instructional goals (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 15; Delineation of Instructional Goals), like curriculum goals, are broad statements referring to student development. Unlike curriculum goals, instructional goals are written to reflect student development at the end of a particular course of study. Oliva (1982) has characterized an instructional goal as "a statement of performance expected of each student in a class, phrased in general terms without criteria of achievement" (p. 350). In the model instructional goals are generated at the department level to reflect student development at the end of a specific departmental course. It is at this step that the role of the instructor in the delineation of instructional goals (Individual Instructor Phase). The instructional goals generated are pertinent to the specific material studied and indicate student development as a result of exposure to a daily lesson plan, a chapter plan and/or a unit plan. The instructional goals in the Individual Instructor Phase are, in the model, a subset of the instructional goals generated in the Subject Matter Phase.
Instructional objectives (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 16; Delineation of Instructional Objectives) are derived from instructional goals (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 15) and relate to the curriculum goals and curriculum objectives generated at the department level (Subject Matter Phase, Steps 12 and 13) and the school level (Steps 10 and 11).

An instructional objective is a statement of performance to be demonstrated by each student in the class, derived from an instructional goal, phrased in measurable and observable terms.... Instructional objectives are also known as behavioral objectives, performance objectives, or competencies. (Oliva, 1982, p. 351)

Mager (1984) concurred with Oliva when he affirmed "an [instructional] objective is a description of a performance you want learners to be able to exhibit before you consider them competent. An objective describes an intended result of instruction, rather than the process of instruction itself" (p. 5). He added that instructional objectives are useful in providing a sound basis (1) for the selection or designing of instructional content and procedures, (2) for evaluating or assessing the success of the instruction, and (3) for organizing the students' own efforts and activities for the accomplishment of the important instructional intents. (p. 6)

The Selection of Instructional Methods (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 18) and the Implementation of Instructional Methods (Subject Matter
Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 20) involve the selection and implementation of those strategies which will be used within the classroom. Oliva (1982) indicated that instructional methods have the learners, the teacher, the subject matter, the time available, the resources available, the facilities and the objectives (p. 380) as their major sources. These steps take place at the departmental level (Subject Matter Phase) and at the individual instructor level (Individual Instructor Phase) as well. At the departmental level, these steps will provide choices among instructional methods to be selected and implemented. The individual instructor will choose from among the suggested instructional methods to meet the needs of his/her personal style of teaching keeping in mind the style(s) of learning of the students. In the Faith Community Phase of the model, the Selection of Methods (Step 18) and Implementation of Methods (Step 20) are dealing with the manner in which the concepts of faith-community building will be realized in the school community.

Steps 19 (Initial Selection of Evaluation Procedures), 21 (Definitive Selection of Evaluation Procedures), 22 (Evaluation of Instruction), and 23 (Evaluation of Curriculum) are involved with evaluation procedures. Evaluation, according to Wiles and Bondi
"is the critical step in program renewal. The syndrome of endless and random change in American education cannot be broken until school leaders develop a means of measuring progress toward an identifiable goal" (p. 248). McNeil (1985) added that "the general purpose of evaluation is to improve the educational program by facilitating judgments about its effectiveness based on evidence" (p. 206). According to Venable (1958)

evaluation includes two aspects of the learning situation. One aspect of this evaluation is the determination of how much the student learns; this is called measurement or testing and is concerned with the quantity aspects of the learning situation. The other aspect is the determination of the value of what the student learns; this is concerned with the quality of the learning experience. Further, the measurement aspect is usually objective, and the latter aspect of evaluation is subjective in its nature. A sound curriculum program will provide for both types of evaluation. (p. 115)

The form of evaluation to be undertaken will depend upon the type of information desired. As McNeil pointed out "formative evaluation is undertaken to improve an existing program. Hence, the evaluation must provide frequent detailed and specific information to guide the program developers. Summative evaluation is done to assess the effect of a completed program" (p. 206). Saylor and Alexander (1974) have developed a curriculum evaluation model which calls for evaluating the following five components: (a) the goals, subgoals,
and objectives; (b) the program of schooling as a totality; (c) the specific segments of the education program; (d) instruction; and (e) the evaluation program. (p. 311)

In the model Steps 19, 21, and 22 are to take place at the department level (Subject Matter Phase) and the instructor level (Individual Instructor Phase). The focus is on the measurement of student achievement (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Steps 19 and 21) and the effectiveness of the instruction (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 22) in relation to the specific curriculum goals (Subject Matter Phase, Step 12) and objectives (Subject Matter Phase, Step 13) and specific instructional goals (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 15) and objectives (Subject Matter Phase, Individual Instructor Phase; Step 16). In the Faith Community Phase of the model, Steps 19 (Initial Selection of Evaluation Procedures), 21 (Definitive Selection of Evaluation Procedures), and 22 (Evaluation of Faith Community Phase) the evaluation procedures and the evaluation refer to the entire school community, not to the students only. Evaluation of the Faith Community Phase is done in relation to Step 12 (Specification of Goals) and Step 13 (Specification of Objectives). At Steps 19 and 21 of
the model evaluation procedures will be selected in the Faith Community and Subject Matter Phases to be used at Step 23, Evaluation of the Curriculum, in addition to Evaluation of Faith Community Phase and Evaluation of Instruction. Step 23 is the evaluation of the total curriculum: the Subject Matter Phase, the Individual Instructor Phase, and the Faith Community Phase. This evaluation is considered a summative evaluation of the efficacy of the curriculum which Saylor and Alexander (1974) defined "as the plan for providing sets of learning opportunities to achieve broad goals and related specific objectives for an identifiable population served by a single school center" (p. 6).

Summary

In this chapter a proposed theoretical model for curriculum development and/or improvement for use in the Roman Catholic school system was presented. The model stressed the uniqueness of the Roman Catholic system by addressing the needs of the Roman Catholic Church, the needs of the diocese or archdiocese, and by including the development of a faith community. The direct involvement of the faculty in the curriculum development and/or improvement process was emphasized in this model with their involvement beginning at Step 2 and continuing through Step 23.
Summary

From the selected literature reviewed, analyzed and synthesized it can be deduced that the Roman Catholic school system was, and is, indeed, different from the public school system. It could also be said that teachers in the Roman Catholic school system were expected to possess the same qualities as those expected to be possessed by teachers in the public school system. It was also clear that the teacher in the Roman Catholic school system was expected to possess additional qualities as well. The curriculum theories/models of Dewey, Tyler and Bruner were determined to possess certain elements (goals, objectives, organization of the curriculum, philosophy, psychology of learning, and evaluation) which addressed both the needs of the public school system and the Roman Catholic school system. In regard to values, perhaps the most important element for the Roman Catholic school system, it was found that the curriculum theory/model of Dewey addressed this issue. The curriculum theories/models of Tyler and Bruner did not.
In Chapter II: Review of the Literature, several curriculum theorists and researchers in the field of curriculum (Beane et al. 1986; Oliva, 1982; Taba, 1962; Mann, 1982; McCutcheon, 1986; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977) indicated that the classroom teacher must have an important role in the curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement process for it to be effective. Just as the theory/model of Dewey addressed the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in regard to values, so did it explicitly and positively address the question of direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. The curriculum theories/models of Tyler and Bruner, however, did not explicitly or positively address the question of direct faculty involvement in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. The literature reviewed indicated that a curriculum model which dealt exclusively with the Roman Catholic school system was needed. Similarly, in light of the evidence regarding teacher participation in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement which indicated that faculty participation led to an enhancement of instructor efficacy (McNeil 1985; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977), it was logical that
the proposed theoretical model incorporate faculty involvement into the process.

Conclusions

The results of the synthesis of literature reviewed in this study permit the conclusion that the majority of curriculum theories/models reviewed do not address the needs of the Roman Catholic school system in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement. Clearly none of the curriculum theories/models reviewed was directed explicitly to the particular needs of that school system.

Despite evidence to support that teacher involvement is a necessary component of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement, a conclusion from the results of this study indicated that the majority of curriculum theories/models do not call for direct involvement of the faculty in that process.

Recommendations for Further Study

The theory/model presented here has not been presented as the final statement on curriculum theorizing and/or curriculum modelling. Until such time as this theory/model is implemented in the process of curriculum development and/or curriculum improvement it remains an untested theory. Further research is required to determine if the model is workable in its present form. It is tenable that the proposed model is
acceptable to curriculum planners and developers as it is presented here. The model may, however, stimulate curriculum planners and developers to modify it to meet their specific goals and objectives in a curriculum development and/or improvement process.
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