ingress to work hard for change can be negative. Trust is hard to obtain and easy to break, and it requires persistence, patience, and consistency in all leadership behaviors.

Unfortunately, high schools and middle schools appear to have a serious leadership deficit, which results in lower achievement, less professional community, and limited trust. Secondary schools in larger districts, whether they were in a metropolitan core or a large suburb, were less likely than elementary schools to experience leadership that promotes teacher leadership and change. While schools with more affluent students had more parent engagement and influence, they were also more likely to maintain the status quo and less likely to have principals whose leadership was associated with energetic efforts to make changes.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CULTURAL CHANGE

Changes in school culture affect the way in which adults in and out of the school work with each other to improve practices and create the best learning environments for all children. Changes in culture have a strong relationship with instructional effectiveness in the classroom. And they alter how students experience school in other ways as well, because the culture affects how adults behave in the hallways, in monitoring the lunchrooms, and when greeting students as they walk in the door. All of these changes in culture lead to higher levels of student achievement, while also contributing to higher levels of satisfaction among the professional staff.

In some of the schools we studied, the effective leadership behaviors were simple, such as protecting time for team meetings. In others, they were more focused on specific actions to create a strong sense of internal professional community. One example in a medium-size district in the South involved efforts to bridge the gap between middle-class teachers and high-poverty students. In order to bring parents who were marginally employed in multiple jobs into the school, the principal partnered with a local company to install a laundromat in the school building. If a student came in with dirty clothes, a staff member washed their clothes so that they went home with clean clothes. The principal invited parents to wash their own clothes free, and teachers often used that time to talk to parents about their children’s progress. Principals’ efforts to increase parent-teacher collaboration were invariably appreciated by teachers and contributed to success in their classrooms.

The implications of our study are clear. Principals and teacher leaders can improve school culture and student learning by:

1. Supporting individuals and groups both to identify and to preserve what is valuable to them;
2. Guiding a school to “chip away” at cultural features that nullify or inhibit change;
3. Helping members to understand the forces and conditions that will shape the future, ensuring cultural adaptation; and,
4. Consistently checking to make sure that aspirations for change are understood and that they result in observable new behaviors in schools.
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Questions for Reflection

1. The authors found that three elements are necessary for school culture that stimulates teachers to improve their instruction. What are the three elements? Do any of them surprise you? Do the study’s findings match your own experiences in schools? Explain.

2. Based on the research reported in this article, principals appear to be the critical link in stimulating the conversations that lead to classroom practice associated with improved student learning. How should the principal stimulate conversation with his or her staff members to advance classroom practices that improve student learning? What should be the content of those conversations? What information would you need to begin these conversations?

3. Based on your experiences, how do you believe principals build trust with the students, staff members, and other stakeholder groups in a school community? How do they lose or betray trust? When trust is lost, who and/or what suffers most? What do the authors suggest principals do to help engender trust by teachers toward the school leader?

Perspectives on Four Curriculum Traditions

WILLIAM H. SCHUBERT

ABSTRACT: The history of curriculum leadership reveals that various theoretical orientations to curriculum have been proposed. By having hypothetical speakers address the central curriculum question, “What is worth knowing?” Schubert suggests that there are four theoretical orientations to curriculum thought—intellectual traditionalism, social behaviorism, experientialism, and critical reconstructionism.

Since the advent of graded textbooks by the mid-1800s, teachers and school administrators have relied on them to such an extent that when many educators and most nonteachers hear the term curriculum, they think of textbooks. Pioneers in the curriculum field, however (e.g., John Dewey, Franklin Bobbit, W. W. Charters, Hollis Caswell, Ralph Tyler), argued in the first half of the 20th century for a much more complex and variegated conceptualization of curriculum. Although these scholars, the array of others who accompanied
FOUR CURRICULUM TRADITIONS

Intellectual Traditionalist Speaker

[Appearing somewhat formal, self-assured, and willing to deliver the inspirational lecture or to engage in analytic, Socratic dialogue and debate]

The best answers to the core curriculum question (What is worth knowing?) are found in the great works and in the organized disciplines of knowledge. The great works are the best expressions of human insight, understanding, and wisdom, and the disciplines are the best organizations of knowledge as created by experts in each field. Most certainly, I am an advocate of what is often called a "liberal education" for all. But why? My rationale for advocating study of the great works (in all fields, e.g., arts, sciences, humanities, social sciences) is that they, more than any other source, stimulate human beings to probe deeply into what Mortimer Adler and Robert M. Hutchins have referred to as the great ideas, and more recently what Allan Bloom, E. D. Hirsch, Diane Ravitch, Chester Finn, William Bennett, and others have advocated as necessary and neglected knowledge. Adler, for instance, writes of six great ideas: truth, beauty, goodness, liberty, equality, and justice. These ideas transcend matters of culture, race, gender, class, age, ethnicity, location, health or ability, national origin, and any other aspects of individual and social life that too many consider reasons for gaining separate or individualized treatment.

This focus on individual differences neglects what all human beings have in common—in fact, it omits what makes them essentially human, namely, the great ideas. Every human who has ever lived is concerned about these matters in his or her own life and in the social context of that life. The best expressions of insight into the great ideas are found, not in the intellectual lubum of textbooks, but in the best expressions that human beings have produced, namely, the great works of literature, art, music, philosophy, social and psychological theory, mathematics, history, and the natural sciences.

Whenever possible, the primary sources should be read; however, due to barriers of language, cultural frame of reference, and ability, I admit that secondary sources need to be used. These are adequately found in good translations and in the summaries of essential knowledge available in the disciplines of knowledge.

Social Behaviorist Speaker

[Less formal attire, not quite a lab coat—but in that spirit, opting with the desire to discover and invent, analytically and scientifically, what works for the needs of today's world; a little rough around the edges]

Basicalliy, I am a grubby empiricist (with a gleam of eye that shows great respect for scientific investigation, with the "grubby" merely being a way of asking listeners to put more stock in results than in appearances). I don't ask for too much, only that one have evidence for one's advocacy. The Intellectual Traditionalist seems to think that just because a content area has stood the test of time, so to speak, it is valuable for what students need today.

Textbooks of today carry little more than redacted relics of past textbooks, and the same unquestioned curriculum is passed from generation to generation. These textbooks rarely even get to the level of "great ideas" that the Intellectual Traditionalist promotes. Even though ideas, however, need to be looked at for their relevance to today's students. Taking a cue from one of the greatest Intellectual Traditionalists of all (though I disagree with much that he promotes), I recall that Socrates warned that the unexamined life is not worth living. I want to add that the unexamined curriculum is not worth offering.

To that end I want to tell you a little story from a curriculum classic called The Saher-Tooth Curriculum, written by Harold Benjamin in 1939. (By the way, intellectual traditionalists were so powerful in education at the time that Benjamin had to write under a pseudonym, J. Abner Peddwell.) Being an advocate of economy of time (an earlier version of "time on task"), I am pleased to tell you that the book is short and to the point, even if it is literary and one of the only funny curriculum books in existence!

The story line has a young man who just graduated from college, planning to be a teacher, on a celebratory vacation seated at the longest bar in the world in Tijuana. He sees his old professor from an introduction to education course, strikes up a conversation, and learns that the professor has been on sabbatical studying the educational system of prehistoric peoples.

The conversations are about what he learned. He learned, for example, that prehistoric education classes bore such titles as "Fish Grabbing with the Bare Hands" and "Saber-Tooth Tiger Chasing with Fire." The practical value of these courses for prehistoric life is obvious. However, as time went on and the climate became intensely colder (glaciers arrived), the streams froze up and the saber-tooth tigers migrated to warmer parts of the world. Nevertheless, even then, there were Intellectual Traditionalist educators who argued that the great ideas embedded in fish grabbing and tiger chasing would build the mind and must be preserved for all generations. The absurdity of this hardly needs to be noted . . . (or does it, given contemporary intellectual traditionalists?)

With this in mind, I want to say that I am a behaviorist in the sense that we need to identify the kinds of behavior that help students become successful in today's world (as well as the behaviors of teachers that lead to achievement of the desired behaviors in students). I am sociable in the sense that I think that such behaviors should not be taken mindlessly from traditional curriculum values and practices, but rather from systematic investigation of what it takes to be successful in society today.

Experientialist Speaker

[Very casual, trying to "speak in" to the audience, obviously desirous of engaging them in an interpersonal fashion, rather than by lecture or by precept]

Sometimes we think of curriculum as a configuration of experiences that lead to the acqui-
sition of skills, bodies of knowledge, and values or beliefs. I am not altogether happy with this three-part separation, and see skill, knowledge, and value as part of a seamless fabric; nevertheless, each of these categories has a heuristic value for my present purposes.

I want you to think of a skill you have that helps you frequently. I want you to think of a body of knowledge that you are glad you have. Similarly, I want you to think of a value or belief that guides your life and helps you deal with difficult circumstances.

Take some time to ponder. (pause) Then ask yourself how and where you acquired the skill, or body of knowledge, or guiding value. Tell someone else stories about getting to the place that you now are regarding this skill, knowledge, or value. Try to understand the conditions under which you gained these capacities. If these are powerful learnings, then understanding more about the conditions under which they occurred (in your own life and the lives of others with whom you exchange) will help you to understand powerful learning for your students.

Are the conditions of powerful learning in your life, and in the lives of others you know, present in the lives of your students in your school? The speakers portrayed here represent four quite different curriculum positions. They might be considered akin to archetypes of curriculum that re-emerge in different incarnations and under different labels in each generation all around our globe. Intellectual Traditionalists call for realization of the power of the classics and the great ideas embedded in them (and the accompanying disciplines of knowledge) to overcome the problems of any day. Social Behaviorists, in contrast, call for a new look at what knowledge, skills, and values lead to success in each generation. Experientialists and Critical Reconstructionists deem what they consider to be the authoritarianism of Social Behaviorists and Intellectual Traditionalists, and call for greater grassroots participation. This means that students themselves and the concerns, interests, and injustices they feel deeply must be the starting point for meaningful and worthwhile learning.

What does this all mean? Must the reader (or teacher, or policymaker, or student) choose one side or another? In the heat of an earlier battle in the progressive era, John Dewey argued that choosing either progressive or traditional education as superficially practiced was not the main point. In Experience and Education, one of Dewey's last books on education, he said prophetically in the preface: "It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than that represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties." Dewey's admonition makes it necessary not to become a card-carrying Experientialist, Critical Reconstructionist, Social Behaviorist, or Intellectual Traditionalist, but instead to remember and develop relevant aspects of all of these positions as possibilities for each educational situation encountered.

The fundamental question is not merely whether to have textbooks, but to ask continuously what should be done and why it should be done—with or without textbooks. Each of the curriculum positions offers an avenue to curriculum that transcends most textbooks available, enabling teachers to meet student needs, concerns, and interests more fully. This, however, does not mean that textbooks and other more interactive instructional materials are irrelevant. In fact, rather than rejecting textbooks and related instructional materials, it would be better to ask how instructional media (teacher made, commercially prepared, or student generated) can be created to deeply capture the essence of the Social Behaviorist, Intellectual Traditionalist, Critical Reconstructionist, and Experientialist alike. Surely, these positions do contradict one another at many points, and practices that bespeak many of them will be had at all costs. However, it is also possible to see each position as complementary to one another, speaking at once to different needs in any complex educational context.

Thus, the great curriculum development task before us is to draw upon all curriculum traditions for the insights and understandings that best fit situations at hand. This means that no text or policy or written curriculum is the final answer. Good answers lie in continuously asking what knowledge and experiences are most worthwhile now and, now and now... throughout the whole panoply of situations that lie ahead. Moreover, such asking must be done by all who are affected by the consequences of that asking, including students who have the greatest vested interest yet are too often left out of the process of considering matters of purpose that affect them so dearly.
of government is found in the individual. The founders of the American republic endorsed Enlightenment thinkers such as John Locke and Montesquieu, who emphasized individual rights and personal virtue. The founders of the new republic understood that each person living under a monarchy was a dutiful subject. However, the republic required citizens of character—formed, engaged, and caring citizens of the republic.

Even today, the belief that people can govern themselves is not generally accepted. A quick survey of world governments demonstrates the predominance of monarchy, dictatorship, aristocracy, and theocracy. Many governments grant a grudging nod to the people by allowing them to vote, but that is a far cry from the principles on which the American republic was founded. The people of the United States are not subjects. Understanding that American citizens must live in common society together, individuals grant rights and privileges to their government.

When the republic began, moving from subject to citizen required a fundamental transformation of personal identity and a change in obligations and duties. However, this new identity was not activated by birth or immigration. The individual had to learn to be a citizen. Not only schools but also other institutions of society and within communities taught civility, courage, integrity, concern, and curiosity—in short, virtue or character appropriate for daily participation in democratic principles and republican responsibility.

LOSS OF COMMUNITY AND CONNECTION

America is an ideal expressed in the Declaration of Independence and implemented through the U.S. Constitution. Some people argue that the nation continually strives for but never achieves that ideal of a democratic republic anchored in character and virtue. Ralph Waldo Emerson (1837, p. 248) worried about the breakdown of communities and loss of dependable morality. He wrote that the state of society is “one in which the members have suffered amputation from the trunk, and strut about so many walking monsters—a good finger, a neck, a stomach, an elbow, but never a man” (419).

As early as the nineteenth century, the tension between individualism and American republican principles was evident. Americans often act out of self-interest without regard for community interests. Economic and technological advancements have increased social fragmentation, segmented communities, dispersed families, and left individuals increasingly isolated. Twenty-first-century technology such as television, the Internet, and electronic headsets may heighten this isolation. Engaging in civic discourse is hard work and is more difficult when means for opting out are easily available. With a population of more than three hundred million people (Phillips, 2002), the United States has an increasing number of citizens who have little or no tradition in understanding democracy.

Thomas Jefferson’s republican ideal of engaging citizenship in small rural communities gave way to increasingly larger urban areas. By the mid-twentieth century, more people struggled to remain connected and maintain community in sprawling suburban settlements and enclaves (Morison, 1965). Some small villages and towns still exist in many regions of the nation. Also, within larger cities or urban centers, small neighborhoods bring people together socially, culturally, and politically. However, there are also people such as airline pilots who live in the United States but consider their communities to be New York, Paris, Amsterdam, Hong Kong, and Tokyo, where their jobs take them regularly. Such individuals may have homes in America, but they otherwise have little connection with the community and civic life. This condition is not unique; people increasingly work for multinational companies in the global economy.