

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT:

A HISTORY OF THE IDEA AND PRACTICE,

1890-1940

by

RALPH M. BENNETT, JR.

(Under the direction of Dr. William G. Wraga)

ABSTRACT

Recent reform proposals have recommended greater teacher participation in the decision-making process. Curriculum and instruction are areas which are frequently suggested as appropriate for teacher participation. Current discussions of teacher participation in curriculum development seldom include any historical perspective of teacher involvement in curriculum work. The implication is that there is little to learn from past practices to involve teachers in curriculum development. Reasons for this implication included: limited number of examples past efforts to advise current practice; past efforts exploited teachers rather than trying to involve them in meaningful collaboration; and, curriculum development is no longer pertinent to post-modern education.

An examination of the rhetoric and practices of teacher participation in curriculum development from the period 1890 through 1940 was conducted to investigate these assertions and to ascertain any significance for current practice. Schubert's Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years (1980) served as a guide for references to the rhetoric and practices of teacher participation in curriculum development. Books addressing curriculum and issues of teacher participation were included. Each book was reviewed for ideas, rationales, and descriptions of practice. The bibliographies of each book were reviewed for additional sources on ideas and practices in teacher participation in curriculum development. Additionally, secondary sources were obtained through searches of Dissertation Abstracts, Periodicals Content Index, Education Index, Educational Literature, 1907-1932 and ERIC records.

This study found that from 1915 to 1940 the practice of teacher participation was widespread, though it never matched the rhetoric. Teachers participated at school, system, and state levels. Teachers participated from inception and even initiated curriculum work, but most often were involved in the production of the actual materials. A variety of purposes were given for participation including the promotion of professional growth and democratic ideals. Implications for present practice included making provisions for participation by all teachers (i.e., through curriculum

study, action research, etc.), selecting representative teachers to conduct the actual work of production, providing for adequate support (i.e., release time, clerical help, professional resources including consultants, etc.), and organization of participants.

INDEX WORDS: Curriculum development, Curriculum revision, Educational history, Educational practices, Participative decision-making, Teacher participation

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT:
A HISTORY OF THE IDEA AND PRACTICE,
1890-1940

by

RALPH M. BENNETT, JR.

B.S., Georgia College, 1980

M. Ed., Georgia College, 1985

Ed. S., Georgia State University, 1990

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

© 2002

Ralph M. Bennett, Jr.

All Rights Reserved

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT:
A HISTORY OF THE IDEA AND PRACTICE,
1890-1940

by

RALPH M. BENNETT, JR.

Approved:

Major Professor: William Wraga

Committee: John Dayton
Robert D. Heslep
H. James McLaughlin
William Swan

Electronic Version Approved:
Gordon L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2002

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my parents, Ralph and Joan, and particularly to my wife, Lucy, whose loving support saw me through the last seven years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express sincerest appreciation to my dissertation committee-- Dr. John Dayton, Dr. Robert Heslep, Dr. James McLaughlin, and Dr. William Swan-- for their suggestions and patience. In particular, I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. William Wraga, whose guidance through the process and enthusiasm for curriculum history helped to keep me focused.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
1 OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
A Brief History of Teacher Participation	3
Background of the Problem	23
A Rationale for Teacher Involvement	29
Significance of the Study	63
Statement of Purpose	69
Research Questions	69
Scope of the Study	70
Methods and Procedures	70
Assumptions	75
Limitations of the Study	75
Definitions of Terms	75
Organization of the Report	77
2 THE START OF THE PROGRESSIVE ERA, 1890-1909	79
The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation	94
Early Practices	137
Summary	142
3 THE IDEA TAKES HOLD, 1910-1919	153
The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation	159
The Emergence of Teachers' Councils	213

	Summary	233
4	THE PRACTICE BECOMES WIDESPREAD, 1920-1929	249
	The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation	252
	The Rise of Curriculum Committees	378
	Summary	480
5	THE PRACTICE MATURES, 1930-1939	496
	The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation	499
	The Appearance of State Curriculum Programs ...	573
	Summary	690
6	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	706
	Dominant Ideas	708
	Dominant Practices	713
	Significance of Past Efforts	722
	Contributions to Present Understanding	724
	REFERENCES	751

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The history of education is written in terms of the curriculum (Briggs, 1926, p.1).

A renewed interest in teacher involvement in curriculum development can be found in the writings on educational reform and curricular improvement over the last twenty years. Writers on educational reform call for greater teacher participation in the decisions related to curriculum and instruction as one way in which to promote educational improvement. During the 1980's, various national reports (e.g., Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; National Governors Association, 1986; and Holmes Group, 1986) called for increased teacher participation in curriculum development to improve student achievement and professionalize teaching. Empowering teachers and professionalizing teaching were common themes in discussions of teacher involvement in curriculum development (e.g., Giroux, 1994; Paris, 1993; Sizer, 1992). The educational tasks of schools, and therefore the focus for decision-making by school-based governance structures, include curriculum development and instructional program development, according to Glickman (1993, p. 68). Glickman (1998) asserted that since furthering democracy, or as he quoted Dewey, "education for democracy" (pp.

175-176), should be the ultimate goal of education, democratic practices such as shared decision-making in matters of curriculum and instruction serve not only to professionalize teaching, but also to promote the ideal of "democracy as education" (p. 176). Other writers suggested that to separate teachers from the process of curriculum development (in effect, to have external curriculum experts develop a curriculum to be implemented by teachers) was ineffective because teachers' and students' perceptions, values, beliefs, and experiences served to mediate the curriculum. Clandinin and Connelly (1992) contended that

teachers do not transmit, implement, or teach a curriculum and objectives; nor are they and their students carried forward in their work and studies by a curriculum of textbooks and content, instructional methodologies and intentions (p. 365)

Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) maintained that one thing that research in curriculum implementation has made clear is that "curriculum was never really implemented as planned but rather adapted by local users" (p. 428). While there were writers who argued against teacher involvement in curriculum development (e.g., Sullivan, 1975; Walker, 1978) and trends such as the calls for state and national standards (i.e., curriculum) which further removed teachers from the process, a large and growing body of current literature advocates teacher involvement in curriculum development.

A Brief History of Teacher Participation in Curriculum Work

Teacher involvement in curriculum development, however, is not a new idea in education. There is a significant historical record, concerning both theory and practice, about teacher participation in curriculum development. For example, writings on the idea can be found as early as 1903 with Dewey's article entitled "Democracy in Education" in which he asserted that "questions of methods of discipline and teaching, and the questions of the curriculum, text-books, etc." should be submitted "to the discussion and decision of those actually engaged in the work of teaching" (pp. 194-195). Advocacy for the idea of teacher involvement in curriculum development was also found in the first half of the twentieth century in the writings of such educators as Newlon, Caswell, Briggs, Bonser, Hopkins, and from various educational groups. Bonser (1920), for example, in a discussion of democratic practices in schools, maintained that

if the schools are to be saved to do their appointed work in the service of our democracy, their boards of education, superintendents, principals, and supervisors will have to bear broad minded, sympathetic, and genuinely democratic relationships to their teachers. They will have to provide means for the participation of teachers in the promotion of the school's enterprises and policies. They will have to learn enough about what good teaching is and about what a good teacher can accomplish if she is treated as a personality with some initiative, creative capacity, and judgment of values, to treat her as a professional equal. (p. 115)

Later, Bonser (1924) contended that:

the curriculum for a given school or school system should be the joint product of all the school staff.

Teachers should participate in any revision of a curriculum to such a degree that they feel a large share of authorship in its changes and of responsibility for carrying out the changes. (p. 154)

Similarly, the 14th Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (1936) concluded that many teachers did not relate to most courses of study because they had been written by people who were far removed from classroom practice. Additionally, these authors noted that many courses of study sat on shelves unused because teachers had not been involved in their development (p. 356). Hopkins (1941), in his description of cooperative democratic interaction, asserted that teachers and students, along with other significant adults, should be responsible for designing the curriculum used in the classroom (pp. 319-323). The Forty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education included a list of effective curriculum programs, compiled by Cutright (1945). Among the characteristics was to "to provide for wide participation on the part of teachers" (p. 240). While a common theme in many of these writings was democratic practice, the implication was that teacher participation produced more effective and meaningful curricula than those produced by external sources.

Examples of large scale efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development included projects at the building level (e.g., the Dewey School), at the system level (e.g., the Denver Curriculum Revision Project), and at the state level (e.g., the Virginia Curriculum Revision Program). One

example of teacher participation in curriculum development at the building level occurred from 1896 to 1903 at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, which became known as the Dewey School. Tanner and Tanner (1995) asserted that "the Laboratory School appears to have pioneered in collaborative decision making and teacher reflection" (p. 52). Yet, Tanner and Tanner (1991) noted earlier that "surprisingly little attention has been given to [Dewey's] practical work in curriculum development- the questions and problems that he and the teachers tried to answer" (p. 101). How the teachers participated was well-documented (e.g., Mayhew & Edwards, 1936).

Understanding Dewey's thinking on testing educational ideas in practice was important to understanding how the teachers participated in curriculum development at the Laboratory school. In an address to parents of the school in 1899, Dewey (1915) noted that:

the educational conduct of the school, as well as its administration, the selection of subject-matter, and the working out of the course of study, as well as the actual instruction of children, have been almost entirely in the hands of the teachers of the school; and that there has been a gradual development of the educational principles and methods involved, not fixed equipment. The teachers started with question marks, rather than fixed rules, and if any answers have been reached, it is the teachers who have supplied them. (p. 166)

That the development of the educational principles was gradual is not surprising. The formulation of objectives and principles, for Dewey, was a cyclical process. The questions originated in the classroom. Educational

philosophy or theory was developed to address the questions. The theory was tested in the classroom. A new set of questions arose and the cycle began again. Dewey (1929) asserted that:

education is by its nature an endless circle or spiral. It is an activity which *includes* science within itself. In its very process it sets more problems to be further studied, which then react in the educative process to change it still further, and thus demand more thought, more science, and so on, in everlasting sequence. (p. 77)

Because of this cyclical process, Dewey believed there were never permanent principles or objectives. Principles and objectives were constantly being reviewed, reflected on, and revised. Dewey (1929) maintained that:

there is no such thing as fixed and final set of objectives, even for the time being or temporarily. Each day of teaching ought to enable a teacher to revise and better in some respect the objectives aimed at in previous work. (p. 75)

Educational philosophy, principles, and objectives had to be tested in practice or else they "become speculative in a way that justifies contempt" (p. 56). Because learning objectives were not fixed or permanent, those closest to the actual teaching-learning process needed to be able to constantly reflect on and design appropriate curricula.

As Dewey stated in School and Society (1915), the teachers began with questions. This was in a sense the starting point of any educational endeavor, according to Dewey (1929):

Concrete educational experience is the primary source of all inquiry and reflection because it sets the problems, and tests, modifies, confirms or refutes the conclusions of intellectual investigation. The

philosophy of education neither originates nor settles ends. It occupies an intermediate and instrumental or regulative place. (p. 56)

That any educational idea had to be tested in practice, reflected upon, and then modified was fundamental to the operation of the Laboratory School and how teachers were involved in curriculum development. The teachers met on a weekly basis to discuss the prior week's work. Teachers' formal reports of the results of testing ideas in their classrooms constituted the basis for these weekly discussions. The teachers' experiences were discussed in the light of the principles on which the school was established. The reflection on and sharing of teaching experiences was an integral part of the Laboratory School (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936, pp. 366-382) and the basis on which curricular and instructional decisions for the school were made. Kliebard (1988), in his discussion of the relationship of school organization and the cycle of school reform, described the weekly meetings:

there were weekly meetings with teachers, not to discuss administrative issues or discipline problems, but to review the prior week's work. Significantly, the emphasis was not upon projection of activities in terms of the next week's lesson plans or statements of objectives for the future, but upon *reflection*. Specifically, there were frequent discussions on the workaday operation of the school in relation to the theoretical principles that were supposed to guide it. . . . Moreover, a cooperative social reorganization was deliberately fostered, and teachers were encouraged to visit the classrooms of other teachers. Even formal seminar groups were initiated. (p. 25)

The weekly meetings served as the mechanism for teacher participation in curriculum development and revision.

The weekly teachers' meetings served an additional purpose. Dewey viewed cooperative social organization as a substitute for the traditional supervisory practices in which a supervisor or administrator was viewed as the authority on educational theory. Dewey, in Mayhew and Edwards (1936), noted that:

it soon becomes evident under conditions of genuine cooperation whether a given person has the required flexibility and capacity of growth. Those who did not were eliminated because of the determination that they did not "belong." (p. 31)

A fundamental principle of the school--the school as a cooperative social organization--was preserved and effectively modeled in this way.

Dewey, in Mayhew and Edwards (1936), cited two immediate benefits of the teachers' cooperative involvement at the Laboratory School. The cooperative discussions of the results and the effects on students made improvements in curriculum and/or instruction relatively easy (p. 387). The second benefit, which is more important to this paper, was the further professionalization and improvement of the teaching staff. Teachers became investigators as they tested educational theories in practice (pp. 372-373). As Dewey (1929) stated in The Sources of a Science of Education, the educative process which included teachers as investigators gave teachers greater control in that it:

enables the educator . . . to see and to think more clearly and deeply about whatever he is doing. Its value is not to supply objectives to him, any more than it is to supply him with ready-made rules. Education is a mode of life, of action. As an act it is wider than science. The latter, however, renders those who

engage in the act more intelligent, more thoughtful, more aware of what they are about, and thus rectify and enrich in the future what they have been doing in the past. (pp. 75-76)

This benefit was one which would be restated in other efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development such as the Denver Curriculum Revision Project.

Newlon (1929), in a discussion of Dewey's influences in the schools, reviewed four principles he believed were basic to Dewey's philosophy of education: (1) a focus on the "nature and needs of the child;" (2) the perception that education was the "process of experiencing;" (3) an adherence to the "doctrine of interest and effort;" and (4) a belief that the school was "inherently a part of the total social process" (pp. 691-693). This fourth principle influenced the trend toward innovations in administration and supervision:

[Dewey] regards the school as a social institution The school community whose processes are social processes, not different from the social processes that go on outside the school. (p. 693)

In particular, "the teacher has been acquiring a new status. Democracy in administration, teacher participation in administration, are the watchwords of to-day" (p. 696), according to Newlon. As an example of teacher participation in administrative activities, Newlon briefly described a large city school system's efforts to implement a program of continuous curriculum revision in which the teachers were key players (p. 696). The program he was referring to was the Denver Curriculum Revision Program.

The Denver Curriculum Revision Program was an historical example of a system-level effort to involve teachers in curriculum revision. Newlon and Threlkeld (1926) contended that the "extent to which teachers participate" in the revision of the curriculum of the Denver schools was "an outstanding feature of the program" (p. 231). Threlkeld (1925), the deputy superintendent of the Denver schools at the time, described the process of curriculum revision in The Elementary School Journal and later that same year at the Sixty-third Annual Meeting of the National Education Association in Indianapolis. The program was established on four principles, of which teacher participation was the outstanding component. For Newlon and Threlkeld, a primary problem was helping teachers make the connection between curriculum and instruction. Threlkeld asserted that "in the last analysis, no course of study [curriculum] is any more effective than the extent to which it is actually taught in the classroom" (p. 573). Unless teachers had some connection to the curriculum or "intelligent understanding of their work" (p. 573) beyond what had traditionally been expected of them, then delivery of the intended curriculum was haphazard, at best. Threlkeld maintained that the most effective way in which to help teachers gain an intelligent understanding of their work was "to secure the co-operation of the teachers in making the courses of study [curriculum] which they are to teach." Because Newlon and Threlkeld sought to involve

teachers the Denver plan included "a large number of committees" (p. 573).

The Denver curriculum revision process was organized around two types of committees: subject-matter committees and central-organization committees. Subject-matter committees were further organized into elementary, junior high school, and senior high school groups. Each of these groups were further divided into the subject areas for which each was responsible (e.g., English, mathematics, science, kindergarten, social science, Latin, and modern languages). For example, there were three committees which deliberated on the mathematics courses of study or curriculum-- an elementary mathematics subject-matter committee, a junior high school mathematics subject-matter committee, and a senior high school subject-matter mathematics committee.

Membership on the subject-matter committees was composed so as to "offer the maximum inducement to the classroom teachers to enter the discussions unreservedly" (Threlkeld, 1925, p. 574). Membership on the committees, in most cases, was composed entirely of teachers. Expertise in a particular subject area was the reason for the presence of an administrator or supervisor in the rare instances where administrators or supervisors served on subject-matter committees. Every subject-matter committee was chaired by a teacher. Because of the number of schools in the Denver system, it was impractical to have a teacher from every school on every subject-matter committee. However, every

effort was made to be sure that all schools were equitably represented among the subject-matter committees. Committee members were expected to keep their schools informed on committee progress. Likewise, committee members were expected to solicit input on committee work from their colleagues to share in committee meetings (pp. 574-575).

There were three central-organization committees: the committee on constants in the high school, the committee on the organization of studies in the high school, and the committee on classification and guidance. As might be deduced from their designations, two of the committees dealt with high school graduation requirements and organization of the high school curriculum. The committee on classification and guidance was responsible for creating a system of "administrative devices which are to be used to put the entire program into effect" (Threlkeld, 1925, p. 576). Committee membership on these three committees was made up exclusively of administrators.

One unique feature of the Denver Curriculum Revision Program was the use of substitute teachers to allow regular teachers to do curriculum work during the regular school day. Peltier (1965) reported that both Newlon and Threlkeld were dissatisfied with the program the first year because of the demands that were placed on the teachers. Peltier noted that Newlon and Threlkeld were soon aware that

tired teachers who worked on curriculum revision after school hours, in the evening, and even on Saturdays and holidays, found it impossible to put forth their best efforts. (p. 126)

One might guess that there were concerns, as there would be today, about regular classroom teachers being away from their classes and the result of their absences on learning. Threlkeld (1925) at least partially addressed this issue when he asserted that

Curriculum revision is fundamental to all else [italics added], and certainly it should not be done at odd times; especially it should not be done by those who have used up their best energies by teaching a full day in the classroom. Those who have the curriculum-revision work to do should be relieved from classroom duties while they are so engaged. (p. 576)

If making the connection between curriculum and instruction were as important for teachers as Newlon and Threlkeld believed, then curriculum and curriculum revision would have to be fundamental to instruction. Because of this fundamental relationship, instruction appeared to be sacrificed. However, Newlon and Threlkeld (1926) saw this teacher participation in curriculum revision in a broader context:

a curriculum-revision program that involves every teacher in the study of curriculum problems and in participation in the process of determining what the content of course and method of instruction should be affords the best possible device for the training of teachers in service. A program of this kind, properly directed, will ultimately raise every fundamental issue pertaining to curricula and method for the consideration of teachers and administrative staffs. (p. 231)

Participation in curriculum work would not only serve to improve curriculum and instruction, but could ultimately serve to make for better teachers and administrators.

A second fundamental principle of the Denver curriculum revision program, according to Threlkeld (1925), was that "the most advanced educational thought of the profession as a whole should be incorporated" (p. 573) to ensure that the curriculum developed reflected the most current research. To accomplish this, Newlon and Threlkeld instituted two additional unique features of the program. Subject-matter groups were instructed to begin their work by reviewing the current literature related to their subject area. To facilitate this research, Newlon consolidated the professional libraries in the system into a central location in the administration building where the subject-matter committees conducted most of their meetings. A librarian was assigned to assist teachers. Peltier (1965) reported that Newlon eventually expanded the holdings in the professional library to three thousand books (p. 143).

A second feature instituted to incorporate the most advanced educational thought was the use of curriculum specialists to assist the subject-matter committees.

Threlkeld (1925) contended that

there comes a time . . . in the work of the committee when it is extremely helpful to have present in person some outstanding specialist in the particular field of that committee's work. This idea is carried out by bringing many of the leading specialists of the country to Denver for definite personal work with the committees. (pp. 579-580)

However, curriculum experts were not brought in to direct the work of the committee. No experts were invited until a committee had "their problems defined, when they were able

to state issues clearly and to ask definite questions about them" (p. 580). Threlkeld reported that 28 specialists had come or were scheduled to come to Denver by 1925. In the five-year period from 1923 to 1928, Peltier (1965) reported that a total of 34 specialists came to Denver to work with various committees. The specialists who came included such names as Rugg, Briggs, Bonser, and Charters, and represented such institutions as Harvard University, University of Chicago, Columbia University, University of Michigan, and University of Colorado (p. 145).

Curriculum specialists were also provided to supervise the work of the committees. Armentrout, director of teacher training at Colorado State Teachers College, and Hopkins, professor of education at the University of Colorado, started the curriculum revision program as supervisors of committee work. Armentrout did not return after the first year and was replaced by Whitney, director of research at Colorado State Teachers College. Hopkins' services were employed for three days a week while Whitney was employed one day a week (Threlkeld, 1925, p. 577). The supervisory responsibilities described by Threlkeld, however, did not seem to follow contemporary conceptions of supervision. According to Threlkeld's description the supervisory responsibilities centered around coordinating the work of the various committees:

By having [Hopkins or Whitney] in charge of all three committees in a particular field, such as mathematics, a very thorough co-ordinating agency is provided. All three committees are under his leadership.

Furthermore, he can call joint meetings of committees or joint meetings of chairmen as he sees the need for doing so. One of the advantages of this plan is that it combines co-ordination and unity with maximum freedom of expression. More important yet, perhaps, it offers a chance to unite the work of the two or three committees on the level established by the most progressive committee, if there happens to be variation in points of view. In other words, . . . one [committee] may immediately take a progressive point of view and proceed to get its curriculum materials ready accordingly. When this principle of procedure begins to materialize and the results of it begin to appear in the work of one committee, it is practically certain immediately to influence the work of the other one or two (pp. 577-578)

This suggests that the supervisors were not expected to direct or overtly influence the committee work. They might, however, use the work of the other committees or the teacher discussions in joint meetings to direct and influence committee work.

A final component of the Denver program was the provision of a clerical staff to assist the teachers' committee work. As much of the clerical work as was feasible was turned over to this staff. Teachers were not expected to type committee reports. Rough drafts were submitted to, and then prepared by, the clerical staff. Stenographers were provided for meetings with the specialists. Threlkeld (1925) noted that "so far as possible, the committee members are relieved of the burden of clerical work" (p. 578).

The Denver program of curriculum revision was initiated during the 1922-1923 school year and continued in its basic form well into the 1940's. Peltier (1965) indicated that the program, while altered, continued well into the 1960's

(pp. 194-195). The Denver program was widely recognized and widely emulated as an exemplary model of curriculum revision during this time. There was evidence that the Denver program had a positive effect on student achievement (see Peltier, 1965, pp. 172-178). However, Kliebard (1995) stated that the "most lasting legacy of the Denver program was the emphasis given to active teacher participation in curriculum reform" (p. 182). The continuation of the program for at least twenty years and its evident success in impacting student achievement (see Peltier, 1965) suggested that the Denver program's example can serve to inform current improvement efforts.

The Virginia Curriculum Revision Program was an example of efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development at the state level. The program was begun in 1931 and was designed by Caswell, a curriculum consultant from Peabody Teachers' College, and Hall, Virginia's state superintendent for instruction. Kliebard (1995) asserted that

by the 1930s, influenced by the increasingly popular notion that curriculum revision should be undertaken by the participants who would be called upon to implement the innovations, some states initiated major programs of change built on the Denver model. By far the most famous of these was the Virginia Curriculum Program . . . (p. 191)

However, there was some disagreement about this influence. Burlbaw (1991) claimed that the influence of the Denver plan was "indirect, at best" (p. 236). While Caswell used the Denver methods to varying degrees in his work in Alabama and Florida, the Denver program had little impact on instruction

in Caswell's view. Caswell's goal in Virginia was also to improve instruction in addition to improving the curriculum (p. 236).

Burlbaw (1991) reported that Caswell, Hall, and Campbell, a colleague of Caswell's from Peabody Teacher's College, began the project in 1931 by conducting an assessment of the teachers' ability to participate in curriculum work. They found that most teachers were poorly prepared. Caswell developed The Study Course for the Virginia State Curriculum Program as a plan of study to help prepare teachers around the state for curriculum work (pp. 237-238). According to Seguel (1966), 16,000 teachers and administrators were invited to participate in this general curriculum study. The reported number of actual participants in this initial phase varied, however, depending on the writer. Burlbaw (1991) related that Caswell reported that "10,000 teachers participated in the first phase of their program" and that "more than 18,000 teachers participated in organized study groups directed by trained teachers" (p. 238).

Even though the numbers vary, the concept of the teacher participation in the curriculum revision process may be of greater importance. In keeping with his goal to improve both curriculum and instruction, Caswell and Campbell (1935) maintained, as Newlon and Threlkeld had earlier, that the most effective method for teachers to gain

an intelligent understanding of their work would be accomplished through:

wide participation of teachers in the study of the need for curriculum revision, in the exploration of new materials and procedures, in trying out materials and instruction produced by others, and in producing materials for their own use (p. 497)

This was essentially an outline of his plan for teacher participation in the Virginia program. The program of revision was introduced to the participants with an explanation that:

the questions to be raised were matters of great importance in curriculum making but that there were no final answers to them. The hope was that a working consensus could be reached in the process which would foster the general staff cooperation necessary for a good curriculum program (Seguel, 1966, p. 148)

Groups of teachers met from January to March of 1932 in the various school districts. Discussion and reading centered around the seven topics outlined by Caswell in The Study Course for the Virginia State Curriculum Program: (1) What is the curriculum? (2) Developments which have resulted in the need for curriculum revision; (3) What is the place of subject matter in education? (4) Determining educational objectives; (5) Organizing instruction; (6) Selecting subject matter; and (7) Measuring outcomes of instruction. Reports of the progress of the study groups were submitted to the system superintendents (Burlbaw, 1991, p. 237; Seguel, 1966, p. 148).

To provide organization and coordination, four state-level committees were created: aims, principles, definitions, and production. The state aims committee began

their work while the teachers studied the seven topics created by Caswell. While it is unclear who were members of the state aims committee, Seguel (1966) explained that the state aims and production committees shared some of the same members because Caswell believed that the same people should have "responsibility for both determining ends and devising means" (p. 150). The state aims committee, along with the members of the other committees, spent the summer of 1932 studying in the curriculum laboratory with Caswell at Peabody Teachers' College. By the end of the summer, the state aims committee had developed a tentative list of 62 goals for elementary education (Burlbaw, 1991, p. 240; Seguel, 1966, p. 150). This tentative list was submitted for comments and suggestions to various business and lay groups around the state. Burlbaw (1991) noted that few changes were made (p. 241).

Once the aims were approved, teachers began developing lessons and units to address one or more of the 62 aims. These lessons and units were submitted to the system-level production committees which reviewed the materials before sending them to the state-level production committee. The state-level production committee had the responsibility of accepting or rejecting submitted materials. Caswell and Hall reported that "thousands of units were examined, revised, and tested" (Burlbaw, 1991, p. 241) by the state-level production committees.

By the summer of 1933, enough materials had been collected to publish what Seguel (1966) called a "tryout edition" (p. 152). A new committee was formed to handle the compilation of materials--the Elementary Reviewing and Unifying Committee. This committee was charged with the responsibility of reviewing the materials and making the changes needed to arrange these materials according to grade and subject. Fifty-two school systems, represented by between 250 and 317 teachers, were sent the tryout edition to test on a voluntary basis during the 1933-1934 school year. Evaluation and suggestion forms were included at the end of each lesson. The field test of the tryout edition met with a favorable response which led to the publication and distribution of the Tentative Course of Study for Virginia Elementary Schools: Grades I-VII in 1934 (Burlbaw, 1991, pp. 241, 244; Seguel, 1966, pp. 152, 154).

As was stated earlier, a primary intent of the Virginia program was to influence instruction. This presented a different challenge from that of implementing a course of study. Burlbaw (1991) noted that

Caswell proposed a radically different approach to influencing teacher practice, one based not on the installation of curriculum materials but on invitation and cooperation aimed at improving instruction and learning. This model did not rely on the previously used method of mandates and coercion. (p. 242)

Caswell and Campbell (1935) discussed installation as follows:

The installation of new courses of study is a phase of the curriculum program that requires careful consideration. As in other aspects of a curriculum

program, the nature of the work of installation will be conditioned by the type of program or the point of view from which the program has been developed. If writing new courses of study has been the chief purpose of the program, the period of installation will be brief and the procedures employed largely formal. It will consist, for the most part, in the distribution of the courses of study and the announcement of general regulations regarding their use. If, on the other hand, the curriculum program is more comprehensive in purpose and scope, the process of installation will of necessity require a longer period of time and will include every aspect of the instructional program.

It is suggested that a program of installation should provide: (a) that installation of new courses be optional, (b) that it be gradual, (c) that it be carefully supervised, and (d) that it provide for the training of teachers in the use of new materials. (p. 511)

The last two provisions were addressed by providing courses in curriculum work at the state's universities and colleges and by providing in-service training using the Study Course for the Virginia State Curriculum Program developed by Caswell in 1932 (Burlbaw, 1991, p. 246).

Burlbaw's (1991) summary was pertinent to the idea that a historical perspective was missing from current reform ideas:

Although the Virginia Plan was implemented more than 50 years ago, the problems encountered have changed little in the ensuing years. Curricular reformers, if they would develop a historical understanding of current problems, can benefit from examining past practice, from looking at details and evaluations rather than relying on generalizations that provide a view of the big picture but omit significant details. The form of the Virginia Plan may have changed between 1932 and 1952, but the program's continuation for such a period indicates that some of its aspects might be useful to curricular reformers today. In the light of the contemporary calls for curricular reform, the program and its installation, which resulted in more than 20 years of use, may warrant further investigation not just for its historical interest but also for its lessons. (p. 249)

Past educational practices, when sufficiently researched and analyzed, can inform current efforts at curricular reform. Yet, an accurate historical perspective of past efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work is missing in much of the current research.

Background of the Problem

Much of the reasoning behind the idea of teacher involvement in curriculum development during the first half of the twentieth century is more than vaguely similar to the current reasoning used to justify teacher involvement in curriculum development at this time. For example, Briggs (1926) observed that

it is obvious that no sound progress is possible [in advancing the curriculum] unless the teachers are convinced of the wisdom and validity of the new program and unless they are able to put it into successful practice. (p. 40)

As another example, Newlon (1926) asserted that through teacher participation on an extensive basis, teachers

come to appreciate courses of study because they see their practicality and usefulness, and in the last analysis the worth of a course of study is conditioned by the extent to which it is successfully employed by the teacher. (p.233)

Compare this to Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) in their citation of one of the characteristics of curricular change: "[Teachers] must perceive that [curricular] materials are going to meet important needs as well as be practical and usable" (p. 416). Another common assertion made was that involving teachers in curriculum development would serve to professionalize teaching. Newlon (1926) contended that

"since teaching is a professional job, the practitioner can be master of his profession only if he is conversant with the theories that underlie practice" (p. 233). These and other parallels between current and past justifications indicated that some of the challenges related to teacher participation in curriculum work were similar to those encountered in the past.

While there are many contemporary calls for teacher involvement in curriculum development and attempts have been made to put the ideas into practice, much of the writing in these areas ignored these and other important historical precedents. For example, Clandinin and Connelly (1992) in a section dealing with the history of teacher involvement in curriculum development failed to mention, even generally, any of the writings or efforts from the first quarter of the century. They suggested that the "idea of the teacher as curriculum maker" (p. 366) did not begin to take shape until Tyler's (1949) Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. While they stated no intentions to present a substantial history of teacher involvement, omission of a more complete historical perspective failed to present a complete picture of the teacher as curriculum maker which was their intention. Paris (1993), in an attempt to present a historical perspective of teacher agency in curriculum development, devoted 5 of the 156 pages to tracing the history of teacher participation in curriculum work from the turn of the century until the present.

Both examples advocated teacher participation in curriculum work, but they also exemplified the concerns of writers on curriculum history, such as Davis (1989) and Garrett (1994), who deplored the superficial treatment of historical perspectives. Davis described current "accounts of dominant ideas in the curriculum field" as mostly "unrecognizable" because, in an attempt to generalize, or summarize, these accounts tended to emphasize ideas over practices (p. 3). Detailed accounts of ideas as well as practices can provide understanding, and more importantly, models for discussion and consideration in current attempts to involve teachers in decisions on curriculum and instruction. In order to effectively address curriculum development today, it is vital to consider what has been learned in the past.

Being unaware or uninformed of past practices and ideas was a concern for many writers on educational and curricular issues. The ahistorical perspective of current writing and practice would not be surprising to some. Caswell (1979) expressed a concern that the attention "revisionists give to [past] educational practice is too limited in scope" (p. 2). Attempts to re-interpret historical accounts have incorrectly assumed that "theory reveals practice" and, in making these inaccurate assumptions, have "ignored some highly significant aspects of educational development" (Caswell, 1979, p. 1). One inaccurate conclusion, in

particular, that has drawn based on inaccurate assumptions was that

American educational institutions have not played the democratic, benevolent role that educators have traditionally claimed for them. On the contrary, assert these critics, the schools are themselves oppressive institutions (Caswell, 1979, p. 3)

Garrett (1994) lamented the practices of "using sources no more than five years old" (p. 390) in some education classes or of the superficial treatment of past educational practices in some education texts. Specific to curriculum history, Davis (1991) contended that "the curriculum field, from its beginnings earlier in this century, has honored its history by neglect" (p. 77). Garrett (1994) likened this ahistoricism to a teacher with no memory of what s/he has done in the classroom. With no memory, efforts to improve practice or curriculum are futile. Curriculum history serves as the "collective memory" of educators (Garrett, 1994, p. 392).

One area of study in the field of curriculum history suggested by Davis (1989) was that of "curriculum ideas and rhetoric" (p. 3). Although the history of curriculum ideas is an important area for continuing study, he stressed that "curriculum history (i.e., the history of ideas) must not be divorced from curriculum practices" (p. 11). Davis suggested two reasons for studying past practices: (1) the ideas and rhetoric seldom represent the actual practices; and (2) the "overemphasis" of ideas misrepresents the views of the curriculum field. Teacher participation in

curriculum development might well fit into this category. Efforts in the Dewey School, The Denver Curriculum Project, and the Virginia Curriculum Revision Project are oft-cited examples of this perspective. These are exemplary of the perspective and important examples. In light of Davis' concerns, however, three important questions come to mind concerning past practices: Were these examples representative of the dominant practice at the time or were they isolated incidents? What was the significance of the practices of teacher involvement for which there are historical records? Perhaps more important than significance- What can the practices contribute to our understanding of teacher involvement in curriculum development? Although Davis called for more studies of past curricular practices, he predicted the continuing appearance of "more studies of curriculum ideas and rhetoric" (p. 9). This would not necessarily be a negative trend if these studies

elaborate, penetrate, assess, and relate not only the most prominent curriculum ideas of an era, but the swirling fury of competing, even trivial ideas seeking attention and legitimization. (p. 9)

A study, then, of the history of the idea of teacher involvement in curriculum development with consideration given to the practice of the idea during the period and to any competing ideas could be significant.

Unfortunately, the tendency is to disregard early educational practices as naïve, ill-informed or primitive attempts which have little to offer us today. This seems to

be the case regarding teacher involvement in curriculum development. Pronouncements such as "the era of 'curriculum development' is past" (Pinar, 1995, p. 5) suggest that there is little or nothing to be learned from these past efforts. The negative effects can be seen in the current literature. Past efforts are either downplayed as insignificant or misrepresented altogether (e.g., Slattery, 1995).

While some writers (e.g., Garrett, 1994) indicated that the study of educational history is of value in and of itself, the study of any history should serve an additional, if not more important, purpose. A primary purpose for the study of educational and curriculum history is to add perspective and understanding to current practice and theory. In that light, it is important to establish a need for a historical account of efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development. At least one need can be seen in the various perspectives which indicate that teacher involvement in curriculum work is a crucial aspect of educational reform.

The ahistorical nature of reform attempts was a concern for writers at least thirty years ago. Bellack (1969) noted that

Curriculum innovators of the past decade have attempted to solve the difficult problems of curriculum planning and development with scant attention to the historical dimensions of these problems. (p. 283)

His review of the literature cited several writers who expressed similar concerns during the decade of the 1960's (e.g., Kliebard, 1968; Goodlad, 1966; or, The Committee on

the Role of Education in American History, 1965). These writers' primary concern focused on the negative effect that lack of a historical perspective had had on attempts at curricular reform. For example, Goodlad in Bellack (1969) expressed a common concern:

A substantial number of the new crop of reformers have approached the persistent, recurring problems of curriculum construction in the naïve belief that no one had looked at them before. (p. 283)

Knowledge of past curricular practices can not only provide much needed perspective and successful models of curricular reform; Bellack (1969) indicated that this historical knowledge can create an awareness of the complexity of change and how the past has influenced the present (p. 284).

A Rationale for Teacher Involvement

While vital historical perspective is lacking, there is currently a growing conceptual-theoretical base which serves to form a framework for thinking about teacher participation in curriculum development. This framework will only be briefly discussed since it is not critical to this paper. However, the existence of this expanding framework does support the need of a more comprehensive examination of teacher involvement in curriculum work. The conceptual-theoretical framework could be formed by ideas on teacher agency, democratic practice in education, collaboration, curriculum implementation research, motivational theory, and professionalization of teaching.

Teacher Agency in Curriculum Development

Teacher agency forms the foundation for a conceptual-theoretical framework for teacher participation in curriculum development. An agent is defined as any person "who engage[s] in action or do[es] things" (Heslep, 1997, p. 3) or one who "initiates action" (Paris, 1993, p.16). Teachers are agents because they engage in or initiate actions which revolve around the teaching-learning process and, ultimately, curriculum and instruction. Students learn in different ways and at different rates. Teachers engage in or initiate actions based on decisions and choices they have made concerning what students should learn (i.e., curriculum) and which strategies present the best opportunities for learning (i.e., instruction).

In his discussion of philosophical thinking in educational practice, Heslep (1997) proposed several ideas related to teacher agency which must be generally accepted in order to facilitate philosophical questioning in educational practice. These ideas are important to this discussion of teacher participation in curriculum development. The first idea is that "an educator is an interpersonal agent. That is, he or she is a person who does things that directly or indirectly influence some other doer of things" (p. 20). Teachers' actions have impact on learners, parents, other teachers, administrators, and the community which they serve. Teachers themselves are affected by the actions they generate. The interactions

with students, parents, and other teachers serve to influence the agent. Interaction is important not only to the general conception of teacher agency but to teacher agency in curriculum making, specifically. If teachers as rational agents are to make decisions based on knowledge and rational thought, this knowledge can best be expanded and developed through interaction with colleagues and others who can make contributions to the thinking on curriculum.

A second idea Heslep (1997) proposed was that educators are rational agents. That is, educators

are knowledgeable. They are cognizant of who they are, what they are doing and why, what are the ends sought through their actions, who are the agents with whom they are interacting, and what are the immediate outcomes of their actions. (Heslep, 1997, p. 20)

Teachers make decisions using a complex knowledge base which comes primarily from practical experience and technical/professional sources. Nolan and Francis (1992) identified three components of the professional knowledge base: general pedagogical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge (p. 50).

Pedagogical content knowledge was defined as the

capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students. (p. 50)

Pedagogical content knowledge is of critical importance to the teaching-learning process and a powerful example of how teachers must act as rational agents. The concept of pedagogical content knowledge, in particular, speaks to the

thinking of others that any externally developed curriculum ultimately must be filtered through those who are expected to teach the curriculum.

A third idea related to teacher agency discussed by Heslep (1997) was that educators "exercise control over their purposes and the actions by which they seek to attain their purposes" (pp. 20-21). In other words, teachers essentially act freely. This freedom to act can be either attained formally or informally. This freedom to act, or autonomy, can be granted through political structures as has been traditionally done with professions such as lawyers and doctors. Autonomy can also be gained informally, as Lortie (1969) described, through loose formal organizational structures found in organizations such as schools and school systems. As Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) pointed out in their summary of curriculum implementation research, whether teachers are granted formal, informal, or no autonomy in curriculum matters, teachers are a critical, if not key, component in the delivery of curriculum. Because teachers act, in a sense, as a filter for curriculum, the final decisions about goals, purposes, assessment, strategies, and materials lie with the teacher. In this sense, teachers are autonomous. While it is not the sense of freedom intended in conceptions of agency or professionalism, this informal autonomy provides a foundation for thinking and discussion about formalizing teacher autonomy in curriculum matters.

A fourth idea concerning agency is that the actions of educators, in addition to the characteristics of interaction, knowledge, and freedom, are characterized by purpose, judgment, deliberation, and decision (Heslep, 1997, p. 21). Heslep described how these characteristics relate to the actions of teacher-practitioners:

Knowledgeable and free agents act for purposes that they choose on the basis of judgments about the worth of proposed ends. In addition, such agents perform actions primarily as means for attaining their purposes, and they decide about which alternative courses of action are the right ones to perform. (p. 21)

Teachers' actions are guided by their professional and personal goals. These goals are affected by many factors which may or may not include those influences of a specific externally-developed curriculum. Even when considering specific objectives of an externally-developed curriculum, teachers must interpret and evaluate objectives in order to make decisions such as how to best present a concept or skill to a variety of learners, which objectives receive priority in a finite amount of instructional time, and which of the available instructional resources provides the best support for the objectives. Teacher purpose, judgment, deliberation, and decision all serve to mediate and modify any curriculum.

Paris (1993) used teacher agency as a basis for teacher participation in curriculum development. In following the characteristics of rational and moral agents in general, teacher agency in curriculum matters means teachers initiate

"deliberation, creation, critique, and change" of curriculum, are knowledgeable of "alternatives to established curriculum practices," are allowed "the autonomy to make informed curriculum choices," invest themselves in their actions, and are involved in "ongoing interaction with others" (p. 16). Paris contended that during the first half of this century teachers were formally engaged in the "creation and critique of curriculum" (p. 5), but as curriculum began to be perceived as "scientific knowledge, discovered by experts using methods and prior knowledge inaccessible to the typical classroom teacher" (p. 12), teachers' formal roles in curriculum development were diminished. However, Paris asserted that teachers have always been involved in curriculum development and revision when they have responded to

curricula they deemed inadequate or inappropriate for their students by embellishing it, reorganizing it, or rejecting it entirely and holding fast to curricula that they had tested and refined over the years. Similarly, teachers have long created curricula outside the sanctioned content in order to respond to the needs and interests of their students. (p. 21)

In addition to the informal revision of curriculum, teachers' perceptions serve to mediate the curriculum because each teacher's perceptions of the curriculum and their curriculum work is unique, "personal," and "subjective" (p. 3). The meanings that teachers place on the curriculum and their curriculum work act as a filter for what may ultimately be presented during a lesson. This is one reason why current research in curriculum implementation

suggests that externally developed curriculum is seldom, if ever, implemented as intended by the developer(s).

Paris (1993) described teacher agency in regards to curriculum as involving "personal initiative and intellectual engagement" (p. 248). Paris (1993) and Heslep (1997) used the same basic definition for the term agent-- "one who initiates action" (Paris, 1993, p. 188). Additionally, Paris' sense of teacher agency in curriculum development carried with it thinking similar to Heslep's concerning moral agency or, as Paris described it, "moral responsibility" (Paris, 1993, p. 188). The autonomy associated with agency, according to Paris, "requires a continual wariness of 'acquiescence and mindlessness'" (p. 248). As with Heslep's conception of rational agency, Paris' (1993) conception of teacher agency in curriculum development "requires initiating action that is conscious, interested, committed" (p. 26) and remaining ever "conscious of multiple possibilities" (p. 30). Finally, as with Heslep's conception on interpersonal agency, Paris (1993) stated that teacher agency in curriculum development "involves engagement of others" (p. 188). In sum, teacher agency in curriculum development, according to Paris,

involves initiating the creation or critique of curriculum, an awareness of alternatives to established curriculum practices, the autonomy to make informed curriculum choices, an investment of self, and an ongoing interaction with others. (p. 16)

Certainly, teachers are agents in that they engage in the action of the teaching-learning process. As Heslep

(1997) stated, the actions of agents (i.e., teachers) are determined through interaction, knowledge, freedom, purpose, judgment, deliberation, and decisions. These same qualities are characteristic of teacher actions in curriculum matters. According to Paris (1993), teachers' actions in curriculum matters include the creation, interpretation, critique, revision, refinement, reorganization, or rejection of curricula to meet students' needs/interests and teachers' professional/personal goals. Additionally, each teacher's perceptions of curriculum and curriculum work is unique and acts as a filter which makes each teacher's interpretation and presentation of curriculum unique. Recognition of teacher agency in curriculum matters is critical to a current understanding of curriculum implementation as well as an historical understanding of curriculum development.

Collaboration

Interpersonal and rational agency are important to thinking on collaboration. Paris (1993) suggested that teacher agency requires "engagement of others" (p. 188) and that a teacher-agent cannot act in isolation but only in the context of the "web of the acts and words of other(s)" (p. 188). As an interpersonal agent, the interaction moves in two directions. That is, a teacher influences others (e.g., students, parents, and other teachers) and a teacher is influenced by others. As a rational agent, a teacher is compelled to seek the appropriate knowledge to advise his or her actions in the educational setting. Interacting with

others is one significant way in which a teacher can gain this knowledge.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (1972) defined the verb *collaborate* as "to work jointly with others especially in an intellectual endeavor" and "to cooperate with an agency or instrumentality with which one is not immediately connected." Combining these definitions gives an appropriate definition for collaboration in the context of curriculum development: the cooperative work on the development of the curriculum (i.e., an intellectual endeavor) with agencies with which one is not immediately connected. Teacher participation in curriculum development, while acknowledging teachers as experts in curriculum and instruction, should not be taken to mean that they are the only ones who can contribute to the development of curriculum.

Tanner and Tanner (1995) pointed out that curriculum is influenced by many sources. Understanding what the sources are and how these sources interact to influence the curriculum enhances opportunities for curriculum improvement (p. 594). Additionally, this understanding should enhance opportunities for collaborative work on the curriculum. Tanner and Tanner cited numerous sources and influences: governmental agencies, interest groups, media sources, private foundations, colleges/universities, researchers, authors of curriculum materials, professional educational organizations, external testing agencies/programs,

publishers, business industry, boards of education, administrators, supervisors, teachers, students, parents, and social/political/economic/technical influences (p. 595). While it might not be practical or possible to include all the sources listed directly in a collaborative endeavor, it is possible to consider what all sources suggest is appropriate to include in a curriculum through their publications. Even in the collaborative process, however, Tanner and Tanner (1995) pointed out that "the actual events in the act of teaching, including what the student is expected to learn, are ultimately determined by the teacher" (p. 594). While all sources which influence the curriculum are important, teachers are a critical component in the collaborative process for curriculum development.

Collaboration on curriculum development has a historical basis. For example, in both the Denver Curriculum Revision Project and The Eight-Year Study, resources such as materials and outside consultants were provided to facilitate and support the teachers' work. In the Denver Curriculum Project, external consultants included educators at the district and state levels and university personnel. Teachers chaired all committees and committee membership was largely composed of teachers. In The Eight-Year Study, Tyler was brought in as an expert in assessment and measurement to assist teachers in the development of assessment instruments which would complement the curriculum developed by teachers and students. These examples of

successful collaboration on curriculum development can serve to advise and guide similar attempts today.

Autonomy and Professionalism

Autonomy arises as a critical factor in the debate on the professionalization of teaching. While opinions on the status of teaching as a profession are mixed, most writers on professionalism agree that professional autonomy is a definite characteristic of professions. Less clear is what the term "professional autonomy" actually means. For example, in his discussion of professionalism and the professionalization of teaching, Lortie (1969) detailed how teachers may possess informal autonomy because of the loose organizational structure of schools and school systems. Zumwalt (1988) suggested teachers have professional autonomy and discretion (p. 153), but these are being undermined by a technical conception of teachers which emphasizes "over-standardization of curriculum, measurement-driven instruction, and research-based prescriptions for effective teaching" (p. 149). Many writers on professionalism at least imply that professional autonomy is formally granted through the existing political structures. However, if informal autonomy is important as Lortie suggested that it is, then its relationship to professionalism must be clarified in order to answer these questions. Does informal authority play any role in professionalism? Does informal autonomy constitute a type of professional autonomy? Lortie suggested that teachers possess a great deal of informal

autonomy in matters of curriculum and instruction. Curriculum implementation research suggested that externally developed curriculum is seldom, if ever, delivered as intended by the developers. If these two propositions are accepted, then, from a practical standpoint, granting formal autonomy to teachers in matters of curriculum and instruction would serve to make the development and delivery of curriculum more effective.

The present thinking on autonomy in professionalism is not clear as to whether the autonomy is granted to individuals or to a group; however, the implication is that most writers refer to a collective autonomy. The relationship between professional autonomy and collective autonomy is also vague. Are the teachers in schools that have been granted authority for site-based management or state charters which provide for site-based decisions more professional than teachers in more traditionally managed schools? If this is the case, then professionalism, and specifically autonomy, appears to be a matter of degree, as Etzioni (1969) suggested. Viewing teaching then as a semi-profession and on a continuum moving towards professional status, granting teachers increased autonomy in matters of curriculum and instruction, as many writers on teaching and professionalism suggest, will certainly help to professionalize teaching. More importantly, increased autonomy, as previously stated can serve to make the development and delivery of curriculum more effective.

Current conceptions of teachers as professionals and as rational, moral agents also form an important philosophical base for teacher involvement in curriculum development. Ideas of what constitutes a profession have changed through history and are a subject of continuing debate. For example, Kimball (1992) asserted that our conceptions of professions are cultural-political constructs and change through history:

. . . the way people thought and spoke about 'profession' correspond to changes in the nature of cultural ideals, in the dominant forms of knowledge associated with those cultural ideals, and in the status of the preeminent vocation that upheld the ideal, possessed the knowledge, and exercised authority in various domains of society. (p. 198)

This explains why at various times in our history the preeminent professions have included the clergy, law, medicine, and even education (Kimball, p. 199).

Whether or not teaching constitutes a profession has as many opinions as what constitutes a profession. For example, Altenbaugh (1992) contended that teaching has been characterized as a profession throughout the twentieth century. Etzioni (1969) characterized teaching as a "semi-profession" (p. v). A semi-profession lies in a continuum between nonprofessional employees (i.e., blue- and white-collar workers) and the exemplar professions (e.g., law and medicine). Qualifying as a profession seems to be a matter of degree. Etzioni asserted that semi-professionals'

training is shorter, their status less legitimated, their right to privileged communication less established, there is less of a specialized body of

knowledge, and they have less autonomy from supervision or societal control than 'the' professions. (p. v)

Finally, many writers on reform and teacher professionalism, use the term "professionalization"--the process of becoming a recognized profession--to justify teachers' involvement in the decision-making processes of schools and school systems. The use of this term suggests that these writers generally acknowledge that teaching is not currently regarded as a legitimate profession.

Most current definitions of professions have three characteristics in common: (1) a commitment to and performance of a public service or function (Hatch, 1988; Heslep, 1997); (2) expertise based on professional experience, knowledge based in an organized body of theory and research, and extensive academic training (i.e., credentialism) (Haskell, 1984; Hatch, 1988; Heslep, 1997); and, (3) autonomy in professional life (Haskell, 1984; Hatch, 1988). While the first two characteristics are important, autonomy is critical to the proposition of teachers involvement in curriculum development.

As Heslep (1997) asserted, "practitioners [i.e., professionals] exercise control over their purposes and the actions by which they seek to attain those purposes" (p. 21). If learning is the purpose of education and curriculum instruction are considered as the means through which fulfillment of learning is attained, then a professional conception of teachers involves allowing teachers to exercise control over the curriculum and the instructional

strategies they utilize to deliver the curriculum. Darling-Hammond and Sclan (1992) emphasized that a professional conception of teachers realized that

because students learn in different ways and at different rates, teaching must be responsive to their needs if it is to be effective. As a consequence, teachers must make decisions in non-routine situations using a complex knowledge base augmented by highly developed judgment and skill. (p. 8)

A technical conception of teachers assumes that decisions about teaching can be generalized so as to "teacher-proof" curriculum and instruction. In the technical conception, there is little need for formal or informal autonomy.

In the final analysis, the issues related to the professionalization of teaching and of professional autonomy may ultimately be of minor consequence in the discussion of teacher participation in curriculum development. Glickman (1993), in his discussion of democratic practice in schools, suggested that individual autonomy may, in fact, be detrimental to the success of schools. Glickman asserted that collective autonomy means that the faculty and staff of a school have the authority to make joint decisions about the matters of educational importance to the school. If schools are to be successful and each student is to receive an equitable education teachers cannot "shut their classroom doors and teach whatever they desire" (p. 16). Effective schools, according to Glickman, achieve success "through an accumulation of consistent practices" (p. 16). Consistency is achieved through a coordination of efforts and a conscious plan to align student learning experiences (p.

17). Glickman contended that individual teacher autonomy tended to create situations in which teachers' individual efforts were negated through lack of coordination:

In successful schools, faculty members are not treated as subordinates but instead as the colleagues of administrators and others involved in decisions and actions The most successful schools in America were those that had the greatest degree of site-based autonomy, where teachers were key participants in decisions.

Successful schools exercise collective autonomy, apart from external agencies (districts, school boards, state departments), in making professional decisions about matters of schoolwide teaching and learning. Faculty members willingly decrease their individual autonomy in their own classrooms, in order to gain greater collective autonomy in their school. (pp. 16-18)

Democratic Practice in Education

Heslep (1997) stated that questions arising from teacher agency could lead educators to "discover that these characteristics and norms [of moral action] concord with certain democratic principles and policies" (p. 26). A central tenet of democratic practice in education is the teacher's role in decision making, particularly, in issues related to curriculum and instruction. Writers on democracy in education see a conflict in the school's role and responsibility in preparing students within the undemocratic framework of schools to be responsible citizens in a society in which democratic ideals are valued. Dewey (1903) asserted that:

democracy means freeing intelligence for individual effectiveness- the emancipation of the mind as an individual organ to do its own work. We naturally associate democracy, to be sure, with freedom in action, but freedom of action without freed capacity of thought behind it is only chaos. (p. 193)

He later described this relationship between freedom of thought and action, "the responsibility and freedom of mind in discovery and proof," as an ethical principle of democracy and, by extension, democratic practice in schools (p. 194). For teachers, according to Dewey, the democratic principle of freedom of thought and action meant "the power of initiation and constructive endeavor which is necessary to the fulfillment and function of teaching" (p. 194). This principle would manifest itself for teachers when

every teacher has some regular and representative way in which he or she can register judgment upon matters of educational importance, with the assurance that this judgment will somehow affect the school system. (p. 195).

Matters of educational importance included "methods of discipline and teaching, and the questions of curriculum, text-books, etc." (pp. 194-195).

The arguments against teacher participation in activities such as curriculum development held and still hold some unexplored assumptions. For example, the calls for "experts" to be in charge of the schools have failed to acknowledge the expertise of teachers. Dewey (1903) reasoned that

the logic which commits [the reformer] to the idea that the management of the school system must be in the hands of an expert commits [the reformer] also to the idea that every member of the school system . . . must have some share in the exercise of educational power. The remedy is not to have one expert dictating educational methods and subject-matter to a body of passive, recipient teachers, but the adoption of intellectual initiative, discussion, and decision throughout the entire school corps. (p. 196)

Another argument against teacher participation asserted that teachers were ill-prepared for curriculum development.

Dewey responded:

The more it is asserted that the existing corps of teachers is unfit to have a voice in the settlement of important educational matters, and their unfitness to exercise intellectual initiative and to assume the responsibility for constructive work is emphasized, the more their unfitness to attempt the much more difficult and delicate task of guiding souls appears. If this body is so unfit, how can it be trusted to carry out the recommendations or dictations of the wisest body of experts? If teachers are incapable of the intellectual responsibility which goes to the determination of the methods they are to use in teaching, how can they employ methods when dictated by others, in other than a mechanical, capricious, and clumsy manner? (p. 197)

Interestingly, these same arguments against teacher participation in curriculum development persist today.

Dewey saw this democratic principle missing from practice in schools and its absence as a basic problem for educators to address. Hopkins (1941), too, saw this as a fundamental problem of schools. He stated:

For the past ten years I have been convinced that the central problem in improving education is to aid these groups [i.e., individuals and groups in and out of the schools that are shaping the American educational system] to mature their authoritarian actions into more cooperative, democratic, social interactions. I believe that this is still our most crucial educational problem. (p. i)

According to Hopkins, another principle of the democratic process in schools is that of "cooperative social action" (p. 6). Hopkins suggested that cooperative social action means individuals working together in the problem solving process. He contrasted working together with working for which Hopkins asserted was the lowest level of cooperation

and that level found in many, if not most schools. In cooperative social action or democratic interaction, all individuals work together to set the purposes and policies for the group from the time of the group's inception. The purposes are determined "after inquiry into the needs of the individuals who comprise [the group]" (p. 9). Each group member "assumes full responsibility for the group achievement" and "is motivated more by the desire for social service than for personal gain" (p. 10). The concept of democratic interaction is important to the discussions of collaboration and teacher agency.

As with Dewey, Hopkins asserted that the practice of the democratic process means teachers, among others, are involved in the design or the development of the curriculum: "The curriculum of the school should be designed by all of those who are most intimately concerned with the activities of the life of the children while they are in school" (p. 12). Later, in his discussion of who should design the curriculum, Hopkins asserted that

designing the curriculum should be carried on by those persons who should learn the process of designing, or how to design the curriculum. This means that it is primarily a job for pupils in cooperative democratic interaction with adults, such as teachers, parents, supervisors, principals, and others. (p. 319)

Hopkins, before writings on curriculum enactment, maintained that "the curriculum then is designed by those who are designing it. It is the product of daily living together of pupils, teachers and others" (p. 323). About fifty years later, Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992), in their research

on curriculum implementation, discussed an emerging perspective they described as "curriculum enactment" (p. 402) in which the curriculum is defined as "the educational experiences jointly created by students and teachers" (p. 418).

More current views on democratic practice in schools continue to hold as a basic tenet the participation of teachers in curriculum development. For example, Glickman (1993) stated that part of the answer to the question of how to improve education is to "organize and operate our own schools in accord with the democratic principles of our society" (p. xii). One facet of organizing and operating schools according to democratic principles is to allow schools the autonomy to make decisions about the teaching-learning process. Those decisions which impact teaching and learning in schools are described by Glickman as "core-impact decisions" (p. 34) and concern questions about curriculum, instruction, and assessment among others. Dewey spoke of a similar problem at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago (Mayhew and Edwards, 1936):

Cooperation must, however, have a marked intellectual quality in the exchange of experiences and ideas. Many of our early failures were due to the fact that it was too 'practical,' too much given to matters of immediate import and not sufficiently intellectual in content. (p. 371)

The focus must remain on issues of curriculum and instruction.

Glickman (1998), building on Dewey's thinking in Democracy and Education, questioned the typical method of curriculum development:

What knowledge, skills, and understanding are of greatest worth to public school students? Decisions regarding the scope, sequence, and objectives of curricula and the assessment of student learning have typically been made by those farthest away from the students and local schools. Such decisions are not usually made by or among local educators, parents, students, or local community members. Instead, curricula, promotion, and graduation requirements are made by state boards of education Local school boards and districts most often play the role of interpreting such requirements and adding their own uniform regulations regarding schedules, subjects, standardized tests, and textbooks.

A recent phenomenon, federal involvement in curriculum development, has arisen from the national standards movement the underlying assumption is that local schools lack either the inclination or the capacity to develop and hold themselves to rigorous curricular goals and assessment. (p. 43)

Externally-developed curriculum "disempowers schools" (p. 44) and dampens any meaningful discussion and reflection on questions about the curriculum. Since discussions of curriculum are of core importance to the success of schools, little progress can be made toward true reform of schools until this idea is explored. According to Glickman, local school control over curriculum and assessment is a key to successful educational reform.

A perspective on leadership is critical to the discussion of democratic practice in schools. In his summary of the changes in ideas of supervision and leadership in education over the past fifty years, Pajak (1993) identified four general conceptions of educational

leadership that emerged during this period: the educational leader as democratic educator (1940s-1950s), the educational leader as organizational change agent (1960s-1970s), the educational leader as corporate visionary (1980s), and the educational leader as teacher (1990s) (pp. 160-163). The conception of educational leaders as democratic educators which developed during the first half of the twentieth century and the emerging conception of educational leaders as teachers are the most pertinent to this discussion of democratic practice. Dewey's ideas on schools as cooperative social organizations and reflection demonstrated in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago characterized the conception of the democratic educator (p. 164). As for the conception of educational leaders as teacher, Pajak (1993) stated:

This emerging conception resembles the 'democratic leadership' advocated during the 1940s and 1950s in that it unites administrators with teachers, and schools with local communities, in cooperative, problem-solving efforts. But it also incorporates contemporary conceptions of leadership that address the learning needs of information-based organizations. (p.162)

Crucial to the conception of educational leaders as teachers is the idea that schools become learning organizations. In other words, faculty, staff, and administrators learn from practice through constant reflection, dialogue, and experimentation (pp. 174-174).

Pajak (1993) identified four "elements" of educational leaders as teacher which can serve to "facilitate organizational learning":

(1) an empowerment of self and others through cooperative effort, (2) an intellectual activity that helps group members transcend superficial understanding, (3) the collective application of knowledge to practical problems, and (4) a commitment to making the future somehow better. (p. 175)

While all are important, empowerment of self and others speaks directly to the idea of democratic practice in schools and the issue of teacher involvement in curriculum work. Democratic practice in schools that are learning organizations is characterized by cooperative decision making and "group consensus achieved through dialogue" (p. 176). The cooperative decisions focus on issues such as curriculum and instruction, staff development, hiring and spending. Organizational learning is facilitated because participants learn through dialogue and reflection. Dewey's idea of working hypotheses is relevant here because in a sense all decisions become working hypotheses ultimately directed at improvement. As each decision is tested in the school, another cycle of reflection, dialogue and learning takes place.

Curriculum Implementation

Research on curriculum implementation provides another theoretical/conceptual thread for teacher participation in curriculum development. Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) described the three "dominant approaches to research in curriculum implementation" (p. 402): the fidelity perspective, the mutual adaptation perspective, and the curriculum enactment perspective. As its name suggests, the fidelity perspective is concerned with measuring the

degree to which curriculum innovations have been implemented as planned and, subsequently, trying to figure out the factors that encourage or hinder full implementation of a particular curricular innovation (p. 404).

Curriculum would be described as "the planned curriculum that may be embodied in a course of study, a textbook series, a guide, a set of teacher plans, or an innovative program" (p. 427). Curriculum knowledge is perceived to be in the purview of external curriculum experts. Teachers are perceived as technicians. The success of a particular curricular innovation is determined by the degree to which teachers carry out the innovation as directed by curricular experts. Outcomes are measured to determine the success of the implementation.

The mutual adaptation perspective focuses on how curriculum is implemented as well as the outcomes. External experts are still perceived as possessing sole curricular knowledge. However, because curricular innovations are more generic, adjustments to the curriculum by teachers are expected to adapt to the local context. While the teacher plays a more active role in this perspective, research in mutual adaptation does not necessarily represent a commitment on the part of researchers to negotiation and collaboration on curriculum (p. 410). Teachers are seen as integral only to the degree that their input is necessary to adapt the curricular innovation to the local context.

Curriculum enactment focuses on how curriculum is constructed by teachers, and students, in the classroom.

Curriculum would be defined as "educational experiences jointly created by student and teacher" (p. 418).

Curriculum becomes much more complex because it is mediated by experience, knowledge, and interaction within the classroom. Teachers, along with students, are perceived as creators of curriculum knowledge. External experts become teachers of teachers (p. 418). While externally developed materials may be used, these materials are considered mainly as resources for teachers and students.

Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) asserted that "research on curriculum implementation has yielded clear findings about the conditions that facilitate or inhibit the process of implementing a proposed curriculum" (p. 402). A major finding is that curriculum is never implemented as planned but rather adapted by local users (p. 428). This suggests that, regardless of the orientation, the teacher cannot be discounted as a critical component of curriculum development and implementation. Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt listed other factors which facilitate curriculum implementation. These factors are positively correlated to implementation. In other words, the more evident the factor, the greater the degree of implementation. The factors relevant to teacher participation in curriculum development include: (1) recognition for the need for change on the part of the participants; (2) understanding of goals and what is to be achieved; (3) perceptions of utility and practicality of materials; (4) the district's

past successes with change; (5) planning for problems; (6) level of district and principal support; (7) utilization of data to inform improvement initiatives; (8) level of collegiality, trust, support, interaction, and communication between teachers; and, (9) sense of teacher efficacy (pp. 416-417). Teachers play a vital role in all of these factors.

Improved or enhanced student performance should be the ultimate goal of any reform effort. In addition to the clear findings on what facilitates curriculum implementation, there is evidence that involving teachers in curricular decisions has a positive effect on student performance. Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) contended that

when outside influences are perceived and used as attempts to provide teachers with tools to collaboratively develop their skills, knowledge and attitudes in context-specific environments, they have positive effects for teacher development, enriched curricular experiences, and student outcomes. (p. 427)

Organizational Theory

Organizational theory offers an additional conceptual support for teacher involvement in curriculum development. Likert (1967) described four management systems and the effects of each one on the productivity of the organization. Likert presented the four systems as a continuum beginning on the right end of the continuum with the least productive management system, exploitive authoritative. Next comes the benevolent authoritative and the consultative management systems. The most productive management system,

participative group, is found on the left end of the continuum. The participative group management style, which Likert renamed System 4, provides an important conceptual-theoretical link to the development of the idea of teacher participation in curriculum development.

Four ideas are important to Likert's theory on management systems and are specifically applicable to a discussion of a participative group management style. First, the component parts of each management system (i.e., exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, participative group) must be "internally consistent" for a particular management system and the organization it guides to function effectively (p. 123). Therefore, a group decision-making process characteristic of a group management system would not be effective when utilized in an exploitative authoritative management system. For example, using fear, threats, and/or punishment could not be effectively combined with group decision-making. The first basic concept is fundamental to all management systems as described by Likert. The next three concepts are basic to a participative management system. The second basic concept is that

the leader and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and in all relationships within the organization, each member, in the light of his background, values, desires, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance. (p. 47).

A third fundamental concept is that group decision-making and group supervision must be used by leaders of all work groups within the organization. Likert described a work group as "a superior and all subordinates which report to him" (p. 50). The final concept fundamental to a participative management system is that every member of the organization should hold high performance expectations for the organization and for themselves individually. However, as Likert pointed out, these expectations cannot be imposed upon members of the organization. The goals and expectations must be arrived at cooperatively through the group decision-making process (p. 51).

Likert went on to describe the characteristics of an organization that is guided by a participative group management system. Some of the pertinent characteristics focus on the character of the decision-making processes and include: positive attitudes which serve to facilitate achievement of organizational goals; mutual trust, confidence, and cooperation between members of the organization; high level of satisfaction with membership in the organization, supervision, and personal achievements; upward communication which is initiated by all members of the organization and communicated accurately; communication between peers is facilitated; a substantial amount of cooperative teamwork is present; teamwork is encouraged and facilitated; "decision making is widely done throughout organization, although well integrated through

linking processes provided by overlapping groups"; all members of the organization are generally aware of problems; most available technical and professional knowledge is used in decision making; decision making processes contribute substantially to the motivation of members of the organization to implement goals; goals are usually established through group participation; goals are accepted overtly and covertly; pressures to obtain complete and accurate information to guide behavior of individuals and groups; excellent productivity; and, absenteeism and turnover are low (pp. 14-24). Likert's theory on participative group management presents a management system which is highly motivational to the members of the organization which utilizes it primarily because shared decision-making is a critical component.

Although Likert's theory describes any human organization, his examples focused on sales productivity. While his theory stresses group decision-making processes, some might view the theory as being manipulative in the sense that the purpose of the group decision-making processes is, ultimately, monetary profit (i.e., sales productivity). Ford (1992) proposed a theory for motivating people (i.e., Motivational Systems Theory) in which "the general conception that *facilitation*, not control, should be the guiding idea in attempts to motivate humans" (p. 254). Ford stated that:

motivation is at the heart of many of society's most pervasive and enduring problems, both as a

developmental outcome of demotivating social environments and as a developmental influence on behavior and personality. (p. 2)

A major task of his motivational theory, Ford stated, was to understand and facilitate the relationship between job satisfaction and work productivity (p. 2). Ford asserted that "one of the most important messages . . . is that motivation provides the psychological foundation for the development of human competence in everyday life" (p. 16).

Ford (1992) defined motivation as

the organized patterning of three psychological functions that serve to direct, energize, and regulate goal-directed activity: personal goals, emotional arousal processes, and personal agency beliefs. (p. 3)

Personal goals are "thoughts about desired (or undesired) states or outcomes that one would like to achieve (or avoid)" (p. 248). Emotional arousal processes are those activities and experiences which serve to promote a positive climate (i.e., enthusiasm, excitement, satisfaction, and other emotions capable of initializing and sustaining effort) in the organization. Personal agency beliefs, in effect, are perceptions of individuals about the feasibility of action toward personal goals. Personal agency beliefs "interact with personal goals to help determine the strength of motivation to achieve such goals" (p. 46). There are two sets of personal agency beliefs: capacity beliefs, which are "evaluations of whether one has the personal skill needed to function effectively" (p. 251), and context beliefs, which are "evaluations of whether one has the

responsive environment needed to support effective functioning" (p. 251).

Ford (1992) examined the links between job satisfaction and productivity in relationship to Motivational Systems Theory (MST). Ford stated that most research on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity cite little or no correlation; however, because MST views job satisfaction as the "successful attainment of an employee's personal goals" and productivity as the "successful attainment of the organization's goals," Ford saw the lack of correlation as a problem in the organization of the work environment. Specifically, the problem, as Ford saw it, centered on the lack of alignment between employees' and the organization's goals (p. 231). A key then to motivation in any organization, according to MST, is the degree of alignment between these two sets of goals. Alignment does not imply similarity. Ford states that alignment requires the employee understands the organization's goals, what is expected of him/her in that context, and the "job thus defined affords the attainment of the worker's core personal goals" (p. 232). Examples of core personal goals include "belongingness, resource acquisition, mastery, self-determination, and positive self-evaluations" (p. 235). Ford suggested five interrelated strategies for aligning employee and organizational goals resulting in increased in motivation: (1) "develop a climate of acceptance, caring and cooperation"; (2) develop programs and policies that

facilitate employee involvement; (3) focus on programs which, among other things, "reduce organizational layers, reward personal initiative and responsibility, form self-managed teams, offer flexibility in scheduling, benefits, etc."; (4) develop recognition programs which focus on the achievements of groups rather than individuals; and, (5) remove "arbitrary or inefficient rules and procedures that highlight the unresponsiveness of the work environment" (p. 235). Both Ford and Likert agreed that a key strategy in facilitating motivation is the formation of cooperative goal structures.

Leithwood, Menzies, and Jantzi (1994) use Ford's (1992) Motivational Systems Theory as a foundation for their discussion on gaining teacher commitment to curriculum reforms. They described the motivational process as the

qualities of a person oriented toward the future and aimed at helping the person evaluate the need for change or action. These processes are a function of one's personal goals, beliefs about one's capacities, beliefs about one's context, and emotional arousal processes. (p. 43)

Leithwood, Menzies, and Jantzi suggested strategies for "commitment building" based on motivational theories based on this perspective. A collaborative school culture is crucial. The authors noted that:

with respect to school culture, teachers' commitment is influenced by the degree to which the staff within the school perceive themselves to be collaborating in their change efforts. A collaborative culture influences teachers' context beliefs, in particular the degree to which the interpersonal climate of the school is supportive, caring, and trusting. To the extent that collaboration is perceived as providing professional growth opportunities, teachers' capacity beliefs may

also be strengthened. Such contributions to teachers capacity and context beliefs help explain the positive relationships that have been reported between collaborative school cultures and school effects. (p. 53)

In short, teachers' commitment and motivation to a change or a course of action are influenced by the degree to which they are directly involved in the decision-making processes. Motivational theories in this perspective seem to explain at least some of the psychological aspects of curriculum enactment.

In sum, current thinking on motivation, democratic practices in education, teacher professionalism, teacher agency, and curriculum implementation provide a framework for conceptualizing teacher participation in curriculum development. Motivational theories, such as those proposed by Likert and Ford, suggest that teacher involvement in the decision-making processes, particularly those decisions related to curriculum and instruction, will result in higher levels of teacher motivation, teacher commitment to curricular change, teacher satisfaction, and student achievement. Not only are cooperative decision making structures highly motivational, but research in democratic practices in education suggests that these structures are required to further the primary purposes of American education. Research in professionalism and teacher autonomy suggest that increased autonomy in matters of curriculum and instruction would further professionalize teaching and possibly increase the effectiveness of curriculum

development and delivery. Teacher agency in curriculum work requires teacher involvement in the creation of curriculum, knowledge of alternate conceptions of curriculum and choices in curriculum practices, the autonomy to make decisions based on this knowledge, and collaboration or interaction with others. Research in curriculum implementation suggests that externally developed curriculum is rarely, if ever, implemented as intended by the developers and any curriculum initiative which does not consider the teacher as a critical component in implementation will be ineffective. However, with the extensive literature advocating, either explicitly or implicitly, teacher participation in curriculum development, the actual practice is largely unrealized. While there may be many reasons for this, one key which is missing in the current literature is the historical perspective which might provide not only an understanding of past ideas and practices but also models which would serve to inform current efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work.

Typically, a conceptual-theoretical framework would be used to establish the basis for the research to be conducted. While this framework might suggest areas for further research, that is not the intent here. There are two purposes for this framework, however. The first intent is to attempt to establish that teacher participation in curriculum work is a valid and current issue. By establishing this concepts validity, the second purpose

becomes evident. If teacher involvement in curriculum development is a valid and current issue, then establishing a comprehensive knowledge base, which includes historical investigations, becomes critical.

Significance of the Study

Research on the historical background of teacher participation in curriculum development is lacking and should be investigated further. Why is a historical perspective on teacher participation in curriculum development important? Garrett (1994) contended that current thinking on questions of significance, relevance, or importance implies anything that is not of immediate practical use is not worthy of study. While practical applications are important, he is critical of those who suggest that research, i.e., historical research, is not significant if the research lacks practical applications. Garrett suggested that understanding, i.e., knowledge for the sake of knowledge, can be a legitimate reason to study curriculum history. Bloch (1953) concurred when he wrote that "[the study of history] is an endeavor toward better understanding and, consequently, a thing in movement" (p. 12). The study of curriculum history, according to Bullough (1979), "can be a source of useful data for understanding where we have been, where we are, and where we ought to be" (p. 38). In addition, Davis (1991) asserted that "telling [curriculum history] stories illuminates previously inadequate understanding" (p. 78). Reasons, then, for

studies in curriculum history, and the history of teacher participation in curriculum development, include providing a better understanding and, with this clear understanding, providing possible direction for current efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work.

Even so, does a study of past curricular practices such as teacher participation in curriculum development not have immediate practical use? Specific to the progressive practices of the past, such as teacher involvement in curriculum development, Clandinin and Connelly (1992) asserted that

proper historical studies of [the progressive era] would be illuminating; not only would they help us to understand the history of the teacher as curriculum maker but also they would provide a more balanced picture of the ways in which schools, colleges of education, faculties, consortia, and laboratories might work together. (p. 379)

Not only does the study of curriculum history provide understanding about past ideas and practice, but it can also provide additional perspectives about how practice might work today. Garrett (1994) agreed when he contended that studies in curriculum history can serve to inform current practice and theory. Davis (1977) also asserted that studies in curriculum history can serve to inform contemporary practice:

Historical studies of curriculum should help us to understand the antecedents of the present course of study and of our professional fields. Possessing understanding, we may explore contemporary justifications, analyze new proposals, and, informed, invent more appropriate, more consistent, more valid curriculum. (p. 159)

In order for current curricular ideas and practices to be objectively and constructively evaluated, educators must be informed. Studies in curriculum history help to fully inform educational theorists and practitioners.

Balance and adequate understanding concerning teacher involvement in curriculum work in the past are serious problems. For example, Wraga (1998) expressed concern about the overemphasis on social efficiency and social control in our early curriculum history by, among others, a group of curriculum theorists who were first identified by Pinar (1978) as "reconceptualists" (p. 5) of curriculum theory. In short, reconceptualists were described as curriculum theorists who:

tend to be trained in the humanities, but even those whose backgrounds are social science tend to hold theoretical considerations above the conducting of quantitative research. They have not (even if some maintain they have for the time being) abandoned school practitioners, but fundamental to their view is that an intellectual and cultural distance from our constituency is required for the present, in order to develop a comprehensive critique and theoretical program that will be of any meaningful assistance now or later. (Pinar, 1978, p. 6)

Wraga (1998) asserted that the reconceptual curriculum theorists relied on interpretations of curriculum history which overemphasized theories on social efficiency and social control and downplayed the contributions of the progressive movement to curriculum theory and practice. "This interpretation," Wraga contended, "of the early history of the curriculum field is problematic, at best, and inaccurate, at worst" (p. 13).

Balance is important to any rendering or depiction of history. Davis (1991), in providing guidelines for writing good curriculum history, used the term "representativeness" (p. 80) to encompass balance. "Representativeness [i.e., balance]," Davis maintained, "is achieved by seeking a full sense of identity" (p. 80). This sense of identity in curriculum history and teacher participation in curriculum work cannot be achieved without a balanced depiction of the theories and practices representative of the time period. Related to the concept of balance or representativeness is the need for presenting multiple perspectives in writing accurate depictions of curriculum history (Davis, p. 80). While social control and social efficiency theories have provided perspectives on curriculum and its development during the early part of the twentieth century, they are by no means the only perspectives of this time period. It is questionable whether these were the dominant perspectives of this time period.

While the reconceptualists present a problematic or inaccurate view of past curriculum thinking and practices, even those writers who advocated teacher participation can present contradictory views of curriculum history. Some writers diminish the significance of past ideas and practices by presenting them as primitive, not representative of the field or by misrepresenting intentions and motivations. For example, Slattery (1995) asserted that the Denver Curriculum Revision Program initiated by

Jesse Newlon was an effort to "centralize administrative bureaucracy" (p. 61) suggesting a negative connotation of bureaucratic control. Kliebard (1995) suggested that the effort was initiated primarily to cut costs. Snyder, Bolin and Zumwalt (1992), on the other hand, cited Newlon's efforts as an example of curriculum adaptation and, possibly, of curriculum enactment. Wraga (1998) maintained that the curriculum implementation continuum described by Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) (i.e., fidelity approach to mutual adaptation to curriculum enactment) could also be viewed as a continuum describing autocratic to democratic-participative approaches to curriculum development (p. 12). The Denver Curriculum Revision Program, according to Wraga, represented a prime example of the democratic-participative approach. Newlon himself pointed out that active teacher participation in curricular decisions was the outstanding feature of the Denver Curriculum Revision Program.

Pinar (1995), while decrying the ahistorical nature of the traditional curriculum field, asserted that "the era of 'curriculum development' is past . . . Curriculum Development: Born: 1918. Died: 1969" (pp. 5-6). His implication seemed to be that further study of this period in curriculum history would offer nothing useful. Bolin and Panaritis (1992) while praising past efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development lamented "the trend involving the teacher as a curriculum developer was never a dominant one in the field" (p. 39). Bagley (1933), however,

in a discussion cautioning against teacher involvement in curriculum development asserted that "today there are *no fewer than thirty-five thousand different curricula* on file in the curriculum library of Teachers College, Columbia University, most of which have been prepared by committees of teachers during the past ten years" (pp. 568-569).

Interestingly enough, Bagley seems to be suggesting that teachers participation in curriculum development was being over-utilized and to the detriment of the curriculum field. A study of past ideas and efforts to involve teachers in curricular decisions could serve to clarify some of this confusion.

A final point concerning significance is the need for models and effective strategies to involve teachers in curriculum work. The current calls for teacher participation in curriculum development fail to provide enough details or adequate models to accomplish the task. Attempts to involve teachers in shared decision-making processes such as site-based management have failed to successfully involve them in decisions having core and comprehensive impact, such as issues of curriculum, on students and schools (Allen & Glickman, 1992; Malen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1990). Studies of past ventures to involve teachers in curricular decisions can provide these necessary models. When coupled with current thinking on teacher agency, democratic practices, motivational theory, teacher professionalism, and curriculum implementation, these models

may provide new perspectives on the benefits of teacher participation in curriculum development.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine, describe, document and explain the history of the idea and practice of teacher involvement in curriculum development during the period from 1890 through 1940. This study will serve to provide historical perspective and understanding to advise current attempts to involve teachers in curriculum development.

Research Questions

The study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What were the dominant ideas concerning teacher participation in curriculum development from 1890 to 1940?
2. Are these ideas representative of the dominant practices during this time?
3. What were the dominant practices during this time?
4. What is the significance of the practices of teacher participation for which there are historical records?
5. What can the ideas and practices contribute to our current understanding of teacher participation in curriculum development?

Scope of the Study

This study will consist of:

1. Analysis of ideas from 1890 through 1940 concerning who should be involved in curriculum development, generally, and teacher participation in curriculum development, specifically.
2. A review of the literature concerning the historical record of teacher participation in curriculum development in the United States during the period from 1890 to 1940 including examination of primary sources collected from Schubert's Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years (1980), various bibliographies, and curriculum archives.
3. Examination of the educational context of the idea and practice of teacher participation in curriculum development in elementary and secondary schools in the United States.
4. Assessment of the significance of the historical record in relation to current rhetoric and practice.

Methods and Procedures

The historical method of research will be used in this study. Marius (1995) and Davis (1991) liken good historical research to the telling of stories, i.e., a narrative. Good historical narrative has the well-developed elements (i.e., characters, settings, and action) of a good story. Building on the works of historians such as Nevins, Carr, Gottschalk, and Marius, Davis (1991) suggested several guidelines for

conducting research in curriculum history. First, as with all research, the work must be supported by evidence. In the case of historical research, primary sources provide the most effective evidence. Davis maintained that using primary sources offers authority to historical research (p. 79). Bloch (1953) made the analogy of a historical document (i.e., primary source) as "a 'track,' as it were- the mark, perceptible to the senses, which some phenomenon, in itself inaccessible, has left behind" (p. 55).

The next guideline for research in curriculum history offered by Davis involved the interpretation of the curriculum story: "The narrative offers mindful interpretations of the curriculum story within the appropriate contexts" (p. 80). Marius (1995) asserted that "it is the writer's interpretation of facts that raise questions, provoke curiosity, and make us ask the questions who, what, where, when, and why" (p. 13). Marius urged caution in interpretations and judgments. The complexities of the motivations of characters and causes of events must always be considered. Careful study and consideration of the evidence may yield multiple interpretations.

Significance is another important consideration in research in curriculum history. Like a good story, elements such as "major turning points, events, and people are treated in depth to the development both of their importance to the story and its interpretations and a realistic portrayal of the times" (Davis, 1991, p. 80). Care must be

taken to avoid misplacing or misrepresenting the significance of a particular character or event. Again, careful consideration of the evidence should assist in a balanced presentation.

The context of the curriculum narrative is crucial to the telling of a good story. Davis (1991) defined presentism as imposing contemporary interpretations and judgments of curriculum practice and issues upon events, individuals, actions of the past (p. 80). A good curriculum story must clearly describe the time period in terms of social, intellectual and educational thinking. Bloch (1953) explained that

the first duty of the historian who would understand and explain [people and events from another time] will be to return them to their milieu, where they are immersed in the mental climate of their time and faced by problems of conscience rather different from our own. (p. 41)

Other guidelines proposed by Davis for writing curriculum history included providing representativeness, providing multiple perspectives, and emphasizing style. Representativeness is achieved by seeking a full sense of identity. This is accomplished by resisting the tendency to romanticize, stereotype, or oversimplify characters or events (p. 80). Multiple perspectives are important to the telling of a good curriculum story. According to Davis, multiple perspectives served to "emphasize both continuity and change over time" (p. 80). To emphasize style, Marius (1995) suggested writing about history "in the same spirit that you would write a good story" (p.15).

Bloch (1953) noted that "one of the most difficult tasks of the historian is that of assembling those documents which he considers necessary" (p. 69). Guides such as archival and library catalogs, museum indices, and bibliographies are crucial. In this particular study, Schubert's Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years (1980) will serve as the initial guide. Schubert developed his book because of the "difficulty [at the time] in locating bibliographies of curriculum works" (p. *xii*). As a result, his work included all of the curriculum development literature from 1900 to 1976. The primary question guiding selection of books was, "What Twentieth Century books contributed substantially, directly or indirectly, to curriculum thought?" (p. *xvi*). Criteria for selection relevant to this particular study included those books which sought to answer the questions, "How do or how should people determine what to teach others? How do they defend or justify it? What issues are involved in deciding what to teach or learn?" (pp. *xvi-xvii*).

For this particular study, two criteria will be used to narrow the general focus of Curriculum Books. First, only books listed for the period 1900 through 1940 will be used. This narrows the list to 228 books. Second, only books during this period which address the issue of teacher participation in curriculum development will be included.

Once the list is narrowed to the books for the period 1900-1940 which include discussions of teacher participation

in curriculum development, each book will be reviewed. Ideas, rationales, and descriptions of practice from each book will be included in this study. The bibliographies of each book will be reviewed for additional sources on ideas and practices in teacher participation in curriculum development.

Context is an important consideration when discussing the ideas and practices described in the sources obtained from these bibliographies. In addition to the bibliographies on curriculum works provided by Schubert's text, he also provided discussion on the historical context (e.g., socio-cultural, intellectual, artistic, and scientific developments; major curriculum movements, trends, books and authors) of periods from which the books are cited. While other sources will be consulted to provide a complete context, Schubert's work will provide a valuable resource in this area.

Primary sources are critical to lend authority to this study; however, secondary sources will also be utilized. These secondary sources will be used to lend perspective to the study and to establish connections between ideas and practice. In addition to the procedures described, secondary sources will be obtained through searches of resources such as Dissertation Abstracts, Periodicals Content Index, Education Index, Educational Literature, 1907-1932 and ERIC records.

Assumptions

1. Primary sources documents reviewed are authentic.
2. Primary source documents present an accurate account of ideas and practices from the perspectives of those creating the primary document.
3. Findings can be generalized to current practice.

Limitations of the Study

A major limitation in an historical study such as this could be the availability and accessibility of primary source documents concerning actual practice.

Definitions of Terms

Collaboration, in regards to curriculum work, is defined as the cooperative work on the creation, development, critique, and revision of the curriculum. Those involved in this collaborative effort must include teachers and can also include, but not be limited to, students, parents, school administrators, community members, state educational agency members, university personnel, and private consultants.

Definitions of curriculum are numerous and range from curriculum as a course of study to curriculum as a function of the context and interaction "between teacher, children, and content" (Paris, 1993, p. 16). One's definition of curriculum may affect how teacher involvement in curriculum work was attempted. A simple or encompassing definition, while difficult, would serve the purpose of this paper and encompass the wide variety of projects to involve teachers

in curriculum work. Tanner and Tanner (1995) offered a definition based on the views of Dewey which might be appropriate considering the number of early programs which were influenced by his thinking: "that reconstruction of knowledge and experience that enables the learner to grow in exercising intelligent control of subsequent knowledge and experience" (p. 189). It should be noted that the historical record suggested that curriculum was viewed in a much broader context during the period of study. Curriculum and course of study were used interchangeably and could include objectives, as well as, instructional activities and teaching resources.

Curriculum development is used generically to describe any act of deliberating, creating, critiquing, and/or changing curriculum. It might also include what Paris (1993) described as exploring "curriculum potential in received curricula" (p. 16) if teachers are allowed professional autonomy in their exploration. Curriculum work, curriculum construction, curriculum revision, and other similar terms are assumed to be synonymous with curriculum development. The term curriculum development did not come into wide usage until the 1920s.

Curriculum history is defined by Kliebard and Franklin (1983) as

the scholarly attempt to chronicle, interpret, and ultimately understand the processes whereby social groups over time select, organize, and distribute knowledge and belief through educational institutions. (p. 138)

Teacher participation, according to Rosow and Zager
(1989)

can include various forms and degrees of consultation and/or delegation, ranging from a voice for teachers in management decisions before they are adopted, to full-fledged semiautonomous teams in which teachers determine the problems to be solved, design their own solutions, and then implement them. (p. 16)

Organization of the Report

Chapter I provides an overview of the study, including the introduction, background of the problem, significance of the study, statement of purpose, research questions, scope of the study, methods and procedures, assumptions, limitations, definitions of terms, and organization of the study.

Chapters II through VI will provide a review of the idea and practice of teacher participation in curriculum development. For each decade discussed, 1890 through 1940, an overview of the educational context (i.e., major curriculum movements, trends, books and authors). A discussion of the evolution of the idea of teacher participation in curriculum development and the actual implementation of the idea in practice. The levels at which teachers participated, the step or point at which teachers became involved, and the purposes for which teachers participated will form the framework for the summaries of each of these chapters.

The final chapter will summarize the study and offer recommendations for implementing the model in schools and suggest implications for future research.

CHAPTER II: THE START OF THE PROGRESSIVE ERA, 1890-1909

. . . we are without professional memory about where [teachers' intellectual] freedom has existed and in what circumstances it is most effective. (Tanner, 1997, p. 64)

The transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth century was marked by several developments which had significant impact on curriculum and curriculum development. One of these developments was the dramatic growth of the population of the United States. Immigration contributed significantly to this population growth. In addition to this general growth in population, large cities, particularly those with factories, experienced an increase in their populations as people moved to these cities in search of jobs. Concurrently, Rugg (1926) noted that "1890 marked the beginning of an experiment in democracy: mass education" (p. 33). The increasing population and mass education dramatically affected education. The size of schools and the numbers of schools grew to accommodate an increase in students. The size and number of school systems increased, also. The factors contributing to the dramatic growth in the student population, in particular, immigration and mass education, caused educators and others to begin questioning the curricula of the schools.

As schools and systems grew, so did the administrative complexity. The number of superintendents and central office administrators increased to handle the complexities of large school systems. The appearance and growth of the superintendency took place during the last half of the nineteenth century. Schubert (1980) noted that "during this period of transition to the twentieth century the need for full time experts to engage in specialized decision-making was a frequent occurrence in many occupations" (p. 16). Specialized administrative positions such as assistant superintendent for secondary schools, elementary supervisor, and director of research began to appear as school systems grew. Curriculum and curriculum development were not immune to such specialization, particularly as curriculum gained recognition as a separate field of study within education. Schubert (1980) reported that

the emergence of an area of specialization within education, an area known as curriculum development, was thus no surprise. Full-fledged curriculum developers were not yet present, although they were on the horizon and would quite fully present themselves in the next decade. Nevertheless, their ancestors were very much present. (p. 16)

Titles such as assistant superintendent for curriculum and director of curriculum began to appear in the literature. Administrative complexity and the appearance of curriculum experts further complicated the question of who should be responsible for curriculum development.

Advances in science, technology, and industrialization were related developments which had a profound impact on

curriculum and curriculum development, as with all of education. The rise of the physical and natural sciences, particularly after The Civil War, had a significant impact on society and on education. Kimball (1992) suggested that during the last half of the nineteenth century "the cultural ideal, the fundamental source of cultural inspiration and legitimacy, shifted from 'polity' to 'science'" (p. 200). He asserted that the failure of political solutions which led to the Civil War, the political corruption, particularly at the federal and state levels, and the Spanish-American War resulted in a weakening of the political idealism which was evident prior to the Civil War. The influence of science, brought on by the developments and discoveries in the physical and natural sciences particularly after the Civil War, began to fill the void brought on by the loss of faith in politics.

As the natural and physical sciences gained influence and credibility, the intellectual authority of these sciences increased. The social sciences then began to look to the natural sciences as the source for conceptual models and for confirmation. Kimball (1995) asserted that the "belief that the objective methods of the natural sciences should be used in the study of human affairs, and that such methods are the only ones in the pursuit of knowledge"(p. 206) began to find its way into curriculum and curriculum development, as with all of education. The question of the appropriate curricula could be answered scientifically.

Curriculum development was a matter for the scientific method. Calls and proposals for "scientific curriculum-making" began to appear in the literature.

Business and industry had a similar impact on education at the beginning of the twentieth century. Callahan (1962) asserted that during the first decade of the twentieth century "the dominance of business men and the acceptance of business values (especially the concern for efficiency and economy)" (p. 18), along with other related factors, set the stage for many educational administrators to accept these values as a means for operating schools efficiently. Callahan (1962) and Kliebard (1995) contended that education was greatly influenced, in particular, by the works of Edward Ross (e.g., Social Control) and Frederick Taylor (i.e., Scientific Management). Kliebard (1995) suggested that the bureaucratization of educational administration found its beginnings in the efficiency movement during this period.

Efficiency and standardization certainly became increasingly common themes in educational literature during the first decade of the twentieth century. As with education, in general, curriculum and curriculum development would be influenced by the efficiency movement. Both Kliebard (1995) and Schubert (1980) identified advocates of the social efficiency as a powerful and distinct influence on curriculum and curriculum development. For Rugg (1926), the parallel between mass education and economic mass

production was obvious. By 1900, mass education, like mass production, "was ready for standardization The next two decades witnessed its consummation" (Rugg, 1926, p. 33). Standardization would carry certain implications particularly for teacher participation in curriculum development. Standardized and uniform curricula were also common themes in the literature during the first half of the twentieth century.

While not a new development by the start of the twentieth century, the issue of teaching as a profession would be an undercurrent of thought influencing thinking on teacher participation throughout the first half of the twentieth century. According to Kimball (1992), several related factors served to influence the conception of a profession, particularly the conception of teaching as a profession, during this period. Kimball asserted that the cultural ideal of science which evolved during this period was evident in "the widespread acclaim and fascination with the natural and physical sciences" (p. 230). Other fields of knowledge, particularly the social sciences, were influenced by developments in the natural and physical sciences. The relatively new social sciences (e.g., psychology and sociology), in turn, provided educators justification for claiming professional status, in part, based on the new "science of education" which drew heavily from the social sciences.

During the last half of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, the influence and status of science was unequalled. Kimball (1992) contended that during the growth in the status of science "the institutional locus of control was established in education" (p. 230). Universities and colleges became the centers for scientific study. As a result, this status and influence, at least for a short time, was associated with education and educators, according to Kimball. This association served to influence the professional standing of educators. Kimball noted that this was, at least partly, evidenced by the increase in the number of articles in education journals devoted to discussion of teaching as a profession (p. 272).

Teacher autonomy in curricular and instructional matters was a primary consideration in much of the literature. One of the first pieces that could be located which suggested that teacher autonomy, at least to some degree, was an accepted notion appeared in Connecticut Common School Journal (1840) in an article entitled "Co-operation of Parents in Improving Schools":

Be careful, too, in all that you say and do, to *recognize the teacher as presiding over the affairs of the school*. Even members of school committees, and school visitors, should do this. He is placed here, and clothed with official authority for this purpose. (p. 86)

"School committees" were comparable to the local board of education; "school visitors" were the equivalent of supervisors. Later articles will expand on a perceived conflict between the school system, e.g., lay control,

school boards, superintendents, and supervisors, and teachers and the effect of this conflict on the teaching profession. While "presiding over the affairs of the school" and "clothed with official authority" were not explained, the terms suggested that there were decisions that teachers were entrusted with and expected to make.

In a two-part series on whether teaching yet constituted a profession Douai (1880a) asserted, "Teaching is not yet a profession" (p. 227). One reason for his contention was that teachers' freedom was limited by "laymen," i.e., school boards:

The business of teaching is underrated in its requirements and in its effects. Laymen are considered proper judges of educational work and of the wants of our schools; it is as a rule by laymen that teachers are appointed and dismissed, examined and reexamined, commanded and judged, that plans of study are laid out and school-books are selected, and much more such intervention. (p. 228)

Notably, this is the first piece located which explicitly linked professionalism and teacher autonomy, and specifically the laying out of the plan of study, i.e., teacher involvement in curriculum work. Douai also attributed teaching not being considered a profession to the lack of long-term commitment on the part of teachers. Women's careers were short-lived because "they are eagerly in demand as wives" (p. 228). Many men's careers were short-lived because they "use teaching as a stepping-stone to some more attractive profession" (p. 228). Those men who remained were, many times, "less talented than unsuccessful in every other calling" (p. 228). He concluded the first

installment with some suggestions for making teaching a profession: the appointment of teachers to school boards, the provisions for stipends to normal school students and pensions for teacher retirees, and more comprehensive training of teachers.

In his second installment, Douai (1880b) continued his discussion with additional suggestions on how to make teaching a profession. Again, Douai explicitly connected professionalism and teacher autonomy and at least implied that teachers should be involved in curriculum work:

Among the inducements which should be held out to persons born for the teaching profession, in order to allure them to it, the principal one is, *more influence for the pedagogue in all pedagogical matters*, and less interference with his work on the part of laymen. (p. 244)

Not only was this one way in which to make teaching a profession, but it would serve to attract more qualified teachers, and "persons born to the teaching profession," into teaching. This was a point that would be made frequently, culminating with Dewey's writing on freedom of intelligence- the most qualified were not attracted to teaching or did not stay in teaching because they were not permitted to exercise their intellectual initiative.

Hailmann's (1882) piece on the "Emancipation of Teachers" was one example. Hailmann asserted that since freedom was "the most important concern for our schools, ranking all others, however weighty" (p. 339) teachers should be accorded the same consideration in their work in the schools. However, freedom, for Hailmann, did not mean:

the unimpeded indulgence of all desires and aversions, according to chance, whim, or passion; such a freedom were that of the despot or the licensed slave. Freedom worthy of man is always moral,- i.e., it rests on a true appreciation of human relations, of good and evil. Freedom, self-determination, gives us rights; morality, duties. Freedom permits us to decide what we shall do or abstain from doing; morality bids do nothing that might work injury to humanity, to leave nothing undone that might work benefit. Freedom grants us the exercise of our faculties in such a way that others may not be deprived of freedom; nay, that they may be enabled to enjoy it to a higher degree. (pp. 339-340)

According to Hailmann, true freedom was always moral in nature and was guided by the "inner requirements" of the profession, the laws of pedagogical "science," or the "laws that are in accord with" pedagogical science (p. 340).

Teachers should be independent of any authority which was not based on the pedagogical science or worked in opposition to this science. To help avert any such problems, anyone with direct authority over teachers "should be chosen from their profession, or at least from those who have a professional knowledge of the teaching science" (p. 341). Most importantly, the goal of the emancipation of teachers was, according to Hailmann,

the control of the work by the profession, admission to its ranks by the profession, and dismissal from official position only for cause and with the concurrence of a professional tribunal. (p. 342)

In Hailmann's view, teacher autonomy would serve to strengthen the teaching profession, or least give it professional status.

Just as Douai expressed earlier, Hoose (1882), who viewed teaching as a profession, considered lay control a threat to the teaching profession:

What is the status of the teacher under the system? The theory of *in loco parentis* places him under amenability to the public; although he is hired by a Board, yet he is not its agent solely; The system provides no professional life and surroundings for a teacher; his qualifications may be passed upon by persons who have but slight, if any, acquaintance with the profession of teaching. Law makers and supervising officers are industriously restricting the conditions of a certificate of qualifications; a certificate may be annulled often by authorities acting upon mere nominal cause under the inspiration of whim, or favoritism, or partisanship. These circumstances curtail the liberties and privileges of a teacher and thwart his ambitions and purposes. . . . he would like to introduce changes in his school but cannot because the system will not allow them. (pp. 30-31)

While Douai believed that teaching was prevented from becoming a profession because of lay control, Hoose expressed the belief that teaching as a profession was inhibited by lay control.

In the 1884 meeting of the National Educational Association in Madison, Wisconsin, N.E.A. President Bicknell (1885) proposed these goals for the association to pursue: the union of all teachers, the creation of a teaching profession by professional methods, the examination of teachers by competent boards, and the creation of departments of pedagogics in any institution that prepares teachers (p. 281). He also endorsed "the organization of school faculties" proposed by Eliot (1875) ten years earlier. Bicknell quoted Eliot verbatim on the problems of the superintendent attempting to involve himself in

administrative and educational management. Bicknell

commented on the school faculties:

These faculties should be chosen from the corps of teachers, exercising such functions as their superior wisdom in matters of practical detail would fit them to enjoy. . . . The proper balancing of influences, educational and administrative, would be secured in the most important decisions relating to the educational work of the community, Much of the power of our teaching talent is now wasted in the merciless wear and constant friction between the authority that contrives and the hands that execute. (Bicknell, 1885, pp. 309-310)

Bicknell predicted changes in supervisory practice.

Supervisory practice would focus less on the "empiric" and more on the "philosophical," less on "petty details and experiments" and more on "fundamental principles." He also perceived supervisors:

growing more disposed to greater freedom to their teachers in managing and instructing their schools. And I doubt not the day is not far distant when they will quite clearly perceive the advantages that will be gained from availing themselves of all the power that may arise from the free and intelligent thinking of their teachers. (Bicknell, 1885, pp. 310-311)

Taken in the context of his endorsement of Eliot's proposal concerning school faculties and Eliot's assertion of what constitutes educational management of schools, the implications of teachers "managing their schools" probably included teacher participation in curriculum work. The conception of school faculties, i.e., teacher autonomy and involvement in curriculum work, and a "science of education," i.e., the endorsement of the study of pedagogics as part of teacher preparation suggested a way to strengthen the professional status of teaching presented to a national

forum. This could only serve to strengthen the link between these, until now, separate developments.

The reform movement which would become known as the Progressive Movement was another development which would influence curriculum and curriculum development. Callahan (1962) asserted that in addition to the influence of business and industry on education, "the reform movement identified historically with Theodore Roosevelt and spearheaded by muckraking journalists" would also have a significant effect on education after 1900 (p. 2). While the impact would be felt after 1900, the groundwork for the reform movement in education was laid a decade earlier. Callahan (1962) and Cremin (1961) traced the progressive movement in education to Rice's work from 1892 to 1893 which culminated in the publication of The Public-School System of the United States (1893). Rice identified problems such as politically-corrupt school systems and poorly trained teachers in the school systems of the United States. Rice's remedy for these problems was the efficiency and scientific management. Callahan (1962) contended that principles such as efficiency and scientific management tended to strengthen the influence of business and industry on education since these same principles were being applied successfully in these areas.

While Rice (1893) identified problem areas and schools which typified these problems, he also identified schools which, in his perspective, demonstrated exemplary practices.

Rice suggested that one reason that these were exemplary was that teachers were involved in curriculum work. For example, schools in Indianapolis and Minneapolis were rated as the highest class of schools because teachers were involved in unifying the curriculum, that is, developing curriculum in which "the wall between the various branches [of study] . . . disappear, an attempt being made to teach the subjects in their natural relations to each other" (p. 222). Other exemplary curriculum work by teachers was noted at the Cook County Normal School under the leadership of Colonel Francis Parker from 1883 to 1899. Cremin (1961) reported that teachers at the Cook County Normal School were expected to "start where the children were and subtly lead them . . . into the several fields of knowledge, extending meanings and sensitivities along the way" (p. 133). This suggested some degree of input into and control over the curriculum. Cremin reported that Rice was "lyrical about the work calling the faculty 'one of the most enthusiastic, earnest, progressive, and thoughtful corps of teachers that may be found anywhere'" (p. 133).

As education came under closer scrutiny, so did what was taught in schools. Upon until the 1890's, mental discipline was the dominant theory informing curriculum (Kliebard, 1995; Cremin, 1961; Rugg, 1926). Kliebard (1995) contended that "one impetus for change [in the curriculum] came as a consequence of a massive new influx of students into secondary schools" (p. 7). Psychologists such

as G. Stanley Hall, William James, and Edward Thorndyke contributed to new thinking which brought mental discipline into question (Kliebard, 1995; Cremin, 1961). Social changes, advances in science, knowledge about learning, and changes in educational philosophy, along with the increasing criticism of public schools, brought about the gradual decline of mental discipline as a viable theory for learning and foundation for curriculum development. As competing theories concerning curriculum emerged to fill the gap left by the decline of mental discipline, "we see beginning to gel the interest groups that were to become the controlling factors in the struggle for the American curriculum in the twentieth century" (Kliebard, 1995, p. 7). Kliebard identified four groups vying for recognition: the humanists, the child-study movement (led by G. Stanley Hall), the social efficiency educators (exemplified by the thought of writers such as Rice and David Snedden), and the social meliorists (led by Lester Frank Ward) (pp. 23-25). Schubert (1980) acknowledged three groups: the traditionalists, social behaviorists, and experientialists (p. 6). While the labels and configurations varied, there was no disagreement on the fact that there was a wide array of ideas contributing to curriculum thinking during this period.

Along with the increased scrutiny of curricula, curriculum emerged as a separate field of study within education during this time, according to Schubert (1980).

He asserted that curriculum began to be acknowledged as a separate field of study from "philosophy, literature, social sciences, and recently education" (p. 4) at the start of the twentieth century. Cremin (1961) suggested that a starting point was the work of Herbert Spencer:

By the turn of the century a revolution was clearly at hand, and progressives found themselves with a growing body of theory to support the pedagogical reformism they so dearly espoused.

If the revolution had a beginning, it was surely with the work of Herbert Spencer. (p. 91)

If Spencer's book marked the progressive revolution in education, his question "What knowledge is of most worth?" would initiate the change for curriculum. Additionally, as mental discipline as an educational theory was increasingly criticized a void appeared which the growing body of theory referred to by Cremin rushed to fill.

The emergence of curriculum as a field of study was accompanied by a more subtle development. Kliebard (1995) contended that

with the change in the social role of the school came a change in the educational center of gravity: it shifted from the tangible presence of the teacher to the remote knowledge and values incarnate in the curriculum. (p. 1)

This shift brought a scrutiny of the curriculum which had not existed before. Curriculum development became the focus of study, according to Schubert (1980): "[Educators] now wanted to know how curriculum should be developed. Thus began the era of curriculum development" (p. 5). As the center of gravity shifted from the teacher to the curriculum, so, too, did the responsibility for the

curriculum shift from the teacher to the school administrator and curriculum expert. The curriculum was viewed as separate from the teacher as teachers were increasingly portrayed and perceived as poorly trained and as lacking expertise in curriculum matters. Curriculum and curriculum development became an administrative responsibility centered in the superintendent (Rugg, 1926; Sogard, 1909; White, 1893; and, Payne, 1875). This practice, though, would be increasingly challenged throughout the first half of the twentieth century.

The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation

One of the earliest articles located that was specific to teacher involvement in curriculum work appeared in New-England Journal of Education in 1875. Eliot (1875) wrote about "the personal element in teaching" (p. 49) which he proposed as the most valuable characteristic of an effective teacher. He defined "the personal element" as the personal influence that a teacher has on his or her students. In Eliot's thinking, the only way for this "personal element" to be most effective was for the teacher to have "free play" (p. 49). Eliot defined "free play" in this way:

To make himself thoroughly felt, the teacher must be in possession of all the powers natural to his office. His mastery of the plan he is to work by, his control of the instruments he is to work with, his direction of courses and methods, ought to be as nearly independent as is consistent with due subordination to a common system. (p. 49)

Curriculum, i.e., the "plan" the teacher was to work by, and instruction, i.e., the "instruments" and "methods" the

teacher was to use, were suggested to be under the purview of the teacher. However, there was an important qualifier-- "[The teacher] ought to be nearly as independent as is consistent with due subordination to a common system." This will continue to be a point of concern with other advocates. A continuing concern was how to balance the freedom of the individual teacher in matters of curriculum and instruction against the perceived needs, particularly the need for uniformity, of the system. Eliot went on to expand on this point: "Teachers are not absolute, and ought not to be; but they ought to have a great deal of power to do what they think right" (p. 49). If some limits, then, must be placed on the teachers' "free play," then the identification of these limits was important.

Eliot (1875) proposed an organization of the faculty which, in his view, will balance the needs of the teacher against the needs of the system. He divided the "management of the school" into two parts--the educational and the administrative (p. 49). The school committees, or boards, and the superintendents, or commissioners, fell under the administrative heading, while teachers came under the educational. The responsibilities, according to Eliot, which fell under administrative management included "the establishment of schools, the erection of school-buildings, the election and payment of teachers and others in school-service" (p. 49). Those responsibilities which belonged to educational management included:

instruction and discipline in all their relations, courses and exercises, studies and text-books, examinations, terms and vacations, the care of scholars, individually, and in all the detail which individual treatment involves. These are personal matters, every one of them, entering into the character and lives of both teacher and pupil, and demanding a personal consideration which administrative boards are generally unfitted to attempt. (p. 49)

School committees, and other administrative boards, were not fitted to attempt these responsibilities because they were absent from the daily operations of the school.

Additionally, since school committees were not in the school and classroom on a regular basis, they were not able to adequately assess the needs of individual students or plan a course of study for individual or even groups of students.

Eliot (1875) pointed out that superintendents were generally chosen from the teaching ranks, and, that as a relatively new phenomena in education, the use of superintendents had proven effective in many parts of the country. However, their effectiveness was within the realm of administrative management. While there were apparently those who might suggest that superintendents perform both administrative and educational functions, Eliot made it clear that:

while confessing our obligations to the superintendents who have labored in our behalf, it is not ungrateful in us to doubt their being equal to the educational management of the schools in its completeness. In becoming superintendents, they cease to be teachers; they are no longer on the same ground where they stood before, and where, I have ventured to assert, it is best for educational managers to stand. They are in an office whose functions are not rarely educational, but largely administrative; From the very nature of the case- from the two-fold character of the labors committed to them- from the fact that they are

administrators as well as educators, they are, at least to some extent, disqualified for the purely educational details of which teachers, and teachers alone, are the natural masters. It is therefore teachers that I would have these details transferred. (pp. 49-50)

Even though Elliot made it clear that superintendents' functions were primarily administrative, there was still the problem of balancing teacher freedom against the needs of a system in which a school was "linked with others of the same kind, if not the same degree," and which could not "be separated from them without mortal injury" (p. 50). Some organization had to be secured in order to provide this balance.

Elliot (1875) was one of the first to propose a practical way in which to provide for teacher participation in the decision-making process, and specifically input into curriculum which of necessity would become more and more uniform especially in larger school systems. His proposal to the American Institute of Instruction was that

the teachers, as a body, might be allowed to nominate some of their representatives, and from those nominated the school committee might elect not less than ten or more than twenty, to form a school faculty. Wherever annual elections of teachers could be dispensed with, the members of the faculty might be appointed to serve for at least three years, one-third retiring every year. This would insure permanence to the faculty, and yet give an opportunity to call in new members and keep up the interest and confidence of the entire body of teachers. The faculty would bear the same relation to the school committee as is borne by a college faculty to a board of trustees. If its chairman were the superintendent of schools, he would be in a position to assist its work and to connect it with the work of the school committee. It would sustain a relation to the schools and their members like that of a college faculty to the professors and students of its institution. (p. 50)

And what relation would this school faculty have to the curricular and instructional issues of the schools and the system?

[The school faculty] would have authority over instruction and discipline in all its parts. It would decide upon the introduction of new branches and the lopping of old ones, the expansion and contraction of studies, the choice of books, instruments, and methods, . . . (p. 50)

Again, this article was significant for two reasons: It was the earliest located that suggested that teachers should have a direct role in curriculum work and it proposed a plan to put the idea into practice. It was unlikely that these ideas developed in isolation; it was equally unlikely that these ideas did not appear in other periodicals for discussion and criticism. However, no related articles could be located. While there was no evidence that Eliot's proposal had any influence on current or later attempts to put these ideas into practice, his proposal for school faculties was endorsed ten years later at the first National Educational Association conference, and many of the later attempts will be similar in nature to his proposal.

Additionally, there were no explicit links made between professionalism in teaching and teacher participation in curriculum development. However, with prior discussions concerning the issue of teaching as a profession, particularly those advocating teacher freedom, or autonomy, as one means of achieving this goal, this question begged to be asked: Was there an implied link between the idea of "free play," and all that Eliot suggested it entailed, and

the growing focus on teaching as a profession? This link would soon be made more explicit.

In an article entitled "Reform in the Grammar Schools," Hart (1892a) opened with a discussion of how some boards infringe on the professional responsibilities of teachers. Hart proposed that "unthinking persons" would assume that the teaching profession would be accorded professional oversight in matters of "methods of teaching" and "choice of subjects," just as other professions have oversight in matters specific to those professions (p. 235). Hart asserted that while "it might be supposed that at least in the technical matters of curriculum and division of time the teachers would have sway, this is not the case with public schools" (p. 253).

In an analysis of "the distribution of power" in a school system, superintendents had the most power, in Hart's (1892a) opinion, followed by school boards. And while it was "in the power of the school boards to force reforms upon unwilling superintendents," these reforms stood little chance of success "without the aid of the teachers" (pp. 253-254). Educators, such as college presidents, secondary school principals, and "the public at large" came next in order of power. Teachers were last and were "in the unfortunate position of exercising great responsibility without much opportunity to make their preferences felt" (p. 255).

This analysis was a preface to Hart's (1892a) description of a reform which was being tried in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Hart described the reform:

As soon as the newly constituted school committee was organized in January, 1892, a motion was made for the appointment of a special subcommittee to examine into the whole question of the time and subject-matter of the grammar school curriculum. The committee embraced two of the most experienced and conservative members of the board besides some younger and more impulsive spirits. It adopted the plan of holding a kind of invitation meeting. Thus, into one session were introduced superintendents and teachers from those neighboring cities in which new methods and new subjects had been introduced. At another time the masters of the grammar schools were invited to present their views with regard to shortening the grammar school course. Again, a delegation of teachers was in to meet several experts in the new subjects which it was proposed to introduce; and all the members of the school board were at one time or another invited to sit with the committee and to take part in its deliberations. The purpose was that the committee might clearly understand the difficulties in the way of reform, and might put itself so far as possible in the place of those by whom new methods were to be carried out. Most of the objections were thus obviated by changes in the scheme, or at least had been considered, before report was made. The result of the committee's labors, therefore, met with gratifying approval, and their recommendations were adopted, with a few verbal changes, precisely as they were made. (pp. 256-257)

By today's standards this might not seem much of a concession to teachers on a board's part. By standards of the 1890s, for the board to seek teacher input and for board members "to put [themselves] as far as possible in the place of" the teachers who were expected to carry out the changes, must have represented a significant step.

The fact that Hart (1892a) chose the word "reform" to describe the effort suggested its significance for the times. The fact that Hart was a professor at Harvard at

this time and Harvard was involved in assisting with the reform might lead contemporary critics to charge that Hart's and, for that matter, the statements of other writers at this time, were "self-centered and self-aggrandizing" (Kimball, 1992, p. 233). Other contemporary criticisms specific to teacher involvement in curriculum development included charges that efforts were related to principles of scientific management, attempts to introduce efficiency (in a negative connotation) into the system, or attempts to bureaucratize the system to promote administrative control when the reformers themselves indicated other motivations. Kimball (1992) expressed some amazement in the way writers of this period, and their motives, were perceived by contemporary critics:

Such testimony declaring the importance of education is well known to historians; the interesting point is that it is not believed. The growth of science and education and their intimate relationship are not doubted, but the educational enthusiasm, particularly expressed by educationists near the turn of the century, is scarcely credited. In fact, the dominant view in historiography is that educators at all levels constituted a demeaned and relatively undesirable profession. This paradox of an exalted view of education cobbled to a degraded view of the educational profession is partly explained by the neglect of comparative- both temporal and professional- for what is inherently a relative judgment. (p. 230)

While Kimball addressed this charge specifically to education as a profession at the turn of the century, this concern has merit also in a broader sense in education. To make a judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, some criteria for evaluation has to be used. In the absence of other evidence from the period, care must be taken to avoid

presentism, i.e., examining past events through contemporary perspectives, or as Kimball defines presentism, making assumptions that educational issues presented themselves at the beginning of the century in the same way they do at the end (p. 231).

This issue was more problematic as Hart (1892a) continued to describe the teachers' reaction to the reform effort:

The teachers, as soon as they understood that no change would be made without their co-operation, and without their having an opportunity to discuss the details and to suggest amendments, have taken a most gratifying interest in the whole matter. (p. 256)

Whether this was a true assessment of the teachers' reaction to the reform or an educational leaders attempt to put a reform effort he was involved in in a positive light was a matter of interpretation. The best that one can do is speculate in the absence of supporting or contradictory evidence. If the situation in public schools was such that teachers were denied opportunities to participate in the "subject-matter of education, the choice of studies and of text-books, the preparation of courses of study, and the fixing of tests of proficiency" (p. 253) by local boards of education, as Hart asserted, then it would seem likely that teachers would respond positively, at least initially, to an opportunity for input, particularly if they had never had this opportunity previously. On the other hand, Hart's depiction of the teachers' response could possibly be an attempt to promote the reform especially in the light of

Harvard's involvement and the general mood of reform in the progressive atmosphere of the time.

Harvard's involvement, the involvement of "several experts in the new subjects," and the involvement of superintendents and teachers from other schools who had introduced "new methods and new subjects" (p. 256) were notable features of this reform effort. As Hart (1892a) related four new subjects were adopted for the grammar school curriculum as a result of this effort: English literature, geometry, physical geometry, and physics (p. 268). Experts in these subjects and educators from other schools which had introduced these subjects collaborated with the Cambridge committee to provide the information needed to make decisions. Harvard's involvement was to "furnish, at its own expense, normal instruction for the Cambridge teachers" (p. 268) in the teaching of geometry, physics, and physical geography presumably because of the "newness" of these subjects. The fact that these features were highlighted in the article, particularly Harvard's involvement, suggested that they were somewhat unique at the time.

That same year, Hart (1892b) wrote another article, "The Teacher as Professional Expert," which appeared in The School Review and in the Journal of Education in abbreviated form. He introduced this article with a problem that faces those perceived or recognized as experts in a democratic society:

in a country where men are politically equal, it is hard for the community to accept the superiority of experts, even in their own limited fields. The practical man considers himself not only master of his own business, but a better judge of professional matters than the man who has spent his life in acquiring technical knowledge. (p. 5)

Hart suggested that this was how the majority of Americans perceived most professions including the teaching profession. He found this ironic considering that teachers made up "the largest body of educated men and women" (p. 6).

The issue of the level or amount of education as a profession was an interesting one. The assumption that lawyers or physicians were better educated than teachers was not necessarily correct, according to Kimball (1992). When normal schools and teachers colleges were compared to the preeminent professional schools, this might be an accurate assumption. However, the number of preeminent professional schools was small and these schools were highly selective. The number of colleges and universities increased rapidly during this period. Consequently, the quality of many colleges and universities in 1898 was little better than what could be had at a good secondary school, according to the U.S. Commissioner of Education (Kimball, 1992, p. 216). "Likewise," Kimball asserted, "the vast majority of the schools for the learned professions, except divinity, operated at the level of secondary schools or lower" (p. 216). He said this demonstrated "the anachronism of the assumption that legal and medical education occurred at the graduate or even collegiate level" (p. 281). This led to

the "long-standing" perception that the level or quality of education provided by the normal schools and teachers colleges was not comparable to that provided by other professional schools. When viewed in a broad context, however, this was not the case. This led Kimball (1992) to assert that:

the education of schoolteachers was relatively higher than has often been portrayed. In 1910, when no more than 8 percent of those admitted to practice law or medicine were college graduates, the average length of education for male and female secondary school teachers in the country was two years beyond high school. Thus, when the Denver city schools were requiring in 1905 that all high school teachers hold the AB, it would have been an unreasonable standard for Denver lawyers or physicians. Similarly, in Missouri, the normal schools compared quite well to law and medical schools. Through at least 1910, the 'regular' medical schools were found to have 'abysmally low educational standards.' And the law schools were little better. The normal schools, meanwhile, were elevated from the secondary level to 'early college work,' and a study of 299 normal school students who registered at the state university between 1912 and 1915 found that 63 per cent earned better grades than the other university students. (p 282)

That teachers were educated as well as or better than the other professions, when considered in a broad context, makes Hart's observation even more ironic.

Hart (1892b) proposed an examination of three points to determine the real status of teachers. First, was the professional status of teaching. According to Hart, the three characteristics of a profession were specialized training, an organized polity, and a commitment to teaching as a "life-work" (p. 7). What made teaching questionable as a profession, in Hart's mind, was that the long-term commitment was generally lacking and the quality of training

was questionable (pp. 7-8). Hart's perspective on the quality of training provided by the normal schools (he noted that "the Normal Schools at present occupy the same position as the old Medical Schools" (p. 7)) was a case in point for Kimball's (1992) assertion about comparisons of normal and other professional schools. When compared to Harvard, where Hart was a professor at the time, few, if any, normal schools could measure up to those standards. Hart did point out later that the quality of normal schools was improving to the benefit of the teaching profession.

As an aside, the fact that training and commitment were still issues at the turn of the nineteenth century is of interest. These issues continued to be major concerns through the twentieth century. Even at the turn of the twenty first century, Riley (2000) in a speech delivered at the National Conference on Teacher Quality was quoted as stating that there are too few teachers who are well-trained and dedicated to the profession. He maintained that "it's gotten so bad that some schools have been forced to put any warm body in front of a classroom" (p. 46). He further asserted that "it has been estimated that 250,000 teachers are working without proper preparation in course content, or without any kind of training in how to teach" (p. 46). While the historical context and situations may change, many of the basic issues and ideas in education seem not to change.

The second point Hart (1892b), in his article on teaching as a profession, examined in regards to the status of teachers was the degree to which teachers were recognized as experts. Hart contended that what teachers wanted was "not that people look upon [them] as encyclopaedias of learning, but that they should ask and take [teachers'] advice upon strictly professional matters, such as school organization, courses of study, and school methods" (p. 9). The problem was, according to Hart, that teachers were viewed more as government employees than as members of a profession- "[teachers] are not retained like lawyers, but hired like letter carriers" (p. 9). The solution to the problem was that teachers be treated as the experts in educational matters, especially "over the selection of studies" (p. 10).

What constituted a curriculum expert was unclear. Expertise implied knowledge and experience in the area of expertise. A curriculum expert would have knowledge in curriculum and experience with curriculum work. As a new field of study, curriculum theory was in its infancy. Most curriculum experience could be found with teachers and pioneers such as Parker and Dewey. Schubert (1980) suggested a less precise method for becoming a curriculum expert during this period:

the early Twentieth Century brought a gradual growth in curriculum books that portrayed the evolution of curriculum as a separate sub-field With this evolution came the emergence of unwritten standards for becoming a legitimate member of the expanding curriculum coterie. For example, to have a curriculum

scholar as one's mentor enhanced one's chances of becoming a recognized curriculum scholar or practitioner. One became known as curriculum authority if one published books or articles with curriculum in the title. (p. 6)

What constituted a curriculum expert and who could be considered an expert was problematic, at best.

The third point in Hart's (1892b) examination focused on the improvement of the professional status of teaching. He cited three trends which were improving the profession. First, Hart considered the quality of education provided by the normal schools to be improving. Second, the "scientific study of pedagogy" (p. 12) was beginning to exert influence in university training. Third, through the collaborative efforts of universities and colleges many practicing teachers were able to benefit from extension courses and the like. He noted the efforts of Harvard with the Cambridge teachers as one example.

In sum, the primary way in which to promote teachers as experts in their profession and improve the status of the teaching profession, in Hart's (1892b) view, was to provide teachers freedom, and autonomy, particularly in curriculum matters. He suggested that one reason that it was necessary for teachers to be able to make decisions about the selection of subjects was that teachers had to "take each child as we find him, and give him all the training that his mental powers allow, up to the point reached by our schools" (p. 13). In other words, one reason teachers needed control of the curriculum was because of the complex decisions that

they had to make about the learning of each individual student. Uniformity, the expectation that all students learn the same thing, was "the great bane of American education" (p. 14), according to Hart. He concluded by suggesting, also, that allowing teachers the opportunity "to think, to suggest and criticise" (p. 14), presumably on curricular issues, would, in addition to allowing teachers to educate children more effectively, improve the teaching profession.

In another article on teachers as experts, Dunton (1893) suggested that assumptions based on "crude views" and "antiquated opinions" have hampered education (p. 327). Dunton indicated that one of these was the presumption that "any man of learning, or any man who has received the majority of the votes of his town or city, is on this account competent to direct all matters of education" (p. 327) and specifically the preparation of a course of study. This question would challenge writers up until the present: What qualifies a person as an expert in curriculum or curriculum development?

Dunton (1893) proposed five criteria that qualified a person to prepare a course of study:

1. He must know the aim, or purpose of education. . . .
2. He must be acquainted with the process of education as it takes place in the mind of the child. . . .
3. He must know the different classes of educators, and the part that each class is to perform in the work of education. . . .
4. He must know the means needed for causing in the child that part of the process of education which should be performed in school. . . .

5. Before a man is prepared to make a course of study, he must be fairly familiar with the doctrine of educational values (pp. 328-329)

These qualities, according to Dunton, would allow a person to make a course of study that would meet the needs of students. While Dunton did not list knowledge of the students that the course of study was being prepared for as a quality, he did suggest in summary that the person preparing the course of study should be "tolerably familiar" with the "origin and destiny" of the students for whom the course of study was prepared (p. 330). Dunton also maintained that the supervision of teachers required the same or similar knowledge and skill. Unfortunately, for Dunton, both curriculum-making and supervision were being conducted by those he considered lacking in expertise, namely the school boards.

Dunton's (1893) solution to the problem was that "teachers are to be selected and appointed on account of their professional knowledge and skill, and that they are to be trusted and deferred to as experts" (p. 332). He considered making courses of study "the most important work next after teaching" (p. 333). It was interesting that for Dunton curriculum was secondary to instruction. The expert, then, who was fit to teach should be qualified to participate in the development of the curriculum.

There were, of course, a variety of perspectives about how to make a course of study and who should be involved in its development. That most courses of study were developed

by those other than teachers (e.g., superintendents, school committees) and with little or no input from teachers was a given. Many of the articles cited so far pointed out the conflicts resulting from decisions made by school boards and superintendents without the involvement of teachers. Many of the articles cited here also implied that only teachers should be involved in the development of the curriculum. There was also a perspective which viewed the making of a course of study as not an "either-or" proposition. For example, Schurman (1893) found it "a hopeful sign" that college and university educators and public school educators were collaborating, not only for the work on the Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies, "but for all our educational interests" (p. 67). Schurman warned that letting teachers make their own curriculum should be avoided if it meant excluding "persons of larger scholarship and wider training" (p. 67). He noted that there were "few educational gatherings" in which the idea of teachers making their own curriculum did not get attention (p. 67).

Eliot (1894) also praised the collaborative efforts of educators on the work of the Committee of Ten. The purpose of this article was to address the criticism of "college men" dictating what should be taught in secondary schools. The crux of the objections, according to Eliot, was:

More than half of the members of the Conferences were at the moment in the service of colleges and universities, and the same was true of the Committee of Ten. The wise management of schools for children of from six to eighteen years of age is a different

business from the wise management of colleges and universities. (p. 209)

Eliot maintained that educational reforms, whether in the kindergarten or in the university, were essentially the same. He cited six principles and objectives of educational reform which apply to all levels. The first was that instruction must be individualized. The second was the focus on the six fundamental objectives of any educational effort: training of the organs of sense; practice in grouping, comparing, and making inferences; training in recording observations and making comparisons; training in written and oral expression; and, instilling the "ideals of beauty, honor, duty, and love." Third was the recognition that the "true end of education" was "effective power in action." The fourth principle was the "selection or election of courses" which, according to Eliot, applied to "two thirds of the entire educational course between five and twenty five." Training in discipline (e.g., habit, self-control) was the fifth objective. The final principle was the "specialization of teaching" (pp. 211-220). Again, these principles and objectives of educational reform, Eliot asserted, were applicable at all levels of education and should serve to unite all educators in their reform efforts.

Eliot (1894) also pointed out what he viewed as an organizational policy which was also basic at all educational levels. This was:

the policy, namely, that administrative officers in educational organizations should be experts, and not amateurs or emigrants from other professions, and that

teachers should have large advisory functions in the administration of both schools and universities. (p. 221)

He suggested how teachers might be organized to bring their influence to bear on educational decisions:

all teachers of a single system should be associated together in such a way that by their representatives they can bring their opinions to bear on the superintendent and his council, or in the last resort on the committee or board which has the supreme control of the system. The teachers of the same subject should also be organized for purposes of mutual consultation and support; and at their head should be placed the best teacher of the subject in the whole system, that his influence may be felt throughout the system in the teaching of that subject. (p. 222)

Eliot contended that efforts to increase the "official influence" (p. 223) of teachers in public schools, among other types of reform measures, were underway in spite of doubts that reforms at colleges and universities were applicable to public schools.

That teachers be involved in the decision-making process seems logical given that most of the fundamental principles and objectives of educational reform ultimately are teacher-focused. For example, the individualization of instruction or the training in observation would be accomplished by the teacher. This suggested that Eliot realized that the reform efforts of the Committee of Ten had little chance of success without public school teacher support. Given the fact that one of the criticisms that Eliot was addressing was that the curriculum reforms proposed by the Committee of Ten were perceived to be an intrusion by college and university leaders into the realm

of public schools, of which these leaders supposedly had no knowledge, Eliot's claim that teachers should be and were involved in the decision-making process might be perceived as disingenuous.

Eliot (1894), however, contended that the curriculum reforms proposed by the committee, of which it should be noted he was chair, were not their primary achievement. What was of greater significance was the method in which the committee went about to arrive at their recommendations. That method was to involve teachers, among others, of all educational levels in the investigation and discussion which took place prior to provide the Committee of Ten with the information which helped to formulate their recommendations. Eliot asserted that this method emphasized the value of collaborative efforts in reform attempts (pp. 224-225).

On the whole, the greatest promise of usefulness which I see in the Report of the Committee of Ten lies in its obvious tendency to promote co-operation among school and college teachers and all other persons intelligently interested in education, for the advancement of well-marked and comprehensive educational reform. (pp. 225-226)

While critics charged that the Committee of Ten was infringing on the work of schools and trying to force the expectations of a few college and university leaders on the schools, Eliot suggested that just the opposite was true. More importantly, the committee's work put into practice what he was advocating at all levels of education.

Additionally, from the perspective of teacher participation in curriculum work, the work of the Committee

of Ten might be considered an effort, while not the primary effort, to involve educators from all levels in curriculum development on a national scale. Rugg (1926) asserted that "until the work of the Committee of Ten there was little or no cooperation among teachers and specialists in committees or other organized groups for the careful discussion of the content and arrangement of the curriculum' (p. 30).

Certainly, from a contemporary perspective, critics might find fault with this contention. The National Council of Education, which initiated the work of the committee, was made up of the elite educational leaders of the day. The Committee of Ten was composed primarily of college and university leaders. The effort was not initiated by school teachers nor was it necessarily the idea of school teachers, even though the National Council of Education was a part of the National Education Association. The National Education Association itself was dominated by administrators (Willis, et al, 1994, p. 73). The number of school teachers involved in the work of the subcommittees would be a subject of debate. Nevertheless, Eliot's assertions that school teachers were involved in the work of the subcommittees, that the effort was a collaborative one, and that these factors were the Committee of Ten's most significant accomplishment must be given some recognition.

Parker (1894), in an address delivered at the annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence in Richmond, concurred with Eliot's assessment that the involvement of

teachers was the most significant achievement of the Committee of Ten's work. Parker declared that "the great merit of the Report of the Committee of Ten lies in the fact that it magnifies the importance of the teacher" (p. 147). Parker continued with a discussion of the importance of teacher freedom and how to go about fostering teacher freedom.

Colonel Francis W. Parker, in fact, was a good example of Kimball's (1994) contention that mobility within the field of education influenced the perception and development of teaching as a profession. In a biography written as an introduction to Notes of Talks on Teaching, Patridge (1883) detailed Parker's educational career as a teacher, principal, supervisor, principal of a normal school, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. Interestingly enough, especially in the light of the preceding and forthcoming discussion of his advocacy for and practice of allowing teachers freedom in professional decisions, Cremin (1961) described Parker as an autocrat who was loved by his teachers and pupils (p. 132). Cremin noted that Dewey called Parker "the father of the progressive movement" (p. 21). It was interesting in that Parker could be perceived as an autocrat, the founder of progressivism in education, and an advocate for teacher freedom all at the same time.

Winship (1900) claimed, in a retrospective of Parker's term as superintendent in Quincy, Massachusetts, from 1875 to 1880, that the "first great inspiration which came

through [Parker's] work in Quincy was freedom to the teacher" (p. 259). For Parker, there must be nothing which hampered the work of the teacher. While ideas of Parker's were incorporated into the school system, "satisfaction at a revelation through his own thought was nothing in comparison with one that came through one of his teachers" (p. 259). Teachers' ideas were considered and incorporated into the Quincy schools' plans and programs. Teacher input and autonomy was viewed as a sign of professional power. As Winship stated Parker gained great personal satisfaction from "the professional power of his teachers, a power secured through freedom" (p. 259).

Parker (Patridge, 1883) continued to advocate teacher freedom in instruction and in the development of the course of study after his tenure in Quincy. In his lectures at the Martha's Vineyard Summer Institute, Parker asserted that

perfect freedom should be given the teacher to do the best work in her own way. That is, the highest good of the child should be the sole aim of the teacher, without the slightest regard for false standards.
(quoted in Patridge, 1883, p. 154)

Parker, in examining the fallacies of some criticisms of teachers, pointed out teacher concerns about inadequate courses of study and how these courses of study inhibit good teachers (pp. 154-155).

In his address to the Department of Superintendence introduced previously, Parker (1894) restated this belief of the need for teacher freedom: "Teachers must be more independent. They must have greater freedom. They must

appreciate and assert their individuality" (p. 147). Freedom had to include teacher participation in decisions on curricular and instruction. The way in which teachers would have more influence in the educational matters that affected them was "to do more by way of aggressive discussion of educational problems and values" (p. 148). The setting for "aggressive discussions" to take place was the 'local teachers' meeting" (p. 148).

The success of a teachers' meeting, according to Parker (1894), was dependent on each teacher "contributing the best he has for all" (p. 148). He proposed an outline of activities which he suggested would foster such a meeting. First, he maintained that "some skillful teacher should be the leader therein" (p. 148). Each teacher attending the meeting would be expected, among other activities, to "state clearly what he has definitely in mind toward improving his school," "present his opinion upon the subjects he is teaching, upon what he would eliminate, upon what he would like added," and share principles which guided his practice (p. 148). In other words, those attending the teachers' meeting were expected to share their views on curricular improvement and what each was doing instructionally that was effective. Parker stated that there were three standard questions posed to each teacher at every meeting: (1) "What do you need in school to materialize your ideals?" (2) "What modifications are needed in your school plans or program?" (3) "What changes will help you in the text-books

or in their use?" (p. 148). Teacher input into school plans and programs, and control of instructional resources and materials sound similar to current proposals for site-based or school-based governance programs. While Parker may have been an autocrat as Cremin suggested, he proposed a facilitative role for administrators here. He concluded that the teachers' meetings were invaluable because "no change can be made satisfactorily that does not come from the fullest, freest discussion by the teachers themselves" (p. 148). This would continue to be the practice at least until 1926 when at the Francis W. Parker School in Chicago, Cooke and Osborne (1926) reported that

the classroom teachers have always helped to determine and develop the curriculum. These teachers have been free to modify both content and method to fit the particular needs of particular groups of children. They have been encouraged to experiment, even radically to change the content of the curriculum, subject only to the condition that they be able to convince the faculty and the principal of the desirability of the experiment or the value of the innovation that they wish to make. The resulting spirit of freedom and of cooperative responsibility has had a vital influence, not only in shaping the actual curriculum, but also in building up the spirit of the school (p. 309)

Parker's work with teachers through these teachers' committees was influential in Dewey's work at the University of Chicago laboratory school.

In 1896, Dewey began the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago. How the curricular and instructional issues were addressed by Dewey and the teachers at the school has previously been described and was well-documented by others such as Mayhew and Edwards (1936). Nevertheless,

it is important to emphasize that teachers played a primary decision-making role in curricular and instructional matters in the Laboratory School. This fundamental belief was alluded to in "My Pedagogic Creed" (Dewey, 1897). Dewey stated that the school was a social institution and education was a social process. The ultimate goal of the school was to "[bring] the child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for social ends" (p. 78). The teacher's role was not "to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child," which was what traditional schooling attempted, but the teacher's role was "to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences" (p. 78). The selection "of the influences which shall affect the child" formed the basis of the "working hypotheses" that he referred to in the work done at the Laboratory School. He and the teachers worked to test these "selected influences" in practice. The "working hypotheses" were formulated in discussions held during teachers' meetings much in the same format suggested by Parker earlier. To a great degree, it could be said that not only were teachers involved in the development of the curriculum of Laboratory School, but largely responsible for its development.

In Isolation in the School, Young (1901) asserted that "the level of power of the educational system is determined by the degree in which the principle of cooperation is made

incarnate in developing and realizing the aim of the school" (p. 10). The public school system was a primary example of the influences of isolation, according to Young (p. 18). While critics charged that teachers were opposed to change and were the reason for continued practice of outdated theories and methods, "change has been written large over every theory and method of instruction and management" (p. 22). Changes made "in a way that is hostile to the spirit by which the highest type of character is developed in rational beings" only served to create teachers who adopted "the new, without previous thought as to its desirability, without activity of the intellectual conscience" (p. 22). According to Young, it was imperative to "keep alive the mental process in the individuals of the educational force, so that many of the best among the applicants for certificates would not become inefficient while actually engaged in teaching" (p. 23). The basic thesis, then, was that when teachers were isolated from the "aim" of the school or school system, i.e., teachers were not allowed to participate in the decision-making processes of the school or system, the result was an ineffective and inefficient teaching force.

For Young (1901), the "aim" of the school system or the school was interpreted as the course of study and the "more the aim was defined by the superintendent or the principal, the less unity will characterize it in the teaching force" (p. 24). Some of the objections she predicted would be

offered to all teachers participating in determining the course of study included that there would be as many aims as there were teachers, teachers were satisfied with the status quo, teachers had too many other responsibilities, and teachers had "no ideals to set up" (pp. 23-24).

The "business of supervision," as the popular conception of the time would define it, came about as a result of efforts to standardize methods, introduce new subjects into the curriculum, and "the strong administrative character to guide" rather than be the one on "the treadmill" (Young, 1901, p. 27). Supervision, according to Young, posed as many problems as it attempted to solve such as "the strong tendency at present time to get away from the active work of teaching children," the conflict posed by a supervisor who was a "person *in* power rather than a person *of* power," and "the creature comforts" [i.e., higher salaries and elaborately furnished offices] which became "a natural outcome of the withdrawal from the duties of direct teaching" (p. 31). Young asserted that what was being called "close supervision" would have negative effects on teachers. Close supervision resulted in a misguided attention to details which were better left to teachers. Eventually, teachers ceased "to occupy the position of initiators in the individual work of instruction and discipline, and must fall into the class of assistants, whose duty consists in carrying out instructions of a higher class which originates method for all" (pp. 106-107). The

implication was that the need for supervision developed as a direct result of teachers being isolated from the aim, or the course of study, of the school or system.

Young (1901) illustrated the problem of isolation with a powerful analogy:

Daily one sees teachers trying to hold a class to some statement in the text-book that is without content for the pupils, or to a chain of reasoning that is but a form to them, and then, after creating conditions foreign to those under which thought plays freely, say with much fervor: "Think! Think! You must think. Why don't you think?" How much difference is there between this method of the teachers and that of principals and superintendents who announce their conclusions in theory and their ideals in practice, and then say to the teachers, "Take these thoughts of mine and be original in using them?" (p. 32)

When an idea or change originated in one part of the school or system, i.e., the administration, and was forced on another part of the school or system, i.e., the teachers, in addition to teachers' effectiveness being reduced, a "peculiar" reaction took place, according to Young. This reaction was evidenced in such occurrences as the function of the principal being reduced to "sitting in the office" taking care of responsibilities not directly related to teaching children or teachers' perceptions that they are "the only part [of the school] that works" (p. 33).

Young (1901) proposed that the course of study, the curriculum, was also isolated- from social life which should logically be its basis. The reality was that much of the curriculum was based on subject matter which had been rejected as "having been made useless by modern thought and invention" and by social life "as cumbersome and needlessly

wearisome" (p. 38). When new subject matter had been adopted, it had been added to the existing curriculum rather than replacing other out-dated subject matter. As the subject-matter expanded, teachers' work was reduced to drudgery as they tried to prepare for teaching various unrelated subjects and assess student performance based on minutiae. Administrators recognized those teachers who perfected the drudgery as "faithful" and "conscientious" (pp. 39-41). The result of the dull routine, the drudgery, and the isolation was a "deprivation of the exercise of inherent powers, both originative and constructive-negation" (p. 44). Young (1901) contended that a positive result of the isolation and overloading of the curriculum was that:

in the attempt to retain all subjects, attention was drawn to the isolation of each, and for a brief period the opposite of isolation, *i.e.*, correlation, was the watchword of the day. There is as yet but slight change in the opinion of the two opposing parties on the subject of state education, yet is influencing the other and bringing the subject of the course of study of the schools into the field of social inquiry. (pp. 95-96)

Young's statement confirmed Schubert's (1980) later assertion that curriculum development as a formal area of inquiry began at the turn of the twentieth century:

In essence, [educators] now wanted to know how curriculum should be developed for schools. Thus began the era of curriculum development as a separate sub-area of specialization within the study of education. (pp. 4-5).

From this point on, then, it stands to reason that there should be an increase in the rhetoric and the practices of

involving teachers in curriculum development, not as a result of Young's work but as evidenced by it.

Young (1901) concluded her treatise with a recommendation for securing freedom of thought in the teaching and reducing the resultant isolation. Her recommendation was similar to those proposed by Eliot and Parker earlier. That her recommendations would also bear similarities to those practiced by Dewey was not surprising, given her work with Dewey as a student at the University of Chicago and colleague in the Laboratory School. It should also be noted that Young worked as a supervisor of instruction at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago under Dewey. She recommended school councils at each building which would be composed of teacher representatives. The purpose of the school councils was to "insure a free play of thought and its expression" (p. 108). Additionally, Young suggested that there would be a central council composed of delegates from each school council. Teacher recommendations would be presented for consideration to the superintendent. Any points of contention in recommendations would be presented to school councils, with the superintendent in attendance, for further discussion. If a point of contention could not be resolved satisfactorily, the superintendent "*should act in accordance with his own judgment, and be held responsible for the outcome*" (p. 109). Young indicated the superintendent's decision would not come as a surprise in that the purpose of

the open discussion was to familiarize "all with the essentials involved, and those sharp breaks in theory and practice which have been made in the past would no longer be possible" (p. 109). Open discussion would require decisions "based on theory; not mere experimentation, based on personal preferences" (p.109).

Whereas Eliot, Parker, and Dewey all proposed or practiced teacher participation in a school or small system setting, Young's proposal was flexible. It allowed for adaptation by a school, a small school system, or a large system. This would prove useful in her later work as superintendent of Chicago schools.

In an address to the Illinois Teachers' Association, Lane (1902) asserted that "teachers should have a voice in the matter of determining the course of study, the text-books to be used, the methods and plans for securing effective work" (p. 216). He further asserted that some organization of teachers should be created to consider "all important school changes, especially those relating to teacher's work" (p. 216). He cited as an example the "school, district, and central councils" established in Chicago in 1900. These councils, according to Lane,

provided a way in which any modification of the course of study or any important educational reform or movement may be initiated by any teacher, or school corps of teachers, or by any district represented by all the principals and one appointed representative of the assistant teachers of each school, or by a central council represented by selected delegates from the district councils. (p. 216)

The proposed modification would then be discussed in the several councils and a written plan presented to the superintendent or the school board for their consideration and action.

This innovation apparently continued for several years with various modifications. Jackman (1906) discussed a proposal before the Chicago Board of Education which, among other things, included "organization of all the principals and teachers in each district" and for "these organized bodies to act in a supervising capacity in the direction of educational affairs of the district" (p. 265). District superintendents were to be replaced by "twelve teachers holding principals' certificates, to be selected by the organized principals and teachers in each district; these teachers to serve as critics" (p. 265). Jackman noted the general negative reaction of the public at least as presented by the newspapers of Chicago. He attributed the negative reaction to the public's desire to have a school system run in a business-like manner. At the same time, current innovative business practices included soliciting employee input in business decisions. It should be noted that Jackman served as a teacher under Francis Parker at the Cook County Normal School. Jackman considered the public confused or misinformed about business practice. Additionally, school boards acted less than business-like when they ignored suggestions "from the outside" (p. 266), in Jackman's view.

The next year, the actual proposal was presented in at least two other education publications- in abbreviated form in The Elementary School Teacher and in its entirety in the Chicago Teachers' Federation Bulletin (Sub-committee of the School Management Committee of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1907). In addition to the principle points summarized by Jackman, the proposal cited expert opinion as supporting evidence. Charles W. Elliot, then President of Harvard University, asserted that

Teachers should have large advisory functions in the administration of both schools and universities. . . .
. All the teachers of a single system should be associated together in such a way that by their representatives they can bring their opinions to bear on the superintendent and his council, or, in the last resort, on the committee or board which has supreme control of the system. (Jackman, 1906, p. 2)

Nicholas Murray Butler, then President of Columbia University, suggested that

All teachers who have passed the probationary period and are serving on a permanent appointment should be ex-officio members of a teachers' council, which should meet regularly for the discussion of questions relating to text books, courses of study, methods of teaching, and so on. . . . I need not enlarge on the great advantage that will follow from giving teachers a direct voice in the matters that directly concern them. Such a policy promotes the solidarity of the school system and tends to harmony and order as well as to increase the efficiency of the teaching force.
(Jackman, 1906, p. 2)

Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart contended that

For the participation of teachers in school organizations there are many positive reasons. In the first place, the community needs their expert advice. . . . They are in a better position than their supervisors to discover at least the minor defects of school systems. . . . Not to draw upon the results of their experience is to waste a part of the nation's resources. . . . The teachers need the stimulus of

debate and of formulating opinions which go on record.
. . . . The Superintendent will not be harmed by
organized advice. . . . School boards need such
direct relations with their teachers. (Jackman, 1906,
p. 2)

The final quote, taken from Dewey (1903), has already been
discussed at length but bears repeating:

Until the public-school system is organized in such a
way that every teacher has some regular and
representative way in which he or she can register
judgment upon matters of educational importance, with
the assurance that this judgment will somehow affect
the school system, the assertion that the present
system is not, from the internal standpoint, democratic
seems to be justified. Either we come here upon some
fixed and inherent limitation of the democratic
principle, or else we find in this fact an obvious
discrepancy between the conduct of the school and the
conduct of social life- a discrepancy so great as to
demand immediate and persistent effort at reform. (p.
2)

The reasoning of the subcommittee in proposing the teachers
be organized into "an official consultative and advisory
body" (p. 1) was based on two propositions: teachers were
"more intimately related to the work of educating the public
school children than any other department" and teachers, and
therefore the school system, would never achieve the desired
level effectiveness as long as their judgments could not
achieve official recognition and consideration. This
reasoning was similar to Dewey's in "Democracy in Education"
(1903) where he contended that "democracy means freeing
intelligence for independent effectiveness- the emancipation
of the mind as an individual organ to do its work" (p. 193).
As long there were no policies and procedures for involving
teachers in issues of curriculum and instruction, then

teachers' intelligence and effectiveness would be restricted.

In another article entitled "Democracy in Education" appearing in The Elementary School Teacher, Kinley (1906), influenced by the political and business scandals resulting from "ring rule and bossism" (p. 377), expressed concern about the increasing bureaucratization of educational organizations and tendency toward the control of educational organizations by one person or small group of people. The emphasis on administration, according to Kinley, relegated teaching to a position of secondary importance. For Kinley, the essential question centered on who should make decisions related to educational matters.

The popular conception of a well-administered school or school system was one which had a high degree of uniformity in curriculum and method and was run efficiently. By contrast, Kinley (1906) described the ideal school or system as one which had no uniformity, "because each individual pupil would be treated according to his specific characteristics" (p. 384). This implied that the teacher must determine curriculum and methods to accommodate the needs of individuals. Additionally, the school or system could only be as good as the degree to which they allowed their teachers to determine the course of study and methods which "contribute to the growth of the people whom they affect" (p. 385). With this "free action" must come the

"responsibility for the consequences of that action" (p. 385).

Kinley (1906), if not influenced by Dewey, expressed a similar thought on intelligent action, i.e., intelligent teaching, and participating in the decision-making process:

The teaching itself, of course, can be done only by the teachers, but teaching involves more than merely 'imparting instruction.' Teaching cannot be intelligently done unless the teacher participates in the way that I have described, in shaping the policy of the school system of which he is part. (p. 392)

In that line of thought, "the curriculum should be democratic in character" (p. 395). Teachers must be involved in the development of the curriculum in order to be effective teachers. Not only teachers should be involved, but the community should have input and even students should be involved with "the guidance and advice of parents and teachers Opportunity for selection of studies develops the judgment and the sense of responsibility" (p. 395).

As Young (1901) suggested, and Schubert (1980) later reasserted, curriculum as a formal and separate field of inquiry started to develop at the beginning of the twentieth century. One evidence of this is the growth in the number of books on the subject of curriculum that can be found beginning in 1900. Schubert (1980) pointed out that "books identified by their authors as curriculum books were virtually non-existent prior to 1900" (p. 5). From 1900 to 1909, Schubert identified fifteen books written on the subject of curriculum. Many of these books solely addressed

the curriculum question- What knowledge is of most worth? However, as Schubert also maintained, the beginning of the twentieth century brought the question of curriculum development, i.e., how curriculum should be developed for the schools, to the forefront and some of the curriculum books identified by Schubert began to address this issue.

For example in a chapter entitled "The Teacher Versus the Course of Study," McMurry (1906) examined the relationship between the teacher and the curriculum. He suggested that teachers needed an externally-developed course of study because they did not have time to participate in the its development and because many did not have the expertise "to lay out a plan for all grades in all subjects" (p. 19). A course of study which was "liberally and practically laid out on the basis of matured theory and experience" would serve as an effective guide for inexperienced as well as experienced teachers (p. 20). The course of study must be "very flexible, so as to suit many kinds of teachers and schools and sorts of children" (p. 21).

At the same time, McMurry (1906) maintained that "the freedom and spontaneity of the teacher should be guarded and encouraged" (p. 21). In order to accomplish this, the course of study "should be an outline of leading topics rather than a description of details" (p. 21). Most courses of study, according to McMurry, were so detailed so as to leave the teacher little opportunity for creative

initiative. McMurry contended that real teacher freedom would be found "in the power to modify the course [of study] in regard to the selection and emphasis of topics, and especially in all the details of executing plans" (p. 21). While the curriculum should be developed by curriculum experts, teachers should have the freedom to modify the curriculum as their professional judgment led them to meet the needs of their students.

Another example can be found in Dewey's The Educational Situation (1904). Dewey distinguished between the administrative and educational sides of the educative process in much the same way as Eliot (1875) did earlier. Dewey pointed out that the tendency was to ignore the impact that the administrative side (e.g., grouping of students, grade organization and arrangement, curriculum development, curriculum implementation, hiring and assigning of faculty, and promotion and pay) had on educational purposes and ideals. Dewey asserted that the reality of education was "found in the personal and face-to-face contact of teacher and child" (p. 23). This contact could not be achieved through administrative policies and procedures. Dewey contended that this contact dominated the whole educative process and it was "in this contact that the real course of study, whatever be laid down on paper, is actually found" (p. 23).

In that same vein that Young presented isolation and its effects on the school, Dewey (1904) suggested that

teacher effectiveness was reduced when the teacher cannot "see" and understand the interrelationships in the whole educative process when the teacher was excluded from, or isolated from, parts of this process. The way in which the course of study was created was one example. An externally-developed curriculum, i.e., one developed by the board of education, superintendent, or supervisor, "by a power outside the classroom" (p. 33), ignored the contact between teacher and child.

Through that contact, the teacher was in one way a filter for what was presented to the child. The curriculum, the textbook, and any other materials and resources were mediated by the teacher. Consequently, Dewey (1904) contended that

what gets to the child is dependent upon what is in the mind and consciousness of the teacher, and upon the way that it is in his mind. . . . just in the degree in which the teacher's understanding of the material of the lessons is vital, adequate, and comprehensive, will that material come to the child in the same form; in the degree in which the teacher's understanding is mechanical, superficial and restricted, the child's appreciation will be correspondingly limited and perverted. (pp. 33-34)

The teacher's understanding of the curriculum became "mechanical, superficial, and restricted" when he or she did not participate in its development.

When the teacher did not participate in the development of the course of study, the course of study remained "an external thing to be externally applied to the child" (Dewey, 1904, p. 33). Dewey described the results of a curriculum which was imposed on the teacher and student:

Doubtless the experience of the individual teacher who makes the connections between these things and the life of the child will receive incidental attention in laying out these courses. But, so long as the teacher has no definite voice, the attention will be only incidental; and as a further consequence, the average teacher will give only incidental study to the problems involved. If his work is the task of carrying out the instructions imposed upon him, then his time and thought must be absorbed in the matter of execution. There is no motive for interest, of a thoroughly vital and alert sort, in questions of the intrinsic value of the subject-matter and its adaptation to the needs of child growth. He may be called upon by official requirements, or the pressure of circumstance, to be a student of pedagogical books and journals; but conditions relieve him of the necessity of being a student of the most fundamental problems in their urgent reality. (pp. 31-32)

As Dewey suggested earlier in "Democracy in Education" (1903), participation in the whole educative process served to develop the professional intellect of the teacher and the effectiveness of the teacher depended on his or her "intellectual equipment" (p. 34).

Since the practice of involving teachers in the development of curriculum was relatively new and limited during the period of 1890 to 1910, literature documenting teacher perceptions of the idea and practice was sparse. Sparser still were teacher-authored pieces on teacher participation in curriculum development. Most of the literature at this time concerning teacher participation and related areas, was authored by college professors and school administrators. This would continue to be the trend through the first four decades of the twentieth century. If the assertion that educators were highly mobile within the educational field is accepted and its corollary that the

occupational divisions within the teaching field were more blurred than in other professions is also accepted, then the orientation of the author may be less important for these early articles.

The relative absence of teacher-authored articles and texts on the subject of teacher participation might very well be attributable to the same factors that inhibited the actual practice of teacher participation in curriculum development. For example, the predominant perception that teachers were poorly trained and educated may have convinced journal editors and text publishers that teachers had little to contribute. This was certainly the predominant view in discussions concerning teacher participation in curriculum development. There were those, however, who were interested in teachers' perceptions for various reasons. Efforts were made to investigate teachers' perceptions concerning their participation in curriculum work.

For example, a study conducted by Brochhausen (1908) suggested that teachers endorsed the idea of their participation in curriculum development. A survey containing three questions was submitted to teachers in cities in New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Indiana, Minnesota, and Ohio. The three questions were: What has aided and inspired you most as a teacher? What assistance from superintendents (or supervisors) has been most helpful? Can you suggest anything more helpful to teachers than the

needs now employed? One hundred and fifty responses were received (p. 249).

Of interest to a discussion of teacher involvement in curriculum work, were the teachers' responses to the third question. Brochhausen (1908) called special attention to one suggestion- "a co-operative planning of the curriculum" (p. 262). Brochhausen recalled a specific response:

It would increase interest through participation. All teachers criticize the course of study more or less, but for the most part unconsciously. I think it (the co-operative planning) is *the* way to get the best work for the children, and a needed means of inspiring teachers. (p. 262)

Brochhausen noted that nine other respondents expressed the "wish that there might be a better planning, through the co-operative work of teachers with superintendents and supervisors" (p. 264). Six other respondents recommended that "greater freedom be given to the teacher" (p.264). Although teacher participation had not been widely-practiced during this time, there was evidence to suggest an interest on the part of teachers.

Early Practices

To this point, the examples of practice have been limited, with the work of Parker and Dewey being most notable. The examples of practice, however, began to increase toward the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. An editorial piece entitled "Participation of Teachers in Educational Policies" (1909), made this point and highlighted the work of Superintendent Stratton D. Brooks in Boston as an example of effective practice. The

description of his work was taken directly from his annual report to the board. One challenge for growing school systems, according to Brooks, was the issue of providing instruction which was appropriate to the needs of the individual and providing "reasonable uniformity of aims, methods, and material" in a system "where pupils change yearly from district to district" (p. 30). If "separate schools of the same school system should have reasonable uniformity in aims, purposes and policies," the administrative challenge became the nature of these policies and "who shall determine them" (p. 30).

Brooks (Participation of teachers in educational policies, 1909) asserted that "one grave defect in American education is the lack of any *institutional* method for the participation of teachers in major educational policies" (p. 30). In most systems, educational policies were determined administratively, usually by a superintendent or principal. Stability became a problem since educational policies changed as administrators changed. Additionally, a "lack of [professional] responsibility" developed among the teachers along with "the growth of a feeling of waiting for orders rather than a feeling of intelligent participation" in the development of educational policies (p. 30).

Just as autocratic control was a problem, allowing individual teachers to teach without regard for cooperatively developed school plan and the work of colleagues was just as intolerable. While individual

freedom "may produce contentment," individual freedom leads to "educational chaos" (Participation of teachers in educational policies, 1909, p. 30). Brooks' answer to these challenges was

an organization that provides for the fullest consideration of educational policies by teachers, by principals, and by the supervisory force, wherein every major problem may be discussed with fullest harmony and with most complete information as to its bearing upon the interests of the pupils, of teachers, and of the community. Such an organization . . . would guarantee a professional rather than a personal consideration of school problems. (p. 30)

Teacher participation ultimately provided professional consideration of educational problems.

Brooks (Participation of teachers in educational polices, 1909) summarized how such an organization had functioned in the Boston school system. Each high school had teacher representatives who sat on the High School Council. The Council considered recommendations formulated in high school department meetings. Once recommendations had been considered and approved, the High School Council submitted recommendations to the Head Master's Association "and here the questions are the broader lines of high school administration that they may involve" (p. 30).

Representatives from high school departments sat on this council to insure that each recommendation received informed consideration. The recommendations of the Head Masters' Association were, in turn, submitted to the Board of Superintendents where the recommendations were considered in the light of their impact on the entire school system.

Brooks maintained that once a recommendation reached the school

it does not represent the personal opinion of any teacher, principal or superintendent. It may fall somewhat short of the best that has been proposed, but it is almost certain to be the best that is possible at that particular time and with that particular set of teachers. It represents intelligent and responsible participation of all interests in a decision that can be carried into effect by hearty co-operative effort. (p. 30)

Intelligent participation by teachers resulted in the best possible solutions and most effective implementation of these solutions.

Brooks (Participation of teachers in educational policies, 1909) listed sixteen committees which have been organized to address various policies within the Boston school system. Of the sixteen, seven (i.e., geography, arithmetic, English, elementary science, physical training, and history) appear to have dealt specifically with curriculum development. Brooks noted that "in accordance with the general belief outlined" teachers had participated "in the determination of the course of study and of general education policies" in the Boston schools (p. 30). Brooks also indicated that there were plans to create a similar organization for principals and teachers at the elementary levels in Boston. In a later review of educational reforms, Downey (1910) maintained that "the present course of study in the Boston schools is the result of the active co-operation of teachers with school officials" (p. 418).

In a report by the Committee of Educational Progress of the Harvard Teachers' Association, Downey (1910) asserted that "a phase of educational progress which is everywhere claiming attention is the matter of professional co-operation in the teaching body" (p. 417). Downey cited several examples of actual practice in Boston, Tacoma, and Dallas. The Boston example has already been discussed. Downey reported that in Tacoma, Washington, the objectives of the teachers' council were to promote collaboration among teachers and to represent teachers in professional matters before the school board. Four teachers from the high school and sixteen teachers from the lower grades made up the council. No administrators served on the teachers' council. Downey reported that the Tacoma Teachers' Council met twice a month. Downey also noted that a report on teachers' advisory councils had been made to the Washington Educational Association. Discussions concerning the replication of the Boston plan were underway (p. 419)

In a report to the Dallas, Texas, school board, Superintendent Arthur Lefevre (Downey, 1910) made a similar statement as Superintendent Brooks of Boston when he asserted that "the substitution of autocratic regulation for genuine organization in the professional life and work of teachers is the worst defect in the public school systems of the United States" (p. 419). To address this defect, Superintendent Lefevre organized a "Teachers' Advisory Council" which was composed of teacher-elected

representatives from each grade in the elementary schools, from each high school, and two principals from the elementary schools (p. 419).

Superintendent Lefevre reported how the advisory council functioned:

This council shall meet as occasions arise to hear all teachers who may desire to present their views, and the council shall be required to file with the secretary of the Board of Education on or before the first day of June each year such report as it may choose on matters concerning the elementary schools or the system as a whole, addressed to the superintendent, but to remain intact in the records of the Board and to be considered by the Board in connection with the reports and recommendations of the superintendent. In addition to the representative council, the faculties of the high school shall file in the same manner a report dealing with matters especially concerning the sphere of the high school (Downey, 1910, p. 419).

The advisory council met with the superintendent throughout the year. A summary report of their work and concerns was to be filed with the board annually. While these initial attempts to involve teachers might be unimpressive when viewed from a contemporary perspective, one must keep in mind that the predominant perspective during this period was that teachers were not qualified to or interested in participating in deciding educational policies. In the light of the prevailing view, these initial attempts represented significant reform at the time (see also, Lefevre, 1909).

Summary

Paris (1993) and Schubert (1980), among others, have suggested that teachers, through their classroom practice, have always been involved in informal curriculum study and

decision-making. The formal authority for the curriculum in the early history of public education in the United States, however, initially rested with school boards or comparable bodies. Schubert pointed out that, during the period from the early to mid-1800s, "curricular recommendations . . . are offered as minor parts of elaborate philosophical systems" (p. 3). The micro-management (i.e., statements of aims or objectives specific to subject areas) of the curriculum did not develop, according to Schubert, until the turn of the twentieth century. This suggested that statements concerning curriculum which were issued by school boards during the nineteenth century were, at best, very broad in nature. Teachers during this period, particularly up until the mid 1800s, had wide latitude as to content and methods.

Curriculum study as a formal and separate area of investigation, Schubert (1980) noted, began at the turn of the twentieth century (p. 4). The development and growth of school administration, particularly the superintendency, began during the mid-1800s. The dominant thinking and practice of this period placed the responsibility for the curriculum, or course of study, with the superintendent and school board (e.g., Baldwin, 1891; Gilbert, 1906; Estabrook-Chancellor, 1908; Participation of teachers in educational policies, 1909).

As the population of the United States increased during this period, the growth and consolidation of schools and

systems led to the creation of the position of superintendent. It was unclear as to when the first superintendent was appointed, but the first half of the nineteenth century appeared to be a common period of reference for many authors Pickard (1902), for example, reported that the establishment of the first state superintendent was recorded in Massachusetts in 1837, while first city superintendent appeared in 1839 in Rhode Island (p. viii). Perry (1912), on the other hand, reported that the first state superintendency was established in New York in 1815. The first city superintendents appeared, according to Perry, in 1837 in Buffalo, New York, and Louisville, Kentucky (p. 376). Regardless of the exact date, superintendents began assuming the responsibility for curriculum development. For example, Kliebard (1995) noted that as early as 1836 the superintendent of the Chicago schools "established a distinct course of study for each subject at each grade level" (p. 2). Schubert (1980) pointed out that as the formal study of the curriculum expanded school systems began to "differentiate line and staff positions as curriculum supervisors, coordinators, and consultants" (p. 4). This served to solidify the formal authority for the curriculum in the superintendent's office.

Curriculum work was influenced primarily by popular textbooks and various national curriculum committees, according to Rugg (1929). The term "cut-and-paste" came into usage to describe a common method for curriculum

construction for which superintendents were criticized. The "cut-and-paste" method involved the superintendent, or the superintendent's designee, in collecting popular textbooks, the recommendations of the national committees, and widely-recognized courses of study from other cities. Desirable parts from each resource were compiled in various arrangements to create courses of study. Curriculum construction through the superintendent or through the superintendent's office was the dominant practice during this period and would continue to be the predominate method through the period under study.

While the "cut-and-paste" method was the predominate method for curriculum development, the idea and practice of teacher participation in the formal process began to gain advocates. The initial thinking focused on professional aspects of teaching. Democratic practice in schools and in school administration became the focus for teacher participation at the turn of the twentieth century. Many authors during this period contended that teaching was not a profession because of teachers' lack of professional autonomy. These authors pointed specifically to the absence of teacher authority over curricular and instructional issues. As early as 1840, an editorial in the Connecticut Common School Journal (Co-operation of parents in improving schools, 1840) contended that the responsibility for "presiding over the affairs of the school" (p. 86) should rest with teachers. Specifically, authors asserted teaching

was not a profession because school boards constructed courses of study without teacher participation (e.g., Eliot, 1875; Douai, 1880a; Hart, 1892a; Dunton, 1893). As Douai (1880b) later maintained, teaching would not be considered a profession until "more influence for the pedagogue in all pedagogical matters" (p. 244) was granted. Furthermore, various authors contended that teachers wanted to be treated as educational experts and consulted on "strictly professional matters, such as school organization, courses of study, and school methods" (Hart, 1892a, p. 9).

Discussions concerning democratic practice in school administration began to appear in the last half of the nineteenth century. These discussions reached their highest level immediately after World War I. Dewey was probably the most notable advocate of democratic practices in schools at the turn of the twentieth century. Dewey repeatedly asserted that teachers should be involved in curriculum work (e.g., Dewey, 1903, 1904, and 1937). He also put these assertions into practice. Dewey's work with teachers in developing curriculum at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago beginning in 1896 has been widely-documented and recognized (e.g., Kliebard, 1995; Tanner & Tanner, 1995; Tanner, 1991; Cremin, 1961; Mayhew & Edwards, 1936). While Dewey's influence in this area was difficult to trace, there was evidence to suggest that his writings and practice had significant influence on teacher involvement in curriculum work (e.g., Newlon, 1929).

Similar to this but not necessarily stated in terms of democratic practice was the thinking of some authors that curriculum development should be a cooperative effort, an effort which included teachers. College professors, in particular, began promoting the idea of cooperative curriculum work and acting as consultants in curriculum work (e.g., Eliot, 1894; Schurman, 1893; Hart, 1892a and 1892b). Rugg (1926) indicated that the work of the Committee of Ten marked the first organized effort at cooperative curriculum development between teachers and college professors. Many authors praised these efforts at cooperative curriculum work (e.g., Rugg, 1926, Eliot, 1894; Parker, 1894; Schurman, 1893). In fact, Parker (1894) considered the most significant contribution of the Committee of Ten to be the "magnified importance of the teacher" in curriculum work (p. 147). Others suggested that the level of teacher participation in a cooperative effort determined the effectiveness of a school's curriculum (Young, 1901, p. 10). Downey (1910) asserted that cooperative curriculum construction was "a phase of educational progress which is everywhere claiming attention" (p. 417). The discussion and acceptance of the idea of teacher involvement in curriculum work was increasing rapidly by the end of the first decade of the twentieth century.

School organization was a relatively new area of examination during this period. As schools and systems grew

in size and complexity, the question of how to organize effectively became a significant issue. Writers began to make a distinction between the administrative and educational functions within the school (e.g., Dewey, 1904; Eliot, 1875). Administrative functions centered around such issues as buildings and maintenance, and personnel matters. The educational functions included curricular and instructional matters, and classroom management. While administrators had both administrative and educational roles, teachers should share in the educational functions, according to an increasing number of writers. Many of these writers were beginning to examine how teachers might be organized within a school or system to participate in these educational functions. Eliot (1875) proposed a school committee made up of teachers to present teachers' perspectives to the school board particularly on curricular and instructional matters. Specific to curriculum, Eliot maintained that teachers should have the authority to "decide upon new branches, and the lopping of old ones, the expansion and contraction of studies, the choice of books, instruments, and methods" (p. 50). Bicknell (1885) endorsed Eliot's conception of the school committee and its function in the president's address to the National Education Association in Madison, Wisconsin. School councils (Lane, 1902; Young, 1901) and advisory councils (Downey, 1910; Lefevre, 1909) were similar in function to Eliot's conception of the school committee. Teachers' meetings were

a primary organizational tool for curriculum development in Parker's and Dewey's work.

It seemed natural that the discussion of teacher participation as an idea would precede widespread practice. While the practice of teacher participation in curriculum work was not widespread, examples were beginning to appear in the literature at the turn of the twentieth century. Winship (1900) asserted that "the first great inspiration which came through" Parker's work in the schools of Quincy, Massachusetts, from 1875 to 1880, was "freedom to the teacher" (p. 259). Hart (1892a) described the cooperative efforts of teacher representatives and school board members in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to make changes in the grammar school curriculum. Dewey considered Parker the "father of the progressive movement" and acknowledged his influence on his own thinking (Cremin, 1961, p. 21). Dewey's own work at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, from 1896 to 1903, was exemplary as a model for teacher participation in curriculum development. Chicago became one of the first large cities to experiment with teacher involvement through school councils (Jackman, 1906; Lane, 1902). Superintendent Stratton began work with Boston teachers in 1909 (Downey, 1910; Participation of Teachers in Educational Policies, 1909). Lefevre (1909), the superintendent of the Dallas, Texas, school system described his own efforts to involve teachers through advisory councils. Downey (1910) also reported on the work in Dallas

and, additionally, on the work of teachers in Tacoma, Washington.

The level of participation by teachers varied during this period. While Dewey's work in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago was a notable exception, most participation documented at this time was through teachers' or advisory councils. All of the documented examples, except in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, put teachers primarily in an advisory role. In larger systems, such as Chicago, Tacoma, and Boston, teachers recommendations wound their way through several levels before reaching the superintendent for his consideration. In Dallas, Texas, the recommendations of the teachers' council were submitted separate from the superintendent's recommendations and were made a part of the official board record. While the recommendations of these teachers' and advisory councils covered a broad range of issues, curricular issues were a focus noted for all.

Where curricular issues were addressed by these teachers' councils, the issues might be presented by an administrator, such as the superintendent, or might be initiated by the teachers themselves. In the example of Boston's High School Councils, many recommendations originated with the subject departments within high schools. Though teachers might initiate examination of a curricular issue, their recommendations were almost always subject to the approval of an administrative group or the

superintendent. Only in the example documented in Dallas did the recommendations of the teachers' council go directly to the board of education. However, these were still considered recommendations to the board subject to their approval or rejection.

The purposes for teacher participation also varied. Many of the stated intentions of the programs for teacher participation during this time focused on the professional development of teachers and on curricular improvement. The primary purposes for teacher participation at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago were to facilitate reflection in order to enhance curricular and instructional improvement and to foster the school as a cooperative social model. In Boston, the participation of teachers was intended to achieve three purposes: to meet the individual needs of students, to provide some degree of uniformity between schools, and to develop professional responsibility. Likewise, the primary purpose for teacher participation in Dallas was to develop professional responsibility among teachers. The stated purposes in Tacoma, Washington, were to promote collaboration among teachers and to represent teachers in professional matters before the board of education. In Chicago, teacher participation promoted three purposes: to capitalize on the practical expertise of teachers, to allow the full expression of teacher judgment in curricular and instructional matters, and to improve school and system effectiveness. full expression of the

judgment of principals and teachers on questions pertaining to courses of study, textbooks, departmental work, duties and advancement of teachers and other educational topics. (p. 26) While there were a variety of purposes for teacher participation during this period, professional and curricular improvement were common to many of the documented efforts to involve teachers.

CHAPTER III: THE IDEA TAKES HOLD, 1910-1919

While the first decade of the twentieth century may have witnessed the conception of the curriculum field, Schubert (1980) asserted that "the second decade of the Twentieth Century . . . is the most frequently acknowledged as having given birth to the curriculum field" (p. 29). The curriculum field certainly was coming into its own by the second decade and curriculum development was at the forefront of curriculum study. Kliebard (1995) described the first twenty years of the twentieth century as one of "furious" curriculum reform efforts (pp. 97-98). The literature concerning curriculum increased significantly and some of the most important works on curriculum were published during the second decade of the twentieth century. Four of the most significant works on or related to curriculum- Dewey's Democracy and Education (1916), Bobbitt's The Curriculum (1918), Kilpatrick's "The Project Method" (1918), and The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918)- were published during the second decade. These major works represented the varying conceptions of curriculum development which were vying for ascendancy, according to Kliebard (1995), during this period.

Interestingly enough, one's position on curriculum development (i.e., how curricular aims were determined or what these curricular aims might be) did not necessarily

indicate one's position on teacher participation in curriculum work. All the major conceptions, i.e., social efficiency/social behaviorist, experientialist, intellectual traditionalist, etc., had advocates for teacher participation in curriculum development. In fact, the four major works identified above all made statements explicitly advocating or strongly suggesting teacher participation in curriculum development. Granted, issues such as the purposes for participation, the degree of participation, contributions to be made, etc., varied. These variations, however, seemed to be more a function of a combination of other considerations, such as lack of training, rather than of a particular conception of curriculum development.

The social efficiency conception of curriculum, as described by Kliebard (1995), or the social behaviorist conception, as identified by Schubert (1980), was represented by Bobbitt's work, The Curriculum (1918b). Schubert (1980) noted that The Curriculum was "considered the first major book on curriculum" (p. 32) by many curriculum scholars. Kliebard (1995) considered Bobbitt the epitome of "the new breed of efficiency-minded educators" (p. 84). Kliebard (1995) also considered the efficiency movement, especially as represented through Bobbitt's work, highly influential even into the latter part of the twentieth century. Although Kliebard (1995) "credited" Bobbitt with providing education with the metaphor of schools as factories (p. 85) with all of the negative

implications of autocratic, top-down management, Bobbit (1918b) was explicit that teachers had an important role to play in curriculum development.

The experientialist school of curriculum thought was represented by Dewey's Democracy and Education (1916) and Kilpatrick's "The Project Method" (1918), according to Schubert (1980). Both were considered to be extremely influential on the curriculum field. Schubert (1980) asserted that the impact of Democracy and Education (1918) "on curriculum thought and action was monumental" (p. 33). Likewise, Kilpatrick's "The Project Method" (1918) had a significant effect on curriculum thought and practice. Schubert contended that the project method "became widely known among curriculum scholars and practitioners" (p. 34). Kliebard (1995) also noted the major impact of Kilpatrick's work: "Within a short time the project method became the major alternative to scientific curriculum-making" (p. 141). Both Dewey's and Kilpatrick's work suggested that teachers had a direct role to play in curriculum development.

Though not in the purest sense, The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) was most representative of the intellectual traditionalist, according to Schubert (1980). Kliebard (1995) considered The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education to be the "capstone of the quarter century of furious efforts at curriculum reform" (pp. 97-98). Both Kliebard (1995) and Schubert (1980) agreed that the recommendations in The Cardinal Principles of Secondary

Education were widely accepted because they were considered less extreme than some of the other curriculum proposals circulating at the time. Kliebard (1995) noted that The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education was frequently cited "as embodying the highest wisdom in curriculum matters" (pp. 97-98). As with the other major curriculum works of the second decade, recommendations in The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education included teacher participation in curriculum development.

In addition to the "furious" curriculum reform efforts, two developments during the second decade of the twentieth century proved to be influential on curriculum and curriculum development. One of these has already been alluded to-- the influence of science, particularly the natural sciences. Scientific management, scientific curriculum making, and efficiency were common themes. Callahan (1962) asserted that "in these years America was enormously preoccupied with Taylor, scientific management, and the idea of efficiency" (p. 23). In fact, Kliebard (1995) noted that "the field of curriculum . . . was born in what may be described as a veritable orgy of efficiency" (p. 81). Scientific management and the efficiency movement facilitated the trend toward centralization and bureaucratization of education, and the standardization of the curriculum.

The centralization and bureaucratization of education, and the standardization of the curriculum continued during

the second decade at the expense of teacher participation.

North (1915) noted that

educators, both of the theoretical and practical classes are, in fact, awakening to a realization that modern centralization of school control, modern unification of content and method in the school course, have obscured the value of the individual teacher's experience and judgment, while magnifying that of the expert supervisor or chief. (p. 10)

While the scientific management and efficiency movements facilitated centralization and bureaucratization, writers such as Kliebard (1995) contended that "the bureaucratization of the American educational enterprise would likely have occurred anyway; it had already been underway for some time" (p. 81). Initially, centralization and bureaucratization of the schools was attributed to the tremendous growth of schools and systems at the turn of the twentieth century. Even with the trend toward centralization and bureaucratization with their tendencies toward excluding teachers, there were numerous examples of teacher participation in curriculum development. In fact, there were writers such as Bobbitt (1918) and Snedden (1910) who suggested that teacher participation and scientific management with its tendency toward centralization were not necessarily exclusive.

The second event which was to have an impact on teacher participation was World War I. World War I began in 1914 and the United States entered three years later in 1917. The Russian Revolution, a related event, took place in 1918. These events led to a renewed emphasis on democracy and

democratic practices in education in the United States. Discussions in the educational literature had always focused on two conceptions of practice: democracy as education and democracy in education. With the perceived threat to democracy posed by the events surrounding World War I and the Russian Revolution, the primary focus became democracy in education.

Early in the twentieth century, the educational autocrat was presented as a hindrance to democratic practice. Autocratic practice in the early part of the twentieth century was even viewed as desirable in those schools where teachers were perceived to be inadequately trained. As the events surrounding World War I and the Russian Revolution unfolded, dictatorships and totalitarian governments became a threat to democracy. These were considered a much more serious threat.

Democratic practice in all institutions was the method advocated in which to address these threats. Democratic practice in educational institutions was proposed as a crucial way in which to prepare students to live in a democratic society. These advocates reasoned that teachers could not be expected to promote democratic practices within their classrooms unless they were provided opportunities to participate in the administration of their schools. Curriculum development was viewed as a primary vehicle through which to promote teacher participation.

The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation

Increased centralization and bureaucratization of the schools and school systems continued to be characteristic of education during the second decade of the twentieth century. These trends were a concern for many educators, would continue to be of concern through the period under study, and would impact thinking on teacher participation in curriculum work. In an analysis of centralized and localized administration, Snedden (1910) concluded that while a legislative tendency toward centralization was inevitable and probably necessary, there was middle ground which might preserve the benefits of both centralized and localized administration of public education. Snedden had originally presented this article in the form of a speech to the Educational Council of New York in 1908. At this time he was a professor of educational administration at Teachers' College, Columbia University. When this article appeared in Education two years later, Snedden was serving as the state commissioner of education for the state of Massachusetts.

Efforts by state legislatures to bring uniformity in functions such as textbook selection and curriculum development through centralization at the state and county or district level were causing concerns among educators. Additionally, Snedden (1910) associated bureaucracy with centralization and considered bureaucracy to be a negative effect of centralization: ". . . we have to note that

administrative centralization tends to entail the evils of bureaucracy, and less when it is in charge of experts with more or less permanent tenure" (p. 542). Even though he considered centralization necessary, he believed there were actions which could be taken to offset the negative effects. This point is important. Some contemporary perspectives associate progressive administration at the turn of the century with attempts to bureaucratize public education. Here, Snedden made it clear that bureaucratization was not desirable and suggested actions which might be taken to counteract the negative effects of centralization, namely the tendency toward increasing bureaucracy.

Snedden (1910) suggested two general methods for achieving a satisfactory balance between centralized and localized administration of public education. The first method was to provide for a division of the responsibility for "a given function between two agencies, one which represents the relatively expert and centralized aspect of administration, the other the more democratic and local. According to conditions, the initiative will lie with the one or the other of these agencies" (p. 543). Snedden cited two types of divided administrative power: a division between expert (i.e., superintendent) and lay officials (i.e., board of education members), and a division between a central agency (e.g., state department of education or state legislature) and a local agency (e.g., local board of education).

The first division identified by Snedden (1910), between expert and lay officials, had been enacted into law in states such as New York, Ohio, and "especially in Southern States and Indiana" (p. 543). In theory, these laws served to correct the disadvantages of centralization by "giving large powers to the expert" but reserving "final control to the public and its lay representatives" (p. 543). However, in practice Snedden pointed out that because many state and county superintendents were elected "the development of the real expert" was inhibited (p. 544).

The division between a central agency and a local agency was illustrated through examples such as the state approval of local plans for school buildings or state laws setting a minimum salary which local boards might choose to supplement. Snedden (1910) focused on the tendency toward uniformity in textbooks and courses of studies in many states. In addition to bureaucracy, uniformity, according to Snedden, was a negative and unnecessary result of centralization. He stated that there was "no inherent reason why . . . the adoption of a state system of textbooks should mean absolute state uniformity" and there was "inherently no good reason why a course of study should be uniform throughout a large city . . ." (pp. 544-545). By extension, Snedden would probably have stated that there inherently was no good reason why a course of study should be uniform throughout a state. He believed that more opportunities for progress existed by allowing for local

variation in textbooks and courses of study with input from the centralized administration.

The second method was "found in the existence of bodies which, in the exercise of more or less localized functions, reflect public opinion, inform official and centralized agencies, and in turn through the exercise of these powers are themselves enlightened and have their appreciation of the general system of administration enhanced" (pp. 545-546). In other words, by participating in centralized administrative functions, these groups became more expert in, not only their work, but in administrative work. This was similar to an earlier argument by Dewey (1902) in Democracy in Education in which he contended that the process for making teachers more expert and for overall improvement of the teaching force required their participation in those decisions related to relevant educational matters. Snedden (1910) identified two bodies which served to inform centralized agencies: lay groups (e.g., citizens' groups and parents' organizations) and "the relatively minor officials in the system itself who are in most intimate touch with the practical problems" (i.e., principals and teachers) (p. 546). The involvement of the second group was most relevant to this study.

In Snedden's (1910) view, the willingness of teachers to participate and their intimate knowledge of the practical problems made their input "essential to the wider administration" (p. 547). However, centralization tended to

eliminate teachers' input, according to Snedden. To counteract this, and characteristic of any "wise system of administration," Snedden suggested utilizing "the vast resources of experience, available in the ranks, . . . to stimulate the self activity which results from the exercise of legitimate freedom," (p. 547). Among the examples of this kind of cooperation, Snedden cited groups of teachers making recommendations in the development of curriculum or the selection of textbooks. While the examples of cooperation were numerous in Snedden's view, the problem was that "no regular policy has yet been developed of providing it for a variety of situations" (p. 547). Although these examples had existed informally, according to Snedden, in many school systems, he emphasized that "in a complex system of administration it is no longer sufficient to depend on casual and unorganized efforts" to promote cooperation (p. 548).

In view of the trend toward centralization, Snedden (1910) proposed five principles to be considered and put into effect. First, only "genuine" experts should be considered to fill positions for administrative heads. This meant the practice of electing superintendents would have to end. Second, a committee, representing the public interests, should work in conjunction with the expert. This provided a balance between expert and lay control. Third, the division of responsibilities between centralized and localized administrations should be clearly established in

policy. Fourth, lay groups should be established "to represent local sentiment, to study administration, and . . . to express public opinion." Finally, groups of teachers and principals should be created to represent "local expert sentiment," to study problems, and to make "final recommendations" (p. 549).

In sum, Snedden (1910) believed the trend toward centralization was inevitable and, in some cases, necessary. The negative aspects of centralization, in particular, bureaucracy and uniformity, could be addressed by seeking a balance between centralized and localized administrative structures. These negative aspects could also be offset by involving the lay public and local experts (i.e., teachers and principals) in the pertinent decision-making processes regarding functions such as textbook selection and the construction of courses of study. Of note, is the fact that Snedden viewed the involvement of local experts such as teachers as a way to offset the bureaucratic tendencies of centralization, not as way to enhance or add to the bureaucracy.

In his book on elementary curriculum, Gilbert (1913) prefaced his discussion of the elementary course of study by asking, "Why is the course of study in use in our elementary schools constituted as it is?" His answer was that this was a question "that should be answered by teachers, parents, and public officials, if the best results are to be obtained by the schools." However, "most teachers take the course of

study handed down to them from above and teach it perfunctorily, without much serious consideration of its reason for being or for its motive" (p. iii). The primary purpose of his book was to provide the reasons for and the benefits of teaching the subjects found in the general elementary courses of study.

Gilbert (1913), a former superintendent of schools in St. Paul, MN, Newark, NJ, and Rochester, NY, stated that any curriculum serves both educational and economic functions. The educational function of the curriculum was to "serve as a guide for teachers in their work; for, unlike the ordinary college curriculum, it is not made by those who use it" He described the economic purpose as "the cohesive force that makes an aggregation of schools a system" (p. 1). The details he provided in his discussion of these two functions gave some further insight into his views of the teachers' role in curriculum construction.

As a guide for teachers, the course of study should prescribe the "main and fundamental facts" (Gilbert, 1913, p. 10) within a given body of knowledge, but allow for "freedom as to details and methods" (p. 8). The details and methods of the curriculum were to be "worked out by the teacher and the principal, according to local conditions" (p. 8). Gilbert asserted that teachers, in particular, "can attend to these matters better than the maker of the course of study" (p. 8). Consideration of these details would contribute to the professional growth of the teacher.

Considering his strong contention that the course of study should serve as a guide for teachers, Gilbert (1913) made a curious statement: "A course of study should not be too easy of comprehension" (p. 9). His logic was that a curriculum that was difficult to comprehend would require teachers to study it more closely and to study the principles behind its construction. "A course of study that a teacher can keep in his desk and follow satisfactorily by occasional references to it is a feeble course indeed," Gilbert claimed (p. 10). This, along with teachers working out the details of content and method (p. 8), would contribute to teachers' growth according to Gilbert.

While teachers were to have wide latitude in the details and methods of the course of study, Gilbert (1913) made it clear that the construction of the course of study was the responsibility of the superintendent (pp. 11, 193). Beyond this, Gilbert did not discuss how the superintendent was to go about the development of the curriculum. He did, however, make some implications about the development process. The primary purpose of this book was to explain why certain subjects were included in the elementary curriculum. This suggested that Gilbert assumed that some, if not most, of the curriculum was already established. This was supported by his statement in the preface that "most school officials accept the conventional curriculum inherited from the past and used by their neighbors and pass it on to their own schools, taking for granted that it is

right" (p. iii). So, from Gilbert's perspective, the curriculum was not really constructed by the superintendent in any real sense. The curriculum was more or less adopted or adapted. A wide range of activities for achieving the ends were to be included in the curriculum. These activities might be suggested by the superintendent, according to Gilbert, but the activities were primarily the province of the principals and teachers.

A role for teachers and others in this adoption/adaptation process was suggested by Gilbert (1913). "Teachers, parents, and public officials" (p. iii) were to consider the merits and justification for the each of the subjects being taught in the elementary school. Because his primary purpose was to offer justification and support for each of the subjects he propounded, Gilbert did not discuss the direction of the process if the group reviewing the elementary curriculum found some or all insufficient.

The other function of the curriculum, the economic function, was to bring unity to a school system. Gilbert (1913) questioned, however, how much uniformity was desirable. A desirable level of freedom for teachers should be preserved. The varying needs of children had to be considered (p. 2). Gilbert outlined four factors to be considered when deciding the question of uniformity: the effects of differences in content and method on the progress of any child in the system; the effects of transfers for students from one school to another within a system; the

evaluation of teacher efficiency in relation to student progress; and, in small and rural systems, suggestions to and resources for teachers (p. 3). Gilbert saw uniformity being a problem directly related to the size of the school system- the larger the school system the greater the need for uniformity.

Uniformity of curriculum was a topic of discussion at the fifty-first annual meeting of the National Education Association. A plan for a uniform minimum curriculum with uniform examinations was under consideration for the state of New York. McMurry (1913), in an analysis of the idea of a uniform minimum curriculum, stated that the best way to judge the appropriateness of any curriculum was to examine the proposal in the light of "the surest standards we have, i.e., the aims and principles of education" (p. 133).

Operating under the assumption that teachers and those who made the curriculum shared the same or similar aims and principles, McMurry (1913) examined a uniform minimum curriculum using the "specifications a classroom teacher is expected to follow, and her method of doing it" (p. 133) to judge its appropriateness. According to McMurry, modern educational theory required the classroom teacher to consider two factors in the instruction of students: the individual differences of each student in the classroom, which he termed the psychological factor, and those aims determined by society as appropriate to the education of those students, the social factor. In the light of these

two factors, the curriculum became the "instrument" through which the teacher achieved these ends. In his conception, the curriculum was subordinate to the psychological needs of the student and the social needs of the community (pp. 134-135). Because it "ignores all individual qualities and local conditions," McMurry concluded that a uniform curriculum offered little aid to the classroom teacher either "in spirit or by positive suggestion" (p. 136). As to a minimum curriculum, McMurry concluded that it offered even less to the classroom teacher because it tended "to emphasize mere quantity [over quality], to oppose omissions from that quantity, and to demand a quantity so large that it [was] inimical to reflection" (p. 140).

McMurry (1913) was critical of what he perceived as an attempt, through a uniform curriculum and uniform examinations, to prevent mistakes by teachers. He stated:

It is true that teachers will make mistakes- even the best of them. But no mistake can be greater than that of the higher educational officials, when they refuse teachers the opportunity to make mistakes by putting them in a straight jacket. Mistakes necessarily go with freedom; and educational systems have got to be founded on trust of teachers, not on suspicion (p. 142)

Even more to the point of this study, McMurry contended that this freedom specifically applied to the construction of the curriculum by teachers:

We have said that the curriculum is the key to an educational system. Let me ask my opponents how the uniform minimum curriculum . . . provides for the freedom and growth of teachers. Again, the classroom teachers are the only persons in the world who have most of the knowledge necessary for making curricula

that will fit. What provision is there in this scheme for bringing it into use? (p. 142)

Those officials responsible for developing the uniform curriculum were not only ignoring those possessing most of the knowledge needed for making curricula, they were unable to use these teachers to make a uniform curriculum because of the psychological and social factors of schools and classrooms. Additionally, McMurry viewed the school as the unit of study for a curriculum just as the individual child was the unit of study for the teacher. In this perspective, then, it would follow, also, that a course of study would have to be developed by those most intimately involved with the school.

Discussions about teaching as a profession continued and the subject of improvement was a focus at the Salt Lake City session of the National Education Association annual meeting. Suzzallo (1913) asserted that the reorganization of the teaching profession was "primary in all substantial and wholesome progress" and in all reform efforts which had previously taken place (p. 363). Suzzallo characterized a profession as those occupations which were performed as a social service, required expert knowledge and practice, could adapt effectively to change (what he called a "mastery of crisis"), and capable of effective collaboration with all concerned groups-- a trait he called "ethical cooperation" (p. 364). While each of these characteristics was discussed and described, expert service and effective adaptation are the most pertinent to the present study.

As a feature of expert service, Suzzallo (1913) asserted that teachers had to have the power and authority to teach children or else their work would be less than expert. This authority had its legitimate basis in "superior knowledge and skill" (p. 366). This "superior knowledge and skill" would come through adequate education (i.e., a high school education for elementary teachers, college training for secondary teachers, professional coursework in "general and special methods of teaching," educational psychology, educational sociology, and "their interpretation and application"), a knowledge, gained through study and experience, of the "problems and purposes of modern social life," and a "sincere and wholesome character" (p. 367). While Suzzallo did not mention curriculum work as a part of expert service, Suzzallo's standards for expert service would prepare teachers for curriculum work according to McMurry's conception.

Suzzallo's (1913) discussion of the ability to adapt to changing psychological and social factors (i.e., mastery of crises) as characteristic of the teaching profession was even more suggestive that teachers must have a substantive role in the construction of curriculum. Suzzallo described "mastery of crises" in this way:

The conditions underlying teaching and administration vary because we have new selections of children and new problems of civilization to deal with. These variables create a constant succession of new difficulties that challenge our resourcefulness. (p. 368)

Suzzallo used an analogy of a factory worker who performed the same unvarying routine each day without the challenge of having to solve the problems of daily variations in the routine. This was a difference that separated the professional from the nonprofessional and one characteristic which qualified teaching as a profession. As Suzzallo pointed out in continuing the analogy, "No such limiting situation exists in teaching. The teacher is the master of the school, unless he makes of it a machine which masters him" (p. 368). Moreover, Suzzallo asserted that "efficient" teachers, in fact, the "great teacher[s]," were the ones who could adapt effectively to the needs of individual students. These teachers would never want a "rigidly fixed school system, an unchanged course of study, the same subject, or the same grade" (p. 369).

As with McMurry, Suzzallo (1913) suggested that a uniform curriculum would be ineffective because it could not meet the needs of individual students or even individual schools. Additionally, each teacher had to have ultimate authority over the course of study to adapt (i.e., add to, subtract from, or even create) it to the ever-changing needs of individuals in their classroom. By extension, the curriculum declined in effectiveness the farther removed the curriculum-maker was from the classroom or the school.

The superintendent and/or principal were traditionally acknowledged as the persons primarily responsible for curriculum development during the first half of the

twentieth century (e.g., Gilbert, 1913). Two articles, while not directly addressing the issue of curriculum work, discussed the idea of superintendents and principals involving teachers in all decisions which affected the schools. Hughes (1913), a superintendent of the Syracuse, NY, school system, asserted that principals should involve teachers in the general administration of the school:

The responsibility resting upon the principal for the proper results in a school will never be met unless the teachers of the school appreciate that responsibility in its large sense and are ready to share it. (p. 157)

Hughes listed instruction and discipline as primary responsibilities of the principal. In the classroom, these were the responsibility of the teacher. Because of these shared responsibilities, Hughes argued that the lines separating classroom duties and administrative duties were blurred, "Each, to a degree, overlaps and involves the other" (p. 156).

Ironically, Clark (1914), a principal of a school in Los Angeles, contended that superintendents should allow teachers more input into the educational policies of the school system. He stated:

. . . a public school system should not be under the domination of any one person. We need and must have, to be sure, authority, but what we need is group, not individual authority. (p. 21)

Clark began his article with reference to democratic practice in the hiring and dismissal of teachers, but he expanded his contention to include "issues affecting a school system" and that teachers should have some say in

those issues which directly affected them (p. 23). While Clark, like Hughes, never directly cited curriculum work as one of those issues, the assumption that curriculum development was not one of "the great problems of school administration" (p. 20) that teachers would be excluding what had been a primary administrative responsibility.

Because curriculum as a field of study was still developing, what should be included in a course of study and how to construct a curriculum were the major topics concerning the curriculum field. McMurry (1915) proposed general principles for the development of school curricula. To add weight to his proposal, McMurry included the names of ten educators who reviewed and, ultimately, approved these principles: Henry Suzzallo, professor of Educational Sociology; George Strayer, professor of Educational Administration; Frederick Bonser, associate professor of Industrial Education; William Kilpatrick, associate professor of Philosophy of Education; Milo Hillegas, associate professor of Elementary Education; Thomas Briggs, associate professor of Education; Henry Pearson, principal of the Horace Mann School; Ernest Horn, principal of the Speyer School; Thomas Wood, professor of Physical Education; and, Charles Farnsworth, associate professor of Music (p. 307). These names were of note because almost all of these educators would, at one time or another during the first half of the twentieth century, make important contributions to the curriculum field. Also of note was

that all were university professors at Teachers College, Columbia University.

McMurry (1915) proposed a curriculum which was focused on social problems and organized the subject-matter around these problems. While he believed that some uniformity in subject-matter would naturally result, the needs of the individual school had to be addressed:

. . . this local influence must come neither after the common content has been found, nor necessarily at the beginning of the entire procedure. It is an influence which must be taken into account from the start, and must make itself felt continuously through the process (p. 314).

As the title of the article, "Principles Underlying the Making of School Curricula," suggested, McMurry considered the individual school the unit of study for the curriculum. The curriculum, then, while uniform in some respects would be unique to each individual school.

McMurry (1915) suggested that the process be approached as a revision of existing curriculum rather than development of a completely new course of study. Because the process would be slow and all schools in a system would have to be involved, the existing curriculum would serve the purpose in the interim. Additionally, because the process occurred at the school level, he surmised that some schools would be more effective in the process than others. These effective schools would act as models, "experimental centres" (p. 315), for all schools. The existing curriculum would provide the less successful schools a guide to use in the interim.

McMurry's (1915) contention that the school was the unit of study for the curriculum suggested who would be involved in the revision of the existing curriculum. He stated:

Those who must perform the major part of this task for a given school must be the ablest persons directly connected with that school, i.e., some of the teachers, interested and informed members of the community, the principal and other supervisory officers; because they are the only ones who can possibly have the knowledge and interest for the task. (p. 315)

Curriculum development, in McMurry's view, was to be a truly collaborative effort in which teachers were active participants.

The word "efficiency" was commonly used in discussions of most educational ideas- administration, curriculum, instruction, buildings- during the progressive period. Suzzallo (1913) earlier made reference to the efficient teacher in his discussion of the reorganization of the teaching profession. Discussions of efficiency in all aspects of schools-- efficient supervision, efficient administration, efficient teaching-- were common subjects for journals and texts. For some, efficiency entailed centralization and bureaucratization which served to separate teachers from curriculum work. The meaning, however, varied with perspective. For example, Updegraff (1917) asserted that cooperation was essential for efficiency and was a critical component of scientific management. He cited one example, of several small school systems, in which

teachers, supervisors, principals and superintendent meet on an equal plane in the fortnightly consideration of common problems to the solution of which the most recent and effective methods are applied. Between meetings each teacher is seeking the raw material, the facts, that form the basis of study. (p. 20)

Efficient scientific management, according to Updegraff, meant that teachers had to be involved in the decisions which affected their school, one decision of which was curriculum- the raw material, the facts, that form the basis of study. In Updegraff's perspective, an efficient system involved teachers in decision-making, i.e., curriculum work, rather than removing them from the process by placing the responsibility for curriculum in a central office position.

In addition to these discussions, what made for an efficient curriculum was a topic of discussion at the annual meeting of the National Education Association at Portland, Oregon, in July, 1917. Yocum (1917) outlined a preliminary report, originally entitled The Course of Study as a Test of Efficiency of Supervision, to the Committee on Superintendents' Problems made to the association the previous year. In this outline, he reviewed the "factors which together constitute what is most essential to efficiency- definiteness, selection, inclusiveness, adequacy, and economy" (p. 213). Since none of these factors addressed how the efficient curriculum was constructed and who participated in its construction, the article was not immediately pertinent; however, the same discussions following Yocum included after his outline are pertinent and revealing about what he did not include.

For example, Snedden (1917) reminded curriculum-makers (apparently he did not include teachers in this group) that "the teachers of this country are comparatively young and untrained" and, therefore, need a course of study which could be "lookt upon as a guide . . . in every sense of the word." As a guide, the course of study would set "boundaries wherein the teacher is expected to teach" and should give "suggestions as to how [the teacher] can achieve results." Still, those teachers who were able to "devise a better method and defend it" could vary from the course of study. Snedden was explicit here about teachers' participation in curriculum development: ". . . they are not capable to any considerable extent of origination [of curriculum], and . . . commonly they have not the time to work out new devices even if they had the capacity" (p. 214). This was an apparent contradiction to his earlier stated position on teacher involvement in curriculum work (see Snedden, 1910). Contradictions such as these were not unusual, however. As Cremin (1961) noted, this period was characterized by "a remarkable diversity of pedagogical protest and innovation; from its very beginning it was pluralistic, often self-contradictory" (p. 22).

Bagley (1917) also responded favorably to Yocum's outline, especially to the idea of definiteness in a course of study. Yocum (1917) described definiteness as "educationally useful details" which required "detailing without which it is impossible to judge whether a course is

educationally useful or not" (p. 213). Bagley (1917) contended that most teachers needed a course of study which provided definite suggestions for implementing the curriculum. Because Bagley believed that the freedom of the teacher was secondary to the "larger democracy of the general social organization" (p. 216), he opposed the idea that individual teachers needed the freedom to vary from the prescribed course of study. Additionally, Bagley asserted that most teachers' work was "confused and ineffective" (p. 216) without a definite guide to follow suggesting that these teachers had no idea of the "values that are eternal and universal" (p. 217) which were worthy of inclusion in a course of study. This being the case, these teachers would have little of value to contribute by participating in curriculum development. Contentions that teachers were poorly trained, had little time, or had no curriculum expertise were common arguments against teacher participation in curriculum work.

Others maintained that the traditional methods of curriculum development had been effective with or without teacher participation. Teacher participation, then, was of no consequence to the effectiveness of a curriculum. For example, Mott (1917), the superintendent of schools of Seymour, Indiana, stated that:

Of the making of courses of study there has been no end. During the past fifty years every great supervisor in education has worked out courses of study adapted in greater or less degree to the needs of his school, with or without the cooperation of his teachers. These courses have served an excellent

purpose in guiding teachers and students in the character and amount of their work. (p. 218)

Needless to say, Mott did not think it necessary to involve teachers in the development or revision of the curriculum.

A primary factor in the opposition of many of these writers to teacher participation in curriculum work was the limited extent of formal education that at the time was typical for teachers. The typical level of education for elementary teachers at the time was a high school diploma. The average length of education for secondary school teachers was two years beyond high school (Kimball, 1995, p. 282). While the common perception was that teachers of the period were under-educated, the statistics could be misleading. Kimball (1995) noted that in 1910 "no more than 8 percent of those admitted to practice law or medicine were college graduates" (p. 282). While teachers may have lacked the education of most professors of education and many superintendents, the evidence suggested that their educational levels were comparable to, if not better than, the other professions of the day. Nevertheless, the perception was that most teachers lacked the training and education to do curriculum work.

Obviously, there continued to be those opposed to the idea that a course of study should be flexible or that teachers might be able to contribute to the development of a course of study. While not necessarily the popular view judging from the responses to Yocum's (1917) presentation,

there were also those who continued to endorse these ideas.

For example, it was noted that:

Dr. Winship voiced a plea for freedom for initiative on the part of the teacher and a condemnation of the autocratic and often mechanical way in which the course of study planned for one locality or region is often adopted for another without regard for local conditions or the attitudes and abilities of mind of the teaching body itself. (p. 215)

Winship had long been an advocate for recognizing teaching as a legitimate profession. Additionally, he obviously opposed the calls for a uniform curriculum based on the fact that uniformity ignored variations in students and teachers.

Englemann (1917), superintendent of schools of Decatur, Illinois, described how he involved all of the teachers of the system in a year-long process to revise the course of study. This process will be detailed in the section on practice. He advocated for the involvement of teachers in the process of curriculum revision:

If most superintendents make course of study [without involving teachers], then as a body of schoolmen we stand condemned, but I do not believe that this is any longer the usual procedure of the superintendent, whatever may have been true in years past. I have known a number of superintendents who have taken the lead in making or reorganizing the course of study for their own schools, and their method was not unlike our own. (p. 215)

Englemann involved all 200-plus teachers of the school system. These teachers were divided into committees and sub-committees to address the various areas of the course of study. They consulted courses of study from other systems, expert opinion, and incorporated the practical expertise of the local teachers to revise the course of study. Once a

tentative course was finished, teacher and community input was solicited. This input was incorporated into the final course of study.

Newlon (1917) highlighted the Decatur process as an example of the scientific curriculum policy he sought to define. About the Decatur process, he stated that in "some such manner I believe the curriculum problems must be solved" (p. 261). Later, he re-emphasized his belief that teachers should participate in the construction and revision of courses of study:

Finally, permit me to say a word about the method that ought to be employed in the working out of curriculums and courses in the school. If we are to have democratic schools, taught and administered in democratic ways, with socialized instruction, we cannot have cut and dried programs handed down by administrators to faculties. (p. 266)

In addition to the benefits of promoting democratic values, Newlon contended that involving teachers in curriculum work was the "best kind of professional study" (p. 266) that could be provided. He asserted that once teachers had gone through the process of investigating, studying, debating and, finally, creating a course of study, "that group of teachers will teach better and with more understanding and sympathy than they could ever otherwise teach" (pp. 266-267). Newlon offered evidence for his contention in the study of one Superintendent Wilson of Topeka, Kansas, who, after an "extensive examination of the 'courses of study' of a large number of school systems," concluded that "the best 'courses' were those that were the results of the

cooperative efforts of teachers and executive officers" (p. 267). Newlon (1917) concluded by affirming his belief in the participation of teachers, not only in curriculum development and revision, but in the general policies of the school:

If we are to have a democratic school we must have a democratic organization of the faculty, and, . . . , the faculty must participate in determining the policy of the school if the maximum efficiency is to be obtained, whether it be in teaching, in administration, or in curriculum making. (p. 267)

For Newlon, a comprehensive and scientific curriculum policy included the participation of the entire faculty in problem-solving.

In an editorial examining the effects of World War I on democracy and education, Walker (1917a) theorized that the end of the war would bring a re-examination of democratic practices in all institutions including education. He claimed that

Out of this war, . . . , will come a new democracy and a new educational system- a democracy not so obsessed by the mania for quick returns as to forget the necessity for long-term investments in education, and a system of public education that is at once democratic, rational, efficient, complete. (p. 111)

Interestingly, the implication was that a school or school system could be, at the same time, democratic and efficient. This contrasted with the common assumption that democratic practice was inherently inefficient and, therefore, a choice had to be made between democratic schools and efficient schools.

In a companion piece, Walker (1917b) started his

re-examination of democracy in educational administration by contrasting "two distinct schools of thought regarding matters of school administration" which he labeled "the paternalistic and the democratic" (p. 111). In regards to teacher participation in curriculum work, the paternalistic form of school administration would "prescribe everything from the program of study, . . . , to the minutest detail of the daily schedule" and "make a fetish of uniformity regardless of varied and varying individual needs or community conditions" (p. 112). The democratic form of school administration would consider individual and community needs and "provide for flexibility in curricula, in text-books, in programs and schedules" (p. 112). The argument that teachers needed the flexibility and authority to adjust the curriculum and even create curriculum to meet the individuals needs of their students would be made more frequently through the first half of the twentieth century. It would also become a contemporary justification for recognition that teachers are curriculum makers and should be involved in curriculum decisions (see, for example, Paris, 1993).

World War I had a significant impact on the writings about democracy in education particularly during the transition from the second to the third decade of the twentieth century. Education, during this time, was seen as the instrument for renewing democratic practices in the United States. References to and contrasts with the

educational and political systems of other countries (e.g., Germany and Russia) were common in these discussions. The references were sometimes subtle and many times nationalistic.

In a piece entitled "Education for Democracy," Boodin (1918) was an example that used the threats to democracy (i.e., Germany, Russia- and the Tammany machine in New York) as justification for democratic practices in the schools:

. . . until we have teachers who have in their own life the spirit of democracy, and are capable of cooperating in the performance of common tasks We shall have no thorough-going democracy. (p. 726)

Boodin identified two areas for democratic practice- "teachers who have in their own life the spirit of democracy" (i.e., in the classroom with students) and the "performance of common tasks" (i.e., in the administration of the school). Boodin questioned how "products of democracy" could be created if schools did not educate through "example and practise" (p. 724). Boodin alluded to "the experiments [in democratic practice] that have been tried in the grades under the wise leaders in New York City and elsewhere" that were "promising" examples (p. 729).

The questions of curriculum and instruction, however, had potentially interesting twists. Whereas countries such as Germany were seen as threats to democracy, Boodin (1918) suggested that education in the United States should take its cue from Germany to indoctrinate or inculcate students in the morals and the ways of democracy. Boodin stated that "it is necessary also to change our methods of teaching so

as to produce the moral qualities necessary for democratic citizenship" (p. 729). He proposed the elimination of the elective system and institution of a group system similar to the European Gymnasium (p. 729). Additionally, education in the United States, according to Boodin, "must also furnish the right content for democracy" (p. 729).

As in Germany, educators in the United States should "use every content subject of the curriculum to impress upon its youth the ideals" of a democracy (Boodin, 1918, p. 729). Every subject area, particularly those in the areas of the humanities and social sciences, would focus on these ideals. For example, economics would be taught so as to make it self-evident that all citizens "should be productive in some way, material or spiritual" and to make students aware of the "possibilities of and advantages of cooperation and the need of such social control as will ensnare the highest welfare for all concerned" (p. 730).

While Boodin (1918) described democratic practice as "teamwork" (p. 729) and cooperation "in the performance of common tasks" (p. 729), he did not discuss if this was applicable to the construction of curriculum and decisions about instruction. His perspective was suggestive that he considered the practice of democracy in the schools as separate from considerations of curriculum and instruction. He stated, "In addition to remodeling our system of control [from autocratic to democratic], it is necessary also to change our methods of teaching" (p. 729). He went

on to discuss his ideas about curriculum and instruction described in the preceding paragraphs, but he made no mention of teacher participation. The role of teachers in the construction of curriculum, considering his proposals for curriculum and instruction, was questionable.

The labor movement with its continuing efforts to organize workers into unions and press demands for better working conditions and wages was prominent during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Education was not immune to this influence. Of concern to administrators and school boards, were efforts to organize teachers to further their concerns about such issues as salary, tenure- and a voice in school administration. An editorial which originally appeared in The School Board Journal (1918) appeared sympathetic to the teachers' efforts to gain a voice in school and system policies.

The campaigns waged by teachers in a number of large cities can not be interpreted as simple fights for higher wages and a more secure tenure of office, but rather as a demand for recognition of the teacher in the conduct of the schools and for greater democracy in administration. (p. 741)

The editorial lauded the efforts of some superintendents to organize teachers into representative councils and committees. The editorial endorsed "a readjustment in the teachers' status in the schools" and predicted this readjustment "to come later, if not in the near future" (p. 741).

Demands for more efficiency in education usually were connected to demands to make decisions and policies in

education more scientific. As with the word efficiency, the meaning of "scientific" and "scientific method" varied.

Calls for a curriculum or course of study which was scientifically derived were common. Bobbitt (1918a) insisted that scientific curriculum making was too complex a task for any one person or group. He stated that

The time has come . . . when our profession should consciously make decision as to what constitutes scientific procedures in the solution of [curriculum making], and should then proceed with the large co-operative professional task of accomplishing the work. (pp. 222-223)

Bobbitt went on to describe various curriculum-making efforts which involved various groups such as business men, students, and teachers. In his example involving teachers, Bobbitt described a project by Charters and Miller (1915) in which teachers were enlisted to collect data. Edith Miller, the co-author of the study, was a high school English teacher in St. Louis. The study was summarized in the section on practice in this chapter. Bobbitt noted that similar studies were conducted in "northern Illinois, Boise, Cincinnati, Speyer School, Bonham, Tex., Columbia, Mo., and Detroit" (p. 224).

While not directly critical of the traditionally accepted method of curriculum development- the method of superintendents making the course of study- Bobbitt (1918a) suggested that he considered it unscientific and, therefore, unacceptable. In his discussion of math curriculum, Bobbitt stated that "practically everywhere courses of study in arithmetic and high-school mathematics are made up on the

basis of guess, personal opinion, or a combination of the two" (p. 224). He continued to describe an effort to make the creation of a course of study in mathematics more scientific. In this study, superintendents were polled as to what should be included in a mathematics curriculum. Bobbitt viewed this as unscientific because,

Such study is based upon the presumption that superintendents are well informed as to the mathematical processes that are and need to be carried on by the adult population of the different communities. There are reasons to think that this assumption is not as well founded as we should wish. Superintendents have general impressions in the matter, rarely do they have accurate information. (p. 225)

This challenged the common assumption that educational administrators by the very nature of their positions were curriculum experts. Exactly what qualifications made one a curriculum expert was, at best, vague during the first part of the twentieth century. As Schubert (1980) suggested, there were few curriculum experts, in the contemporary sense, because of the relative newness of the field. Whether Bobbitt recognized this or not was unclear. Nevertheless, he asserted no one person or group could scientifically or adequately construct a course of study.

In his important work, The Curriculum, Bobbitt (1918b) further developed his ideas about scientific curriculum making and contended that most of the current literature had been devoted to educational methods with little attention given to the "theory of curriculum-formation" (p. v). According to Bobbitt, "The scientific task preceding all others is the determination of the curriculum" (pp. 41-42).

The scientific method was being applied to other areas of education, but until it was applied to the curriculum the other efforts would prove ineffective.

In what Bobbitt (1918b) described as the "feudal theory" of curriculum development, the "superintendent and principal . . . layout the courses of study, choose the books, supplies, and equipment, and direct the methods" (p. 78). This method was ineffective, in Bobbitt's perspective, because it only involved the teacher in a "fragment of the total process" (i.e., the limited perspective of teaching in the classroom) which eventuated in "results which do not greatly resemble the ultimate objectives" (p. 78).

By contrast, the democratic theory of organization and curriculum development provided for the involvement of the total group in the decision-making process. Bobbit viewed the superintendent as a generalist who specialized in leadership. Principals and, particularly, teachers were the specialists. According, then, to Bobbitt (1918b),

Where all are made intelligent as to the group-labors, the sum of the knowledge of the specialists added to that of the generalists is greater than that of the generalists alone; and this aggregate is a more effective directive agency. (p. 79)

Participation made teachers more effective because they were able to see their roles in relation to the total organization and see objectives in relation to the total curriculum.

Two examples of the varying perspectives concerning scientific management can be seen in Bobbitt's discussion.

Bobbitt saw his perspective of scientific management in clear contrast to the "so-called 'Taylor System' of scientific management" (p. 83). He pointed out that the Taylor System was not popular, frequently abandoned, and viewed as ineffective by those who attempted it. In addition, he viewed the Taylor System as unscientific. It was unscientific and, therefore, ineffective because it did not "enlist the intelligence and initiative" of all members of the organization (p. 84). Bobbitt considered the Taylor System the "halfway" point in the achievement of true scientific management (p. 84). What the Taylor System lacked, in Bobbitt's view, was a scientific attitude on the part of the workers: "Science rules in the planning-room; it must also rule in the consciousness of the workmen" (p. 84).

Bobbitt (1918b) considered the "human element" (p. 84) critical to the ultimate effectiveness of scientific management. He noted that

it has arisen with organization, where men work in groups, and where the generalist must be in part the director- at least the leader- of the specialists; where he must play upon them as does the conductor of the orchestra. (p. 84)

In this analogy, teachers were the specialists. The relationship between teachers and administrators was much like the relationship between managers and foremen. In this relationship, Bobbitt pointed out that "the greatest single source of coordination is a large ground of common understanding, community of thought, and mutual confidence

in the motives actuating both sides" (p. 85). This climate of trust was achieved by making sure that all members of the organization were "informed as to the controlling science" and had "access to all the facts relative to . . . vital affairs of the group" (p. 85).

In this type of organizational climate, all members of the organization were treated as partners in the organization's endeavors. Bobbitt suggested that partners in an organization cooperated "intelligently and effectively" and "mutually" recognized and respected "interdependent interests" of all members of the organization (p. 86). For Bobbitt this implied that all members of the organization had "access to the same body of facts; and that all have the trained powers of mind necessary for rightly interpreting and judging of those facts" (p. 86). This applied to the relationship between teachers and the curriculum in a school or system.

Bobbitt (1918b) extended this analogy to include the students. Contrary, though, to interpretations which viewed the students as the product, Bobbitt considered students as "the ultimate workers . . . the teachers rank as foremen" (p. 84). As foremen must know their workers to get the maximum production, Bobbitt (1918b) contended that teachers

must know the pupils: know their varying mental capacities, their interests, their aptitudes and abilities, their states of health, and their social milieu. (p. 85)

Keeping with the analogy, Bobbitt pointed out that "arbitrary driving will not work with men" (p. 85).

Therefore, teachers must also "know how to arouse interest; how to motivate [students] from within" (p. 85). Bobbitt asserted that "the driving force" for learning had to lie "in the will" of the student (p. 85).

In conclusion, Bobbitt (1918b) asserted that more study needed to be devoted to a "method of curriculum discovery" rather than the "details of curriculum content" (pp. 284-285). Most books on curriculum preceding the publication of The Curriculum were concerned more with what subjects should make up the curriculum and justification for these selections. The few books that suggested a method for curriculum development treated the topic only cursorily. Traditionally, the curriculum came, first, from textbooks and/or the school board, and, then, as school administration evolved, the superintendent. This may have occurred unintentionally, however little attention had been devoted to the principles of curriculum-making. And whether readers agreed or disagreed with the principles proposed by Bobbitt, he asserted that what was important now was "that each find scientific principles and methods of curriculum-formulation which he can himself accept; and which make thought the basis of curriculum-making rather than imitation" (p. 285).

The superintendent of the Cleveland school system, Spaulding (1918), in a lecture to superintendents during Superintendents' Week at the University of Chicago, contrasted "two extreme types of school administration"- the autocratic and the co-operative types (p. 561). The

autocratic type of administration was characterized by isolation, inefficiency, rigidly-defined positions and responsibilities, and top-down communication. Spaulding emphasized the mechanical nature of this form of administration. The benefit of the autocratic type of administration, from Spaulding's perspective, was the "certainty about the distribution of responsibility" (p. 562). All participants in the organization were clear about their responsibilities. The primary disadvantage was the isolation caused in part by the rigid structure. According to Spaulding, the autocratic type was the prevalent form of school administration in the United States (p. 563).

In contrast, the co-operative type of school administration was characterized by two-way communication (i.e., top-down and bottom-up), group problem-solving, experimentation, and high morale. Spaulding (1918) stated that the advantages of the co-operative type of school administration were "the development of high morale throughout the system" (p. 563), the availability "for use the wealth of experience, of knowledge, of inspiration and ideals, represented by the whole teaching force" (p. 564), and the extension of "the professional education and progress of everyone concerned" (p. 564). Spaulding cautioned, however, that the co-operative type of school administration required as rigidly placed responsibility as the autocratic type and objective evaluation of all work.

Spaulding (1918) indicated that the educational or teachers' council was one method of which he was aware for facilitating the co-operative type of school administration. He noted that the teachers' councils were operating in "Chicago, New York, Boston, Los Angeles, Portland, and other cities" (p. 567). While he admitted to having no direct knowledge about any of these efforts, Spaulding stated that a primary weakness of the teachers' council was that members of a council frequently represented groups rather than the entire school system. He expressed the belief that

a council should represent everyone in the system. At least in theory everyone should have a choice in the representative to the council without belonging to any voluntary, organized group (p. 567).

Representation on councils had to be carefully considered.

Spaulding (1918) had the experience and expertise to support his assertions. He was involved in the creation of teachers' councils in the Minneapolis and Cleveland school systems. These are described in more detail in the section of this chapter on the practice of teacher participation in curriculum development. However, it should be noted that these councils were involved in "problems relating to the curriculum" (p. 569).

In an address to the Classroom Teachers Department of the National Education Association, Bagley (1918) examined the status of classroom teachers and suggested some ways in which that status might be improved. At the time, Bagley was a professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. One method in particular could be found in the

"distinction between purely administrative matters . . . and educational policy" (p. 385). Bagley found no conflicts between the administrative function and "delegating to the teachers as such a large measure of collective responsibility for what may be called the educational policies of the school or the school system" (p. 385). According to Bagley,

Educational policies concerning the course of study, the adoption of textbooks, the adjustment of the program, the provisions for exceptional pupils of all types, and similar matters may well be determined by the teaching staff acting as a unit, or by a representative 'senate' of teacher selected by the teachers themselves. (p. 385)

Thornburg (1918), the superintendent of schools in Des Moines, Iowa, asserted that the superintendent should be the leader in interpreting the curriculum. What exactly entailed interpretation of the curriculum Thornburg did not make explicit. However, he did make it clear that curriculum development was a collaborative effort involving teachers with the superintendent as leader in the effort:

Pages, chapters, topics, and subtopics are not a curriculum. Material, places, conditions, and their relationship to the pupil, present or future, when properly organized, not by the superintendent at his desk, but by teachers, principals, supervisors, and superintendents, after survey trial and application, might form a fair basis for a curriculum. (p. 618)

Additionally, the superintendent was to cultivate leaders among the teachers to assist with the construction and application of the curriculum.

. . . the training of leaders in an educational system is of equal importance to the selection of those capable of leading. Numerous teachers can be found in every system who have initiative, scholarship, teaching

skill, personality, social aptitude, health, and surplus vitality to develop and carry forward the important lines of present-day school activities (p. 619).

The most "important lines of present day school activity" were, according to Thornburg (1918), the teacher, the pupil, and the course of study (p. 618).

In the ensuing discussion of Thornburg's address, Hunter (1918a), the superintendent of schools in Oakland, California, contended that the superintendent's greatest responsibility was

to shape the development of this thing we call the curriculum by leading the forces which actually make it, and to interpret it to at least three groups of people- to the teachers, to the board of education, and to the public. (p. 621)

As a leader in interpreting the curriculum, the superintendent must be "a student of curriculum-making" (p. 621). Because of new demands being placed upon education, superintendents could not address curriculum issues in the traditional ways. According to Hunter (1918a), progressive curriculum-making required the superintendent to examine and seek

(1) the great national purposes of education, (2) the defects of our present school organization and the machinery in obtaining them, and (3) the assistance of the whole teaching force in the active work of scientific investigation and experimentation. (p. 621)

From these ideas, Hunter (1918a) proposed four principles of curriculum-making which would serve to guide superintendents in meeting the new demands. The second and third principles were the most relevant to the issue of teacher participation in curriculum development. The second

principle dealt with variation and had two parts: (1) curriculums must reflect the "group needs" of students based on "social inheritance, economic environment, and natural tendencies" (p. 622) and (2) curriculum will vary from school system to school system, and possibly from school to school, based on the needs of the communities which they serve. The third principle stated,

Curriculum will be made by two groups of people: first, by classroom teachers, or their respective committees, who are studying the needs of children by first-hand contact; and, secondly, by special groups of experimenters employed by communities to study individual and group differences in children and to survey community needs. (p. 622)

If needs and abilities did vary from student to student, then, in Hunter's perspective, the curriculum had to be designed to meet these needs. According to Hunter, however, it would be impractical to create a curriculum which addressed the strengths and weaknesses of each student. A practical solution to this dilemma was to create a curriculum which addressed the needs of groups of students. Those in the best position to assess the needs of individual students or groups of students and develop curriculum based on these needs were classroom teachers.

In an broadened version of his discussion before the Department of Superintendence, Hunter (1918b) expanded on the third principle concerning teachers and researchers developing curriculum. To the original idea that teachers and teacher committees would develop curriculum based on their studies of the needs of children, Hunter added,

In our industrial districts where neighborhood and community centers will develop at a rapid pace, groups of teachers themselves will decide the curriculums. Superintendents will be wise in recognizing this responsibility and capitalizing the best work of such teachers. (p. 275)

Hunter added in his summary that the superintendent must be both leader and collaborator in his role as interpreter of the curriculum. And as collaborator, he must ensure that each of the four principles of curriculum-making, on which he elaborated, were carried out.

The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) received much attention, as it still does today, for what it proposed for the objectives of secondary education, but the commission writing the report also addressed the participation of the faculty in coordinating the subject matter and activities of the school to address these educational objectives. The seven objectives the commission proposed (i.e., health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character), even with the accompanying descriptions and discussions, were very broad. These objectives were to serve as guides for the various curriculums which would be developed for each secondary school. Reports from committees under the umbrella of the commission proposed "the aims, methods, and content of the various subjects of study and curriculums in the light of these principles" (p. 26).

The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) suggested that each high school should be organized around

these educational objectives. A weakness of the traditional high school, according to the commission, was that it was organized around subject areas. This type of organization tended to fragment the school-

there will result an overvaluation of the importance of the subjects as such, and the tendency will be for each teacher to regard his function as merely that of leading the pupils to master a particular subject, rather than that of using the subjects of study and the activities of the school as means for achieving the objectives of education. (p. 22)

Organizing the school around the objectives of education would serve to unify the activities, the subjects of the school, the school itself, and make the school more effective in the education of students.

The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) proposed two organizational structures for developing the curriculums for each secondary school based on the size of each school. In "large" (p. 21) high schools, the commission recommended that

each curriculum, or group of closely related curriculums, . . . be placed under the supervision of a director whose task it shall be to organize that curriculum and maintain its efficiency. (p. 21)

This group of curriculum directors along with others (i.e., the health director, the citizenship director, the vocational and educational guidance director, and the director of preparation for leisure) would comprise the "principal's council" (p. 22). The members, or directors, of the council were to be selected from the faculty and "charged with the responsibility of studying the activities of the school with reference to a specific objective" (p.

22). The activities of the school included the related subject matter.

In "medium-sized" high schools, the teachers of each school would be "organized into committees to consider the problems of the various curriculums" (Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 1918, p. 22). The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) pointed out that "the principal may appoint committees of teachers" (p. 23) which suggested that other options, such as election by the teachers themselves, were acceptable. The committees of teachers would be charged with the same responsibilities as the directors of the principal's council described in the previous paragraph. The commission also asserted that "an advantage of the committee plan is that a larger number of teachers will be stimulated to acquire a broad educational point of view" (p. 23).

Palmer (1919), a principal of the Sophie J. New school in Mount Vernon, New York, maintained that teachers should be given "greater responsibilities in the shaping of our work" and that principals of schools played an important role in bringing this about (p. 542). Whether this was his practice was not explicit. Since he never made it clear that this was a his practice at the school, this was included as rhetoric advocating the practice. Palmer suggested ways to create an expectation that more was desired of teachers than clerical work, rote teaching, or well managed classrooms. The suggestions included

frequently soliciting teachers' opinions and suggestions, encouraging experimentation and sharing results, providing teachers leadership opportunities, and providing opportunities for frequent and critical examinations on "every feature of school work" (p. 542).

Palmer (1919) implied an understanding that involving teachers was a developmental process. In the climate of the time, teachers "feel that they are followers and subservient to the will of higher authority . . . and the majority of teachers are contented with this order of things" (p. 541). Because of the majority of teachers had this perception, Palmer stated that the "correct spirit of active co-operation must be worked up" (p. 542). This "spirit," or climate, would be developed by frequently holding "conferences with individual teachers and groups of teachers" in which "all concerned are on an equal footing" and any participant might act as leader depending on circumstances (pp. 542-543). Realizing that teachers might not willingly or easily share opinions and suggestions initially, he suggested confidential questionnaires (p. 543). These questionnaires could serve as the focal point for conferences. As the "spirit" of the school became more conducive to teachers participating and sharing more willingly, the questionnaires might be used less frequently.

While Palmer (1919) never directly addressed curriculum as an area for teacher participation, his comments were suggestive that curriculum was not excluded. His opening

comment about involving teachers in the "way of organization of the whole school work" (p. 544) was indicative of teacher involvement in all aspects. Later, Palmer stated, "Many executive and administrative qualities lie dormant within the teaching force" (p. 544). Curriculum construction and revision was considered by many to be a responsibility reserved for principals, superintendents, or other experts. Palmer suggested that teachers might be considered expert in some areas: "The teacher who is in the work every day, and is a real live teacher, should be able to do many things better than a superintendent or principal" (p. 544). Finally, he wrote of creating an expectation in teachers that they were responsible for more than "following dictated methods and courses of study" (p. 542). If teachers were expected to do more than follow dictated curriculum and were expected to offer constructive criticism and suggestions in the whole school work, by implication, curriculum development and revision were legitimate areas of teacher involvement.

The fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held in Milwaukee, featured several addresses on the subject of teacher involvement in the creation of courses of study and numerous addresses endorsing teacher involvement in the administration of the schools. Those advocating for greater teacher participation ran the gamut from teachers to principals to superintendents to deans and professors of education. These perspectives

were also varied. Gould (1919), Bogan (1919), and Harden (1919) offered support for the idea of teacher involvement in administration and policy-making, in general. Others were more specific to curriculum development. Gildemeister (1919), in a follow-up on an address concerning a national commission studying the problems of elementary education, stated that one ideal of democracy was the idea of participation. Participation in a democracy entailed acting in the "alternating capacities of leader and follower, so that each individual and his environment perpetually interact and grow together" (p. 183). This also would be an ideal in the process of curriculum revision.

Challenges such as a low average length of service for teachers, two to three years according to Gildemeister (1919), and minimal teacher preparation had prevented widespread teacher involvement in curriculum-making. However, changes and improvements in these and other areas required that an "ever-increasing number of teachers" participate in the "revision of our national curriculum for elementary schools" (p. 183).

In another address to the Elementary Department of the N.E.A., Harris (1919a), a former chair of a teachers' council in Minneapolis, endorsed the practice of the teachers' councils:

What I do advocate and thoroly believe in is a real conference of administrative officers with representatives whom the teachers choose, a conference in which there is mutual respect, and in which weight is attacht to the opinion of both sides, so that both contribute to the outcome of the conference. (p. 189)

She detailed the formation of the teachers' council, or advisory council, in Minneapolis beginning in 1912. After a lengthy study, the initial teachers' council was instituted in 1915. The composition of the teachers' councils has already been described. Harris stated that in the four years the teachers' council had been in existence, the council had "dealt with such vital problems as courses of study, textbooks the merit system, length of day, typical school building, and salary increases" (p. 191).

In an address to the Classroom Teachers Department of the N.E.A., Coffman (1919a), the dean of education at the University of Minnesota, advocated for a cooperative form of school organization. He stated that the only purpose for school organization was to facilitate instruction. He asserted that

Every device, every detail, every working schedule, every salary, every teacher, every supervisor, must be evaluated in terms of the excellence of the work. Better conditions for work can be justified only on the ground of better work. (p. 377)

Any organizational plan had to be evaluated in relation to its effectiveness in promoting and facilitating instruction. Coffman contended that with this principle of organizational effectiveness "we have an intelligent basis for cooperative planning and cooperative organization" (p. 377).

In an expanded version of his speech which appeared in The American School Board Journal, Coffman (1919b) maintained that the suggestions and impetus for improvement should come from teachers primarily because of their

proximity to the problems. However, solutions to problems were most effectively arrived at cooperatively. Teachers, administrators, and supervisors "must meet together upon a common ground and thru discussion and evidence arrive at a common conclusion, which will serve as a basis for action" (p. 30).

Coffman (1919b) used the curriculum to illustrate his point. Traditionally, the curriculum had been "handed over ready made to the teachers" (p. 30). However, as Coffman pointed out earlier, the teachers' perspectives on the curriculum differed from those making the curriculum. He warned, though, that a curriculum prepared exclusively by any group "must be viewed with suspicion" (p. 30). A cooperative effort involving teachers to develop curriculum was needed, according to Coffman.

Gardner (1919), a teacher at Park Street School in Milwaukee, in an address presented to the Classroom Teachers Department of the N.E.A., endorsed the concept and practice of the teachers' councils or advisory committees. She asserted that

there can never be the right kind of cooperation in the school system until the representatives of the people on the school board and the instructors of the children of the people in the classroom are brought into closer relationship (p. 378).

Although there were those who opposed teacher participation because teachers "'have not that all-round and distant view,'" Gardner contended that teachers have the "'the close-up' and intimate view which no other group in the

school has" (p. 380). The teachers' perspective was an essential component of cooperative structures such as the teachers' council. She pointed out that some of these teachers' councils had been allowed a role in curriculum development and textbook selection. Gardner noted that most successful examples were "those of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Toledo, Boston, New York, and Portland- no two are exactly alike" (p. 379). Yet, all offered teachers the opportunity to participate in the administration and organization of the schools.

Gosling (1919), a supervisor of secondary education in the Department of Public Instruction for the state of Wisconsin, described the successful superintendent as one who can effectively utilize "all the brains of the community to assist him in his administration" (p. 29). He asserted that teachers should be an important part of this cooperative effort because "they are in closer touch with the problems of the school than [the superintendent] is" (p. 29). The teachers, then, were more than mere employees. Gosling described them as "coadjutors" (p. 29) or, simply put, those who work together with others to achieve a goal. This established a relationship, according to Gosling, which was official in nature rather than depending on "the whim or caprice or good will" (p. 29) of the superintendent.

In Gosling's (1919) view, there was a beneficial psychological aspect to cooperation:

By an inherent quality of human nature people identify themselves more readily with projects of their own

making than with these which are made by others. Good psychology, therefore, requires that a superintendent shall associate the teachers with himself in the formulation and in the execution of the policies of the school. (p. 29)

Policies cooperatively arrived at would be more effectively carried out in the schools. While psychology was in its infancy in the United States at this time, this principle of human nature would serve as the foundation for motivational and organizational theories until the end of the twentieth century.

According to Gosling (1919), teachers had the most to offer in the selection of textbooks and in curriculum development. In both cases, teachers were the "most directly concerned in using them" (p. 29) and, yet, the common practice had not been to involve teachers in curriculum construction. This practice was changing, though. Gosling offered as an example the practice of the Cincinnati school system under Superintendent Condon to involve teachers in such decisions as textbook selection and curriculum development.

Knapp (1919), a superintendent of schools in Highland Park, Michigan, contended that the issue was not an issue of democratic school administration versus autocratic school administration. Democracy, in Knapp's conception, meant that "all members of society have equal rights (theoretically) and most of them have a voice in the control of affairs" (p. 465). The real issue for Knapp was the matter of control. This can be seen in his analogy of

democratic practice to a government-run train and its passengers. He asked,

What would you think of the [passenger] who wanted a voice in the control of the train after he has boarded it . . . ? And again what would you think would be the result if all the brakemen on a railway system should demand their share of control and should exert their initiative and following their own judgment as to when, how, and where brakes should be applied, and by whom? (p. 466)

In his analogy, someone must ultimately be in control and responsible even in a democracy.

Knapp (1919) maintained that democratic practice was "frequently autocratic in effect, tho not in theory" and that "we as a society have not succeeded in making our democracy absolute" (p. 469). In other words, democracy was an ideal we had not yet achieved and might not be achievable in practice. Additionally, democracy was "slow and inefficient" (p. 466). Beside the fact that democratic practice had advantages and disadvantages, just as autocratic practice did, there were other factors to be considered in the discussion of democratic versus autocratic practice. Knapp contended that there was "no proper analogy between self-government of society and the management of its schools" (p. 74) to serve as a guide for a superintendent. Knapp also pointed out that, from his perspective, there was a conflict between the legal responsibility of the school board and the institution of democratic practice in the schools. These issues had convinced Knapp that democratic practice was not a solution for effective school administration.

What educators should be focusing on instead, according to Knapp (1919), was the "dominance between a single individual and cooperation" (p. 469). He defined cooperation as "joint action or operating together" (p. 465). In a cooperative system,

the person possessed of responsibility shares that responsibility and his powers and duties with others for the purpose of producing better results by capitalizing the talent of the many. This is the principle of division of labor applied to control. (p. 465)

Knapp suggested that cooperation was the most effective form of administration and the effective superintendent would "capitalize the talent of his force and use it to the limit" (p. 469). The method in which the superintendent would capitalize on this would be in the creation of teachers' councils. The teachers' councils would serve three purposes: (1) "to broaden and educate the teachers in school administration and school policies," (2) "to make [teachers] realize the impracticability of some of their unofficial ideas," and (3) "to considerably increase the sources of constructive planning" (p. 469).

A council would be composed of representatives of the various teacher groups present in the system. The superintendent and representatives "would meet on common ground" (Knapp, 1919, p. 469). According to Knapp, there would be some councils that would "have their meetings without the presence of any executive" (p. 469); however, he did not explain what circumstances would require this.

The superintendent was to use the teachers' council in the creation of policies for the school system (p. 469).

Of the four types of councils identified by Knapp (1919) (i.e., "the council with no power and no official recognition," the "council whose recommendations are recorded," the council "whose recommendations become unwritten law and are usually followed," and the council "authorized by law with actual responsibilities" (p. 470)), Knapp endorsed the third type. The superintendent was to maintain his or her authority over proposed policy recommended by the teachers' council.

Knapp (1919) had established the teachers' council in Highland Park where he was superintendent. He suggested a process for establishing a teachers' council:

The superintendent must give his attention to establishing a system, after this he may occupy himself with determining the talents of his force and with a division of responsibility as well as labor, remembering that the best kind of teachers' council exists to advise the superintendent and should be invited to do so. (p. 473)

The teachers' council in Highland Park had been involved in numerous activities which Knapp listed and proposed as appropriate activities for other teachers' councils. The first activity listed as a practical way of "giving teachers a proper and profitable share in the conduct of school affairs" was for the teachers' council to appoint a "committee to make a course of study" (p. 473).

In his book entitled The Curriculum, Richmond (1919) suggested a method "making our school curricula simpler,

more elastic, and more united within themselves" (p. v). The "main guiding principle" for his proposal was "to simplify [the curriculum] by unification" (p. 10). Unification of the curriculum would be achieved by searching for the "unifying truths of science that draw the detailed work of the various sciences into a group of common realisations" (p. 10). For example, in the study of history, Richmond contended that there were "three main interests in history: biography, event, and structural sequence" (p. 14). In mathematics, "problems of quantity and proportion as arise in science and geography" (p. 23) would be appropriate common realizations or connections. Once unified by these common connections, the curriculum would become a "synthetic curriculum" (p. 25), according to Richmond. The unification, or synthesis, of curriculum and method was Richmond's focus.

The creation of a synthetic curriculum and synthetic method posed the ultimate problem of the training of synthetic teachers, that is, teachers who would understand the common connections between the subject areas. One solution proposed by Richmond (1919) was "the collaboration of teachers to work out the natural system of relations that is to be found between the main subjects of the curriculum" (p. 40). This would be most beneficial for groups of teachers "who try to teach as a community" (p. 40). Richmond predicted that the collaboration of teachers in

this way would "lead to profound and far-reaching form in educational method" (p. 40).

There were other benefits in this cooperation in curriculum development. Richmond stated that

when the school staff begins to work as a whole towards the production of a synthetic curriculum, each member of the staff is stimulated to think out a simple philosophy of his own. It broadens our outlook upon any subject to see it in its natural relation with other subjects; also, the processes of staff discussion encourages every one . . . to make as much of the significance of his own subject as possible. (p. 41)

As with other advocates of teacher participation in curriculum development, Richmond contended that their participation would serve to make them more effective teachers.

The Emergence of Teachers' Councils

Pearson (1913a; 1913b) reported on the curriculum work of teachers at the Horace Mann Elementary School at Teachers College of Columbia University. The curriculum presented represented the gradual revision of the curriculum over a period of six years by the teaching staff. Pearson (1913a) noted that teachers "were peculiarly free to modify their methods of teaching and the subject matter of instruction whenever it seems wise to do so" (p. 65). In the development of curriculum, he also noted that the purpose had been for the curriculum to "reflect the experience and opinion of the entire teaching staff of the school" (p. 66). In this vein, the tentative curriculum outlines were developed by committees of teachers. These tentative

outlines were then presented to the entire faculty for "discussion and modification" (p. 66). After review by the principal and supervisors of the school, the outlines were adopted. These outlines were presented in the series which appeared in the Teachers College Record.

In her study of teacher participation in educational planning and administration, North (1915), a special investigator for the Bureau of Research of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, concluded that teachers were capable of effectively participating in the decisions concerning any questions "related to the curriculum or the internal administration of the schools" (p. 66). North examined the attempts, both successful and unsuccessful, in various systems to involve teachers in the formulation of school plans. Practices in Los Angeles, Portland, Dallas, New Britain (Connecticut), Boston, Chicago, and New York were cited. North considered those practices found in New Britain, Chicago, and New York to be the most effective in involving teachers in school planning and administration.

In New Britain, Connecticut, the superintendent reported that the primary purpose of the teachers' council was "to furnish to all the factors of the teaching body an opportunity to confer together for the highest efficiency of the schools" (North, 1915, p. 17). The teachers' council had not received legal recognition from the school board. Membership on the council was composed of all school principals and supervisors, one teacher representative from

each of the elementary grades (including kindergarten), and four teachers from the high school. North included the principal in her definition of teacher participation because the principal "must have been at some time a class teacher and is still directly identified with the work of teaching through all the school day" (p. 1). The brief account of the work of the New Britain teachers' council presented by North focused on instructional and curricular issues.

North (1915) next described the work of the Chicago Teachers' Councils. North noted that the idea for the teachers' councils in Chicago originated with Ella Flagg Young in 1899. It will be remembered that Young worked with Dewey in the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago as an instructional supervisor. The original purpose of these councils was to allow the

full expression of the judgment of principals and teachers on questions pertaining to courses of study, textbooks, departmental work, duties and advancement of teachers and other educational topics. (p. 26)

The proposal encountered stops and starts until Young became superintendent of the Chicago school system. Young was allowed by the school board to put her proposal into effect in 1913.

A primary challenge was organizing the teachers' councils. The size of the teaching force employed in Chicago in 1913, according to North (1915), was 7,000 teachers. North reported that Young organized the teachers into 74 group councils, e.g., elementary teachers, elementary principals, secondary teachers, secondary

principals, etc. Each council elected a representative to serve on the General Council. As was the original purpose of the teachers' councils as proposed in 1899, the purpose of the group and general councils was "to give full and free expression or voice to the different attitudes and judgments of the teaching force, on questions pertaining to Courses of Study" (pp. 28-29).

The New York Teachers' Council was organized in 1913, according to North (1915), as a result of, at least in part, the influence of the growing practice around the country to involve teachers in educational planning. North noted, however, that the idea originated as early as 1900. As in Chicago, a primary challenge was organizing the teachers. The president of the New York school board chose to do this through the forty-five voluntary teachers' organizations in existence in the city at the time. North reported that "the presidents of the voluntary teachers' associations took up the matter of organization of such a council" (p. 33). Their proposal was presented to the board of education and approved in July of 1913.

The plan of organization was outlined by North (1915) from the council's constitution and by-laws. The Council was composed of 45 representatives from each of the teachers' organizations which were in existence at the time. Members were to be elected by their representative organizations. The council had two primary functions: to furnish "information and opinions of the teaching staff . .

. upon questions submitted by the Board of Education or by the Board of Superintendents," and to introduce "recommendations concerning problems affecting the welfare of the schools and the teaching staff" (p. 34).

North (1915) reported on the work of the Teachers' Council during its first year, 1914. The council was composed of eleven standing committees one of which was the Committee on Courses of Study. During 1914, this committee presented reports to the board of education on the results of the tentative elementary arithmetic course of study, the proposed course of study in history, and the needed changes in the elementary and secondary courses of study (North, 1918, p. 38). In two of the three cases, the board acted favorably to the committee's reports. In the third case, the committee had not yet prepared a report.

Charters and Miller (1915) related their study in Kansas City, Missouri, of the grammatical errors of children. The purpose of the study was "to find out what the course of study would be if it were based upon the errors of children" (p. 45). Charters was the dean of Education at the University of Missouri, at the time, and Miller, one of his students, was a high school English teacher in St. Louis. Teachers played a critical role in the data collection. The teachers in grades two through seven spent one week logging errors they observed in students' writing and heard in students' speech. Each teacher participating in the study also listed and

prioritized what each believed to be the ten most common grammatical errors made by students.

The errors were then tabulated and generalized into rules to be taught. Percentages relative to the frequency of a particular error were assigned to the related rule. The percentages served to indicate the amount of emphasis to be placed on a particular rule. Additionally, Charters and Miller suggested that there was prerequisite knowledge that students would need to be taught in order to understand the rules generated from the errors. This list of prerequisite objectives and rules generated from student errors composed the proposed course of study in grammar for grades two through seven.

While the purpose was to develop a tentative curriculum based on students' errors, the study illustrated, in a practical manner, one method in which teachers could be involved in curriculum development. Teachers' observations and opinions provided the critical data for analysis. This data essentially provided the objectives for the course of study. Miller, a high school English teacher, provided the analysis of this data (p. 45). Additionally, the study illustrated the benefits of collaboration with university faculty in the creation of curriculum. Professors from the University of Missouri English department served as consultants on questions of grammar. This study was cited later by Bobbitt (1918) as exemplary of scientific, i.e., cooperative, curriculum-making.

In the September, 1915 issue of The Virginia Journal of Education, Virginia's superintendent of public instruction made an announcement concerning the new course of study and new textbooks which were being adopted for the state. Of note, were the comments made by Stearnes (1915) concerning the contributions of teachers to the development and adoption of the state curriculum. First, he stated,

Our most promising and significant forward step . . . is the publication of a new course of study, in the preparation of which at least a hundred of our leading teachers and superintendents have collaborated. (p. 20)

This course of study was being distributed in tentative form around the state "so that the whole teaching body may offer criticisms and suggestions" (p. 20). The plan from this point was for the comments and suggestions to be considered by the general committee, composed of teachers and superintendents, for the final form of the state course of study to be compiled in January, 1916.

In the discussion on Yocum's (1917) Report on Common Characteristics of Efficient Courses of Study to the National Council of Education, Engleman (1917), superintendent of the Decatur, Illinois, schools, described his procedure for involving teachers in the revision of the system course of study. Engleman began the revision process at the beginning of the 1914-1915 school year and invited the participation of the 200-plus teachers employed by the system. His method was a relatively simple and common process:

Committees were assigned for the study of various phases of the course, and these committees in turn divided into subcommittees for work upon still smaller units of each subject. Much time was spent by the teachers in the examination of courses of study issued by leading school systems thruout the country. Use was made of the recommendations of many educational theorists as well, to say nothing of the formulations of various committees whose voice has national acceptance. Such portions of Decatur's previous course as had been workt out in detail and had stood the test of the classroom were incorporated in the various committee reports and used as the nucleus around which certain of our courses were made to develop. Scores of conferences and committee meetings were held during the progress of the work. (p. 215)

After the regular school year was completed, the superintendent, high school principal, and elementary supervisor spent the next six weeks reviewing and modifying the work of the committees. When this work was completed, further input was solicited from teachers and the community concerning the tentative course of study (p. 215).

The process used in Decatur was not unlike the method used by Newlon in Denver. In fact, this process may have influenced Newlon's thinking on the Denver Curriculum Revision Project. Newlon (1917) in his discussion of a scientific curriculum policy discussed his study of the curriculum history of the high school in Decatur, Illinois. Beginning with the establishment of Decatur High School in the 1860's, Newlon traced the evolution of the curriculum to the point in 1911 when it was decided in "a series of faculty meetings that a better curriculum organization must be obtained" (p. 258). This reorganization lasted four years at which time the high school faculty again became dissatisfied with curriculum. As Newlon described it:

In 1915 the whole matter was thrashed out in a series of faculty meetings and a new organization of the program of studies was effected. This program of studies was adopted by a unanimous vote of the faculty after the various provisions in it had been adopted one by one, by majority vote. (p. 259)

In Newlon's view, the process he highlighted in Decatur was the guide for solving all curriculum problems (p. 261).

Fichandler (1917), a principal of a public school in Brooklyn, New York, advocated for and described his practice of what he called "Americanization" (p. 251) which he suggested was synonymous with what others described as democratic practices in education. He suggested that in order to prepare students for American citizenship, "teachers must be qualified by personal experience to achieve this end" (p. 251). However, it was his assertion that this was not the common practice: "Teachers have no voice in the conduct of the affairs of the school, except occasionally" (p. 251). Because "individuals pass on to those under their control treatment similar to that which they receive from their superiors" (p. 251), few students were being prepared for American citizenship.

Fichandler (1917) described his practice of teacher participation for the last four years at the Brooklyn school where he was principal. Teachers participated in the management of the school through the "Teachers' Council" (p. 252). All school problems, "administrative and pedagogic," were presented to the Teachers' Council. The council was then given the opportunity to discuss the presented problems "fully and freely" (p. 252). Suggestions to address the

problems were solicited and generated by all participants. The appropriate solutions were decided by a majority vote of the participants. The decisions of the council were "carried out and enforced whenever practicable by the teachers themselves" (p. 542). The nature of the problems addressed by the Teachers' Council was not clear. From the teachers' comments in response to their perspective concerning the effectiveness of the council, problems related to instructional issues (i.e., methods) were addressed. Administrative and pedagogic problems also suggested issues of curriculum and instruction.

In keeping with the idea of democratic practice, teachers' opinions about how they "regard their participation in the administration of the school" were solicited and included in the article (Fichandler, 1917, p. 252). Fichandler reported that a "large proportion" (p. 252) responded. The responses were classified into five areas: effect on the personality of the teachers, effect on the teachers' attitude toward the school, effect on teachers' attitude toward the supervisors, effect on relations between teachers, and effect on the work of the teachers. The comments which were included in the article were overwhelmingly favorable. Whether these are all the recorded comments or whether these are representative of all the responses was not clear.

Spaulding (1918), the superintendent of the Cleveland and Minneapolis school systems, described the development

and operation of teachers' councils in these systems. The teachers' council in Minneapolis was formed in 1914. The council was composed of

twenty-five members representing all the teachers, principals, and supervisors in the system. . . . Each high school was represented by one teacher. The kindergarten and first two grades had one representative, the third, fourth, and fifth grades had one, and the sixth, seventh, and eighth another. There were two representatives for the special teachers and two representatives of the elementary principals and one high-school principal. (p. 568)

The council drew up a constitution which was submitted to the system faculty for final approval.

Whereas the council in Minneapolis was created essentially on the initiative of the teachers, Spaulding (1918) was primarily the impetus for its creation and development in Cleveland. However, once Spaulding made the suggestion "the council was worked out almost entirely by the teachers themselves" (p. 569). Representation on the council was arrived at in a different way, also. Each school in the system nominated one member to serve on the council. The names were compiled into one list. Then each teacher in the system selected, in this case, twenty names from the list. The twenty members with the highest number of votes formed the committee. As with the Minneapolis council, a constitution was developed and submitted to the entire system faculty for final approval.

These councils considered "all kinds of matters" (p. 568) including "problems relating to the curriculum" (p. 569). However, the examples that Spaulding (1918) used here

to illustrate how the councils operated concerned salaries and teacher dismissal. Spaulding concluded that his experiences with teachers' councils had convinced him that "we ought to get together and study methods and means by which we may profit by this growing desire to work together for the best things" (p. 575).

Harris (1919b), a former chair of a teachers' council in Minneapolis, presented an expanded version of her address to the Elementary Department of the N.E.A. which appeared in The American School Board Journal. Harris went into more detail about how the teachers' council was involved in curriculum development. She stated that the course of study "became very early a subject of discussion in the council" (p. 31). Harris pointed out that during the last four years, 1915-1919, "committees of teachers have outlined the course of study in various subjects" (p. 30). The year of the address (1919), the council made the decision to change the curriculum revision cycle from two to three years "and a readjustment to the curriculum had to be made" (p. 31). The teachers' council nominated the teachers to serve on the curriculum revision committees and the superintendent appointed these teachers to the various curriculum committees. Harris stated that these committees "outlined the entire course [of study]" (p. 31).

Updegraff (1919), in a report of the Committee on Superintendents' Problems, presented the results of a study on administrative cooperation in the making of courses of

study in elementary schools. The purpose of the study was to "describe actual practice in cooperative efforts in the field" (p. 677). Updegraff, first, established a theoretical foundation for the "participation of teachers in the formulation of the policies, plans, and methods of the school" (p. 675). The theoretical framework was established around principles of efficiency established in industry, educational principles concerning student variability, social principles relating to cooperation in democratic practice, and the idea that in order to teach the ideals of democracy effectively the schools must model democratic ideals.

Updegraff (1919) distributed a questionnaire investigating the organization and function of committees in school systems serving populations greater than five thousand. Three hundred twenty-nine cities were included in the study. Eleven percent (70 out of 629 cities in the United States) of cities with populations in the five to ten thousand range were represented in the study. Thirty-six percent (133 out of 572 cities) of cities with populations in the ten to twenty-five thousand range were represented. Fifty-one percent (61 out of 120 cities) of cities with populations in the twenty-five to fifty thousand range were represented. Fifty-three percent (31 of 59 cities) of cities with populations in fifty to one hundred thousand range were represented. Fifty-five percent (17 of 33 cities) of the cities with populations in the range of one

hundred to three hundred thousand were represented. Ninety-four percent (17 of 18 cities in the U.S.) of the cities with populations over three hundred thousand were represented. Updegraff indicated that a special effort was made to get responses from cities with populations greater than ten thousand.

In the section on actual conditions, fifty-four percent (176 out of 329 total cities responding) of the cities responding reported committees created to participate in curriculum development. As a general rule, the population of a city was directly related to the likelihood that the school system used cooperative committees to develop and revise curriculum. Updegraff (1919) reported "wide diversity in the forms of committees appointed to participate in the making of courses of study" (p. 678). Twenty-three variations were grouped into two classifications: "(1) those committees composed entirely, or almost entirely, of administrative and supervisory officers; (2) those committees having teachers included in their membership" (pp. 678, 682). The study also reported data concerning the size of the main committees, how committees were appointed, the composition of committees, factors influencing the selection of members, member qualities needed for success, committee procedures, revision of committee reports, and the proportion of courses prepared by the superintendent.

The researchers also solicited the opinions of the superintendents' in the systems included concerning their opinions as to the "value of the teachers' cooperation in the making of courses of study" (Updegraff, 1919, p. 709). Superintendents were asked three questions: "(1) What does your experience show was lost by having teachers upon these committees? (2) What was gained? (3) Which form of committee do you now prefer?" (p. 709). Updegraff (1919) asserted that the data collected on the first question offered "convincing proof of the desirability of cooperation between teachers and school officers in the preparation of courses of study" (p. 709). Eighty-five percent of responding superintendents indicated that either nothing was lost or "a little time was lost" (p. 709) by having teachers on the curriculum committees.

The responses to the second question- What was gained [by having teachers serve on curriculum committees]?- were grouped into four major categories: benefits for the course of study, benefits for the teachers, benefits for the superintendent, and benefits for the system. According to Updegraff (1919), "superintendents appreciate most the gains to the course of study itself" (p. 712). Typically, the responses suggested that teacher participation improved the practical nature of the curriculum. Almost half of the total responses, however, focused on the benefits to the teachers from participation in curriculum development. The two most common responses from superintendents indicated

that teacher participation increased teacher "efficiency" (p. 712) in the delivery of the curriculum and promoted the professional growth of those participating teachers.

Updegraff concluded that

The large percentage which mentioned the benefit to the teachers indicates that it is the present opinion of superintendents who have used committees in revising courses of study that this form of cooperation constitutes one of the best agencies for promoting the efficiency of the teachers themselves, that thru its operation teachers come to know the course of study better, that they are more interested in making it a success, and that it improves the quality of its work. (pp. 712-713)

The other questions yielded nothing particularly significant to this study.

Several of the study's general conclusions were particularly significant to teacher participation in curriculum development. First, Updegraff (1919) asserted that the large number of superintendents in systems serving populations over twenty-five thousand who indicated that teachers were involved in the development or revision of courses of study should establish this practice as an "accepted principle of administration of schools in such cities" (p. 714). Second, Updegraff concluded that more data was needed for cities smaller than twenty-five thousand before any inferences could be drawn. Third, Updegraff also concluded that "there are still a large number of superintendents, particularly in the smaller cities, who prepare courses of study themselves" (p. 714). Updegraff added that "these practices are not in accordance with the principles of administration deduced from the

science of efficiency nor with the practices approved by the majority of the superintendents . . . in the study" (p. 714). Finally, Updegraff stated that "there are certain forms and procedures which under typical conditions tend more than others to secure the best results" (p. 715).

Thus it can be said: (a) That a committee of supervisors or principals is not so good as a committee of teachers, and that neither is as good as a committee upon which all are represented. (b) That the larger the number of persons engaged in committee work or in some related capacity the better. (c) That any plan is much strengthened if formal agencies are provided by means of which members of committees can constantly ascertain the attitude of teachers whose work is covered by the proposed course. (d) That the method of selection of members upon the committees should be such as to secure, if possible, the most competent persons and also those in whom the teachers have confidence and to whom they can and will express themselves freely as well as receive from them adverse opinion without having their interest chilled. . . . (e) That qualifications of teachers for the work should have greater weight relatively in the selection of members of the central or main committee, while representatives of grades or buildings or both should have greatest weight in appointment of subcommittees. (f) That the plan should include the largest possible participation of the superintendent . . . in all phases of the work . . . (pp. 715-716)

These conclusions were intended as guides for further experiments in cooperative curriculum development and could serve to guide contemporary practice.

Significant to the research question concerning the extent of practice was the data collected on the participating cities. Updegraff (1919) identified participating cities and types of curriculum committees represented by these cities in an outline entitled "Classification of Types of Committees used in the Revision of Courses of Study in Elementary Schools in 176 Cities,

1916-1918" (p. 682). Only the portion of the outline documenting the cities using committees "on which teachers were well represented" (p. 682) was reproduced to conserve space.

Committees on which teachers were well represented

I. To revise courses *in certain subjects*

1. No subcommittees appointed
 - a) No organized means of receiving help or suggestion. (This is the most common form of committee.)
 - b) Advised by grade meetings held especially for the purpose-
Baltimore, Md.; Pittsburgh, Pa.
2. With small subcommittees formed entirely from membership of committee to prepare material covering
 - a) Certain grade or grades- Cincinnati, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Kansas City, Kans.; Columbus, Ohio; Richmond, Va.; Des Moines, Iowa; Aurora, Ill. (Eastside); Aberdeen, S.Dak.; Chelsea, Mass.; Huntington, W.Va.; Superior, Wis.; Long Beach, Calif.; Streator, Ill.; Kokomo, Ind.; New Ulm, Minn.; Long Branch, N.J.
 - b) Certain topics or problems-
Cambridge, Mass.; Allentown, Pa.; Boise, Idaho; Rock Island, Ill.; Elkhart, Ind.; Butte, Mont.
 - c) Either certain grades or topics- San Francisco, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pasadena, Calif.
 - d) Not stated- Chattanooga, Tenn.; Burlington, Iowa; Hannibal, Mo.
3. With small subcommittees composed in part from outside membership of committee to prepare material covering
 - a) Certain grades
 - (1) Without organized means of receiving help or suggestion-
Boston, Mass.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Stamford, Conn.; Kansas City, Kans.; Portsmouth, Va.; Fresno, Calif.; Fort Dodge, Iowa.
 - (2) With assistance of grade meetings held by members of subcommittees- La Crosse, Wis.
 - b) Certain topics or problems- Wichita,

- Kans.; Sheboygan, Wis.
- c) Either certain grades or topics-
Newton, Kans.
- 4. With small subcommittees formed entirely from membership of committee which in turn secured assistance from teachers by each member
 - a) Appointing subcommittees in his own school- Los Angeles, Calif.
 - b) Asking all teachers in his building to assist- Scranton, Pa.
- 5. With subcommittees formed entirely of committees but their membership so large that practically every teacher was a member of some committee and subcommittee- Tacoma, Wash.; Stamford, Conn.; Topeka, Kans.; E. Waterloo, Iowa; Richmond, Ind.; Pomona, Calif.; Eau Claire, Wis.; Mishawaka, Ind.
- II. To revise courses in *certain grades*- Denver, Colo.; Portland, Ore.; Galesburg, Ill.; La Salle, Ill.; Corvallis, Ore.; Latrobe, Pa.; Butte, Mont.
- III. To revise courses in *certain buildings*- Vincennes, Ind.
- IV. A general committee to direct revision of all courses in all grades with special committees
 - 1. For each subject in all grades- St. Louis, Mo.
 - 2. For each subject in particular grades- Decatur, Ill.
- C. Committee to review and edit work of committee- Cincinnati, Ohio; Lynn, Mass.; Ogden, Utah; Boise, Idaho.
- D. Standing committee on course of study- Minneapolis, Minn.; Burlington, Iowa. (pp. 682-683)

A total of sixty-nine of the one hundred seventy-six cities that reported having curriculum committees reported that they used curriculum committees on which teachers were significantly represented.

Also relevant are the procedures reportedly used by the systems providing for notable participation of teachers. Exemplified as typical of systems providing for teacher participation in curriculum development, Updegraff (1919) cited the procedures used by Topeka, Kansas, Kansas City,

Kansas, and East Waterloo, Iowa. The superintendent was involved in each system to varying degrees. Topeka illustrated an example of a superintendent who was closely involved to provide assistance where it was needed, "but without dictating" (p. 702). Kansas City illustrated a superintendent who, while providing for a high degree of teacher participation, provided for a highly structured plan in which he still retained a good deal of authority. East Waterloo illustrated a superintendent who assigned most authority to the teacher committees. All descriptions of procedures were taken from the anecdotal reports of the superintendents which were solicited as part of this study. Updegraff (1919) first summarized Topeka's procedures:

the teachers of each grade nominated three of their number as members of committees from that grade for each subject. These were appointed by the superintendent. The chairman of each subcommittee was a member of the general committee for that subject. The superintendent worked whenever there was a need for his help, but his particular function was to help teachers 'in getting outlook, point of view, and fundamental attack made.' Laymen were called in to assist. The general committee revised the work of the subcommittees, and the superintendent edited all courses for printing. The superintendent was assisted by a general supply teacher serving in a supervisory capacity in keeping in touch with the work of the various committees and subcommittees. Practically all of the teachers served upon some subcommittee. (pp. 700-701)

Gosling (1919), a supervisor for secondary education for the state of Wisconsin, contended that the successful superintendent would successfully involve "all the brains of the community to assist him in his administration" (p. 29). Teachers were included in Gosling's discussion and he

asserted that they would be most helpful in the selection of textbooks and the development of the curriculum. As a current example, Gosling cited the practice of the Cincinnati school system under the leadership of Superintendent Condon to include teachers in the "decisions which concern their daily work" (p. 29)- decisions such as the making of courses of study. Gosling predicted that this practice would lead to "further plans for utilizing the skill and intelligence of the teachers" (p. 29).

Knapp (1919), the superintendent of schools in Highland Park, Michigan, asserted that a cooperative system of school administration was an effective way of "producing better results by capitalizing the talent of the many" (p. 465). The structure he suggested for achieving a cooperative system was the teachers' council. The function of the teachers' council was to advise the superintendent on school affairs. Knapp had established a teachers' council in Highland Park which addressed several issues including: selection of equipment and furniture; development of guidelines for pay during sick leave; study of a twelve-month school year; development of guidelines for publicity of school activities; and, development of guidelines for use of the library. First among the activities listed by Knapp was making a course of study (p. 473).

Summary

During the period from 1910 through 1919, the complexity of educational administration was increasing with

the growth of school systems in the United States. The rhetoric of this period illustrated a growing concern with this complexity as educators grappled with administrative roles, responsibilities, and relationships in a society which valued democratic ideals. These discussions bore directly on teachers' participation in curriculum development, particularly as the responsibility for the curriculum became an administrative responsibility.

The function of the curriculum was an on-going topic of discussion. There was general agreement that the curriculum was to serve as a guide for teachers (e.g., Snedden, 1917 and Gilbert, 1913). It was also generally acknowledged that the curriculum should contain sufficient detail to provide adequate guidance, particularly for less capable teachers (e.g., Bagley, 1917; Snedden, 1917; and Yocum, 1917). Other aspects of the curriculum, however, were being debated during this period.

For example, discussions concerning a nationally uniform curriculum were gaining attention in the educational literature. McMurry (1913) opposed a uniform curriculum for two primary reasons. First, he opposed a uniform curriculum since uniformity tended to "emphasize mere quantity [over quality], to oppose omissions from that quantity, and to demand a quantity so large that it [was] inimical to reflection" (p. 140). This is a lesson that has seemingly been lost in the push for uniform curricula today. The second reason spoke to the issue of teacher participation.

Uniformity was a means for "teacher-proofing", to use a contemporary term, the curriculum. McMurry opposed uniformity reasoning that "mistakes necessarily go with freedom; and educational systems have got to be founded on trust of teachers" (p. 142). This trust was to extend to teachers' participation in curriculum development since teachers were the "only persons in the world who have most of the knowledge necessary for making curricula that will fit" (p. 142). Other writers also maintained that teachers' proximity to students made them crucial to the process of effective curriculum development (e.g., Coffman, 1919a; Gardner, 1919; Richmond, 1919; and, McMurry, 1913).

The responsibility for the curriculum gradually shifted from teachers to principals to superintendents as the population increase in the United States gave rise to the growth of school systems. By this time, there was widespread agreement that the curriculum was primarily the responsibility of the superintendent (e.g., Hunter, 1918a, 1918b; Spaulding, 1918; and Thornburg, 1918). Who should participate in the construction of the curriculum, however, was being debated. Whether teachers should be participants in the development of the curriculum was the most widely debated. Many writers expressed concerns about teacher participation because of poor training, lack of time, and lack of curriculum expertise (e.g., Snedden, 1917; Yocum, 1917; and, Gilbert, 1913). Additionally, some writers maintained that teacher participation had had little impact

on the quality or the effectiveness of the curriculum (e.g., Mott, 1917). These concerns would continue to be offered as reasons for excluding teachers throughout the period of study.

There was, nevertheless, a growing contingent of advocates for teacher participation in curriculum development (e.g., Snedden, 1910; Gilbert, 1913; McMurry, 1913; Suzzallo, 1913; Hughes, 1913; Clark, 1914; McMurry, 1915; Updegraff, 1917; Newlon, 1917; Cardinal Principles of Education, 1918; Coffman, 1919a; and, Richmond, 1919). While curriculum was the responsibility of the superintendent, many writers contended that the effective superintendent would use all the resources at his or her disposal in the development of the curriculum. Spaulding (1918), for example, asserted that a cooperative style of administration, characterized by two-way communication, group-problem solving, and experimentation, was advantageous because cooperation capitalized on the "wealth of experience, of knowledge, of inspiration and ideals, represented by the whole teaching force" (p. 564). Thornburg (1918) and Hunter (1918a and 1918b) maintained that, while the superintendent should be the leader in interpreting the curriculum, curriculum development was a collaborative effort involving teachers in the effort. Gosling (1919) contended that the successful superintendent was the one who could effectively utilize "all the brains of the community to assist him in his administration" (p. 29).

Likewise, Knapp (1919) characterized an effective superintendent as one who would "capitalize the talent of his force and use it to the limit" (p. 469). Clark (1914) and Hughes (1913) asserted that administrators should allow teachers a larger voice in the formulation of educational policies, policies such as the determination of the curriculum. Effective educational administration, at least at one level, was being defined by the role that teachers played.

Teacher participation in curriculum work was justified by democratic ideals according to many writers of this period (e.g., Bogan, 1919; Gildemeister, 1919, Gould, 1919; Harden, 1919; and, Newlon, 1917). Gildemeister (1919), for example, contended that participation was one of the democratic ideals which warranted teacher involvement. He maintained that participation in a democracy entailed acting in the "alternating capacities of leader and follower, so that each individual and his environment perpetually interact and grow together" (p. 183). The events surrounding World War I, in particular, served to bring about a resurgence in the examination of democratic practices in education. Boodin (1918) and Walker (1917a and 1917b), for example, perceived German aggression in Europe and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia to be direct threats to democratic ideals in the United States. The survival of democracy depended on the promotion and practice of these ideals in schools.

During the period from 1910 through 1919, teacher participation was considered by many to be a primary means for promoting professional development and status (e.g., Bagley, 1918; Spaulding, 1918; Newlon, 1917; and, Suzzallo, 1913). Newlon (1917), for example, regarded teacher participation in curriculum development as "the best kind of professional study" (p. 266). Bagley (1918) proposed one method for improving the professional status of teachers: "delegating to the teachers as such a large measure of collective responsibility for what may be called the educational policies of the school or school system" (p. 385). Spaulding (1918) contended that cooperative administration contributed to the professional development of teachers. As a paradox for the concerns about poorly-trained teachers being capable of participating intelligently, a growing number of writers perceived teacher participation as the means to improve poorly-trained teachers. Teacher participation in curriculum development would be viewed increasingly through the period of study as the means for professionalizing teaching.

Contemporary interpretations suggest that teachers were negatively affected by efforts to make education more scientific. Perhaps, in some conceptions of scientific management, teachers were negatively affected. However, the generalizations that all efforts were detrimental to the teaching profession may have been overstated. In fact, writers during the period from 1910 through 1919 were

beginning to suggest that the exclusion of teachers from school administration and curriculum development was unscientific. For example, Updegraff (1917) contended that efficient scientific management meant that teachers had to be involved in the decisions which affected their schools. In other words, the efficient schools and school systems involved teachers in decision-making. In Updegraff's conception, the term "efficient" was suggestive of effective management.

Likewise, Bobbitt's (1918a and 1918b) conception of scientific curriculum making suggested that it was unscientific to exclude teachers from the curriculum development process. Bobbitt challenged the common assumption that administrators, by virtue of their positions, were curriculum experts. He considered the traditional method of curriculum development, i.e., development by superintendents and principals, to be inefficient (i.e., ineffective) and unscientific because it involved teachers in a "fragment of the total process" (p. 78). Administrators were to be viewed as generalists and teachers as specialists. In Bobbitt's conception, the collaborative work of generalists and specialists would result in "a more effective directive agency" (p. 79).

Finally, the rhetoric of the period from 1910 through 1919 suggested that teacher participation made for more effective organization of the schools and school systems. For example, Snedden (1910) asserted that one method for

negating the undesirable effects of increasing centralization in education (i.e., bureaucracy and uniformity) was to involve teachers in the pertinent decision-making processes regarding functions such as curriculum development. Coffman (1919a) maintained that the only purpose for school organization was to facilitate instruction. He contended that in this principle of organizational effectiveness "we have an intelligent basis for cooperative planning and cooperative organization" (p. 377).

Tentative answers to the questions of when teacher participation in curriculum development became widespread and what constituted widespread practice would begin to emerge during the second decade of the twentieth century, particularly the last half of this decade (1915-1919). Up until this period, practice had been alluded to in the literature, but primary sources and the details of these practices were difficult to come by. North (1915) noted this problem:

There is the impression that 'movements' leading to teacher-participation in school planning are contemplated or in existence, but knowledge of the movements themselves or of the channels through which they may be discovered is scanty indeed. (p. 9)

Why this was a problem is subject to speculation since there was little recognition or direct reference to the problem in the literature.

One possibility was the problem of record-keeping or, more specifically, the lack of record-keeping in education.

Taylor (1836b) alluded to this ahistorical feature of the education system of the United States:

The reason the art of teaching is so little understood, is- *there is no instruction in the past*. If teaching had been made a profession there would be a record of the successes and the failures of the past, which would contain lessons more valuable to the teacher than all the projected theories and systems in creation What was experiment one hundred years ago is experiment still. That which was conjecture *then*, is still uncertainty *now*. Teachers have no communication with each other- no exchange of views and sentiments- no mutual aid; each one has toiled alone; each teacher's practical knowledge has been buried with him
(p. 1)

While Taylor's concern was with teaching as a profession, the same argument, by extension, might apply to other areas in education. A real gap in knowledge existed in what happened in individual schools and in what teachers' perspectives were concerning these efforts to involve them in curriculum work.

Another explanation for the dearth of records was that the procedures for developing the curriculum were not considered as important as the actual curriculum itself. For the first two decades of the twentieth century, the concern for both practitioners and theorists was what was in the curriculum. A change in this perspective was evident by 1915. North (1915) noted that the slowly increasing number of references in the literature indicated "a slow shift in the administrative point of view" (p. 10). Schubert (1980) also pointed to a shift in focus from the content of the curriculum to curriculum development during the first part of the twenty century (pp. 4-5).

An increase in the literature in the number of accounts of teacher participation in curriculum development was evident by 1915. North's (1915) study of teacher participation in school planning and administration examined both successful and unsuccessful attempts. The most notable examples of teacher participation in school planning were the Chicago Teachers' Councils, the New Britain (Connecticut) School Council, and the New York Teachers' Council. North's (1915) description of the work of all of these councils included examples of curriculum work. North (1915) concluded that "any matter related to the curriculum" (p. 66) was within the purview of these councils.

During the last half of this decade there were other numerous examples of practice included in the literature. Charters and Miller (1915) detailed the construction of an elementary language arts curriculum using student grammatical errors as the basis of the curriculum. Elementary teachers collected the data used in the construction of the curriculum. This was also an early example of a cooperative curriculum project carried on between a university and school system. Dillard (1915) reported on the work of one hundred teachers and superintendents in the development of curriculum for the state of Virginia. Englemann (1917) and Newlon (1917) described the curriculum work of two hundred teachers in the Decatur, Illinois, school system. Fichandler (1917) provided an account of the teachers' work in a Brooklyn, New

York, public school. Spaulding (1918) reported on the work of teachers' councils in Cleveland and Minneapolis, where he served as superintendent. Harris (1919b), a teacher in Minneapolis and chair of the council, described her experiences with the teachers' council during this period. Knapp (1919) described the work of the teachers' council in Highland Park, Michigan. Gosling (1919) detailed the efforts in the Cincinnati school system to involve teachers in curriculum work.

Organized committees, of which teachers' councils were a part, were a common method for providing for teacher participation in curriculum development during this period. Updegraff's (1919) comprehensive survey of administrative practices for involving teachers in curriculum work revealed a variety of committee configurations from system-level to grade-level committees. Committees might be organized around subject areas, problems, topics or some combination of all three. Committees were responsible for creating new curriculum, revising existing curriculum, or reviewing and editing the work of other committees.

Updegraff's (1919) study also suggested the beginnings of widespread practice in the United States. Updegraff reported that 329 cities participated in the study. Updegraff divided the participants into six categories based on population, those cities with populations: 5,000 to 10,000, 10,000 to 25,000, 25,000 to 50,000, 50,000 to 100,000, 100,000 to 300,000, and over 300,000. Of these 329

cities, 176 provided for some type of committee arrangement for curriculum work. Updegraff reported that of the 176 these participants, 69 cities provided for teacher participation on these curriculum committees.

The data from the study was revealing. For example, of the cities reporting the use of committees for curriculum work 65 reported curriculum committees composed solely of teachers (p. 687). Twenty-nine systems serving cities with populations of 10,000 to 25,000 reported such committees. This composed the largest group. Next in order were systems serving populations of 5,000 to 10,000 with 22 systems reporting this practice. Systems serving cities with populations of 25,000 to 50,000 were third with 13 reporting this practice. The three largest categories (i.e., 50,000 to 100,000, 100,000 to 300,000, and over 300,000) reported virtually no such practice as providing for curriculum committees composed solely of teachers. A total of 65 systems reported curriculum committees composed solely of teachers. Updegraff observed that

the number of committees composed entirely of teachers is just a little larger than the combined number of committees composed solely of supervisors, supervising principals, and teaching principals. (p. 687)

Of those systems providing for curriculum work through committees, those organizing curriculum committees composed solely of teachers were most common. Also of note was the fact that this practice was limited almost exclusively to systems serving cities with populations of 50,000 or less.

Also revealing were the number of systems which provided for some participation by teachers, i.e., as members of curriculum committees of mixed composition. Updegraff (1919) collected data on the number of committees upon which representatives appeared from various positions (i.e., supervisors, supervising principals, teaching principals, teachers, and others). The 176 participating systems reported a total of 351 curriculum committees on which teachers served. The distribution among cities, again, was revealing. Again, the smaller systems took the lead. The systems reporting the largest number of committees with teacher participants were in the 10,000 to 25,000 category with 130 curriculum committees on which teachers participated. Next were systems serving cities with populations from 25,000 to 50,000 with 61 curriculum committees composed of in part of teachers. Third in order were systems serving cities of 50,000 to 100,000 which reported 48 curriculum committees including teachers. Systems serving cities from 5,000 to 10,000 were fourth with school systems reporting a total 45 curriculum committees which included teachers as participants. Next were school systems serving cities with populations over 300,000. These systems reported a total of 38 curriculum committees on which teachers participated. The smallest number of curriculum committees reported was by school systems serving cities from 100,000 to 300,000. These systems reported a

total of 29 curriculum committees on which teachers participated.

Any criteria for establishing what constituted widespread practice is highly subjective. A literal definition suggests that the practice of teacher participation would be considered widespread if it were widely extended or spread out over a wide area. Evidence of widespread practice was emerging particularly during the last half of the second decade, 1915 through 1919. Based on Updegraff's (1919) study, practice was evident in at least 26 states.

As the organization for schools grew in size and complexity, teacher participation moved to higher levels (i.e., at the school, system, and/or state level). While participation was still primarily at the school level (e.g., Engleman, 1917; Fichandler, 1917; Newlon, 1917; and, North, 1915) during the period from 1910 through 1919, examples of teacher participation at the system level (e.g., Spaulding, 1918, and North, 1915) indicated that system-level decision-making was increasing. The advisory or teachers' council was the most common method for providing for teacher participation (e.g., Spaulding, 1918); Engleman, 1917; Fichandler, 1917; Newlon, 1917; North, 1915. Updegraff's (1919) study of administrative structures for cooperative curriculum development indicated that committee organization was also becoming common.

The point at which teachers became involved in the decision-making process varied with teachers' councils during the period from 1910 through 1919. Most teachers' councils were created by superintendents and were purely advisory in nature. However, the authority of teachers' councils appeared to run the gamut. There were teachers' councils in which the participants identified the problems to be considered by the council, solicited and generated solutions, and made decisions based on the majority vote of the participants (e.g., Engleman, 1917; Fichandler, 1917, and Newlon, 1917). That this continuum existed was also evidenced by Updegraff's (1919) study of curriculum committees. Updegraff suggested that teacher authority on curriculum committees fit on a continuum from highly centralized to highly decentralized, where the superintendent exercised little authority and teacher committees were free to work out their own problems.

Purposes for teacher participation varied during the period from 1910 through 1919. A primary purpose for teachers' councils was democratic participation. However, there was a more practical or utilitarian intent implied in the statements of purpose: to reflect the knowledge and experience of the entire teaching staff (e.g., North 1915 and Pearson, 1913). Updegraff (1919) found a broader array of purposes for teacher participation in curriculum committees. A primary purpose for participation, according to Updegraff, was fidelity to the new or revised curriculum.

However, there were other less authoritarian purposes for participation identified by Updegraff. Professional growth and teacher effectiveness were two important purposes.

CHAPTER IV: THE PRACTICE BECOMES WIDESPREAD, 1920-1929

The third decade of the twentieth century, 1920-1929, was a significant period in the development of teacher participation in curriculum work. Schubert (1980) asserted that "the 1920's saw the formidable emergence of progressive education in both literature and practice" (p. 1980). Teacher involvement in curriculum work as evidenced through such practices as the Denver Curriculum Revision Project and Kilpatrick's influential Project Method were examples of the progressive influence noted by Schubert. As pointed out in the last chapter, more schools and school systems were involving teachers in curriculum development. This was evident particularly during the last half of the second decade. Widespread practice was also becoming evident as examples could be found in at least twenty-six states throughout the United States. While evidence of teacher participation in curriculum work was found primarily in larger school systems, examples were also noted in small and rural schools and systems. Not only would these trends continue through the third decade, but evidence of a maturing practice would become apparent.

An example of this maturing practice was found in the Denver Curriculum Revision Program which was begun by Newlon

in 1922. A description of the program has already been provided in Chapter I. The Denver program has often been cited as the pre-eminent example of teacher participation in curriculum development. For example, Kliebard (1995) asserted that "the most lasting legacy of the Denver program was the emphasis given to active teacher participation in curriculum reform" (p. 182). Cremin (1961) contended that Newlon held "a profound faith in the average classroom teacher" (p. 299) which was evidenced by his efforts to involve the teachers of the Denver school system in the development and revision of curriculum. The Denver program was the most comprehensive effort to involve teachers in curriculum work to date.

The Denver program was in some ways a culmination of the previous twenty-five years of the theory and practice of teacher participation in curriculum development. The Denver program was also a thread which would connect the first twenty-five years of theory and practice to the years of practice and theory which would follow the Denver program. Newlon would acknowledge the influence of Dewey's writings and work (see Newlon, 1929) on his own thinking and practice. There was evidence that Newlon's work was also influenced by other examples, such as the work of Engleman (1917) in Decatur, Illinois. Cremin (1961) noted that the Denver program was to have a profound influence on the practice of teacher participation in curriculum work: "Denver's effort was quickly taken up by school systems

across the country" (p. 299). The Denver program was certainly a preeminent example of teacher participation in curriculum development and was one factor in the increasing growth in the practice of teacher participation in curriculum work which would be evident during the period from 1920 through 1929.

Several trends were conspicuous in the curriculum literature of the 1920's. First, Schubert (1980) noted the explosive growth of curriculum literature during this period. According to Schubert, eighty-seven curriculum books were published during the decade from 1920 through 1929 as compared with a combined total of twenty-eight books for the two previous decades (p. 42). A continuing trend in this literature was the emphasis on curriculum revision. Kliebard (1995) maintained that this trend "reached its peak" (p. 156) with the publication of the National Society for the Study of Education's Twenty-Sixth Yearbook (1926). Part I of the two volume set entitled Curriculum-Making Past and Present "attempted to catalog the principal trends that had emerged in the field of curriculum" (Kliebard, 1995, p. 156). One of the trends described in this volume was the involvement of teachers in curriculum revision.

Schubert (1980) noted two other trends in the curriculum literature of the 1920's which had some bearing on the involvement of teachers in curriculum development. One trend was the reporting of curriculum practices. This was of note, according to Schubert, because contemporary

critics suggested that early curriculum writers were not "aware of curriculum practices of their time" (p. 47). The curriculum literature of the 1920's indicated just the opposite particularly in regards to teacher participation in curriculum development. A second trend was what Schubert (1980) described as the "recipifying of curriculum knowledge" which he defined as the tendency to simplify curriculum knowledge into principles or guidelines for use by practitioners (pp. 47-48). Again, this trend will be evident in the literature concerning teacher participation in curriculum work.

The curriculum literature of the 1920's described a decade which was rich in theory and practice. Both the rhetoric and the practice of teacher participation in curriculum development increased significantly during this period. The practice of teacher participation would be established as one of the dominant practices of curriculum development during this decade. Additionally, widespread practice of teacher participation in curriculum development will become evident during the period from 1920 through 1929.

The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation

As has been pointed out by numerous writers, scientific management and efficiency were having considerable influence on the thinking of educators during the period under study. Just as in education, however, there were competing ideas about effective production in industry and business. For

example, in the editor's note to Bonser (1920) the results of experiments in the democratic participation of workers in a several paper manufacturing plants were presented at an alumni conference at Teachers' College. Workers in the plants were presented the best available information concerning the performance of their jobs. They were encouraged to analyze this data and make suggestions about ways that performance might be improved. According to the consulting engineer presenting the findings, these experiments resulted in increased production, efficiency, and earnings.

Bonser (1920) suggested that these experiments had implications for elementary education. Bonser described three challenges for elementary education in "developing the creative impulses of children, and in making the work of men and women a larger opportunity for the expression of personality" (p. 108). The first challenge was the organization of schools around the project method. The implications for the project method and teacher participation in curriculum development have been discussed previously. The second challenge was to change the perception of work, whether in school or the adult world of work, from that of an activity required to produce a good or service to the perception of work as an "opportunity for self-expression and creative effort yielding satisfaction in itself" (p. 109).

The third challenge, and most pertinent to this study, was "the democratization of the administrative and supervisory policies and practices of school boards, superintendents, principals, and supervisors" (p. 109). Bonser (1920) attributed problems such as teachers leaving the profession and ineffective instruction to the autocratic practices of school systems and schools. The remedy to these problems was to "provide means for the participation of the teachers in the promotion of the school's enterprises and policies" (p. 115).

Additionally, Bonser (1920) made a distinction between enervating and energizing occupations. Enervating occupations require work that was "routine, requiring no applications of ideas or feelings in new ways and no stimulation of new ideas" resulting in "a dogged kind of apathetic resignation" (p. 113). Energizing work, on the other hand, called "forth the constant use of ideas and feelings in new ways, and stimulate[d] the development of new ideas" (p. 113). In Bonser's perspective, schools and systems which operated in the spirit of democratic cooperation were energizing to teachers and, as a result, more effective for children.

Rice (1920), a faculty member at Hollywood High School in Los Angeles, California, cited economic and professional dissatisfaction as the causes of problems such as ineffective teachers and loss of initiative in the teaching profession. He attributed this dissatisfaction to the

development of an educational bureaucracy in which teachers were at the bottom of the hierarchy. "Yet," Rice asserted, "the teacher is the only one in the system who really knows what succeeds and what fails in education" (p. 230). He further asserted that the more removed a person, such as a board member, superintendent, supervisor, or principal, was from the actual teaching the more removed this person was from the "essentials of education" (p. 230). Additionally, administrators tended to contribute to the bureaucracy that detracted from these essentials of education.

The way in which to solve this problem, according to Rice (1920), was to "restore democracy" by granting "local autonomy" to school faculties (p. 231). This meant teachers would decide educational policy for their schools. Administrative functions would remain with the superintendents and principals while fiscal responsibilities would continue under the control of boards of education.

One result of the dissatisfaction cited by Rice was the growth of teacher organizations. The stated purposes of many of these organizations included increasing teachers' influence in the determination of educational policies. For example, Stillman (1920) reminded readers that the constitution of the American Federation of Teachers stated as an objective the raising of

the standard of the teaching profession by securing the conditions essential to the best professional service; and to promote such democratization of the schools as will enable them better to equip their pupils and take their place in the industrial, social and political life of the community. (p. 63)

Stillman, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, advocated for teachers councils as one method for providing for the increased participation of teachers in the determination of educational policies. "Advocacy of teacher participation in management," Stillman maintained, "has almost reached the stage of respectability" (p. 64).

Other teachers' organizations, at levels from local to national, also endorsed teacher participation in decisions concerning educational policy which included the construction of courses of study. Like Stillman, Winn (1920), the president of the Seattle Grade Teachers Club, endorsed teacher participation in decisions concerning educational policies and practices. Winn cited a report presented by the National Education Association's Commission on the Emergency in Education which she stated indicated that the school systems making "the greatest progress . . . have requested teachers' organizations to make specific recommendations on courses of study." (p. 98) Winn highlighted the efforts of the Oakland, California, school system in which "a classroom teacher sits with full power of discussion and suffrage in the Superintendent's Council" (p. 98).

Adair (1920), the president of the National League of Teachers' Associations, specifically endorsed the advisory council as an effective means for teacher participation. The purpose of the advisory council, according to Adair, was to capitalize on the experience and knowledge of those "in

direct daily contact with the children and problems of the school" (p. 99). In a departure from some of her contemporaries, Adair asserted that all problems, whether administrative or educational, should be presented for consideration by advisory councils. Any suggestions concerning these problems would be made part of the public record.

Gardner (1920), the president of the Milwaukee Teachers' Association, endorsed the teachers' council as the best way in which to professionalize teaching. Gardner cited other purposes for teacher cooperation in administration:

to encourage individual research and experiment as well as increased professional training; to offer some incentive for individuality, initiative and professional advancement; to develop qualities of leadership among the rank and file of the teaching profession and thus evolve a more desirable type of supervisor. (p. 127)

In short, teacher participation through teachers' councils would serve to improve not only teachers, but principals, supervisors and superintendents.

Teachers' councils should operate in an advisory capacity, in Gardner's (1920) perspective. Final decisions would remain with the superintendents and boards of education. Gardner maintained that most teachers agreed with this view:

In regard to the function of a Teachers' Council, the majority of the teachers take the more conservative view that such councils should act in an advisory council only, and in should in no wise usurp any of the powers of the superintendent or school board. (p. 127)

Gardner suggested that while teachers' councils were to have only an advisory function, the advisory function would be recognized formally. She cited the constitution created for the New York Teachers' Council as an example of formal recognition.

Teachers' councils existed in a variety of forms, according to Gardner (1920). She cited, as examples, teachers' councils in New York, Boston, Toledo, Minneapolis, and Portland. In these examples, the selection of representatives to teachers' councils ran the gamut. Teacher organizations might select representatives to councils. Each school faculty might select representatives. Representatives might be selected on a district-wide basis. Gardner contended, however, that some combination of these was the most effective.

Gardner (1920) asserted that democratic representation on teachers' councils was critical to their success:

The rock on which most teachers' councils have been wrecked has been just this- that representatives chosen by the teachers had no point of contact with the great mass of teachers, hence they acted only as individuals and in many cases became the tools of administrative officers. (p. 128)

The organization of the teachers' councils had to be such that the majority of the teachers' views were presented at council meetings particularly those views which might be in opposition to the administration's perspective. To help ensure that all views were presented, Gardner recommended that all council proceedings should be conducted in a formal manner and all records of the proceedings made public. This

would allow the represented teachers to keep abreast of the work of the council and their representatives.

Gardner (1920) suggested a wide variety of topics for the consideration of the teachers' councils. Topics included school records, student promotion, school maintenance, and the organization and administration of the school. Gardner indicated that the list was not inclusive and suggested no priority for the list of topics she proposed, but courses of study was listed near the top of the list of issues to be addressed by teachers' councils. The fact that she included this in the list was at least suggestive of the importance she placed on teacher participation in the consideration of courses of study.

In a discussion of the supervision of teaching at the meeting of the Pennsylvania State Teachers' Association's Department of Supervising Principals, Koons (1920), a teacher in Allentown, Pennsylvania, suggested teacher participation in curriculum development as a means to improve the professional relationship between teachers and supervisors.

Perhaps a new course of study is in the making. Here would seem to be at last a splendid opportunity to give recognition to those within the teaching staff who have shown marked ability, initiative, and superior executive qualities. The teachers represent approximately ninety percent of those who are to put the plan into operation. Their experience is worth more than anything that can be copied from some other source, often by the 'scissors and paste' method, or framed in some comfortable office largely by theory. Yet how rarely are supervisors willing to receive suggestions, or through discussion and interchange of experiences to arrive at a common conclusion. (p. 439)

Koons, as others did, blamed the lack of initiative and enthusiasm among teachers on the administrative prescription of methods and curriculum. Koons went on to assert that the principle of providing teachers with an organized means of presenting their views on educational plans and policies, such as the course of study, was gaining recognition as an effective practice.

In an address during the general sessions of the fifty-eighth meeting in Salt Lake City of the National Education Association, Skinner (1920), a teacher from Jefferson High School in Portland, Oregon, reiterated Koons' and other teachers' perspectives concerning democratic participation. Not involving teachers in the decision-making process had a "stultifying" effect on the "personality, leadership, and initiative" of teachers, according to Skinner (p. 95). Administrators and teachers in a school must work cooperatively to address the specific concerns of their school, in Skinner's view. While Skinner would not suggest what form the group should take, she stated that, whatever the form, "conference, cooperation, and loyalty" were necessary to the success of any joint effort (p. 96). She did not expand on these characteristics.

Interestingly enough, Skinner (1920), a teacher herself, contended that it would be necessary for administrators to take the initiative in order for democratic participation to be successful in the schools. This is interesting because some contemporary writers are

critical of these early efforts by administrators to involve teachers in activities such as curriculum development. Rather than being perceived as efforts to bring democratic participation to schools, these administrators are perceived as, and criticized for, being committed to other agendas (e.g., Pinar, 1995; Slattery, 1995). To suggest that the initiative must come from teachers, then or now, in order for an effort to be truly democratic seems naïve considering the power structure of schools and systems, then and now. This perspective also excludes administrators and supervisors as democratic participants. A more realistic view, might be that there were a variety of motives for involving teachers. Making judgments about intentions and motives is tricky, at best. Making these same judgments from a contemporary perspective is even more complicated. However, not all of Skinner's contemporaries agreed with her perspective. Stillman (1920), for example, concluded that "democracy cannot be handed down from above, it must originate with and be worked out by the teachers themselves" (p. 65). But even as the president of the American Federation of Teachers, Stillman had to admit, if grudgingly, that "the schools of many a city have profited from the atmosphere of cooperation made possible by the response of school officials to the democratic ideals of the teachers" (p. 65).

The problem may not have been so much whether the idea for participation of teachers originated with administra-

tors. The concern may have been more that not all efforts to involve teachers were acted on in good faith. For example, Herron (1920) deplored conditions which discouraged teachers from actively and constructively participating when opportunities presented themselves.

The administrator who asks teachers to serve on a committee and then revises largely or ignores the report of the committee; who asks for suggestions and tables them; or who makes committee appointments for other reasons than professional qualifications does much to destroy interest in cooperative projects. (p. 97)

One concern, at least, was not that the idea for teacher participation originated with administrators. The concern was with administrators who, either intentionally or unintentionally, used teacher participation for purposes other than professional ones.

Rockwell (1920), a former teacher, explained that her departure from the profession was not a result of inadequate pay but a result of the "individuality of thought, method, and instruction" (p. 408) being ignored. She asserted that "teachers as a rule have . . .no opportunity to present either their problems or their solutions of problems to the men who shape the curriculum and the administrative policy of their school" (p. 408). Rockwell maintained that if teachers were expected to grow professionally they would have to be provided opportunities "to experiment, to judge, and to present their findings in such a way that others may give constructive criticism and share in the benefits of a more intelligent approach" (p. 408) to educating children.

The solution, then, to the problem of improving teachers was not only to raise teacher salaries, according to Rockwell. Improvement would come only when the school system was reorganized to allow boards of education and teachers to act collaboratively in developing educational policies.

Superintendents, supervisors, principals, and college professors continued to endorse teacher participation. Clark (1920), the Sioux City, Iowa, school superintendent, suggested that the "class antagonisms" which had developed between administrators and teachers were detrimental to students. The primary challenge for schools, in his view, was to address this antagonism by building "a harmonious, cooperative, constructive school organization" (p. 94). Clark agreed that modern school organization had been built around efficiency. An implied principle of efficiency, according to Clark, was that each member of the organization had a specific and particular function. "This place and function then," contended Clark, "should be recognized and accepted as authoritative by the public on the one hand and by each and every contributing school factor on the other" (p. 94).

The teacher had functions of a curricular nature in the school organization in Clark's (1920) scheme. First, teachers were to function as leaders through the curriculum, the school organization, and their contacts with students and parents (p. 94). Second, teachers were

to function in needed school organization and curriculum adjustments thru their frank discussions

with their principals, supervisors, and administrators
of seeming school needs or school weaknesses
(p. 94)

As Clark stated, these functions were to be officially recognized by the public and by other members of the school organization. Clark believed that the class antagonism he described could be effectively overcome by recognizing and respecting each member's function and through their cooperative efforts to address school problems.

Wilson (1920), the school superintendent for Berkeley, California, also endorsed the participation of teachers in the activities of school administration such as the development of curriculum. According to Wilson, school administration consisted of two basic activities: the formulation of policies and the execution of policies. Wilson contended that before teachers could effectively execute any policy two things had to happen. Teachers could not simply accept a proposed policy for it to be effectively executed, but they had to "intelligently accept" (p. 176) the policy. This intelligent acceptance required teachers' participation in the formulation of the policy. Otherwise, no policy could ever be carried out as effectively or as intended.

Wilson (1920) considered the construction of courses of study to be a primary example:

Experience shows that the contribution of the teaching staff in the enlargement of programs and especially in the details essential in their execution is great. The improvement in the completeness and helpfulness of courses of study during the last decade largely resulted thru the cooperative attack on the problem in

which each participant worked under the stimulus of the ideas of his associates with the result that the total achievement is a large number of courses of study, infinitely more valuable than ever emanated under the former procedure when the superintendent of schools worked alone or with the assistance of a small number of approximately his rank.

The details which have thus been injected into courses of study are of a kind which can only come from teachers or from those in intimate and close contact with the work of the teaching staff (p. 177).

Wilson directly attributed most of the improvements in curricula to teacher participation in curriculum development. Teacher participation in curriculum work was already underway in Berkeley during the administration of Wilson (see Wilson, 1924).

Gender issues, particularly related to women's rights, were coming to the forefront as part of the broader progressive movement. The nineteenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution had granted women the right to vote in 1920. Blanton (1920), the Texas state school superintendent, suggested that opposition to democratic participation in schools may have been gender-based. Some considered teacher participation in administration to be a radical idea because the majority of classroom teachers were women. Blanton asserted that the initiative of progressive administrators should be credited for the widespread experimentation and efforts to promote democratic participation in school administration.

Once administrators committed themselves to democratic participation, two fundamental issues had to be addressed, according to Blanton (1920). The first issue was the form

that teacher participation would take. While Blanton did not endorse any particular form, she warned against a pretense of teacher involvement. If teachers' suggestions and advice were solicited, then administrators must seriously consider these suggestions in good faith. The areas of administration that teachers should participate in was the second issue that had to be addressed. Two areas, in particular, suggested by Blanton (1920) for teacher participation were the "content of courses of study prescribed for their improvement" and "details of courses of study which they are to teach" (p. 517).

As curriculum grew as field of study and interest, the attention given it in the literature increased. Surprisingly, Salisbury (1920) found that even with this attention and the emphasis on the importance of the course of study in the function of the school,

a large number of school systems big and little over the country do not have available for distribution in any complete and organized form a statement of aims, materials, projects, and standards of achievements . . . which is representative of the best practice in these schools. (p. 382)

She attributed this problem to the lack of time and money available to those responsible, i.e., "superintendents, supervisors, teachers and overworked stenographers" (p. 382), for constructing the courses of study. Adequate time was especially critical. As Salisbury (1920) stated,

An undertaking which has as its end a comprehensive plan of instruction involves a process requiring a part of the time and the best thinking of every member of the staff. Such a process is easily crowded out with the pressure of immediate duties when no provision is

made to free teachers and administrative officers from their routine duties and to permit a working organization to progress on something other than a piecemeal plan. (p. 383)

An adequate course of study simply could not be constructed without freeing teachers from their regular duties.

While Salisbury (1920) considered the construction and interpretation of the course of study to be a function of supervision, she also considered teachers' participation to be an integral part of the construction of courses of study. She described the teachers' role in this way:

The teacher with modern professional training looks to the course for point of view and assignments sufficiently definite to guide her in making her work an organic part of the system as a whole; furthermore, she knows that it is her duty and privilege to participate actively in its improvement. This she does by checking its practicality in subject matter distribution and by offering for incorporation in the course the best her experience may have discovered. (p. 381)

The process itself would benefit because teachers could bring the practical perspective and experience which was lacking in courses of study developed solely by administrators and curriculum experts. In addition to the benefits that teacher participation could bring to the curriculum development process, teachers themselves benefited by developing "a unified and thoroughly progressive point of view qualifying them for definite responsibility in the construction of the course and its intelligent use later" (p. 383).

Salisbury (1920) went on to describe a seven-step process for the construction of a course of study and the

way in which teachers should be involved in this process. The first step was for the superintendent to hold a series of meetings to present to the staff a review of current curricular theory. The next step suggested by Salisbury was for the superintendent to provide

a series of demonstrations illustrating different types of lessons each followed by a discussion of standards for judging the lesson: to build up philosophy and detailed application together. (p. 383)

A common understanding of curriculum and instruction had to be established before the process could proceed. This common understanding would serve to guide the work of the committees.

The third step was of critical importance to the curriculum development process, according to Salisbury, and involved the organization of committees for work. Salisbury recommended that the committees be formed democratically, that is, teachers should have a voice in the formation of these committees and in the choice of the committees on which they would serve. The general organization she suggested called for a steering or executive committee to oversee the work of several subject area committees. The subject area committees would be comprised of principals and teachers. At least three members would make up the executive committee: a representative of the teachers or principals, a representative of university or normal school, and some person who could

carry modern philosophy into every detail of the work by devoting his or her whole time to organizing and directing the working committees, advising them,

revising manuscripts, encouraging, and patiently editing. (p. 384)

Basically, this person was to serve as the coordinator for the work of all the committees.

The fourth step in the process of curriculum development suggested by Salisbury (1920) consisted of a series of meetings held by the executive committee with the chairpersons of the subject committees. One important purpose of these meetings was for this group to come to a decision on the philosophy guiding the work, the aim of education, the procedures for carrying out the work, and the criteria for the selection and organization of the subject matter. Another important purpose of these meetings was "that of securing better correlation between various subject outlines" (p. 380). The subject chairs would be expected to report back to the subject committees to receive criticisms and suggestions. These criticisms and suggestions would, in turn, be shared with the executive committee for consideration.

The fifth step of the process involved the actual work of the subject committees. Salisbury (1920) described this phase as the most difficult and intensive of the entire process. According to Salisbury, the work of the subject committees involved

the business of blocking out the actual work to be covered in the class rooms; readjustments recommended by the council as mentioned above; the application of detail in such a way as to assure the highest possible efficiency of teaching with a minimum of time and effort when the course is put into operation. . . . study of the literature that pertains to the task at

hand; a tentative formulation aims; general directions; selection and organization of subject matter and projects; standards of attainment; bibliographies of the course as a whole and for each grade; a presentation of the tentative outlines to every teacher who has a relation to it; revision in the light of the criticisms of the corps and those representing an out-of-school point of view. . . . includ[ing] pertinent excerpts from recognized authorities on each particular subject and [arranging] for the working out of model lessons to be incorporated in the course (p. 380).

Subject committees would be expected to submit proposed courses of study to those teachers who were expected ultimately to use the courses and incorporate these teachers suggestions. Because of this, Salisbury's process for curriculum development provided for the greatest participation by all faculty members.

The sixth stage involved the editing process. Salisbury (1920) stated that one member of the executive or steering committee would be responsible for editing. However, it was recommended that this person be provided with "a small group of teachers and stenographers adapted to this type of careful work" (p. 387).

"Getting the course into operation" (Salisbury, 1920, p. 387) was the final step in the process. Salisbury (1920) contended that the acceptance of the new courses of study would be greater because all teachers in the system had participated in its initial development. Additionally, curriculum was in a continual cycle of development and revision, in Salisbury's perspective. Curriculum was "not a static, final assignment, but a statement of progress" (p. 387) and the ultimate test came in the classroom. In

Salisbury's perspective, "it is not only justifiable but highly commendable" (p. 387) for teachers to offer suggestions for improvement. Because of this commitment to continual improvement of the curriculum, teacher acceptance of the initial curriculum and the process would be greater.

Whether teachers should participate in curriculum development was no longer the question for Minor (1922), a supervisor of instruction in Anderson, Indiana. She asserted that "teacher participation in the revision of the course of study is now generally recognized as an essential feature of democratic administration in our public school systems" (p. 655). The current challenge for administrators, according to Minor, was "how to secure the maximum of teacher participation, with economy of time and effort, and at the same time maintain high standards of educational theory and practice" (p. 655).

While there appeared to be widespread administrative support for teacher involvement in curriculum development, apparently the response from teachers in some quarters was less than enthusiastic. Minor (1922) maintained that the primary reason for the lack of response on the part of some teachers was "due to a lack of sufficient and systematic preparation" (p. 655). That is, little or no prior preparation had taken place for teachers "in service" to make the task of curriculum development "seem personal and worthwhile" (p. 655) to teachers. Teachers generally had not been "trained to recognize [their] function in the

making of the course of study" (p. 657). It should not have been a surprise that teachers were not interested in curriculum development since for many years "the chief author of the course of study has been the superintendent" (p. 657). Many teachers had come to expect the course of study to be a "ready-made document to be furnished by 'the powers that be'" (p. 657).

Minor (1922) outlined the process she followed to prepare the teachers with whom she worked for making courses of study. First, teachers, as others had been permitted to do, had to "be able to see the need of co-operative endeavor" (p. 656) before they should be expected to participate in curriculum development or revision. Additionally, the process of realizing the need had to be approached democratically if the teachers' "work is to assume the dignity befitting a professional pursuit" (p. 656). In other words, open and professional discussion had to take place. Minor began the school year by reviewing fundamental educational principles through a general discussion with teachers. The discussion was summarized in the form, of a bulletin and distributed to all teachers. The purpose of this discussion, according to Minor, was to agree on the meanings of "much used" (p. 656) educational terminology and to establish a common foundation to focus the work of the group.

During the next month, teachers were asked to note examples of individual student differences in their classes,

strategies that were used to address these differences, and methods that were used to motivate students in various subject areas. These notes were shared and discussed at the next general faculty meeting. Teachers were "stimulated by a sense of responsibility in meeting" the challenges of their classrooms (Minor, 1922, p. 657). A cooperative spirit was stimulated as teachers shared and discussed strategies to address common challenges.

This preliminary work served three purposes, according to Minor (1920):

(1) It gave each teacher definite suggestions to guide her work and resulted in greater efficiency. (2) It gave unity to the various educational concepts that must of necessity vary greatly in a group of eighty-five teachers who differ in amount, kind, and recency of training. (3) It furnished data for discussion as to what should be included in a course of study. (p. 658)

In fact, it was decided, in this case, that the teachers' suggestions would be included as a chapter of the new course of study.

The next step for Minor (1922) was to hold another faculty discussion, this time, on suggestions of leading educators for making courses of study. In a series of faculty meetings, or institutes, teachers discussed topics such as the aims of education (e.g., general aims for the subject and specific aims for each grade), minimum essentials in education (e.g., to provide for citizenship in a social group and for desirable habit formation), the sociological basis of education (e.g., the needs of the community being served by the school), and the psychological

adaptations of the course of study (e.g., age-appropriate methods and provisions for individual differences) (p. 659). The ten schools under Minor's supervision were each provided a set of 14 books, focusing on curriculum and the subject areas, to form the "nucleus of a professional library" (p. 660). Additional books were provided during the course of the work.

English and literature were the courses of study being addressed for the period described by Minor (1922). The process began to focus on these subjects. A committee composed of nine teachers and the supervisor was formed to begin the work of developing the English curriculum. After discussion of the aims of teaching English, the committee decided the organization that the course for English would follow and what information to include. The committee decided that "a course of study should tell *how* to teach as well as *what* to teach" (p. 662). Also important to the committee was "the assignment of work by grades" (p. 662). The committee attempted to delineate the objectives and methods to be assigned to each grade based on knowledge about the psychological development of children. The committee included a bibliography of professional materials at the beginning of each grade section.

Provisions were made for participation of a large number of teachers. In order to provide for wider participation, questions focused on the problems of teaching English were submitted for discussion to the entire faculty.

The results of the discussions, especially the suggestions for motivating students in English, were incorporated into the course of study. Teacher suggestions about how to teach various objectives in English were given "considerable emphasis" (Minor, 1922, p. 662). Teachers were asked to submit a list of five suggestions about each area (i.e., stories, poems, fables, pictures) that was covered in the teaching of English. These suggestions were compiled and assigned to each grade section in the course of study. Teachers also were asked to submit samples of exemplary student work to be included in the course of study.

Gates (1923), superintendent of the Grand Island, Nebraska, school system, wrote a guide for superintendents of small school systems. In a chapter entitled "The Course of Study," Gates described how courses of study for a small school system might be developed through a cooperative effort of teachers and superintendent.

Modern courses of study are the result of a hearty cooperation between the superintendent and his teachers. In very small schools it is likely best to have the entire corps work on one subject at a time under the immediate direction of the superintendent.
(p. 43)

It is interesting to note that Gates labeled as "modern" courses of study which involved the participation of teachers. He made this distinction clear in his contrast with the common method of curriculum development, i.e., the method in which a superintendent, working alone, pulled bits and pieces from various existing courses of study.

Gates (1923) contended preparation and training of teachers in curriculum development were critical. He described the method used by a superintendent to prepare the teachers with which he worked. The superintendent took five months in general teachers' meetings to share professional readings on course of study construction, bring in outside experts to discuss curriculum development, and present examples of what other school systems had done. Once the committees were formed, the superintendent developed an outline to guide the committees in their work and met periodically with each committee.

Once the outline was shared and discussed with a committee, the chairman of the committee took over. Committees obtained exemplary courses of study for reference. Community surveys were conducted. The committee work was assigned to the members and tentative materials started to develop. These materials were discussed and assembled into a tentative course which was distributed to teachers for review. After a year, the committee incorporated suggestions and made revisions.

Gates (1923) asserted that this "modern" method was the superior method for two important reasons. "First, it increases the efficiency of the teaching force by securing the thoughtful participation of teachers in the work and responsibility involved" (p. 47). The way in which Gates used the word "efficiency" suggested effectiveness of instruction since

The chief business of the superintendent of schools is to improve the quality of instruction. Measured by this standard, the type of work suggested is abundantly worth while. (p. 47)

The standard of efficiency was improved quality of instruction. The quality of instruction improved, according to Gates, because of teacher participation in curriculum development. The second benefit that Gates identified was the cooperation itself. Gates stated that "it goes a long way toward establishing mutual confidence and good-will" (p. 47).

The Department of Superintendence of The National Education Association devoted its second yearbook to the elementary school curriculum. A substantial portion of this yearbook was devoted to curriculum construction and various perspectives on how this might be accomplished. Wilson (1924), the superintendent of the Berkeley, California, school system, provided an administrative perspective on curriculum revision for the Department of Superintendence yearbook on the elementary curriculum. Wilson had just finished, the previous year, a cooperative effort in curriculum development in which teachers participated. Three questions had to be addressed when considering curriculum construction, according to Wilson (1924):

(1) What objectives to be achieved should be held in mind in organizing to secure efficiency in the curriculum? (2) Whose services should the curriculum organization and machinery plan use? (3) What organization or types of organization may be expected to realize the objectives proposed and use the personnel suggested with economy and efficiency? (p. 37)

All three questions concern teacher participation in curriculum development.

Wilson (1924) stated that the major objective of curriculum construction was to produce the most effective curriculum possible based on current research in curriculum and methods and to facilitate on-going, continual curriculum revision to keep courses of study current. However, there was a result, while secondary to Wilson's primary objective, which was important to teacher participation in curriculum development and that was the "stimulation and growth of the educational staff of the school system" (p. 37). Wilson maintained that the challenge of keeping the curriculum current held greater potential for professional growth than any other medium in the school system. Participation in curriculum development, according to Wilson, required "all who carried these duties faithfully, to read and study the constant additions to the basic knowledge and the latest approved practices" (p. 38).

As to the question of who should participate in curriculum construction, Wilson (1924) asserted that the use of four groups had yielded the best results: administrators and supervisors, teachers, subject-area specialists, and interested citizens. Each of these had specific responsibilities in the overall process. Administrators were responsible for planning "meetings affording opportunities for the various groups to work cooperatively, fundamentally, and economically" (p. 38). They were

responsible for providing resources, i.e., reference materials, meeting places, and clerical help, to facilitate the work. They had to make judgments on the progress of the work. Once the tentative course of study was completed, administrators had to coordinate its test in actual use in the schools. After a sufficient time had been provided for evaluation of the tentative course of study, administrators had to collect the evaluative data. Administrators had to coordinate the analysis of the data with the other groups involved in curriculum construction. Once the final revisions and editions were made, the administration was responsible for presenting the official course of study and promoting its use.

The organization for the work was critical in Wilson's (1924) perspective. Membership had to be representative and elected democratically. "Any effort to constitute the groups so as to insure in advance certain predetermined results desired by the head," according to Wilson, "will be fatal to fundamental work" (p. 42). The committees had to be allowed to reach their conclusions based on study and discussion, not by undue administrative influence. "Only conclusions arrived at through convictions born of thorough study will stand all tests," Wilson asserted (p. 42).

The organization for the work had to provide for certain activities. "Means of launching the work" (Wilson, 1924, p. 42) had to be provided through the organization for the construction of the curriculum. This included

introducing the work and preparing the participants for the work. "Sufficient meetings for conferences, criticism, and checking" (p. 43) had to be provided for through the organization for work. Opportunities for correlation between subjects and levels had to be provided. Standards for form and organization had to be established to provide uniformity and coherence. Evaluation of the tentative course of study had to be provided for through the organization. Finally, a plan for the continual revision of the course of study had to be arranged.

In a review of Wilson's (1924) paper, Freeman (1924), a professor of educational psychology at the University of Chicago, emphasized "the distinction between the two types of curriculum construction and on the view that the fundamental research must be done by the specialist" (p. 47). Freeman identified two types of curriculum construction: (1) "the fundamental building of a curriculum from the ground up" and (2) "adapting it to the needs of a particular school system" (p. 45). The first, fundamental curriculum construction, required the expertise of a specialized nature. Fundamental curriculum construction required "highly-trained specialists" (p. 46), according to Freeman, which would include university instructors and members of the superintendent's staff, but "they must have special technical training, and they must have sufficient free time to devote to their task" (p. 46). Freeman

suggested that this expertise was of the type not typically found in the four groups identified by Wilson.

Freeman (1924) described this type of expertise as requiring the skills and knowledge to conduct research into the social and psychological aspects of an effective curriculum and the objectives that this entailed. The expertise described by Freeman also required "laborious" (p. 46) research into the subject matter needed to achieve these objectives. The subject matter, then, had to be organized "according to subjects, grades, and perhaps even lessons" (p. 46). Once the curriculum was in place, it had to be evaluated scientifically. Freeman (1924) considered this kind of intensive work to be beyond the capacities of most teachers. However, it was

possible that here and there a teacher who shows special aptitude and acquires the necessary training, may advantageously be released for some of this work, but such a case would be exceptional. (p. 46)

Still, this type of curriculum construction was primarily the work of specialists and not classroom teachers, in Freeman's perspective.

The second type of curriculum work, the adaptation of the "results of the primary research and fundamental study to the conditions and needs of a particular school system" (p. 46), could be done by committees made up of teachers, according to Freeman (1924). It was through the adaptation of the curriculum that "the full force of the requirement that the fullest possible democratic opportunity be offered teachers to contribute to the develop of the subjects which

they are teaching" (p. 47). What this meant was that the initiative would come from the classroom teacher and committees of teachers would be presented, by the superintendent's staff, "surveys of the work which has been done elsewhere" (pp. 46-47) for the teachers' consideration in the "coordination, the meeting of legal requirements, and the like" (p. 47). While this did not seem too different from the work that Wilson described, Freeman emphasized that curriculum formation should not be left to the work of classroom teachers.

Newlon (1924), the superintendent of the Denver school system, also reviewed Wilson's presentation. Newlon (1924) acknowledged the debate "as to the function of the teacher in devising and revising the curricula" (p. 47) presented by Freeman:

There are those who would agree with Superintendent Wilson that the process of curriculum revision should in large part begin with the teacher, and that the teacher should be involved in the program at every step. There are others who would place greater stress upon the services of the subject-matter specialists and students of research. (p. 47)

For those who believed that curriculum development should be left to the subject-matter specialist, there was a further division. There were those who held that once the tentative curriculum has been designed by the specialists, the tentative curriculum might be shared with "teachers for study, criticisms, and suggestions" (p.47). There were others who asserted that teachers had no place in the construction of the curriculum. Curriculum construction

should be the sole responsibility of the specialists. Then, "after the curricula have been formulated [by the subject-matter specialists, the curricula] should be 'sold' to the teachers" (p. 48).

Newlon (1924) asserted that the effectiveness and, ultimately, the success of the system of American public education was dependent on an intelligent teaching force. He further asserted that "no program of public education will succeed that is not thoroughly understood and generally approved of by the teachers" (p. 48). Because of this belief, Newlon endorsed Wilson's conception of the teacher's role in curriculum revision. Newlon maintained that teacher participation in curriculum revision was one of the best methods for the professional development and growth of teachers. The benefits to professional growth included a teaching staff that was current on the latest educational research, that understood the complex nature of any curricula, and that would use the revised curriculum more effectively. It is important to note that Newlon was beginning his own curriculum revision project with his teachers in Denver at this time.

In an attempt to present a balanced view of the issue of the organization most effective for curriculum construction and revision, the Department of Superintendence included the teacher's viewpoint on the issue. Jacobson (1924), a teacher in the Los Angeles school system, maintained that

teachers are the vital factor in curriculum building. Theories of college and normal training departments must stand the test of practical usage. There is many a slip 'twixt the theory and practice of education (p. 64)

The success of any curriculum was contingent on its acceptance and use by the teachers. Jacobson asserted that teachers cannot "do fit work without an intelligent conception" (p. 64) of the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum which they are expected to use. The best way in which to develop this intelligent conception was to involve teachers in the construction of the curriculum: "Only in so far as the teacher participates in the actual forming of the curriculum can she be intelligently cooperative" (p. 64).

Jacobson (1924) offered eight suggestions for the organization for curriculum revision. She recommended committees be formed according to grades and that each grade committee include all the teachers of the grade. All teachers should be asked to bring a proposed outline for each subject considered by the grade committees. Each grade committee should thoroughly address one subject at a time. A thorough discussion should include the determination of objectives, "minimum essentials," and "connected projects" (p. 65). A thorough discussion also could "provide a clearing-house for the solution of problems" (p. 65) encountered by teachers in teaching the subject. Jacobson suggested the formation of a committee made up of business men who would be responsible for making recommendations on "requirements as to arithmetic, writing of business letters,

etc." (p. 65). The tentative curriculum outlined by each committee would have to be acceptable to the majority of the committee. Once the tentative curriculum was completed, each committee would consult with principals, supervisors, and superintendent. A "final consultation and revision" (p. 65) would be held with a curriculum expert.

MacGregor (Department of Superintendence, 1924), the president of the Department of Classroom Teachers, asserted that "because the classroom teacher is on the firing line, she should be most able, through cooperative organization, to produce and carry on a course of study" (p. 116). She proposed seven guidelines for conducting curriculum revision. Curriculum work should involve the entire staff of a school. All members of the teaching staff should be represented in the continuous work on the curriculum. The superintendent should oversee the work particularly to insure that "this representative organization is not only instituted but perfected and untrammelled in its work" (p. 117). Additionally, the superintendent should promote cooperative curriculum work for professional growth. The supervisors "should serve as cooperators, advisors, and . . . as chairmen of the various committees of the organization" (p. 117). Curriculum experts and other leaders should be consulted as needed by local groups. Finally, "permanent machinery" should be put into place to facilitate continuous curriculum revision (p. 117). The organization which would result from following these guidelines, MacGregor contended,

would not only produce the most effective curriculum, but improve the teaching profession.

Barr (1924), assistant director in charge of supervision in the Detroit public schools, outlined the process for making the course of study. He did not make it clear whether this was the process that had been used in Detroit or whether he was simply proposing this process based on his research. In order to answer the question, "Who shall make the course of study?", Barr stated that a "distinction should be made between curriculum making and the making of courses of study" (p. 373). Curriculum making involved determining "the major objectives of education, the listing after experimentation of worth-while activities, [and] the development of the principles of grouping" (p. 373). This work required the expert curriculum builder, according to Barr. On the other hand, building the course of study involved "evaluating subject matter, the gradation of subject matter, the adaptation of subject matter to teaching situations, and the organization of subject matter" (p. 373). Barr contended that the construction of courses of study was the field of work where teachers, principals, and supervisors could "make their most valuable contributions" (p. 373). Barr's distinctions were similar to those made by Freeman (1924).

Barr (1924) paraphrased some "prevailing practices" (p. 373) in the construction of the course of study from the second yearbook of the Department of Superintendence.

First, Barr asserted that both national and local leadership were needed to make a course of study. The national, or expert, leadership would be responsible for "laying down broad general principles" (p. 373). "Locally," Barr asserted, "there is a place for every member of the school department in adjusting the course of study to individual needs of pupils and community conditions" (p. 373). Again, as with Freeman (1924), the part that teachers were to play in curriculum work was in adapting to local needs the curriculum which had been pre-determined by curriculum experts.

Reynolds (1920), a professor of education at the Agricultural College of North Dakota, made a presentation on democracy in education to the North Dakota State Teachers' Association. In his presentation, Reynolds maintained that democracy in education "does not imply individual freedom from restraint, but rather a mutual or co-operative restraint" (p. 179). In other words, teachers should not be free to act on individual initiative. Professional autonomy should not be assigned to the individual. Professional autonomy, in Reynold's perspective, was a collective responsibility.

Reynolds (1924) asserted that democracy in education also meant that "those engaged in daily classroom work shall have a large part in the determination of the policies and practices" in the school (p. 178). Additionally, the method and manner of supervision of classroom teachers would "be

determined in a democratic fashion after a fair and full discussion among teachers" (p. 178). Formal provisions would be made for these and other responsibilities, protections, and method of organization for participation. Reynolds (1924) concluded that regardless of whether teachers were viewed as employees of the board or as educational experts responsible to the public for education, teachers had to be recognized as "co-partners with the board in determining the practical methods of placing education in its proper place in society" (p. 179).

The United States in the first quarter of the twentieth century was still largely rural. Notwithstanding the industrialization which was taking place, the economy of these rural areas was primarily agricultural. Education in rural areas presented a special problem which was evidenced by the increasing amount of literature devoted to rural education. Foght (1920), a rural school specialist with the United States Bureau of Education, maintained that rural education needed to be reorganized and teachers in rural schools had a critical role to play in this reorganization. In preparation for this task, rural teachers should

- (1) Be strong enough to establish themselves as leaders in the community where they are to live and labor;
- (2) have a good grasp on the organization and management of the new kind of farm school;
- and (3) show expert ability in dealing with the redirected school curriculum. (p. ix)

The third characteristic was most pertinent to this study of teacher participation in curriculum development.

Foght (1920) addressed this third characteristic in the section of his book entitled "The Teacher as Maker of the Revitalized Course of Study." Foght asserted that local boards of education and established state courses of study inhibited teacher effectiveness. Boards with little or no expertise dictated the curriculum to be taught without consulting teachers. State courses of study were designed to facilitate textbook use and were a patchwork of "much that is traditional and obsolete" (p. 226). The result was "rubbish for which [teachers] can see no justification" (p. 226) in teaching.

Before any real change or reforms could be made in rural education, courses of study had to be "fundamentally recast" (Foght, 1920, p. 227). Courses of study, and textbooks, intended for use in rural schools must be remade to reflect the needs of rural students, according to Foght. Teachers were the only ones who could effectively do this. He asserted that teachers, "instead of laymen, must decide what shall be taught in school and what shall be left out" (p. 227).

The Committee on Superintendent's Problems of the National Education Association had been studying teacher participation in administration as early as 1917. As previously discussed, Updegraff was chair of this committee when it presented a report on cooperative approaches to curriculum development in 1919. Updegraff (1921), a professor of educational administration at the University of

Pennsylvania, stated that this investigation was "the most extensive study in this subject up to the present time" (p. 284). According to Updegraff, the increasing interest and importance of teacher participation in administration and curriculum development led the National Council to form a committee to continue this work.

In a preliminary report to the National Council, Updegraff (1921) gave a brief history of teacher participation in administration and then outlined some of the issues which must be considered for the proposed study of teacher participation in school management. During the early history of schools in the United States, the school organization was relatively simple: students, teacher and school committee. In this simple organizational scheme, Updegraff (1921) maintained that

the teacher had the full responsibility for the determination of the work to be done, the methods of doing it, and the time in which it should be done. He enjoyed the full freedom which the masters in trades formerly had and which the professional man in medicine and law has today. (pp. 285-286)

The teacher was responsible for curriculum and instruction, according to Updegraff, in the early history of education in the United States.

The growing population of the United States which led to the growth of cities also led to a change in the organizational structure of schools. Principal teachers were appointed to deal with the increasing demands of growing schools, i.e., "buildings, grounds, and the major cases of discipline" (p. 286). As schools consolidated into

school systems, superintendents were selected to handle the administrative responsibilities of the school system.

According to Updegraff, the superintendent's duties evolved into what they were at present:

[The superintendent's] duties gradually increased from those of a mere clerk without the power of exercising executive discretion to include the functions, first, of supervision of teaching, second, of advising the board of education as to the steps it should take, third, of formulating the educational plans of the school system, and, fourth, of recommending the financial expenditures necessary to the carrying out of those plans. (p. 286)

The addition and growth of these two positions in the organizational structure of the schools shifted the responsibility for educational policies, such as curriculum and instruction, from the teachers to the administrative officers, in Updegraff's perspective.

Updegraff (1921) identified four factors which were influential in this shift of decision-making from teachers to administrators. The first factor was the tendency to promote those perceived as the best teachers to become principals and superintendents. This facilitated the perception that principals and superintendents knew what was best in matters of curriculum and instruction. A second factor was the hierarchical organization of schools. Updegraff suggested that this encouraged the practice "of each superior officer giving directions either in general or in minute detail to subordinate[s] without consulting them about the actual conditions which they had to face" (p. 286). The third factor, the influence of the efficiency

movement, was one that contemporary writers such as Callahan (1962) and Kliebard (1995) suggested was most influential on educational administration and the curriculum. Updegraff asserted that "the worship of system by managers in the belief that anything that was systematic in form was efficient" (p. 287) contributed to the shift in decision-making. The fourth factor which contributed to the shift in decision-making from teachers to administrators was

the mistaken idea of the nature of educational processes which regarded the child as plastic material to be shaped by the teacher rather than an actual dynamic force to be guided by him. (p. 287)

The result, as Updegraff pointed out, was a uniform curriculum which was constructed by individuals or groups other than teachers without consideration of student needs or teacher expertise and experience.

Updegraff (1921) identified five issues which needed to be considered in the study of teacher participation in school management: the role and influence of voluntary teachers' organizations in school management; the application of the principles of efficiency, or the science of management, and the role of teacher participation; the conditions requiring new organizational structures for teacher participation; the administrative tasks in which teachers should participate; and, the organizational structure(s) best suited to address specific tasks. The second and fourth considerations were the most pertinent.

The second consideration was the application of the principles of efficiency, or scientific management, to the

school setting. While this had not been the usual practice, Updegraff (1921) suggested the principles of efficiency required "the teacher to be allowed to play such a part in management of the school as his knowledge and experience make desirable" (p. 288). What role teachers should play in school management was the critical question in Updegraff's view. In deciding the answer to this question, Updegraff (1921) pointed out that of crucial importance was the fact that

the education of each child is always under the direct control of a teacher and that the practical aspects of the guidance of pupils are better known by teachers than by either the technical experts or the line officers. (pp. 288-289)

According to Updegraff, effective management required the "careful consideration of the practical aspects of teaching" (p. 289), therefore, teachers' perspectives about curriculum and instruction had to be taken into consideration. The committee studying teacher participation in school management would need to study the principles of efficiency and management to better determine the role of the teacher.

Updegraff (1921) divided administrative tasks into three categories: "policy-forming, policy-determining, and policy executing" (p. 290). Administrative tasks formed the basis for the fourth consideration: "'In what functions in management should a teachers' organization participate when conditions warrant its establishment?'" (p. 290). Updegraff indicated that it was conceivable that teachers could participate in all three areas. However, the principles of

efficiency required one administrator "who is held for finally deciding upon all policies submitted to the board of education and the execution of such policies as are adopted by it" (p. 290). If this was accepted, i.e., that policy-determining and policy-executing were functions reserved to the superintendent, then teacher participation would be limited to policy-forming. Among other tasks, Updegraff suggested that the course of study and methods of teaching fell in the category of policy-forming (p. 292).

MacDonald (1921), a professor of vocational education at the University of Cincinnati, opened his discussion of fundamental principles of democratic school administration by stating that

if there has been any single educational problem which the past twenty years has seen grow from infancy to adulthood, it is that of democracy in school administration. (p. 31)

Democratic practice had met with varied success during this twenty-year period: "Some seem to have succeeded . . . others to have failed utterly" (p. 31).

MacDonald (1921) first provided an analysis of the various conceptions of democracy in order to provide an operational definition for his fundamental principles. He suggested that definitions which limited the definition of democracy to only rights and privileges were too narrow in conception. Dewey's conception of democracy, on the other hand, was much broader in scope, according to MacDonald. He concluded that Dewey's conception of democracy included, but went beyond rights, privileges, duties and responsibilities:

[Dewey} goes even further when he designates open-mindedness, sincerity, breadth of outlook, and thoroughness along with willingness and ability to assume the responsibilities for developing the consequences of ideas which are accepted, as the essential attributes of the true democrat. If expressed in terms social environment, these signify 'a spirit of participation, a desire to cooperate, an ambition to share in the purposeful direction of the world's activities . . . as well as those activities themselves.' (p. 31)

This conception of democracy, influenced by Dewey, was the basis for MacDonald's principles of democratic school administration.

In MacDonald's (1921) conception, each right or privilege in a democracy had a corresponding obligation or duty. These rights and obligations were interrelated. The first fundamental right and corresponding obligation are good examples of this interrelationship. In MacDonald's conception, individuals had the right "to originate ideas regarding any question or problem having to do with individual or group welfare" (p. 31). Its corresponding obligation was that the individual had "to be competent to originate worth-while ideas, those that should command the attention of serious-minded members of the group" (p. 31). In other words, individuals who wished to participate in making decisions were obligated to prepare themselves to participate. Individuals who attempted to exercise their right without the necessary competence could make poor or harmful decisions. There would be little purpose for individuals to develop competence if they were unable to exercise their right to originate ideas.

Generally, the individual's obligations for the rights proposed by MacDonald (1921) required the individual to become knowledgeable about problems in order to make intelligent suggestions, to think intelligently, or logically, about all suggestions, and to cooperate in executing any suggestions decided on by the group. Another fundamental right in MacDonald's conception was the individual's right "to pass judgment upon the ideas expressed by others, more especially those pertaining to group welfare" (pp. 31-32). The individual's obligation was "to be competent to criticise constructively rather than merely destructively, to get down to fundamental principles" (pp. 31-32). A third privilege was the right "to initiate reforms, 'to start something' which is believed to be for the benefit of the larger group rather than of a limited few" (p. 32). The individual's responsibility for the privilege was to think thoroughly through a problem which included anticipating the results for actions and taking responsibility for any results of a chosen action. A final right in MacDonald's conception of democracy was the individual's right "to propose or promote sincerely and intelligently activities which are initiated by others until these have been finally accepted or rejected by the group" (p. 32). The corresponding obligation was for the individual "to work vigorously" (p. 32) to gain acceptance for ideas and "to cooperate fully" (p. 32) in executing those ideas which have been selected by the group regardless

of whether or not these ideas were initially endorsed or suggested by the individual.

In a school system, MacDonald (1921) contended that these rights and responsibilities applied to all teachers and administrators. Not only did these rights and responsibilities apply to teachers, but any questions concerning the management of schools were considered within the scope of teacher participation. The key, MacDonald asserted, was that

If any teacher, principal, or superintendent takes advantage of the right or privilege to originate and express ideas relative to methods of rating pupils, for instance, or of determining promotional fitness, then, beyond a shadow of a doubt, he is morally obligated both

1. To make an honest and careful study of the question in order that he may be justified in asking others to consider it seriously, and
2. To be both disposed and able to cooperate fully with others in trying to put into effect the conclusions reached in any collective deliberations, whether or not he personally approves them. (p. 32)

Taking advantage of the right meant that teachers also accepted the obligations associated with the right. Because MacDonald considered these rights and responsibilities inseparable, there was an implication that the reverse was also true. That is, if teachers were not willing to accept the responsibilities associated with these rights, then they would not be deserving of these privileges.

Certain conditions must exist for democratic practice to exist, according to MacDonald. Both administrators and teachers were responsible for establishing and maintaining these conditions. Administrators would have to establish a

climate which encouraged constructive teacher participation in decision-making. Administrators would have to view teachers as colleagues whose participation was essential to solving the problems of schools. Administrators would have to understand the relationship between teacher participation and teacher growth.

Teachers also had a role in establishing and maintaining the conditions necessary for democratic participation, according to MacDonald. Teachers had to "welcome the chance to grapple with any problem of school welfare rather than limit their interest to questions which immediately concern them" (p. 32). Teachers had to be willing and able to "think intelligently" (p. 32) and to offer constructive criticism on educational matters.

From the conception of and conditions for democratic participation in schools, MacDonald (1921) proposed six fundamental principles of democracy in school administration. He acknowledged the influence of Dewey's writings on democratic practice on his principles. MacDonald's first fundamental principle of democratic administration had two parts: the opinion of every person in the organization must be solicited and the various opinions must be categorized, or "pooled" (p. 32), to provide perspective. MacDonald asserted in his second principle that a climate conducive to the free expression of opinions had to be established and maintained. A third principle stated that as opinions were solicited, those

expressing their opinions must be assured "that their voices are heard" (p. 33). The fourth principle concerned MacDonald's perspective of rights and responsibilities:

There must be a willingness and ability on the part of all first, to give earnest and intelligent consideration to all questions before expressing an opinion and second to accept the responsibilities growing out of their actions. (p. 33)

His fifth principle stated that "democracy denotes the struggling of an interested and involved whole toward a more or less dimly conceived end which they collectively believe in and endeavoring to attain" (p. 33). In MacDonald's perspective, expert opinion and knowledge were valued and should be used to make informed decisions. However, "government by experts, is really inconsistent with true democracy" (p. 33). MacDonald's final principle stated that a clear distinction had to be made between "policy-determining and policy executing" (p. 33). According to MacDonald, teachers were not to execute policies; they were to "determine the policies which most intimately concern them" (p. 33).

McMurry (1922), a professor of elementary education at Teachers College in New York City, outlined four current changes that were occurring in curriculum making: the emphasis on child experience as the foundation for curriculum development rather than abstract subject knowledge, the emphasis on thinking processes rather than factual knowledge, the emphasis on general exercise (i.e., general assembly), and the emphasis on active learning

(i.e., learning by doing). These changes in curriculum making put "the curriculum maker and teacher on much the same plane" because both were "engaged in the same general task" (p. 251).

To bring these new methods into general practice, McMurry (1922) asserted that "the schools must be more fully democratized than they have been thus far" (p. 251). He considered the school to be the basic unit for curriculum making rather than the school system, state, or nation. The curriculum had to be designed to meet the needs of the students of a particular school to be effective. Because the school was the basic unit, curriculum had to be developed "through the combined efforts of supervisors or superintendents, teachers and parents" (p. 251). This could only be accomplished through more democratic participation.

In the fourth report to the National Council of Education of the Committee on Participation of Teachers in School Management, Updegraff (1922) reported that there had a been a steady increase in the practice of democratic participation in school administration since the inception of the committee four years earlier. He noted that structures, such as teachers' councils, which provided for democratic participation in administration could now "be found in city school systems of all sizes throughout the United States" (p. 404). He further noted that while it was "evident that teacher participation in management has come

to stay" (p. 404), there was still was not much information matching types of participation with school characteristics. This was a need he had identified earlier.

The committee's purpose during its four year existence, according to Updegraff (1922), had been to study the various practices of and results of teacher participation in school administration around the United States. As part of its focus on teacher participation in administration, the committee had also studied "the chief form in which teacher participation had been manifested up to that time- namely, the part taken by teachers in the making of the course of study" (p. 404). During their four year study of teacher participation in school administration and the construction of the course of study, the committee had so far concluded that teacher participation "was a positive benefit to the schools, to the teachers, to the superintendents as well as in the making of the course of study and in the improvement of methods of teaching" (p. 405). Updegraff added that the committee's studies "had proved conclusively that teacher participation in the making of courses of study should be adopted by city school systems generally without regard to size" (p. 405). No conclusion, however, was reached as to which form of participation was most effective.

Because of the prominence that teachers' councils had taken in the last years, the committee proposed a study of the organization and function of teachers' councils. Updegraff's (1922) initial observation of teachers' councils

suggested that teachers' councils were not working as effectively as expected because some were taking on responsibilities that were better performed by other agencies. Additionally, some teachers' councils were focused more on functions which were not "an integral part of the operation of the school system" (p. 406). Updegraff attributed these problems with the fact that "we are in the 'trial and error' period of the development of teachers' councils" (p. 408).

In the final section of the committee's report, Updegraff (1922) presented three principles of school management which studies had concluded would determine the success or failure of teacher participation in school administration. First, teacher participation should be developed to further the purposes of the school to the educate of children. The primary purpose of anything done in a school should be to benefit its students. Teacher participation in school administration was no different, according to Updegraff. "Consequently," he asserted, "if [teacher participation] does not benefit the children, it ought not to exist" (p. 407). The second principle stated that teacher participation "should promote the efficiency of the teaching corps" (p. 407). "Efficiency" used in this context was suggestive of effectiveness since Updegraff stated that it meant that participation "should make teachers more competent in instruction" (p. 407). The third principle, which Updegraff noted was a corollary of the

other principles, stated that teacher participation should help the superintendent to be more effective by allowing the superintendent to "accomplish more and better work" (p. 408).

Updegraff (1922) concluded in the committee's report that teacher participation in school administration was becoming more or less a permanent feature in schools. Because of this, further study was needed to gain a "clearer understanding of the aims of teacher participation" (p. 408). Additionally, further study would help to establish criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher participation.

Bonser (1924a), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, discussed the need for revision of the elementary school curriculum. Bonser proposed four sources contributing to the need for elementary school curriculum revision: "changing conceptions of education; changing conditions of life; the early termination of the period of growth in teachers; and certain changes in the forms of school organization" (p. 890).

Bonser (1924a) identified three developments which had influenced the changing conceptions of education:

a behavioristic psychology . . . ; a social, democratic, behavioristic philosophy of education; and an educational sociology dealing with objectives, methods, and controls of social behavior (p. 890).

These influences had served to bring about such changes as "a growing conception of education as directed, desirable

activity rather than as acquired knowledge" (pp. 890-891), "a setting up of educational objectives or outcomes in terms of tangible life activities and purposes" (p. 891), and "the use of objectives, standards of selection and achievement rather than tradition or untested opinion" (p. 891). Bonser contended that it was inevitable that these changes would eventually affect curriculum and methods in schools.

The first quarter of the twentieth century brought a multitude of changes in the conditions of life. Bonser (1924a) noted some of what he considered the more important changes. He identified such changes as the change from economic, social and political isolation to "world-wide interdependence" (p. 891); changes in labor, transportation, communication and entertainment; changes in demographics; and "an increasing consciousness . . . of a sense of personal freedom, an increasing tendency to self-assertion, and, . . . , a growing resentment against the restraints of law" (p. 891). The changes in the conditions of life, according to Bonser, had created "demands for training in social and applied science" (p. 892).

Bonser (1924a) contended that teachers established professional habits early in their careers. As these professional habits became established, Bonser further maintained that teachers "do not tend to continue to grow and make adjustments in their work in response to either changing conceptions of education or changing conceptions of life" (p. 892). The curriculum could serve to further

professional stagnation if it did not reflect these changes. Bonser also suggested that curriculum revision might serve to bring about some of the necessary changes in teaching implied by changes in conceptions of education and changes in conditions of life. He asserted that until the elementary curriculum was revised to incorporate these changes, "changes derived from research studies, [and] recognized new values by educational leaders . . . , the teaching will continue to follow closely the unchanged, written curricula" (p. 893).

Bonser (1924a) identified two desirable types of curriculum reorganization. "One is that of the research type in which the most rigorous procedure of scientific method should be employed" (pp. 893-894). Bonser suggested that this type of revision would not typically be carried out at the local level or by groups of teachers. The second type of curriculum revision was conducted by the "teaching and supervisory staff at a given school or school system" and made use of "the findings and contributions of all who have made profitable, scientific investigations" (p. 894).

As Bonser (1924a) suggested earlier, curriculum revision could provide professional growth and improvement not only through an improved curriculum. The process of revision itself would contribute to professional growth and improvement. The primary challenge for teachers and supervisors in curriculum revision was "largely that of finding and formulating the best principles and practices

known in terms of needs and conditions of that particular school or school system" (p. 894). Bonser asserted that this "work of interpretation and adaptation" presented the "opportunity and stimulus to professional growth" by providing "a motive and the occasion for continued professional study" (pp. 894-895).

In his book, The Elementary School Curriculum, Bonser (1924b) further elaborated on his perspective of curriculum revision. He stated in the forward that the book was "offered as a practical help to supervisors, principals, and superintendents in the improvement of the elementary school curriculum" (p. v). Bonser proposed principles for curriculum revision, two of which were pertinent to teacher participation. In the first principle applicable to teacher participation, Bonser (1924b) asserted that

the curriculum for a given school or school system should be a joint product of all the school staff. Teachers should participate in any revision of a curriculum to such a degree that they feel a large share of the authorship in its changes and of responsibility for carrying out the changes. Superintendents, principals, and supervisors should be responsible for leadership in stimulation, plans of organization for revision, and helpful constructive advice. (pp. 153-154)

Bonser continued to make the distinction between the revision of existing curriculum, which was to be done by teachers, and the creation of new curriculum, which was to be done by specialists.

Bonser (1924b) proposed, in the second principle concerning teacher participation, that

The curriculum can be developed and applied in the spirit of modern democratic and educational ideals only when so organized and administered as to permit a wide degree of flexibility in programs, and large individual freedom for the teachers to adjust the relationships of its parts to the needs of their respective classes. (p. 154)

In addition to their participation in curriculum revision, teachers had to have the flexibility to modify the curriculum to address the individual needs of students in their classrooms.

Bonser also made a distinction between informal revision and adaptation of the curriculum and the formal revision of the curriculum. According to Bonser, teachers were "continually responsible for making immediate adaptations" (p. 424) to the curriculum in their classrooms. Adaptations to the curriculum had to be made based on the needs of students in classrooms. Adaptations were also to be made based on "the interests expressed by children and the important events which may give rise to projects requiring the most valuable subject matter" (pp. 424-425). This was, in effect, revision of the curriculum on an informal basis.

Bonser (1924b) pointed out that "this informal improvement of the curriculum was good" (p. 425), but schools and school systems needed to continually revise the curriculum on a more formal level. Bonser suggested a plan of organization to conduct formal curriculum revision. Bonser asserted that "an organization of the entire professional staff of the school system should be made with

fairly definite responsibilities" (p. 426). Administrators were responsible for "the broader organization of the curriculum and with the formulation of essentials, representing standards set by the state" (p. 426). Teachers and administrators were responsible for "placing [the state standards] in the respective grades most appropriate to the growing interests and capacities of children" (p. 426).

Committees made up primarily of teachers were to be responsible for "the suggestion of typical projects and the organization of the appropriate subject matter and reference sources for these" (Bonser, 1924b, p. 426). Bonser contended that "the organization of the work should thoroughly democratic" (p. 426). This meant that "each teacher should be given the widest possible opportunities to work along lines in which she feels the greatest interest and in which she has most to give" (p. 426). Teacher participation was critical to the effectiveness of the curriculum, according to Bonser, because the curriculum's "detailed application" (p. 426) was dependent on the teachers. The greater the degree of teacher participation and the more meaningful their participation in curriculum revision, "the greater their sense of responsibility and power in carrying [the curriculum] forward in teaching" (p. 426).

Adair (1922), a teacher-member of the N.E.A.'s Committee on Participation of Teachers in School Management, agreed that while teacher participation in school

administration as an officially-sanctioned practice had become widespread, teacher participation as an informal practice was not new. In addressing the National Council of Education, Adair asserted that

if you think back over your experience you will remember that teachers have always participated in school management to a greater or less degree. The fact that an activity was not the subject of general discussion does not presuppose its non-existence. (p. 546)

According to Adair, this informal participation evolved into the idea of the teachers' council, the first of which appeared in Waterbury, Connecticut, in 1908. After a slow start (i.e., 34 councils by the end of 1918), the number "more than doubled" (p. 547) by the end of 1920 and had grown steadily since.

The primary purposes for teachers' councils identified by research, according to Adair (1922), were to generally improve the teaching profession, to stimulate professional growth among teachers, "to foster a spirit of sympathetic good-will and helpfulness," to facilitate understanding between teachers and administrators, and "to give teachers a voice in shaping educational policies" (p. 547). As the work of the committee had suggested, one of the most common educational policies that teachers had participated in shaping during the first quarter of the twentieth century was in the work on courses of study. Not only was work on curriculum the most common way in which teachers participated in school administration, it apparently was one of the most productive. In Adair's summary of the findings

concerning the areas in which teacher participation had been "generally considered beneficial," work on courses of study was listed (p. 547).

While the rhetoric concerning teacher participation had primarily come from administrators and college professors, the work of the committee suggested where the idea had to originate in practice to be effective. Adair (1922) asserted that

general practice has shown that the best place for a teachers' council to originate is with the teachers themselves. Rarely does a council otherwise instituted serve its mission. (p. 547)

A democratic perspective required teacher involvement from the very beginning, i.e., the origination and initiation of the idea of teacher participation. Administrative decree of teacher participation was the antithesis of the conception of teacher participation, in Adair's and the committee's perspective, and was, in many cases, counter-productive.

The Department of Superintendence (1925), in the third yearbook, continued its focus on the elementary school curriculum. As the forward to the third yearbook stated, the foundation had been laid in the second yearbook through the Department's

statement of general educational aims and objectives, through its survey of current curriculum practice, and through its proposed machinery for cooperative effort on curriculum revision in a local community (p. 7).

In deciding on what was the greatest need of school superintendents, the Department's Commission on the Curriculum determined that "the most needed service was the

collection and analysis of outstanding research studies" (p. 7) concerning elementary curriculum. The purpose of the third yearbook was to compile the research studies on curriculum revision which had been "inaccessible because of their technical form, or because of their publication in isolated monographs or magazines, or because of their fragmentary distribution" (p. 7).

The first section of the third yearbook (Department of Superintendence, 1925) outlined "A Cooperative Plan for the Revision of the American Elementary School Curriculum" (p. 9). The yearbook stated that

two methods are needed in curriculum making: (1) the subjective method of expert teaching opinion, and (2) the objective method of expert analysis of social and psychological needs. Both processes should work together. (p. 12)

In other words, the revision of curricula should be carried out cooperatively between teachers and specialists. The role of teachers in curriculum revision had been described in the second yearbook (see Department of Superintendence, 1924).

The role of the expert was not described as clearly. The third yearbook (Department of Superintendence, 1925) placed this role in an advisory capacity. First, the third yearbook stated that national committees, usually made up of recognized experts, "should present raw material" (p. 13) rather than attempting create a national curriculum. A national curriculum was neither possible nor desirable "because of the great variations in social, industrial, and

economic conditions" and "because of our democratic ideal of recognizing local needs and conditions and of considering individual differences of children" (p. 13).

Three elements of courses of study were identified. One element was "the general core that meets nation-wide requirements" (Department of Superintendence, 1925, p. 13). This general core was what the national committees were intended to provide. The second element of every course of study was "the part that has to do with the local community, which may even vary for different communities in the same city" (p. 13). This was intended to be the work of general committees of teachers. The variation between communities within a city was one reason why some writers, such as McMurry, maintained that the school was the unit of study for curriculum development. The third element, "adjustments for individual children and varying groups of pupils" (p. 13), was the responsibility of individual teachers.

The third yearbook (Department of Superintendence, 1925) also proposed that a central agency should be created to act as a "clearinghouse for curriculum research" (p. 13). Provisions would be made for

the exchanging of bibliographies, for rendering available research studies as soon as they are completed, and for the interchanging of the findings of local communities, as classroom teachers test out certain content and procedures. (p. 13)

In addition to participating in curriculum revision, teachers were to contribute to the curriculum knowledge base through their experimentation in the classroom:

Just as scientifically trained workers in our laboratories furnish us with the bulk of scientific literature, so in the future more and more of our educational contributions should come from teachers, administrators, and research workers trained scientifically to observe children and analyze the needs of society. (p. 13)

In other words, the teachers' role in curriculum revision and development was to grow as the expertise grew with training.

Bobbitt (1925) identified obstacles which had to be addressed in curriculum-making at the local level. He pointed out that curriculum-making had become a more complex activity than when

a superintendent or a committee in a relatively short period of time could prepare a syllabus of subject-matter and drill exercises, largely in terms of the textbooks to be used. (p. 653)

Bobbitt stated that most school systems were inclined to engage in curriculum-making by organizing

general committees for the different levels of instruction- elementary school, junior high school, and high school- and then at each level a working committee for each department. More and more, committees are organized with the expectation that the work will continue for several years before its completed. (p. 653)

This suggested that teacher participation in curriculum development through committee work was a common practice, at least in Bobbitt's view. Because the "responsibility rests upon each city to educate its own children" (pp. 653-654), it was logical that curriculum should be made at the local level.

Bobbitt (1925) endorsed this practice and stated that the practice was

in conformity with good principles of democratic school administration. Courses of study employed in a given city should not be handed down from some distant centralized agency. Neither should the school systems accept and adopt pronouncements of the experts in the several fields. (p. 653)

Furthermore, Bobbitt suggested that because the curriculum field was still young there were few experts or "pronouncements of an authoritative character" (p. 653) to guide local systems. Even if there was "authoritative advice, it would have to be applied to the practical conditions of the local situations" (p. 653).

Bobbitt (1925) elaborated on thirteen obstacles that local systems would encounter in their efforts at curriculum-making. The first problem likely to be encountered by curriculum committees, according to Bobbitt, was the "uncertainty as to the function of the school" (p. 654). Bobbitt identified two opposing views: (1) The function of the school was to aid students in the acquisition of the "fundamental processes" , i.e., reading, writing, spelling, computation, and oral and written expression (p. 654), and (2) the function of the school was to develop the whole child, i.e.,

his personal qualities, dispositions, attitudes, habits, powers of judgment, vision of reality, and competence in discharging all of the responsibilities of efficient adulthood. (p. 654)

Bobbitt contended that curriculum work would be greatly aided if teachers and supervisors were able to come to an agreement about the function of the school.

A second difficulty that curriculum committees would probably experience was the traditional view of the aims and objectives of education. Bobbitt (1925) contended that

tradition says that education consists of teaching the textbooks. For the content-subjects, it is the storing of facts in memory. For the skill-subjects, it is a matter of artificial academic drill in relative, or more often complete, isolation from practical applications. (p. 654)

Curriculum committees had to come to the realization that "specific abilities and activities are the aims and that actual living as it ought to be lived is the way to learn to live it" (p. 655). As long as the majority of educators were bound by traditional views, they would continue to perpetuate curricula which had proven ineffective.

Educational science was not sufficiently advanced enough to provide guidance as to what were appropriate educational objectives, according to Bobbitt (1925). This was the third problem for local curriculum committees. Curriculum committees would not be able to rely on any expertise to determine educational objectives. These committees would have to devise their "own surveys and analysis of community activities" (p. 656) to determine appropriate objectives. Bobbitt described the activities as laborious and difficult for any committee to perform.

A fourth problem was the "uncertainty as educational methods or procedures" (Bobbitt, 1925, p. 656). Bobbitt asserted that educational ends determine methods. If a committee holds to the traditional educational aims, then

traditional methods would be utilized. For example, Bobbitt suggested that

if we conceive the end of the process to be the accumulation of textbook information, we shall employ the familiar methods of storing the memory with inert information. (p. 656)

As long as there was no agreement on the educational aims, determining appropriate methods would be difficult. Methods were important because, as Bobbitt pointed out that "it is these [methods] which make up the curriculum" (p. 656).

The fifth problem- "traditions relative to methods and procedures" (Bobbitt, 1925, p. 656)- was very similar to the fourth problem. Bobbitt contended that the common practice was to "accept the [traditional] subject-teaching objectives without question and then adopt the subject-teaching methods as a matter of course" (p. 657). Major obstacles, according to Bobbitt, were the influence of this tradition and "the professional inertness of the great body of teachers who are controlled" (p. 657) by tradition.

"The subject-teaching fallacy" (Bobbitt, 1925. p. 657) constituted a sixth problem and was closely related to the first and fifth problems. Bobbitt asserted that

so long as the members of a curriculum committee conceive their responsibility to be merely teaching a particular subject in academic isolation, they are unfit for curriculum-making of the modern type. (p. 657)

Bobbitt called the subject-teaching fallacy "one of the central obstacles" (p. 657) to modern curriculum-making and a key to several of the other problems.

The fact that "the members of the curriculum committee lack the necessary time and energy for the work" (p. 661) was a seventh challenge to the efforts at local curriculum-making. The expectation that teachers and others employed in a school system would produce quality work after having worked a full day was not reasonable. "A proper type of curriculum," Bobbitt asserted, "can never be made by those who have only remnants of time and energy to devote to it" (p. 661). When members of a committee were tired or short on time, the tendency, according to Bobbitt, was to "follow the easier grooves of habit" (p. 661).

An eighth difficulty existed in the leadership of principals and superintendents. Bobbitt (1925) indicated that

those who are in the position of general professional leadership are, for the most part, primarily directors of routine and only secondarily directors of professional thought and labor (p. 661).

Bobbitt pointed out that frequently a dilemma existed for administrators. While it was "hoped" (p. 662) that administrators were able to attend to both routine and professional duties, time seldom permitted both and most administrators were expected to efficiently address routine matters. However, when administrators did not or could not perform their professional leadership duties, curriculum committees were many times left "without the general leadership which is indispensable" (p. 662). Other problems likely to be encountered by curriculum-making committees included "the isolation of the school from the life of the

community" (p. 657), "community habits, attitudes, and traditions" (p. 658), the influence of textbooks, "the overspecialization of the teaching and supervisory personnel" (p. 660), and "the hesitation of institutions of professional research and training to take the lead" (p. 662).

Bobbitt (1925) noted that he had not presented these obstacles to discourage local curriculum-making, but "to assist them in overcoming the difficulties" (p. 662). He reasserted that "those responsible for education in the local community should plan educational labors for the local community" (p. 663). He added that "they should bear the full responsibility of planning their own work in the light of their own conditions" (p. 663). The "key obstacle" (p. 663) to their work was the traditional concept of educational aims. If all educators specialized "in *education- that is, the right upbringing of human beings-* rather than in subjects and the mere thoughtless teaching of subjects" (p. 663), then the work of curriculum-making committees would be more effective.

Teacher participation was again a subject of discussion of the general sessions of the sixty-third meeting of the National Education Association. This time the topic was teacher participation in the determination of educational policy. Peterson (1925), a teacher in Cincinnati, presented the viewpoint of a teacher on this topic. She endorsed the creation of teachers' councils to facilitate teacher

participation. However, Peterson asserted that the councils should be "developed by the teachers themselves" (p. 94). Peterson concluded that the best way for teachers to participate in the determination of policies was "that they be asked to build up school organization and school policies and then cooperate just as actively to carry them out as they did to build them up" (p. 97).

Peterson (1925) summarized the results of a 1924 survey conducted by the National League of Teachers' Associations concerning teacher participation. Surveys were sent to "seventy of the leading cities" (p. 95); Fifty-three superintendents responded. About half of the superintendents indicated they "did not have regularly organized committee or council upon they might call for help or advice" (p. 95). Of those that did have teachers' councils, "nine were originated by the administrators, seven by teachers, and sixteen by both" (p. 95). Peterson pointed out that those councils which had been created "by cooperative effort of teachers and administrators, have usually succeeded" (p. 95).

As to the work of these councils, Peterson (1925) reported that "work on the course of study has been carried on jointly in many cities" (p. 96). According to Peterson, work on the course of study was the response most often given to how teachers' councils were used. While selection of textbooks was not often noted, Peterson contended that the matter of textbooks was closely tied to courses of

study. "Until teachers know and until they express themselves as to what should go into a textbook," Peterson asserted, "there is not much use in spending time on a course of study" (p. 96). Textbook development and selection was also an important area for teacher participation, according to Peterson.

Adair (1925), a teacher in the Richmond, Virginia, schools, pointed out that increased school enrollments at the beginning of the century had resulted in the lowering of qualifications for teachers. Less qualified teachers in turn resulted in standardization of curriculum and methods. "Thus," Adair maintained, "the teacher was removed from direct participation in the administration in school policy, a procedure that was detrimental both to the schools and the teacher" (p. 99). However, the trend toward standardization had not prevented some school systems from soliciting "formally or informally . . . the mature judgment of their experienced teachers" (p. 99). There had always been school systems which had involved teachers in decision-making, according to Adair. As time passed, this practice was becoming more widespread as teachers and others understood that teachers "had a contribution to make to the schools in the way of methods, courses of study, personnel, organization, etc." (p. 99).

Adair (1925) went on to describe the plan for teacher participation in Detroit. The Detroit plan provided for teacher participation through

experiments and suggestions for the improvement of instruction such as: variations in instructional records and forms, changes in the course of study, suggestions for better classroom organization and management, improved methods of teaching, experimental investigations, [and] child welfare. (p. 100)

Teachers who wished to offer suggestions for improvement had to provide an overview "in not more than three hundred words" (p. 100) which stated

exactly what the experimental piece of work or suggestion is, when the work was started, . . . when it will end, why the results are especially worth while, [and] how the results might be used throughout the system. (p. 100)

Supervisors were assigned to assist teachers with their work. The work was evaluated and rated:

An 'A' contribution is an exceptional piece of work which can be put into immediate use throughout the schools, 'B' needs further study and experimentation, while 'C' receives honorable mention. (p. 101)

Contributing teachers were given recognition by the school system and could receive college credit for their work.

Longshore (1925), principal in a school in Kansas City, Missouri, presented an administrative viewpoint of teacher participation. The purpose, he said, of teacher participation in school administration was to promote democratic practice, "to develop the higher constructive, creative powers of the teachers . . . and to use their united wisdom in improving schools" (p. 107). It was not surprising, Longshore contended, that teachers were not interested or enthusiastic about a principal's plans when they had not participated in the planning. This violated a basic psychological principle, according to Longshore:

good psychology requires that a principal should associate the teachers with himself in the planning and executing of policies of the school. His powers multiply in the same degree as he is able to awaken the latent powers of his teachers. (p. 107)

Not only was teacher participation good educational practice, it was a good psychological practice.

Teacher participation promoted efficiency of the teachers, according to Longshore (1925). That is, participation made teachers more efficient, in that, participation "should make [teachers] more competent in instruction, more responsive to leadership, and more loyal to the school" (p. 452). Additionally, participation "increases the educational knowledge of the teacher, the satisfaction of the teacher in his work, and the efficiency of his teaching" (p. 108). Participation essentially contributed to the professional growth of the teacher. Efficiency then, in this respect, denoted improved classroom instruction. The end result of this "better teaching ability" (p. 452), in Longshore's perspective, was that pupils would benefit by receiving "better guidance and help" (p. 452). Teacher participation in school administration would not only benefit principals and teachers, but, ultimately, the students would benefit.

Teacher participation in determining the policies of the school would also make the school more efficient. As a result of their participation, teachers "know what the plans are and the considerations which were involved in their adoption" (Longshore, 1925, p. 108). Because of this

involvement and knowledge, teachers would "cooperate more willingly, more intelligently, and hence more energetically in carrying out the programs which they have helped to devise" (p. 108). In this context, efficient means intelligent, and enthusiastic, execution of the cooperatively planned programs.

Longshore (1925) asserted that teacher participation in school administration was "fairly well established" (p. 108). The only real question, in Longshore's opinion, was "into what special activities participation may be carried successfully, and what the organization [for participation] should be" (p. 108). Construction of courses of study was one definite area for teacher participation. He stated that

experience shows that the contribution of the teachers in the enlargement of programs, and especially in the details essential in their execution is great. The details which have been injected into courses of study are of the kind which can only come from classroom teachers (p. 109)

Longshore maintained that the administrator "who is more concerned about what is being taught and done in the schools . . . will employ the cooperative method [of curriculum construction]" (p. 108).

Willard (1925), the superintendent of the Seattle school system presented the viewpoint of the superintendent on teacher participation in the determination of school policies. Willard first discussed the various meanings of teacher participation. One interpretation had administrators

sharing in the name of democracy of certain executive authority with selected leaders of the teaching body who are ambitious to secure recognition and prestige for themselves and their group through organized influence. (p. 110)

Willard considered this form divisive and counterproductive to the educational aims of his school system. Willard considered the advisory council, another form, more professional:

Teacher participation, on the other hand, may suggest something wholly professional- a community of interest in the larger issues of education which promotes, not division, but unity of purpose and implies no conflict with centralized administrative control. (p. 110)

In addition to being more professional, the advisory council reserved the administrative function to school administrators.

The advisory council in Seattle was in an experimental stage, Willard (1925) reported. Two representatives from each grade of the elementary schools, including kindergarten, sat on the council. The Grade Teachers' Club, of which eighty-four percent of the elementary teachers were members according to Willard, appointed representatives to the advisory council. These representatives met "at least twice each semester" (p. 112) with the superintendent and his staff. The agendas for the meetings were open to "the discussion of any question that anyone wants to propose" (p. 112). Willard reported that the focus of the initial meetings concerned "kind, quality, and distribution of supplies, equipment and textbooks" and "questions affecting the daily regime" (p. 112).

Willard (1925) also contended that teachers had a role in the revision of courses of study. He briefly reported on a curriculum revision project which had been underway in Seattle for two years. Willard stated that

it may be taken for granted that no curriculum changes of consequence will be undertaken at present without taking counsel with those who will use the changed curriculum. The classroom interpretation of any course of study depends upon the personal equation of the teaching corps and must vary with local teaching situations. (p. 112)

Willard agreed with others who had stated that the effectiveness of any curriculum was dependent on classroom teachers. Willard alluded, also, to what others had termed an intelligent understanding of the curriculum. Willard stated that "a new curriculum that goes beyond the present practices of the [teaching] corps will spend itself against a barbed-wire entanglement" (p. 112). The method in which to avoid this entanglement was teacher participation in frequent revision of curriculum which reflects "the best practice of the forward looking, successful, growing teachers of the corps" (p. 112).

In an address delivered to the Oakland teaching staff, Hunter (1925), the superintendent of the Oakland, California, schools, discussed teacher participation in the determination of educational policies. Hunter considered "building institutions" to be "the first interest of the American people" (p. 665). Of the three phases of institution building he described, Hunter considered America's attempts to establish a public education system

"for 'all children of all the people'" to be "the most important and most fundamental to the success of the ideals for which America stands of any which we can contemplate"

(p. 666). Hunter further asserted that

it is of vital and fundamental importance to the teacher to have a knowledge of and be interested in institution building in this sense. The teacher's success as a member of the profession, indeed the success of the profession itself, is generally tied up to the success which this project of institution building attains. (pp. 666-667)

The success of this public educational institution was directly related to the success of the teachers who made up the public educational institution, according to Hunter.

As he continued with this line of reasoning, Hunter (1925) established four "essentials" (p. 667) for building the public educational institution. "First, in a democracy an institution consists of a supporting body of public opinion" (p. 667). While the institution of public education had the support of a majority of the public, the public was not well-informed and had to be provided

a knowledge of the purposes of the schools and how they do the work. They must know the ideals and goals of the school system, their methods and their organization, and, finally, their results. (pp. 667-668)

The second essential for building the institution of public education, according to Hunter, was "that the public schools must do their work well" (p. 668). Public support could be maintained only by continually providing good results. The third essential was for every member of the public education system to know that the work was being done well. In other

words, every member of system should know the goals of the system and how well those goals were being achieved. The fourth essential for building the public education system was "to create an interested group whose business it is to protect American youth and the institution consecrated to its education" (p. 668). Only the teaching profession, in Hunter's perspective, was capable of this. In fact, Hunter stated that the only way any of the four essentials could be carried out was to "create among the 750,000 teachers of our country a profession indeed and in truth" (p. 669).

Hunter (1925) contended that the primary way in which teaching would become a profession, and teachers would be considered professionals, was the creation of policy which provided for "participation by teachers in the determination of the policies of the public schools" (p. 670). Hunter described teacher participation as "sharing and cooperating in plan-making" (p. 670). He made it clear that "sharing and cooperating in plan-making does not mean assuming the responsibility for administration" (p. 670). In other words, teachers cooperated in establishing educational policies, but these policies were to be administered by "a single-headed authority in each unit of school organization" (p. 670).

Hunter (1925) asserted that "in the work of plan-making there are certain major problems standing out in which teachers will first of all be interested and which they should always share" (p. 670). Hunter identified seven

areas: Curriculum development, methods of instruction, welfare of the profession, school finance, school administration, facilities, and promotion. Hunter pointed to the recent work of the faculty on curriculum organization as an example of successful teacher participation. Hunter further asserted that

no policy affecting these especial problems for any unit of our school organization or for the state-wide organization should be established without having the opinion of the rank and file of teachers fully expressed or without giving that opinion full and complete organization. (p. 670)

Curriculum and its development were one of these major problems that Hunter considered to be in the purview of teacher participation. Furthermore, teacher participation in the determination of educational policies such as the curriculum was crucial to the health and effectiveness of this most important of American institutions.

Cox (1925), a professor of education at New York University, proposed sixteen principles for curriculum adjustment, or revision, in secondary schools. Cox provided a summary of eleven of these principles:

Principles I and II were statements of the general philosophy underlying the planning of the secondary program of studies; the next three dealt with general administrative questions regarding organization; the six that followed dealt with the core-curriculum, curriculum-prescriptions and electives. (p. 253)

Principles fourteen through sixteen dealt with graduation requirements. Cox's twelfth and thirteenth principles were pertinent to this study since they dealt with teacher participation in curriculum revision.

In a preface to his twelfth and thirteenth principles, Cox (1925) asserted that the professional status of teachers was changing as recognition of the profession increased. One change which had to take place was the teacher's relationship to the subject matter:

Unless [the teacher] conceives his task as recreating and modifying his subject-matter and methodology in accordance with his pupils' interests and needs, and with the rapidly changing social conditions and problems, the teacher is a mere cog in a machine of which he has no direct control. (p. 253)

Recognition of teaching as a profession dictated that teachers have direct control over subject-matter and methods in their classrooms. However, Cox envisioned a broader role for teachers in curriculum work.

The individual needs of students and changing social conditions to which Cox (1925) referred served as a preface to his twelfth principle of curriculum revision: "The curriculum needs to be changed from time to time" (p. 254). While this principle seemed obvious, there were "those who accept a printed curriculum as authority and who somewhat resent the suggestion that new times raise new problems" (p. 254). The rapid and continual changes taking place, particularly during this period in history, required at least "a periodic overhauling" (p. 254). However, the ideal, according to Cox, was that the curriculum would "be in a constant state of reevaluation and adaptation" (p. 254).

Once this principle of continual revision was accepted the question of who would conduct revisions had to be addressed. Cox's (1925) thirteenth principle answered this

question: "These changes can best be made by the intelligent cooperation of teachers, school officials, and interested community groups" (p. 255). Since Cox considered teachers to be "inseparable from curriculum," that is, "it must be theirs or they cannot be active agents in carrying it out" (p. 255), they must participate in its development. Cox offered proof that teachers could "be powerful agents for [curricular] reform" through the evidence found in "the difficulty that progressive supervisors and administrators have experienced in getting [curricular] modifications into operation" particularly when "teachers have not understood or sympathized with the changes" (p. 255). In fact, Cox asserted, the success of curriculum revision depended more on "the active advocacy of changes by teachers rather than on the individual zeal of a principal or superintendent" (pp. 255-256) because of administrators' perceived impermanence due to the possibilities of termination or promotion.

Teachers were not to be the only ones responsible for curriculum revision. Curriculum revision was to be a cooperative enterprise. Cox (1925) pointed out that

this cooperative effort does not mean that the teachers of each school or school system would make the careful scientific investigations, nor would they be expected to discover for themselves a philosophical basis for the curricula (p. 256).

Curriculum revision was a process which required the cooperative effort not only of administrators, teachers, and interested community members, but the involvement of

"research specialists and leaders in [educational] thought" (p. 256). However, the involvement of specialists did not relieve others, particularly teachers, from becoming knowledgeable about "the results of the best thinking and investigations that are available" (p. 256). After all, teachers and other members of the community would be expected to "decide on those recommended changes that are best adapted to their own communities, and . . . just what these mean when applied to the curriculum-problems" (p. 256) of the schools in question.

Johnson (1925), a professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, discussed the role of the principal in the administration and supervision of the high school. He contended that for any principal to be effective that principal must "have in mind certain fundamental guiding principles" (p. 2). Johnson proposed three such principles which directly influenced curriculum and teacher participation in its development.

The three principles were closely interconnected by curriculum. As a facet of the first proposition which dictated the principal's role as the "responsible leader of the school," Johnson (1925) contended that the principal was accountable for the "choice of materials suitable for instruction and methods of instruction" (p. 2). The second postulate established the principal's responsibility "for the direction of all activities of the school" which included responsibility for "the organization of curricula

and the selection of the subject matter of instruction" (p. 7). The third principle stated that

the principal should delegate to others, so far as feasible, the details of administration and should hold them responsible for the proper performance of the duties assigned. (p. 10)

One of the responsibilities Johnson suggested be delegated to teachers was "departmental organization, in which heads are made responsible for . . . courses of instruction, choice of textbooks" (p. 11).

Johnson (1925) contrasted the traditional and modern conceptions of curriculum. In the traditional conception, curriculum was viewed as "textbooks reflecting college prescriptions and the theory of general discipline" which required of the principal "little more than the adjustment of teachers and classrooms to a working schedule" (p. 321). In the modern perspective, curriculum was viewed "as including all educative experiences of the pupil, both within and without the classroom" (p. 321). Additionally, the modern conception of curriculum acknowledged "that the same [educative] experiences are not equally adapted to the educative needs of all pupils" (p. 321). This conception of the curriculum "changed curriculum-making from a mere administrative task to one of the most fundamental problems of the school" (p. 321).

The procedures for curriculum-making were based on the idea that curriculum development should be a cooperative process

not only because it is likely to be a better curriculum but also because it will be more effective in its application by teachers who understand its underlying principles and who have shared in the responsibility for its preparation and adoption (Johnson, 1925, p. 326).

In this vein, Johnson proposed a standing curriculum committee "composed of teachers of experience and vision and including a representative of each department" (p. 326). A standing committee served the purpose of continual curriculum revision which Johnson viewed as the ideal. The first responsibility of the standing committee was to create "a statement of general aims" (p. 326) which was to serve as the foundation for the curriculum. After a tentative statement was created by the standing committee, the statement of general aims had to be presented to the entire faculty for final approval.

Johnson (1925) suggested that subject area committees made up of the teachers of those subjects would formulate the objectives for those subjects: "Statements of [specific aims of the different subjects] should be prepared by the teachers of each subject" (p. 327). These specific aims would determine "the choice of materials and methods of instruction" (p. 327). While Johnson did not make clear who would determine materials and methods, it was implied that teachers would also determine these since they were to be responsible for the specific aims. Johnson also suggested that both the general curriculum committee and the subject-area committees would jointly conduct surveys and needs analyses of the community to "add objectivity and

accompanying motive" (p. 327) to the curriculum work. Additionally, Johnson stated that the faculty "should be kept in touch with the progress . . . through presentation in faculty meetings and through mimeographed outlines and reports" (p. 328).

In another commentary on teacher participation from the viewpoint of the principal, McSkimmon (1926), a principal at the Pierce school in Brookline, Massachusetts, and president of the National Education Association, used an analogy of the factory to make her point about teacher participation. McSkimmon compared teachers to machine operators in a modern factory:

Since every complicated part of the machine goes to the making of a valuable product, it follows that success depends entirely upon the knowledge of all delicate adjustments, and no skill, nor resources, nor experimentations can be so important to any kind of directing individual as they are to the operator of the school- the teacher. (p. 21)

McSkimmon pointed out that a recent yearbook had identified thirty-two responsibilities which were of concern to the principal of a school. She questioned whether a school could run as effectively with teachers ignorant of any one of these principal responsibilities. The school could not operate effectively unless teachers understood all the activities of the school. They gained this understanding through participation in the determination of the educational policies of the school, according to McSkimmon.

Specific to curriculum, McSkimmon (1926) contended teachers held valuable insight. It is important to note

that in McSkimmon's perspective, textbooks and curriculum were closely aligned. Textbook selection was just as important an activity as curriculum work. McSkimmon pointed out that curriculum was in need of revision because it had become outdated. As evidence, she offered several problems found in current textbooks. In selecting appropriate textbooks, McSkimmon questioned, "How can anyone but the teacher herself bestow the insight born of intimate understanding to the selection of textbooks?" (p. 72). McSkimmon suggested that the collaborative effort of teachers principals, and supervisors might lead to "some kind of loose-leaf textbook with provision for inserting material provided by the child's own research, made to aid in his reacting growth" (p. 72).

As to the curriculum itself, McSkimmon (1926) suggested that the curriculum be revised to reflect "the new knowledge of interest and primitive instincts, and the variations between chronological and mental age, and play and self direction" (p. 72). Again, teachers had an important role to play in cooperation with the principal of the school and the superintendent of the system. Curriculum revision would result from

the work of every teacher concerned, under the guidance of the wise superintendent and with the keen discerning wisdom of the principal who knows that his best service will be but to clear the path of all obstructions. (p. 72)

McSkimmon asserted that teachers should participate in determining the policies which they would be expected to

carry out in their classrooms. This was such an obvious principle, at least to her, that she wondered "how any other condition of things could have been tolerated" (p. 73).

Briggs (1926), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, presented current research to address various curriculum problems which included teacher participation in curriculum development. In answer to the question, "What are the possibilities of curriculum advance with the teachers of the school?" (p. 39), Briggs responded that

to-day there are many conspicuous instances of representative committees of teachers, stimulated and led by their administrative officers, working cooperatively to construct new curricula and courses of study. (p. 40)

The practice at this time suggested that teacher participation in curriculum work was not only feasible but there were examples of successful practice.

There were several reasons for teacher participation in curriculum development. Regardless of the expertise of superintendents, supervisors, or principals, Briggs (1926) contended that

no sound progress [in the curriculum] is possible unless the teachers are convinced of the wisdom and validity of the new program and unless they are able to put it into successful practice. (p. 40)

Just as administrators and others had had the time and opportunity to consider the "wisdom and validity" of a revised curriculum, teachers needed the same opportunity. In addition to the opportunity to consider the need for a revised curriculum, the revised curriculum would have to be

one that would meet the test of the classroom. Teacher participation, according to Briggs, would also enable teachers to "understand the new proposed details, as well as the general plan, and believe in them" (p. 40). For teachers to understand the proposed curriculum and to be convinced of its value were important to the effective use of the revised curriculum by the teachers.

The theoretical basis and practical methods for teacher participation in curriculum development were being included in the training and education programs for prospective and current supervisors, principals, and superintendents. Barr and Burton (1926), both professors of education, included the theoretical basis and practical methods for teacher participation in their instructional text on supervision of instruction. Barr was associate professor of education at the University of Wisconsin and formerly the assistant director of supervision in the Detroit public school system. Burton was associate professor of education at the University of Chicago and formerly the director in charge of supervision of teachers in training in the Cincinnati public school system. Both the Cincinnati and Detroit school systems had been recognized for their involvement of teachers in curriculum work.

Barr and Burton (1926) made a distinction between curriculum research and course of study making. They pointed out that "the two fields represent different types of activities and will probably be carried forward by two

different groups of educational experts" (p. 214).

Curriculum research, according to Barr and Burton, was to be conducted by the scientific curriculum maker. The work of the scientific curriculum maker focused primarily on determining

the specific objectives of education, the activities or subject matter by which these objectives are to be obtained, the grade placement of these activities or subject matter, the principles of subject matter organization (p. 214).

Barr and Burton asserted that the scientific curriculum maker was "primarily interested in the selection of learning activities" (p. 215).

Course of study making, on the other hand, was to be conducted by teachers and was to be based on the work of the scientific curriculum maker plus other educational researchers. Teachers would focus more on "the selection and organization of subject matter for teaching purposes" (Barr & Burton, 1926, p. 215). Specifically, they identified eight activities in which teachers would be involved during course of study making. Teachers were to express concisely the instructional goals, i.e., "the guiding aims" (p. 214), of the curriculum. Teachers were to decide the educational objectives and assign them to the appropriate subject and grade level. Teachers were to select the appropriate learning activities to achieve the educational objectives. Teachers were to create and manage an appropriate learning environment. Teachers were to "offer usable analyses of the mental processes involved in the several types of learning"

(p. 215). Teachers were to suggest and utilize effective diagnostic and teaching procedures (p. 215). Finally, teachers were to "develop standards of attainment" (p. 215).

Barr and Burton (1926) noted that teachers, and others, would "bring together in the course of study the results of scientific study in many fields; (a) curriculum making, (b) educational philosophy, (c) educational psychology, (d) educational methods, (e) educational measurements" (p. 215). Course of studying making was a much broader in scope than curriculum making. Additionally, curriculum making was focused more on the theoretical/philosophical while course of study making focused on adapting the theoretical to the practical.

The general steps for curriculum making and course of study making in Barr's and Burton's (1926) perspective were essentially the same. The processes they described drew heavily on a process Barr (1924) had proposed previously. The process had sixteen steps: selection and analysis of one of the divisions of the major fields of human activity; determination of the educational objectives from the analysis of human activity; analysis of psychological traits common to human behavior; analysis of social characteristics common to human behavior; "study of the activities of child life;" compilation of objectives derived from the previous analyses; "formulation of guiding principles;" selection of abilities to be developed in the school; selection of the activities designed achieve the educational objectives;

selection of materials and resources; grade placement of materials; organization of activities and materials into instructional units; "formulation of proper methods of teaching;" "determination of standards of attainment;" "introduction of various mechanical devices;" and, continual revision of the course of study (pp. 216-218). Barr and Burton compared their procedures for course of study construction to those outlined by Charters in his text, Curriculum Construction, and found the procedures to be very similar.

Barr and Burton (1926) described the organization for the construction of the course of study. While the organization would need to be adapted to meet individual community needs, according to Barr and Burton, generally "the organization should be a democratic one designed to secure the cooperative effort of teachers, principals, supervisors, and community" (pp. 219-220). The authors relied heavily on the Second Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (1924) in their recommendations for organizing for curriculum work. They summarized the response of MacGregor, president of the Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association, to the question, "How should all the members of a school department be organized . . . ?" which has already been cited (see Department of Superintendence, 1924, p. 117). Essentially, MacGregor's response was that teachers should participate in the construction and continual revision of

the course of study. Superintendents would be responsible for facilitating the work of the committees. Supervisors would chair the committees. Experts would be consulted only as needs arose. It is important to note, that Barr and Burton, in quoting MacGregor, advocated construction of the course of study at the local level.

For additional details concerning procedures for construction of the course of study, Barr and Burton again quoted the second yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (see Department of Superintendence, 1924, p. 111):

Such committees (one for each subject) could with proper stenographic help make in two weeks a course of study incomparably better than any course of study now in print. Each committee must be selected and organized, so that it will not only represent but bring into action the best leadership in this country with respect to the subject concerned. Procedure: (1) A week's preliminary meeting for reviewing and outlining problems, (2) following period of additional study a second week's meeting for formulating a tentative course of study, (3) volunteer schools throughout the country, representing all types of conditions to test out this tentative course of study, and (4) after a trial of a year or two, a final course of study should be formulated from the suggestions and changes made in the tentative course (Barr & Burton, 1926, pp. 222-223).

Barr and Burton, in effect, also endorsed curriculum work through a national committee. The solution to this apparent contradiction might be found in Barr's and Burton's initial distinction between curriculum research or curriculum making and course of study making. Construction of the course of study, in which teachers were to participate, was to be conducted at the local level. While teachers were not

definitely excluded from curriculum research, this was better done by experts. Curriculum making was to be done at the national level.

The fourth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (Department of Superintendence, 1926) also dealt with curriculum work. In the forward to the fourth yearbook, a brief overview was provided of the work conducted by the Department of Superintendence concerning the curriculum. Curriculum making was identified as "the central problem of the teaching profession" (p. 3). It was further stated that "all else that is done in a school system radiates from this difficult and complex problem or contributes to its solution" (p. 3). Because of the importance it placed on curriculum, the Department of Superintendence had devoted the 1924, 1925 and, now, the 1926 yearbooks to curriculum and curriculum work.

After the 1925 yearbook was issued, the Cooperative Plan of Curriculum Revision was created. The purpose of the Cooperative Plan of Curriculum Revision was

to meet the need for testing out the research findings presented in the Third Yearbook, to stimulate further scientific study, and to bring together for their mutual aid school systems actively interested in curriculum building. (p. 3)

It was reported that, at the time of publication of the fourth yearbook, "three hundred school systems, twelve national subject committees, and a General Coordinating Committee" (p. 3) were all working under the auspices of the Cooperative Plan. The purpose, then, of the fourth yearbook

was to present some of the work conducted as part of the Cooperative Plan of Curriculum Revision.

In the first chapter of the fourth yearbook, Judd, Ballou, McAndrew, Spaulding, and Withers (1926) presented some fundamental considerations in curriculum building. The first two parts "attempted to define the general goals of education and to emphasize the necessity of coordinating the elements of the curriculum" (p. 15). The next section, which was pertinent to the study of teacher participation in curriculum development, discussed the methods "by which curriculum revision can be most advantageously accomplished" (p. 15). The authors, in their conclusion, pointed out that

it may have been the expectation of some of the members of this Department that this Commission would supply a revised national curriculum which could be put into all of the school systems of the country. That expectation belongs to the imitation age of curriculum-making. The adoption of a ready-made curriculum by a school system is not the policy advocated. The school systems of this country must realize that a curriculum must fit the local environment and to this end must be constructively adapted to the materials available for teaching in each school system. Furthermore, a ready-made curriculum would have to be made over almost immediately after adoption to bring it up to date. (p. 18)

What Judd, et al., were advocating was curriculum revision through local committees which included teachers, e.g., "A practice which is being widely adopted . . . is the method of working through committees of teachers, principals, and supervisors" (p. 16). A cooperative effort for curriculum revision was essential, according to these authors.

Judd, et al., (1926) asserted that a cooperative effort required "two changes in the general practices of American

schools" (p. 17). Curriculum revision had to be recognized as "just as important a public duty as instruction" (p. 17). In this perspective, participating teachers would be relieved of instructional duties to devote the time needed to effectively conduct curriculum work. Recognition must also be given to the fact that curriculum construction "calls for cooperation on the broadest scale" (p. 17). In other words, an "interchange of experience and materials" (p. 17) had to take place between school systems conducting curriculum revision.

In the second section entitled, "Organizing the Teaching Profession for Curriculum Revision," (Department of Superintendence, 1926) an overview of the purpose and function of the Cooperative Plan for Curriculum Revision was provided. The assertion was made that there was a

need for a cooperative scheme whereby the best efforts of school administrators, classroom teachers, and curriculum specialists in all parts of the country can be pooled so that each can profit from the experience and best curriculum practice of all (p. 23)

The purpose of the Cooperative Plan, then, became to provide a way for "the experience and best curriculum practice" to be shared with interested school systems. Additionally, the Commission on the Curriculum hoped "to foster research and professional cooperation" (p. 23) among those participating systems.

The opportunity for enrollment in the Cooperative Plan was provided in May of 1925. A requirement for enrollment was that the system provide "at least the part-time of one

officer who was to work on the problem of curriculum revision in his own school system" (p. 23). Approximately 300 school systems enrolled initially. The public school systems enrolled included

Cities Over 100,000 in Population: Akron, Ohio; Baltimore, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Denver, Colo.; Des Moines, Iowa; Detroit, Mich.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Houston, Texas; Los Angeles, Calif.; Minneapolis, Minn.; New Orleans, La.; Oakland, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Reading, Pa.; Richmond, Va.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Springfield, Mass.; St. Louis, Mo.; Toledo, Ohio; Trenton, N. J.; Washington, D. C.; Wilmington, Del.; Youngstown, Ohio; New York City, N. Y.

Cities 30,000 to 100,000 in Population: Battle Creek, Mich.; Beaumont, Texas; Berkeley, Calif.; Bethlehem, Pa.; Binghamton, N. Y.; Charlotte, N. C.; Chicopee, Mass.; Columbia, S. C.; Decatur, Ill.; East Chicago, Ind.; East Orange, N. J.; Erie, Pa.; Flint, Mich.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Fresno, Calif.; Highland Park, Mich.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Joliet, Ill.; La Crosse, Wis.; Lakewood, Ohio; Lincoln, Nebr.; Long Beach, Calif.; Lorain, Ohio; Lynn, Mass.; Muskogee, Okla.; Ogden, Utah; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Oshkosh, Wis.; Pasadena, Calif.; Passaic, N. J.; Pittsfield, Mass.; Pontiac, Mich.; Portland, Maine; Portsmouth, Ohio; Pueblo, Colo.; Richmond, Ind.; Roanoke, Va.; Rockford, Ill.; Rock Island, Ill.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; Schenectady, N. Y.; Shreveport, La.; Sioux City, Iowa; South Bend, Ind.; Springfield, Mo.; Springfield, Ohio; Tampa, Fla.; Tulsa, Okla.; Wheeling, W. Va.

Cities 10,000 to 30,000 in Population: Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Adrian, Mich.; Ashland, Ky.; Ashtabula, Ohio; Atchison, Kans.; Bellingham, Wash.; Belmont, Mass.; Biloxi, Mass.; Bloomington, Ill.; Bridgeton, N. J.; Burlington, Vt.; Cambridge, Ohio; Canton, Ill.; Chanute, Kans.; Chicago Heights, Ill.; Chillicothe, Ohio; Coshocton, Ohio; Donora, Pa.; Eau Claire, Wis.; El Dorado, Kans.; Emporia, Kans.; Enid, Okla.; Faribault, Minn.; Galesburg, Ill.; Glendale, Calif.; Gloucester, N. J.; Gloversville, N. Y.; Granite City, Ill.; Hackensack, N. J.; Hagerstown, Md.; Hastings, Nebr.; Hibbing, Minn.; High Point, N. C.; Ironwood,

Mich.; Ithaca, N. Y.; Joplin, Mo.; Lawrence, Kans.;
Leavenworth, Kans.; Logansport, Ind.; Marinette,
Wis.; Marlboro, Mass.; Maywood, Ill.; Melrose,
Mass.; Middletown, Conn.; Millville, N. J.;
Morgantown, W. Va.; Morristown, N. J.; Okmulgee,
Okla.; Owensboro, Ky.; Paducah, Ky.; Palestine,
Texas; Pekin, Ill.; Pocatello, Idaho; Port Jervis,
N. Y.; Raleigh, N. C.; Salisbury, N. C.; Santa
Monica, Calif.; Sapulpa, Okla.; Saratoga Springs, N.
Y.; Sherman, Texas; Streator, Ill.; Virginia, Minn.;
Warren, Ohio; Warren, Pa.; Waukesha, Wis.; Waycross,
Ga.; West Allis, Wis.; Whiting, Ind.

Cities 5,000 to 10,000 in Population: Antigo, Wis.;
Bellevue, Ohio; Bluffton, Ind.; Bryan, Texas;
Centerville, Ohio; Charlotte, Mich.; Clarksville,
Tenn.; Concord, Mass.; Darby, Pa.; Fitzgerald, Ga.;
Fostoria, Ohio; Gainesville, Texas; Grafton, Mass.;
Grafton, W. Va.; Highland Park, Ill.; Idaho Falls,
Idaho; Johnson, R. I.; Lewiston, Pa.; Ludlow, Mass.;
Merrill, Wis.; Mexico, Mo.; Muskegon Heights, Mich.;
Newton, Kans.; Reidsville, N. C.; Ridgeville Park, N.
J.; Royal Oak, Mich.; Rushville, Ind.; Seymour,
Conn.; St. Charles, Mo.; Terrell, Texas;
Thompsonville, Conn.; Titusville, Pa.; Walden, N. Y.;
Webster Groves, Mo.; Westfield, N. J.; Wilmette,
Ill.; Winchester, Va.; Winnetka, Ill.; Wisconsin
Rapids, Wis.; Woodbury, N. J.

Cities 2500 to 5000 in Population: Audubon, N. J.;
Barrington, R. I.; Batavia, Ill.; Boyne City, Mich.;
Canon City, Colo.; Catlettsburg, Ky.; Cherryvale,
Kans.; Clayton, Mo.; Cooper, Texas; Delavan, Wis.;
Edgerton, Wis.; Elmhurst, Ill.; Franklin, N. J.;
Frederick, Okla.; Georgetown, Ky.; Glencoe, Ill.;
Greenfield, Ohio; Greenville, Mich.; Hiawatha, Kans.;
Humboldt, Kans.; Lambertville, N. J.; Lockland, Ohio;
Lodi, Calif.; Lyons, Kans.; Mesa, Ariz.; Montrose,
Colo.; Mt. Union, Pa.; Naperville, Ill.;
Noblesville, Ind.; Olathe, Kans.; Point Pleasant, W.
Va.; Rockyford, Colo.; Shelby, N. C.; Shorewood,
Wis.; South Brownsville, Pa.; Storm Lake, Iowa;
Walsenburg, Colo.; Westminster, Md.; Winslow, Ariz.

Cities below 2500 in Population: Biwabik, Minn.;
Center, Colo.; Douglas, Wyo.; East Lansing, Mich.;
Egypt, Mass.; Elk Point, S. Dak.; Gilbert, Ariz.;
Glen Rock, N. J.; Harrisburg, Texas; Herculaneum,
Mo.; Hope Valley, R. I.; Huntington, N. Y.;
Huntsville, Ohio; Huron, Ohio; Lakewood, N. J.;
Lewes, Del.; Littleton, Colo.; Marengo, Ill.;
Milford, Pa.; Neodesha, Kans.; Oconto Falls, Wis.;
Oxford, Mich.; Plano, Ill.; Reed City, Mich.;
Richwood, W. Va.; Sandwich, Ill.; Sarasota, Fla.;

Springwells, Mich.; Toano, Va.; Tower, Minn.; Ventor City, N. J.; Villisca, Iowa; Wyoming, Ohio; Yale, Mich.

State and County Departments of Education: State Departments of California, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Baltimore County, Md.; Cuyahoga County, Ohio; Lee County, Ga.; Rutherford County, Tenn.; Sonoma County, Calif.; Wayne County, Ga.; Will County, Ill.; Wood County, Ohio. (pp. 23-26).

Many of the participants represented systems which had already involved teachers to a considerable extent in curriculum work.

Harap (1927), a professor at the Cleveland School of Education, proposed principles of curriculum making "to serve as a point of departure for this discussion and to insure comprehensive criticism of the present technique of curriculum constructive" (p. 207). Harap contended that "the chief criticism of the curriculum-making groups . . . is that they fail to include all the persons necessary to give a balanced view" (p. 208). The persons or groups that should be included in a curriculum making group in order to provide a balanced perspective, according to Harap, were

(1) . . . the most capable and most industrious persons who can do the job; (2) . . . persons who have the authority to call upon teachers for assistance in any step of the process; (3) the person who directs the group should have some expert knowledge of the technique of curriculum-making; (4) . . . a person who should be responsible for training teachers to carry out a new course of study; (5) classroom teachers who will think in terms of actual conditions; (6) principals and other supervisory officers who represent the administrative point of view. (p. 208)

These groups represented "the most competent persons" (p. 208) capable of conducting curriculum work. Additionally,

these groups provided a balanced view because they represented the various groups which influenced the curriculum. Harap included teachers in the curriculum making group for the practical perspective they would bring to the group.

Counts (1927), professor of education at the University of Chicago, addressed the question of who should make the curriculum. Who was involved in the curriculum work was a critical concern, in Counts' perspective, because "it is altogether obvious that the character of the curriculum must in the last analysis depend on the character of the curriculum makers" (p. 7). The effectiveness of the curriculum was dependent on who was involved in its development. As important as this was, Counts contended that "up to the present time the profession of secondary-school teachers and administrators has developed no satisfactory technique of curriculum making" (p. 7).

Counts (1927) was critical of past curriculum policy, or lack of a policy. If there had been a curriculum policy, Counts contended it had been one of "laissez faire" (p. 8), i.e.,

In fact, until quite recently we have hardly been curriculum conscious. We have either had great faith in the conventional program or we have assumed the problem would solve itself. (p. 7)

Little attention had been paid to the secondary curriculum except to add to it piece-meal. More importantly, as subjects had been added, little had been removed. The result was an "unintegrated and unwieldy high-school

curriculum" (p. 8). A logical procedure for adding and removing subjects from the curriculum was needed.

"Two characteristics of the task of curriculum making" (Counts, 1927, p. 8) had to be recognized. Counts asserted that curriculum making was a difficult task. In fact, Counts perceived the task to be so difficult that it required curriculum work to be conducted "by persons specially and intensively trained" (p. 9). Counts also asserted that curriculum making was a complex task. Because curriculum making was such a complex task, Counts contended that "it requires the utilization of wide ranges of knowledge and experience and the service of many special abilities and forms of training" (p. 9). In other words, curriculum development had to be approached "as a great cooperative undertaking in which the efforts of many different persons and groups are brought to focus on a common problem" (p. 9).

Before he addressed who should be involved in curriculum making, Counts (1927) identified those groups which should not be involved:

Among these agencies which are interesting themselves to-day in the curriculum and which are not qualified for the task are the following: state legislatures, boards of education, powerful minorities, the college, and persons interested in defense of special subjects. (p. 9)

Legislatures and boards of education were similar, in that, both were legislative bodies with specific legal responsibilities to education, but without the professional training or experience needed to perform "the specialized

educational tasks" (p. 10). Counts asserted that powerful minorities representing special interests had no place in "pleading some special cause in the schools" (p. 11). Colleges had had a negative influence on the curriculum of the high school, according to Counts, and "must be ranked among the most potent influences which have shaped the curriculum of the secondary school" (p. 11). Finally, the emphasis on subjects and departmentalization had had a negative effect on attempts to revise the curriculum. There was no place for those persons who would seek protect some special subject.

Counts (1927) suggested seven groups which should participate in a cooperative effort to develop the high school curriculum:

the psychologist, the sociologist, the philosopher, the specialists in the selection and organization of the materials of instruction, the classroom teacher, the expert in the appraisal of the curriculum, and the high-school administrator. (p. 12)

The psychologist, sociologist, and philosopher would primarily be concerned with the formulation of the purposes of secondary education, according to Counts. Once these purposes have been established, Counts noted that "we shall have to turn to persons expert in the selection of the actual materials of instruction" (pp. 12-13). The only way to determine the appropriate materials, according to Counts, was "through actual experimentation in the schools" (p. 13).

Counts (1927) indicated that experimentation suggested why the cooperation of the classroom teachers was needed.

Counts asserted that "until it has become the possession of the teacher, the curriculum is just so much inert material whose education value is unknown" (p. 13). Counts also alluded to the ability of the classroom teacher to modify this inert material so that learners of all abilities and levels can be successful.

Not only does the teacher make use of the materials of instruction provided by others; he also throws these materials into forms which are as necessary as the materials themselves to the successful achievement of the purposes of the high school. (p. 13)

The only way in which the classroom teacher could do this effectively was to have an intelligent understanding of the curriculum materials which came from participating in its construction.

Rugh (1927), professor of education at the University of California and director of the University High School in Oakland, offered a unique perspective on curriculum reconstruction. He contended that the common analogies used to refer to curriculum work, i.e., constructing, building, making, planning, preparing (p. 229), created a false impression of what was the curriculum. He also asserted that prominent writers on curriculum, such as Bobbitt, Charters, Judd, and Briggs, had also added to misconceptions about curriculum. Rugh stated that Bobbitt had "made a sorry mess of it" (p. 229) by applying "the technique of natural science to education" (p. 229). Charters' technique of using job analysis to determine objectives was too narrow an approach, Rugh asserted, because education and life were

more than jobs. Judd's concept of curriculum as "'formulations to be imparted'" (p. 229) was a metaphor which provided "subtlety rather than educational vision" (p. 229). Briggs overstated his case when he stated that curriculum was "the 'fundamental' and 'paramount' problem" (p. 229), according to Rugh.

While curriculum was "an important administrative instrument or tool," Rugh (1927) maintained that "the actual curriculum operates in the school room, through the pupils and teachers as agents" (p. 230). More importantly, the curriculum was becoming more important than the student, in Rugh's view:

The pupils and teachers are persons and they operate inviolate. The theory herein proposed is that only persons are sacred or inviolate. There is nothing sacred about the curriculum, however well formulated. The curriculum is only a device or plan used to make the learning processes as economical, as efficient and as complete as possible under the given circumstances. In every particular, the curriculum is plastic to the abilities, interests and needs of pupils as particular persons. (p. 230)

The abilities, interests, and needs of students mediated the curriculum and teachers, in particular, had to have the professional autonomy to modify the curriculum as necessary for effective student learning.

If the student and learning were what was important, then, according to Rugh (1927), "it may be necessary to reconstruct the curriculum" (p. 230). Rugh stated that

the theory here proposed is that 'curricular reconstruction' is a function of good teaching and that the administrative formulations . . . are conveniences and economic policies to be followed only up to the point where they fail to function in the interests of

the progressive improvement of the pupil's behavior.
(p. 231)

Rugh contended that "the factors necessarily involved in [the] pupil's learning" came from "the life of the pupil in the situations in which that pupil is now living" (p. 232). Those things which are not relevant to the student's life interfere with the student gaining "the largest possible educational dividend" (p. 232). In this sense, curriculum had to be cooperatively and continually constructed, or reconstructed, according to Rugh. The teacher in direct contact with students, and the students themselves, were the primary participants in this continual reconstruction.

Roberts and Draper (1927), professors of education at the University of Washington, discussed the administrative and supervisory roles and responsibilities of high school principals. In the section entitled "The Principal and the Curriculum," they pointed out that many superintendents and principals still considered curriculum-making to be their sole responsibilities. However, Roberts and Draper asserted

No more significant element in the movement to democratize the schools has arisen than the tendency to require the cooperative study and scholarly contribution of every member of the faculty in the development of various curriculums. Experience shows that such schedules are more successful in that teachers understand them better, teach them more sympathetically, and adapt them more closely to student needs. (p. 66)

Ultimately though, the principal was still responsible for the curriculum in the high school. In actual practice, Roberts and Draper reported that "in many large cities, the matter of final responsibility [for curriculum] rests in the

meeting of principals" (p. 67), while in smaller systems with only one high school, cooperative curriculum development was common.

Threlkeld (1928), who had succeeded Newlon as superintendent of the Denver school system, continued to assert the role of the classroom teacher in curriculum revision. In an address to the Department of Secondary School Principals, Threlkeld contended that any curriculum revision program centered around the problems posed by what he called the "teacher-pupil situation" (p. 616). Threlkeld maintained that "curriculum construction is the problem of the teacher as he faces the pupil who is to learn" (p. 616). All other participants in the curriculum revision process, i.e., "principal, supervisor, research expert" (p. 616), "should be thought of as extensions of the teacher" (p. 616). While these and others had valuable contributions to make to the curriculum, the teacher was a critical participant. Since the teacher-pupil situation was the center of the curriculum revision process, according to Threlkeld, the teacher was an indispensable participant in the process.

Curriculum revision could not be measure by the final product or "what is found between the covers of printed courses of study" (p. 617), Threlkeld (1928) maintained. The "most vital" measures of the curriculum, according to Threlkeld, were the extent to which the curriculum was "genuinely accepted by the teacher as an important help in

his teaching" and the extent to which the curriculum "actually results in growth on the part of the pupils" (p. 617). Maximum growth of pupils would not be achieved without the acceptance and understanding of the curriculum the teachers were expected to use. This acceptance and understanding would not be achieved without teacher participation, in Threlkeld's perspective.

Bursch (1928), a professor of education at Stanford University, suggested that the focus of research in teacher participation in school administration had been large city systems. While he noted that general principles of teacher participation in school administration applied to both large and small school systems, "the small high school has certain limitations as well as particular problems not found in the larger systems" (p. 41). He proposed principles of teacher participation in small school systems. First, participation was more a frame of mind rather than an organizational concern for Bursch. Next, while all teachers should not be required to participate, all teachers "should be stimulated to participate, and their contributions made welcome" (p. 41). Third, Bursch asserted that "participation must be based upon cooperation in the pursuit of a common aim cooperatively arrived at" (p. 41). Fourth, every teacher should have a formal and "guaranteed" (p. 41) way in which to offer suggestions. As others had expressed earlier, participation had to be more than a superficial administrative device: "The voice of those participating

must really count, not merely be heard and then disregarded" (p. 41). A sixth principle to be considered was that participation was to be engaged in primarily for the benefit of the student to improve student achievement. While participation was conducted at the local level, it should frequently contribute "to education at large" (p. 41). Next, Bursch considered participation "a duty and obligation as well as an inherent privilege" (p. 41). Participation required a clear understanding of the functions of all participants by all participants. The tenth principle, based on "the law of unity of organization" (p. 41), dictated that the building administrator was ultimately responsible for all decisions concerning the school. Bursch's next principle stated that participation by teachers did not exclude "expert service and advice" (p. 41). Finally, Bursch asserted that "no effort should be spared to give full recognition and show ample appreciation for all contributions by teachers" (p. 41). Bursch then suggested how these principles might apply in a small school setting.

Gist (1928), in writing about the administration of the elementary school, asserted that "one of the most important problems before the principal is that of establishing and maintaining a democratic regime at all times" (p. 1). Gist had served as principal in elementary schools in Oakland, California, under Superintendent Hunter. It will be remembered that Hunter had earlier advocated teacher

participation in school administration and put it into practice in the Oakland school system (see Hunter, 1918a, 1918b, and 1925).

This influence could be seen in Gist's (1928) perspectives on teacher participation. Gist asserted that "the teachers must participate in all administrative problems, not only in the execution of the plans but in their formation" (p. 4). The result would be "a unity of purposes, an alertness of all, the development of initiative, and in the accumulation of valuable ideas and suggestions" (p. 4). A common way of organizing for teacher participation in schools, according to Gist, was the teacher committee. Gist noted that

these committees often study administrative procedure most carefully, reporting to the principal and the entire corps the results of their study with their recommendation. (p. 4)

While Gist did not specifically address curriculum development, his emphasis on teacher participation in all administrative problems strongly suggested the inclusion of curriculum work.

Uhl (1928), a professor of education at the University of Wisconsin, pointed out that teachers have always enriched and readjusted the curriculum to meet the needs of their students (p. 486). Teacher enrichment of the curriculum had become especially prominent "as the selection and organization of the content of all high-school subjects has been questioned during the last decade" (p. 480). Uhl cited notable examples of teacher enrichment of the curriculum

such as the work of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1917 to establish "the aims and content of desirable courses in English composition and literature" (p. 486).

Uhl's (1928) purpose for referring to these examples was to demonstrate how "the content of courses offered by progressive teachers differs markedly from that which is usually offered in conventional courses" (p. 499). He further contended that

there seems to be little ground for doubting the advisability of suggesting that all teachers make equally valuable additions or substitutes for conventional subject matter. (p. 499)

Uhl reasoned that if such modifications in the curriculum were "desirable, then it can be said that such innovators . . . are providing valuable content which has never been taught by any save superior teachers" (p. 496). The implication was that superior teachers made modifications to the curriculum as a matter of course to meet the needs of their students. Uhl's confidence in the abilities of teachers to modify the curriculum led him to conclude that "in curriculum construction, therefore, let America look to her teachers" (p. 500).

Modification of the curriculum by classroom teachers served as the basis for one of Uhl's (1928) proposed guiding principles for curriculum construction. One guiding principle proposed by Uhl was that it was "desirable that the limitations as well as the contributions of classroom teachers be recognized" (p. 558) in the construction of the

curriculum. Uhl maintained that teacher participation in curriculum development served two functions: "the enrichment of courses and the experimental use of reconstructed curricula" (p. 558). The classroom teacher, according to Uhl, had the

opportunity to operate in spheres which are denied to the widely heralded curriculum expert; that is, the classroom teacher is the person who actually administers curricula and he is, therefore, able to set plans in motion and, if resourceful, to enrich by additions drawn from or suggested by local conditions, pupil characteristics, or the general purposes of the school. (p. 558)

Classroom teachers also had contributions to make related to "important data and advice in the actual charting of the larger aspects of curricula" (p. 558). Limitations of classroom teachers, according to Uhl, included time and narrow perspective.

Williams (1928), professor of education at the University of California, in proposing principles for curriculum making pointed out that

during the first quarter of the twentieth century . . . there has emerged a body of procedures in the construction of curricula which is so general in nature that the statement of such procedures may well be referred to as principles . . . which govern program-making. (p. 183)

While these principles were not yet "final statements" (p. 183), according to Williams, there were common characteristics which were becoming evident in practice. Williams suggested that these principles focused on two problems: "how to organize the staff for work on the

problem, and how to select, organize, and administer the subject matter of instruction" (p. 184).

Organization of the staff for the curriculum work was most pertinent to teacher participation in curriculum development. Williams (1928) asserted that "experience has shown the wisdom of making this study of high-school programs a matter of cooperative concern" (p. 184).

Teachers were to be an integral part of the effort from the start. The first principle of organization for curriculum work, according to Williams, was "to secure the hearty approval and support of the project by the teachers within the school or system" (p. 185). In Williams' view, curriculum development through cooperative effort, of which teachers were to be a part, was "sheer common sense" (p. 184).

The second principle of curriculum making centered on the establishment of a "master committee, sometimes called an executive committee or an advisory council" (Williams, 1928, p. 186). The master committee, according to Williams,

serves as a clearing house for the work, defines the problem, directs and leads the activities, determines the regulations necessary for making the investigation, edits reports, and so forth. (p. 186)

In practice, membership on master committees had varied from seven to twenty members and had represented

three main types of interests . . . namely, those interests which are concerned with subjects of study, those connected with extracurricular activities, and those of concern to the lay public. (p. 187)

Williams suggested that teachers play a role in determining "those whom they believe capable and willing to assume this important role" (p. 188). Teachers were also to serve on the master committee.

Williams' (1928) third principle of curriculum making emphasized research to collect information pertinent to the curricular problem(s) being addressed by the master committee. Williams emphasized that

no organized effort to reconstruct courses, curricula, or a program of studies can go far without having a collected body of information for the use and direction of those who are studying the problem. (pp. 188-189)

Information which needed to be collected included practices in other schools, theories of curriculum and curriculum development, student and community data, and pertinent curriculum research. While the master committee would determine what information was collected, Williams indicated that "the actual process of collecting and assembling the data falls upon the subcommittees, the work being directed perhaps by the research bureau" (pp. 189-190). Again, teachers were to be an integral part of collecting this information, in Williams' perspective. Williams asserted that collecting and assembling this data "demands active, direct teacher participation; and it should be organized out of the teaching staff, and considered as a general staff enterprise" (p. 190).

The fourth principle addressed the organization and work of the subcommittees. Williams (1928) suggested that subcommittee members could be selected by the principal,

superintendent, and/or nominated by teachers. The size and number of subcommittees would be based on needs as determined by the master committee. While teachers in the various subject areas or departments would select representatives to serve on the subcommittees, Williams pointed out that the subcommittees were not to be "organized strictly in line with departmental differentiations" (p. 191). Williams maintained that an integrated approach would be most effective: "No subcommittee should be made up exclusively of members from any one field of knowledge or any single type of school interest" (p. 191). Williams suggested a variety of subcommittee functions which included collecting information and materials, conducting research, compiling research, and editing materials.

Williams' (1928) fifth and sixth principles focused on the testing and revision of the tentative curriculum. As Williams suggested, the real test of the curriculum came in the classroom. Williams stated that "it is toward this test that thoughts and plans of the master committee should have been directed from the very beginning" (p. 194). Williams pointed out that this was one stage of the curriculum revision process which few schools or systems had carried out "in any thoroughgoing manner" (p. 195). An effective test of the curriculum was imperative "as much to develop and refine the technique as to secure a specific result" (p. 195). The master committee and subcommittees were to revise

the tentative curriculum based on the comments and suggestions of the faculty.

However, as Williams (1928) indicated, "such a final program of studies is not, and never ought to be, considered as ultimate, determined, and fixed" (p. 195). The curriculum was never a finished product. Curriculum revision was to be a continual, on-going process. Williams asserted that "one criterion for a good program of studies is its flexibility,- its adaptability not only to the students but also to the changing needs of society" (p. 196). Even though the proposed curriculum would eventually "be carefully drawn up and put into published form" (p. 196), the curriculum would be continually revised to address the needs of students and the community.

Morgan (1929), the editor of the Journal of the National Education Association, asserted that the advances in education during the last decade could be contributed largely to teacher participation, "the ideal that the entire profession and merely a smaller group within it shall determine educational policy and practise" (p. 16). Morgan suggested numerous benefits from teacher participation. Teacher participation allowed more people to contribute to the thinking on the curriculum. Teacher participation provided opportunities for important contributions from those who have had firsthand experience in testing curriculum through practice. Teacher participation brought a renewed sense of significance and meaning in the work of

the teacher. Teacher participation provided a broader perspective of their work within the context of the school. Teacher participation "increased cooperation and loyalty on the part of the teaching staff" (p. 16). Benefits from teacher participation accrued , according to Morgan, to everyone involved with schools- teachers, students, administrators, parents, and community.

While teachers were "having an increasing share" (Morgan, 1929, p. 16) in the revision of the curriculum, Morgan pointed out that there were still numerous problems in education, and with the curriculum, which teacher participation might help to solve. Morgan contended that in many schools "the curriculum still contains much that is illadapted to child and community needs" (p. 16). Additionally, Morgan suggested that problems such as pupil failure and dropouts were related to "the subject matter conception of education" (p. 16), a curricular problem. Teacher participation was a solution to these and other educational problems, in Morgan's perspective.

Charters (1929), director of the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University, addressed the issue of who should make the curriculum in a presentation at an educational conference at the University of Kentucky. Charters asserted that curriculum making was "a cooperative enterprise involving many persons" (p. 17). Charters identified seven "types of persons" who should be involved in curriculum making: "the philosopher, the administrator,

the curriculum expert, the teacher, the psychologist, the sociologist, and the expert in methods" (p. 14). Charters also identified three phases of curriculum building, i.e., "defining objectives, collecting raw materials, and organizing the content of the courses" (p. 14). While the responsibilities varied with the task, the teacher had a role to play in all three phases of curriculum building, according to Charters.

The teacher was to participate in identifying the objectives. Charters (1929) maintained that "the only objectives that count in the classroom are the teacher's objectives" (p. 15). When objectives were created without teacher participation, the developers ran the risk of teachers not understanding the objective or not interpreting objectives in the way the developers intended. This posed a problem for externally-developed objectives. Charters maintained that "an abstract statement of objectives that teachers do not understand or follow has absolutely no influence upon the learning of children" (p. 15). In addition to their participation in the definition of objectives, teachers were to be responsible for evaluation of any objectives "as they are applied to the practices of the classroom" (p. 16). Charters contended that the classroom teacher should be responsible for the evaluation of objectives because the teacher was the one "who more intimately knows whether or not the objectives work" (p. 16).

The teachers' "greatest responsibility" (p. 16), according to Charters (1929), was the selection of materials. Again, the teachers' experiences provided a perspective which none others could provide. Charters contended that teachers should be involved in the "rejection and inclusion" (p. 16) of materials. Charters pointed out that teachers would be "of particular assistance in collecting illustrative materials" (p. 16). Just as with objectives, teachers also had an evaluative role in the organization of materials. Charters maintained that the teacher "evaluates the material as organized and makes suggestions for reorganization" (p. 16).

Charters (1929) also maintained that curriculum making had to be a cooperative effort of which the teacher was an integral part. The teacher had a role to play in all phases of curriculum development. He concluded that

it is doubtful if the time will ever come when a curriculum can be manufactured in the laboratory and handed out in perfect form for use in the classroom.
(p. 17)

A curriculum developed in isolation from the classroom, and the teacher, would never be effective, in Charters' perspective.

Cutright (1929), the director of instructional research for the Minneapolis school system, asserted that an effective curriculum revision program had two challenges:

first, the discovery of desirable technique and materials of instruction, and, second, the provision for a background of understanding an experience that will lead to their intelligent understanding. (p. 405)

While many schools and systems had adequately addressed the first challenge, few had effectively provided for the second. This was a weakness of many of the current programs, according to Cutright. As Cutright pointed out,

the technique of developing courses of study by the use of small groups of teachers, without attention to the remainder of the teaching group . . . may be responsible for the indifference or helplessness which many teachers display in a half-hearted use of new courses of study. (p. 405)

The training of those teachers not involved in the curriculum development usually received "little definite attention at least until the course is ready for publication" (p. 404). Since the purpose of curriculum revision, in Cutright's perspective, was to move teaching practice "to a higher educational level" (p. 404), one implication was that skills and knowledge of teachers would move to this level, also. This was problematic for the teachers who had not participated in the curriculum revision process, according to Cutright.

While the solution would seem to be to involve all teachers in the curriculum revision process, Cutright (1929) suggested that it was not so simple. Cutright noted that "few teachers are prepared to participate in curriculum revision without some knowledge of the problems involved" (p. 405). Cutright contended that teacher training and curriculum revision were intertwined.

Group-wide teacher-training activities create a basis of understanding and readiness which makes every teacher a potential participant in the research activities so essential to curriculum development. The activities of the teacher-training program and the

activities necessary for curriculum revision should be so interwoven and dovetailed that the course of study . . . is the product of group-wide participation- group-wide in the sense, that while the major responsibility for initiating and devising has been carried by the small curriculum committee, all teachers have given definite assistance. (p. 405)

In this sense, curriculum development was a means of professional improvement and growth.

Harap (1929), associate professor of education at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, proposed procedures for curriculum making for small school systems. A popular method of "curriculum making," of which Harap was critical, was the wholesale adoption of the "generally accepted courses of study of the more progressive larger cities" (p. 145). Harap pointed out that "the most popular course of study is not always the most reliable" (p. 145). Harap asserted that "changing the curriculum of a school system is a growing and not a selecting process" (p. 145).

Organizing for the work was the first step of Harap's (1929) procedures for curriculum making in small systems. Harap proposed that, first, a central steering committee should be created. This central committee would be under the supervision of the administrator responsible for curriculum revision. The function of the central committee would be to "determine certain general policies and coordinate the work of grades and departments" (p. 145).

The central committee would also coordinate the work of the "working or subject committees" (Harap, 1929, p. 145) which were to conduct the actual work of curriculum

revision. Harap suggested that these committees be "organized by subjects and by school levels" (p. 145). Harap maintained that "all teachers who are in a position to make any contribution" (p. 145) should be encouraged to participate in the subject committee work. He also noted that the best results would be achieved when all participants were "given free time to devote to curriculum work" (p. 145).

The central committee might coordinate the work of the school system with university study. One way in which the university might work with a small school system, according to Harap (1929), was by providing "an extension class in cooperation with the program of curriculum revision" (p. 145). The "informal assistance and stimulation of educational specialists" (p. 145) could be enlisted to assist with the work, according to Harap. The university could be secured to provide training and expertise for the participants.

A primary function of the central committee was to provide direction for the subject committees. The second step of Harap's (1929) proposed plan for curriculum making was "the preparation of an introductory statement by the central committee for the guidance of all active curriculum workers" (p. 145). The introductory statement would include educational aims, a definition of curriculum, the amount of emphasis to be placed on the natural activities of the pupils and their social needs, and specific objectives. As

this introductory statement was developed, Harap suggested that the central committee "hold occasional meetings of the whole teaching corps for the purpose of pointing out the issues which arose and the position which it took on them" (p. 145).

Once the introductory statement was prepared, the subject committees would conduct most of the remaining work-steps three, four, and five. The third step of curriculum making, according to Harap (1929), was for the subject committees "to ferret out the issues [related to their subject], to discuss them in committee, and to come to an agreement on the position which it intends to take" (p. 145). Step four involved the "determination of the objectives or specific goals of instruction" (p. 146). Once the objectives were formulated, the subject committees would begin what Harap described as "the most important step" (p. 146), the creation of the teaching units. Harap characterized teaching units as "the detailed *plans* and *specifications* for the new educational structure" (p. 146). Harap asserted that this was the point that most teachers became interested because of the creation of something of practical value, namely, "specific usable instructional procedures" (p. 146).

Frazier (1929), a U.S. Bureau of Education official, offered his response to the question, "Who shall make the curriculum?" Only those who were "professionally equipped" (p. 546) to answer three fundamental questions should be

involved in curriculum development. The three questions Frazier proposed were

- (1) What is the natural inborn equipment of the child, and how far has he progressed in development?
- (2) What materials does he need, as an individual and as a member of school, and as a future member of adult society?
- (3) In what school grades shall given materials to be used as stimuli for further growth be placed, and in what order shall they be presented? (pp. 546-547)

Subject-matter specialists, scientific research workers, psychologists, biologists, sociologists, and philosophers all had contributions to make to curriculum development, according to Frazier.

Frazier (1929) asserted, however, that the "curriculum builder par excellence" (p. 554) was the teacher. The effective teacher's "intuitive and experimental methods" (p. 547) were critical to curriculum development. The effective teacher understood how "to study her own problems, drawing from expert opinion only as she may assimilate and apply" (p. 555). As Frazier maintained, "the whole end of curriculum study by the classroom teacher as an established procedure in curricular revision is here disclosed" (p. 554). Additionally,

self-realization and the ability to do a large amount of independent thinking come best to us through the quiet encouragement of the greatest curriculum makers of all, the classroom teachers. (p. 555)

The questions of curriculum started in the classroom and were tested in the classroom- by the teacher. The effective teacher had to be an effective curriculum maker. This

expertise, according to Frazier, made teachers indispensable members of a cooperative effort in curriculum development.

Newlon (1929), professor of education and director of Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University, attributed the increasing practice of teacher participation in school administration and, especially, curriculum development to the influence of John Dewey. Newlon quoted from Dewey's The Educational Situation:

As long as the teacher, who is after all the only real educator in the school system, has no definite and authoritative position in shaping the course of study, that is likely to remain an external thing to be externally applied. (Dewey, 1904, p. 30)

It might prove difficult to directly link the influence of Dewey's writings on teacher participation in curriculum development (e.g., Dewey, 1903) and Dewey's practice of involving teachers in curriculum development (see Mayhew & Edwards, 1936) on other practices. While there might be some question as to the influence that Dewey's views had on the practice of teacher participation in curriculum development in general, Newlon acknowledged the influence on his own practice particularly in Denver.

It will be remembered that, as superintendent of the Denver schools, Newlon (1929) began the Denver Curriculum Project, an oft-cited model of teacher participation in curriculum development (see Newlon & Threlkeld, 1926). Newlon, himself, alluded to the Denver program as an example "of a participation that is both wide-spread and very genuine in character" (p. 696). Newlon asserted that

in progressive school systems throughout the country teachers are becoming curriculum makers and in other ways are contributing largely to the determination of educational practice. (p. 696)

Newlon attributed, if others might not, the widespread practice of teacher participation in curriculum development to the influence of Dewey.

Newlon (1929) also emphasized, as Dewey did, the positive influence of teacher participation in curriculum development on professional development. Newlon contended that "the teacher who has a part in the formulation of school policies . . . is constantly undergoing a process of education essential in good teaching" (p. 696). Newlon further asserted that teacher participation provided the motivation for teachers to study educational problems. That teachers might be interested in those concerns, such as curriculum development, which had traditionally been considered in the realm of school administration should not be surprising. Newlon (1929) agreed with Dewey (1904) who stated that

it is precisely such things (as grouping in classes, grading, machinery of curriculum making, selecting, assigning, paying, and promoting teachers) that really control the whole system, even on its distinctively educational side. (Dewey, 1904, p. 22)

Newlon maintained that there was a direct and powerful relationship between teacher participation, professional development, and instruction.

Evidence that the practice of teacher participation in school administration and curriculum work was becoming more commonplace could be found in the discussions concerning

teacher training. Discussions of teacher training in curriculum making were beginning to appear more frequently in the literature. For example, Lull (1923), the director of teacher training at Kansas State Teachers' College, proposed a course in curriculum making for all teachers-in-training and outlined the content of the proposed curriculum making course. Lull noted that "teachers . . . have been participating more and more in curriculum making" (p. 290). He contended curriculum which teachers had participated in making resulted in more "vital learning" (p. 290) than curriculum for which they had made no contribution. Considering the importance, then, of teachers being prepared to participate in curriculum making, Lull was concerned about the absence of courses in curriculum making in teacher-training institutions. The course he outlined for Kansas State Teachers' College drew heavily from Bobbit's work entitled "Curriculum Making In Los Angeles" (p. 291).

Lull (1925) continued his call for teacher training in curriculum construction with a follow-up piece to his initial article. He contended that curriculum building as an area of study had been largely ignored during the last ten years because of a focus on educational psychology. While educational psychology may have been important, curriculum building was "the eternal, central job of the school, and yet how little attention and systematic effort we give to it" (p. 452). Institutions for teacher-training, in particular, had ignored curriculum building. Even though

"the curriculum is the big central factor of school organization" (p. 452), Lull pointed out that "we are graduating annually thousands of teachers, superintendents, principals, and supervisors, who know little about the curriculum job" (p. 452). Lack of teacher-training in curriculum work was a major problem particularly when considering the increasing number of efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development.

Lull (1925) expanded his proposal for teacher training to include four courses in curriculum development. Each course was to correspond to each of "the four levels of the public school system, viz., the primary-kindergarten grades, the intermediate grades, the junior high school and the senior high school" (p. 452). Teachers-in-training were expected to take the course which corresponded to the grade level they intended to teach. Those training to be supervisors would take all four courses.

The training of teachers in service was also being discussed. Horn (1923), professor of elementary education at the University of Iowa, asserted that two questions had to be addressed to determine who should make the curriculum: "How may each community secure the best course of study for its pupils? How, through courses of study, may the greatest stimulation be brought to the teachers?" (p. 971). Horn contended that the second question "has to do with the development or training of teachers in service" (p. 971).

In response to his first question, Horn (1923) maintained that the best course of study would be obtained "only by building upon the best experience, soundness, research, and keenest judgment which this country affords" (p. 971). Horn contended that individual communities could not prepare adequate curricula and proposed that courses of study be created at the national level. Even then, teachers were to be a part. Horn stated,

The best course of study . . . is possible only by *pooling the leadership* in the field. The leadership in this field is not limited to college professors. Leadership includes all of those who have contributed. It includes the classroom teacher of insight and artistic technique. . . . (p. 971)

Horn also included supervisors, superintendents, and bureaus of research in the cooperative effort to develop courses of study at the national level.

Because a course of study developed in this way would represent the best thinking in a field, it would serve as a model for teachers and superintendents in local systems. Horn (1923) suggested that superintendents and teachers would study and discuss these courses of study. From their study and discussion would come insight into best practices. Horn stated that a course of study developed in this manner "is in the nature of information in which the teacher must be led to have confidence and upon which she may model her teaching practice" (p. 973). This examination and modeling would provide the basis for the professional development.

While Horn (1923) advocated teacher participation, this participation was on a very limit basis. As already

discussed, only certain teachers of "insight and artistic technique" (p. 973) would be selected. He suggested that most courses of study developed locally through cooperative means were inadequate. He rejected the argument that local teacher participation in curriculum development would "result in teaching practice which is superior to that which would be obtained by a superior course placed in the teachers' hands" (p. 973). Most teachers, and superintendents for that matter, simply did not have the expertise needed to develop superior curricula, according to Horn. Additionally, Horn believed that "most of the talk about the teacher's desire to create courses of study is without foundation" (p. 973). He cited an eagerness on the part of most teachers "to take hold of methods proposed by those in whom they have confidence" (p. 973) as evidence of this reluctance.

Lang (1928), a professor of education at Fresno State College in California, also discussed teacher preparation for administrative participation. Lang asserted that the teachers' "assumption of this new function . . . implied an obligation to make preparation for its effective performance" (p. 490). The preparation, according to Lang, should be focused on readying teachers for "intelligent cooperation" in school administration, not to make teachers experts in school administration (p. 490). The purpose of teacher participation in school administration, Lang maintained, was "not to displace the present school

administrative machinery . . . , but through cooperative endeavor to add to its effectiveness" (p. 491).

The Rise of Curriculum Committees

Ortman (1921), a professor of education at Fisk University in Nashville, summarized for the National Council of Education the results of his widely-cited study of thirty teachers' councils across the United States. The thirty councils he studied had common characteristics: elected representatives from all levels of the school system; existed as a separate organization directed by elected officers; governed by a constitution and by-laws; and, organized process for presenting recommendations to the superintendent and/or board. The median number of members of the teachers' councils was eighteen with a range of six to 130 members. There was little or no relationship between the size of the teachers' council and the size of the school system. The median number of groups represented on the councils was eight and included kindergarten, primary, intermediate, junior high, senior high, and special teachers, principals, and supervisors.

According to Ortman (1921), the stated purposes of the councils he studied were "not stated well" and were "so general" (p. 296) that they provided little insight into the operation of the councils. "The real test of the teacher council," Ortman asserted, "comes in the tasks it undertakes and in the degree of success with which it accomplishes them" (p. 296). He identified over fifty tasks undertaken

by the councils he studied. These tasks were grouped into ten categories:

constructed or reorganized courses of study; adopted textbooks and materials for teaching certain subjects; established methods of instruction for different subjects and classes; built up teacher-training requirements and courses; constructed teacher-rating systems; reorganized the rules and regulations of the school; modified building plans in some details so as to result in better service; built up a more comprehensive system of reports; helped increase salaries and reconstructed the financial conditions in the district attending thereon; and cooperated in community work. (p. 296)

Construction and revision of the curriculum was a primary task for teachers' councils.

Ortman (1921) also identified typical relationships that existed between councils and boards of education and between councils and superintendents. He found three common relationships between councils and boards of education:

- (1) no recognition, legal or official. By far the largest number of councils fall under this head.
- (2) Official recognition through the incorporation in the board's minutes or rules of a formal statement that the teacher council is recognized in the schools. . . .
- (3) A legal recognition through the city's charter. (p. 297)

He also found three common relationships between teachers' councils and superintendents. The "parallel type" of relationship existed when "both the superintendent and the teacher council work along parallel lines with as many interchanges as possible, each reporting to the board" (p. 298). Ortman considered this an undesirable type of relationship because it tended to put the superintendent and the council in competition with each other. In the "dominated type" of relationship, the superintendent had

"complete control over the council, even to the extent of appointing and dismissing its members" (p. 298). A third relationship was represented in the "responsible through the superintendent type" (p. 298). In this relationship, the school board recognized the teacher council as a participant with the superintendent in deciding educational policies for the schools. Ortman noted that "the superintendent embodies the recommendations of the teacher council in his recommendations to the board" (p. 298).

Ortman (1921) warned of a potential unresolved conflict which could result from the interaction of these relationships. Some councils might choose to bypass the superintendent and appeal directly to the board in controversial matters. While he offered no solutions, he recommended that the relationships be addressed and "dealt with in an open and above-board manner" (p. 298).

Effective representation by council members was another problem identified by Ortman (1921). A common complaint against teachers' councils was that members did not always represent the views of their constituents. Council members might present their own views or inadequately present their constituents views. Additionally, constituents were not always kept current on council deliberations. Ortman stated the problem in this way:

The two phases of the problem are how shall the teacher council members be kept informed regarding the wishes of their constituency, and how shall the constituency be kept informed regarding the action of the teacher council groups. (p. 209)

Representatives needed to be provided an organized process for receiving the opinions of their constituents and for reporting the deliberations of the council to their constituents.

A final problem of teachers' councils that needed to be addressed in the study was the use of expert opinion.

Ortman (1921) suggested three possible uses of expert opinion in teachers' councils:

- (1) expert opinion to be drafted by the teacher council on its own volition;
- (2) no important policy should be adopted by the teacher council until expert opinion had given it a fair consideration;
- and (3) have the conclusions of the teacher council subjected to expert opinion after they had been adopted. (p. 299)

The tendency, Ortman stated, had been to allow teachers' councils to consult expert opinion on their own initiative or to have councils' proposals evaluated by experts prior to their adoption by boards of education.

The philosophical basis for teacher participation, Ortman (1921) asserted, was the nation's historical pursuits of a more democratic society. This democratic philosophy was best exemplified in Dewey's (1903) "Democracy in Education," according to Ortman. Ortman quoted Dewey's definition of democracy, i.e., "'the individual shall have a share in determining the aims and conditions of his work'" (p. 300), as a philosophical foundation for democratic participation such as teachers' councils. Two corollaries to Dewey's definition formed, what Ortman termed, "conditioning principle[s] of growth" (p. 300). The first principle indicated a benefit to the individual's

professional and intellectual growth: "only by sharing some responsible task does there come a fitness to share it" (p. 300). The second principle suggested a benefit to institutional well-being: "through the free and mutual harmonizing of different individuals the work is done better than when directed by a few, no matter how wise or of good intent that few" (p. 300). Ortman restated these two principles as the principle of "learning by doing" and the principle of "bettering institutions by having all workers in them assist in determining the governing policies" (p. 300). These principles, according to Ortman, were generally accepted and commonly practiced.

Sears (1921), a professor at Stanford University, conducted a widely-cited study of teacher participation in public school administration in which he concluded "that teacher participation in school administration is already a settled matter, justified by both theory and practice" (p. 113). In his statement of the problem, Sears contended that in the course of public school history the roles of teachers, principals, superintendents, and school boards had never been "clearly defined, . . . no one of them has remained constant, and that present practice varies greatly in different parts of the country" (p. 29). He attributed this problem to changes in "industrial processes, in size, density, and racial make-up of population, in occupations, in political organization, in means of travel and communication, in social ideals" (p. 29).

Another influence on these changing roles, according to Sears (1921), was the issue of academic freedom. Sears indicated that after World War I the call for academic freedom moved to the city school systems. The primary issue in these school systems became

In the formulation of the program of education, what shall be the rights and duties of the board of education, the superintendent, the principal, and the teacher respectively? (p. 29)

While teachers were the "principal agitators in the movement" for democratic participation, Sears pointed out that the movement was also "being fostered by leading educational administrators throughout the country" (p. 29).

Sears (1921) stated in order for the idea of teacher participation to be accepted, it first had to "stand the test both of enlightened theory and of sound practice" (p. 29). In an attempt to establish the theoretical basis for teacher participation in public school administration, Sears presented five principles "upon which sound organization and administration of a city school system should rest" (p. 29). Sears' first principle of administration and organization, the principle of unity, stated that "there must be a single executive head, with proper working relationships between his subordinates" (p. 29). The second principle assumed a "thorough understanding" (p. 29) of the functions of the various positions in a school. Authority would be delegated according to the functions accorded each position. For example, since the primary function of teachers was instruction, the authority delegated to teachers would

include curriculum development and revision. The establishment of direct lines of authority was Sears' (1921) third principle of organization and administration. Essentially, this meant that "instructions should pass directly from superior to subordinate and not through a third officer" (p. 29).

The fourth principle called for "coordination through staff advice" (p.29). Staff functions included "investigation, information, advice" (pp. 29-30) whereas a line function was "one of action and authority" (p. 29). According to Sears, rural school teachers performed both line and staff functions while in larger city school systems these functions became much more complex. However, when the principle of coordination through staff advice was followed, "when staff service is provided, and coordination of all the parts and functions of the organization is based upon knowledge, then real unity and cooperation are possible" (p. 31).

Sears (1921) regarded the fifth principle- "every line officer should render some staff service" (p. 31)- as the most important to support for the establishment of teachers' councils. Particularly in large city school systems, the size of the system made it necessary for teachers, whom Sears considered line officers, to provide information and suggestions from a classroom perspective for executive officers. Since executive officers were so far removed from the classroom, it was impossible for them to anticipate the

constantly changing needs of the classroom. Sears asserted that teachers

must have wide freedom to make decisions, the need for which no reasonable administrative rules could anticipate. The more intelligent the teacher . . . the larger freedom she can use, and should have. The more freedom she uses the more suggestions she will be able to give to her superiors. (p. 31)

From this theoretical base, Sears concluded that "there is ample reason to argue . . . that teachers, principals, and supervisors should participate in the formulation of school policies" (p. 31).

Sears (1921) next examined the current practices in teacher participation. Sears sent questionnaires concerning teachers' organizations to 268 city school systems. Of the 131 replies, 70 school systems reported that teachers' organizations participated in the administration of the schools. Sears identified 23 variations for the names of teachers' councils in the participating school systems. Sears noted that while the various names suggested little as to function, an analysis of the various groups' constitutions indicated that teachers' councils viewed participation in administration as a primary function.

Sears (1921) asserted that "it is clear from data at hand that teacher participation in administration in some form is very common" (p. 32). Those city school systems which Sears' study indicated participation in administration through teachers' councils included Altoona (Pennsylvania), Baltimore, Birmingham (Alabama), Binghamton (Massachusetts), Boston, Chicago, Colorado Springs, Covington (Kentucky),

Denison (Texas), Fort Smith (Arkansas), Fort Wayne, Grand Rapids, Kansas City (Kansas), La Crosse (Wisconsin), Lincoln (Nebraska), Methuen (Massachusetts), Muskogee (Oklahoma), Newark, New Bedford (Massachusetts), New York City, North Adams (Massachusetts), North Bergen (New Jersey), Oakland, Portland (Oregon), Racine (Wisconsin), Roanoke, Spokane, Springfield (Illinois), Topeka, Trenton, Waco, Escanaba (Michigan), Minneapolis, St. Paul, and San Jose. While Sears cited numerous examples of teacher participation in school administration, he emphasized that "the question of most importance is not how many cities have teachers' councils, or how much councils are organized" (p. 32).

What was most important, according to Sears (1921), was the work in which teachers' councils were engaged. He asserted that:

real work has been done on curriculum problems, arranging for lectures, extension work, salary schedules, revision of rules and regulations, teachers' rating plans, revision of systems of records, management of school publicity, various pieces of research, teachers' pension legislation, etc. (p. 32)

He noted that this list was not exhaustive. Of importance to this study, however, is the fact that curriculum work was noted as an important function of many of the teachers' councils in Sears' study. Sears (1921) concluded from his study that teacher participation in school administration was primarily found in city school systems, was widespread, was not limited to any section of the country or particular demographics, and was widely supported by superintendents and to a lesser degree by boards of education. Teacher

participation had legal status only in a few cities and operated in an advisory capacity in most cities.

Willard (1923), assistant superintendent of schools in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, summarized the process used in Cleveland Heights for a curriculum revision project involving teachers which began in 1920. Once the initial decision was made by the superintendent and staff to revise the curriculum, teachers played a significant role in the revision of the curriculum. Willard acknowledged a significant influence of the work of Bonser on the process, part of which included the role of the teachers in curriculum revision.

Willard (1923) described the role of the teachers in the curriculum revision process. Willard suggested that the process was research-based. The decision to involve teachers was no different. Willard quoted Bonser:

The making of the course of study should be a cooperative activity enlisting the services of the most expert educational leaders for permanent purposes and values, of supervisors and teachers for that selection and development of immediate purposes and interests which will lead to the use of the socialized values represented by the permanent elements of race experience (p. 208)

The purpose for involving teachers was for the contribution they could make to the curriculum, i.e., the selection and development of immediate purposes and interests. Willard suggested no other reasons for involving teachers.

As with other efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development described so far, the superintendent and staff first decided to meet with teachers "for the purpose of

arousing their interest and securing their cooperation" (Willard, 1923, p. 208). A discussion of the following questions was held in a series of general faculty meetings: What was meant by a course of study? What were the purposes of a course of study? What were the parts of a course of study? What should be the standards or criteria? What was the best method to produce a course of study? What were acceptable sources for a course of study? (p. 208). These questions, according to Willard, came from discussions of the superintendent and staff during their initial decision to revise the curriculum. Since health was a primary concern in the community, the primary teachers were the first to begin work on a course of study in hygiene. The primary teachers again addressed the six questions originally presented to the entire faculty, but this time specific to the hygiene curriculum.

The teachers were now ready to begin the work on the curriculum. Willard (1923) noted that "it was agreed that all teachers were to participate" (p. 209). Committees were established according to organizational topics and all of the primary teachers were assigned to one of these committees by a supervisor. Each committee selected a chair and the chairs from each committee formed an executive committee. The executive committee was responsible for organizing and assembling a draft of the course of study. The draft was given to all of the teachers who would be using the final product for their trial use and review.

Their suggestions were incorporated to create the final product.

Once the curriculum on hygiene was completed, the primary teachers began work on other subject areas. This time, however, they organized their own committees and chose the committee "on which they could best serve" (Willard, 1923, p. 209). Willard indicated that work in social studies, arithmetic and English was either completed or being developed. Work in the same areas was going on in the upper grades at the same time.

Kyte (1923), a professor of education at Washington University in St. Louis, detailed the procedure followed in the Berkeley, California, schools to develop courses of study. Earlier, Salisbury (1920), the director of kindergarten and elementary education, and Wilson (1920), superintendent of schools, had outlined the initial stages of this project which was begun in 1919, but not completed until 1922. Kyte was an elementary principal in Berkeley during the three-year course of this curriculum development project. Curriculum development was "the most important single piece of work" (p. 517) that could be done in a school or system, according to Kyte.

In Kyte's (1923) perspective, an effective course of study had certain characteristics. It would inspire teachers. It would serve as a guide, e.g., the curriculum would outline "distribution of time allotments, selection and distribution of subject matter, and the gradation of

materials" (p. 517) for teachers. It would help teachers understand "purposes, teaching procedures, and outcomes" (p. 517). An effective curriculum would provide definite examples of procedures for teachers. It would be research-based. An effective curriculum would be comparable to "the accepted best and most modern course of study in print" (p. 518).

Curriculum experts were to be used in the construction of the curriculum. Kyte (1923) asserted that "every expert who can contribute to producing a better [course of study] should serve" (p. 518) in its construction. However, one person whose curriculum expertise was little recognized was the teacher. Kyte maintained that "the teacher, who guides children, is one of these experts" (p. 518).

The project in Berkeley grew out of two university courses on modern educational practice offered by Superintendent Wilson at the University of California in the summer of 1919. Several faculty and staff members of the Berkeley schools were enrolled in the courses. The courses were so successful, according to Kyte (1923), that teachers "through their association" asked that Superintendent Wilson "give a similar series of lectures to them" (pp. 518-519). Even though attendance was voluntary, Kyte pointed out that "practically the entire teaching staff attended enthusiastically" (p. 519).

At the end of the course for the teachers, the superintendent shared his interest "in the development of a

new course of study which he desired to produce through the cooperative efforts" (Kyte, 1923, p. 519) of any interested teachers, principals, and supervisors. Interested teachers were asked to submit three choices of subject areas on which they would be willing to participate in development. A committee composed of administrators assigned the teachers to subject area committees based on the teachers' choices.

Each subject area committee was composed of representatives from "most of the grades and many schools" (Kyte, 1923, p. 519). Kyte reported that "over 90 per cent of the teaching staff" (p. 519) agreed to participate and were assigned to the various subject area committees. The chairs were assigned based on their expertise in a subject area and included teachers, principals, and supervisors. A committee designated as the General Committee was created to coordinate the work of the subject area committees. The chairs of the various subject committees made up the General Committee. The director of kindergarten and elementary education was the chair of the General Committee.

While Kyte's (1923) report detailed the work of the committee on the course of study in history and civics for the kindergarten and elementary grades, he summarized the procedures of all the committees. Kyte noted that every type of expert and related research were consulted during the course of the project. This "included studies in subject-matter and method" (p. 536). "Advanced students" (p. 536) in subject matter, such as history, and "authorities in

educational practice" participated as committee members and as consultants (p. 536). Committees examined courses of study from other school systems. Kyte noted that "teachers and principals made large contributions either by serving on the committee or by reporting" (p. 536).

Committees concentrated on providing "careful articulation of grade materials" (Kyte, 1923, p. 536). Kyte reported that elementary and junior high school committees met jointly to formulate plans for articulation. Committee assignments were carefully considered to facilitate the "elimination of gaps between grades" and provide "close articulation" of the curriculum (p. 536). Kyte noted that "the series of grade organization reports in committee was another helpful source" in providing for articulation (p. 536).

Other activities that were part of the Berkeley curriculum program on which Kyte (1923) reported included correlation of the curriculum, provision for staff development activities, and provision for resource materials. Kyte noted that correlation of subject matter was also a primary focus for the curriculum committees in Berkeley. Kyte reported several activities through which correlation was achieved. All of the tentative courses of study were submitted to the general committee for suggestions and criticism. Joint subject committee meetings were held to facilitate correlation of materials. Staff

development activities were based on the needs of the teachers. Kyte reported that

modern teaching procedures, together with their relationship to the objectives of education, the activities of children and the outcomes to be attained, were explained and illustrated in an answer to teachers' expressed needs. (p. 536)

The various committees were also provided with "helpful lists of equipment and books" (p. 536) to assist them in their work.

Kyte (1923) concluded that "the cooperative efforts of teachers made possible such a [desirable curriculum]" (p. 536). In addition to the improved curriculum, he noted several positive benefits which included an increased interest on the part of the teachers in the courses of study and their development. Additionally, the work of the teachers in the classroom improved. Kyte noted the interest of teachers in improving on their work and asserted that "if cooperative making of courses of study accomplished no more than this, they are very worthwhile" (p. 536).

Logan (1924), the assistant superintendent of the Cincinnati schools, outlined the Cincinnati Program of Curriculum Revision in the second yearbook of the Department of Superintendence. First, Logan developed the guiding principles of curriculum-making to be shared with the participants to help keep them focused on the task. Next, all of the teachers were organized into committees. Five committees were created at each grade level, i.e., "the social, civic, industrial, nature, and aesthetic experiences

of the children" (p. 121). The chair of each committee served on a correlating committee to organize the reports for each grade.

Once the committees were formed, the teachers conducted a survey of:

the actual experiences of their children to determine what activities need to be relived or revised in the school life, to make up deficiencies, to strengthen and interpret desirable experiences, and to counteract negative influences. (p. 121)

The teachers then composed an outline of the needs of their students in the sections of the city where they lived, i.e., "crowded downtown sections, residential sections, and rural sections" (p. 121). From this work, each committee developed broad goals and activities which would address the identified needs of the students.

Based on these goals, three steps were decided upon to guide curriculum development. The first step was to decide on the educational objectives based on the needs of students as identified by the survey and subsequent work. Logan reported that these educational objectives guided the selection of the subject matter. Subject matter was selected which would give knowledge of personal, economic, civic, and social value; demand skills of personal and social value; form correct habits of thought and work; afford abundant opportunities for choice; develop worth attitudes and appreciations; and, establish high ideals (Logan, 1924, pp. 121-122). The subject matter was then organized into teaching units. Logan (1924) recommended

that units be "stated as a problem or project rather than a simple fact or question" (p. 122). She also recommended that the units be organized logically allowing for the "psychological reorganization by the pupil" (p. 122). Finally, organization of units should take into consideration correlation with other subject areas.

Logan (1924) presented a tentative course of study for fourth grade geography which followed the proposed outline. These tentative courses of study were being reviewed by the teachers under the direction of the assistant superintendents. Additionally, the elementary principals were meeting monthly to discuss the tentative curriculum. Logan stated that "their suggestions will probably lead to further revision and the placing of the whole in more permanent form" (p. 125).

Floyd (1924), a principal at Selma Avenue School in Los Angeles, briefly described her experience in curriculum making in the Los Angeles school system under Salisbury, the Director of the Course of Study (see Salisbury, 1920). Floyd asserted that "probably the most outstanding work of the year in which the entire teaching force of Los Angeles had a part was making the present curriculums" (p. 483). Floyd pointed out that the value of having teachers involved in curriculum work was recognized. Once the decision was made to revise the curriculum of the Los Angeles school system, Salisbury "immediately started the whole teaching

force thinking and working in a truly democratic manner" (p. 483).

According to Floyd (1924), "practically every principal and teacher was on some committee" (p. 483). A committee, designated the Alpha Committee, was responsible for coordinating the work of the other committees and was composed of five principals and one supervisor. Each grade in the school system formed a committee designated as a Beta Committee which was composed of eighteen supervisors, principals, and teachers. The Beta Committees assigned at least ten teachers to sub-committees based on the subject areas taught at that particular grade level. Understanding that a useful curriculum "must be made over as soon as finished" (p. 489), a standing committee was later formed to guide ongoing revision. This committee was composed of three supervisors, five principals, five teachers, one psychologist, and three school counselors.

Floyd (1924) listed fifty tentative principles that were developed by Salisbury to guide the work of these committees. These tentative principles were submitted to the faculty for their consideration. The teachers were surveyed to determine their agreement or disagreement with each of the principles. Their responses were compiled. From these responses, a pamphlet entitled "Principles on Curriculum Making" was distributed to all the participants. Floyd reported that "the course of study was then made in

each subject and for each grade using these principles as the basis" (p. 489).

While his primary purpose was to describe the role of the principal in curriculum construction, Davis (1924), a principal at J.E.B. Stuart School in Norfolk, Virginia, alluded to the role of teachers in a curriculum revision project in Norfolk which began in the fall of 1922. Davis reported that the superintendent first formed a general committee "which was to be responsible for the entire project and which was to plan the work, organize it, direct it, and bring the final results into harmony" (p. 491). Half of the general committee was made up of teachers. The general committee assigned responsibilities to various sub-committees which were made up of "members of the school staffs who were not members of the general committee" (p. 492).

Davis' (1924) description of his relationship to the teachers in the school in which he was responsible suggested the role of teachers on the various committees. He frequently conferred with teachers in the school who were serving on sub-committees. He shared resources which might be informative, some of which were "from his own professional library" (p. 492). In relation to this, Davis asserted that it was the responsibility of the principal to "lend every assistance which the resources of his plant afford to teachers who are carrying on classroom experiments in connections with curriculum problems" (p. 491). This

suggested an active role for teachers not only in a formally-sanctioned activities such as the Norfolk project Davis reported on, but also informal activities which occurred in classrooms everyday. In this vein, Davis reported that he helped teachers set up "controlled experiments" (p. 492) which helped to inform the committees on which these teachers served.

Davis (1924) asserted that the principal must "make the teachers feel that the problem of building the courses of study is their problem" (p. 491). In addition to encouraging experimentation, he facilitated this in other ways. Bulletins were distributed to faculty members to keep them current on the work of the sub-committees and "important achievements of the members of his staff" (p. 492). Davis also maintained that it was important to encourage teachers "to stand boldly for what they knew to be professionally right" (p. 492). Keeping teachers informed and respecting their contributions helped teachers to feel the problems of curriculum construction were their problems, according to Davis.

Threlkeld (1925), deputy superintendent of the Denver schools, reviewed the main principles of the Denver program of curriculum revision and described how these principles manifested themselves in practice. Threlkeld proposed four principles:

- (1) The participation of the local professional corps must be procured as a basis for the entire program.
- (2) Definite administration and supervision of the local corps is essential.
- (3) The most advanced

educational thought of the profession as a whole should be incorporated. (4) Curriculum revision should be continuous. (p. 573)

The first principle was most pertinent to the study of teacher participation in curriculum work.

Threlkeld (1925) asserted that "in the last analysis, no course of study is any more effective than the extent to which it is actually taught in the classroom" (p. 573). Teachers had to have "an intelligent understanding of their work" (p.573), according to Threlkeld, in order for the curriculum to be effectively taught in the classroom. The best way to accomplish this intelligent understanding, from the perspective of the Denver program, was "to secure the co-operation of the teachers in making the courses of study which they are to teach" (p. 573). As a result, Threlkeld pointed out, the Denver program of curriculum revision was characterized by a large number of participating teachers. One of the most significant results, Threlkeld would later conclude, was "teacher growth in terms of insight into the significance and possibilities of the teaching profession" (p. 582).

There were primarily two types of committees in the Denver program: subject-matter committees and central organization committees. Subject-matter committees were concerned with particular subject areas. According to Threlkeld (1925), there were three sets of subject-matter committees, one set for each school configuration, i.e., elementary, junior high, and senior high. A set was

comprised of the subject areas such as English, mathematics, science, social science, Latin, and foreign languages. There would be, for example, four elementary school subject matter committees: elementary English, elementary mathematics, elementary science, and elementary social science. Threlkeld reported that because of the number of elementary schools, every school was not represented on every elementary subject-matter committee. Every elementary school, however, was represented on some elementary subject-matter committee. Every junior high school was represented on every junior high school subject-matter committee. The same was true of senior high schools and senior high school subject-matter committees. Threlkeld reported that "this division is made on the theory that such a plan will better insure complete participation" (p. 574).

Threlkeld (1925) maintained that "in appointing the subject-matter committees, the primary consideration is to make the participation of the classroom teacher the starting-point" (p. 574). This meant, Threlkeld further maintained, that "the committees should be so constituted as to offer the maximum inducement to the classroom teachers to enter into discussions unreservedly" (p. 574). This was accomplished by excluding administrators from most subject-matter committees. Additionally, teachers chaired every subject-matter committee.

There were three central-organization committees, according to Threlkeld (1925): the committee on constants

in the high school, the committee on the program of studies in the high school, and the committee on classification and guidance. These committees were composed of administrators. However, none of these committees were concerned directly with the revision of the curriculum. The committee on constants was primarily concerned with senior high school graduation requirements. The committee on the organization of the program of studies was concerned primarily with the "pupils' selection of courses" (p. 576). The committee on classification and guidance was concerned primarily with record-keeping.

A unique characteristic of the Denver program of curriculum revision was the practice of providing teachers time to work on curriculum revision during the regular school day. Teachers working on curriculum revision were not "expected to do their work after having taught a full day in the classroom" (Threlkeld, 1925, p. 576). Substitute teachers were provided to relieve these teachers from their regular duties. As to those who might question the regular teachers being absent from their classrooms, Threlkeld asserted that "curriculum revision is fundamental to all else" (p. 576).

Another unique feature was the effective and liberal use of curriculum specialists to assist in the work of the committees. Threlkeld (1925) pointed out that the subject-matter committees had done an effective job in collecting and incorporating the relevant research. "There comes a

time, however, in the work of a committee," Threlkeld contended, "when it is extremely helpful to have present in person some outstanding specialist in the particular field of that committee's work" (p. 579). These specialists were invited only after the subject-matter committee was "able to state issues clearly and to ask definite questions about them" (p. 580). The specialist would stay as long as needed. Threlkeld reported that, as of 1924, "fourteen such specialists were brought to Denver, and a like number is scheduled for this year" (p. 580).

Other unique features included the provisions for clerical staff and the establishment of a professional library. A secretary and two to six assistants were provided for the sole purpose of "typing, mimeographing and clerical work of all kinds" (Threlkeld, 1925, p. 578) related to the work of the committees on curriculum revision. Additionally, the regular administrative clerical staff was enlisted to assist with this work. Committee members were not expected to do any of this work. An extensive professional library was established to provide "available reports of research, recent books, and articles dealing with curriculum revision and problems of teaching" (p. 578). Threlkeld called the library "a keypoint in the program" (p. 579).

Foster (1925), an associate superintendent for the Pittsburgh school system, reported on teacher participation in curriculum making for the secondary schools of

Pittsburgh. A primary purpose for teacher participation in curriculum work, according to Foster, was the professional growth of teachers. Foster questioned whether teachers, initially, were qualified to conduct curriculum work.

Foster asserted that

if for no other reason, it is a good thing for teachers to be placed in a position where they will be compelled to study the objectives and consider the subject-matter to be used in connection with a consideration of their own particular subjects. Teachers are bound to grow while working on such a committee (p. 142)

In Foster's perspective, there had to be some starting point for teachers and since curriculum work was to be continuous, Foster contended that teachers might as well be involved from inception.

Foster (1925) reported that the program was initiated at the beginning of the 1924-1925 school year with the appointment of the curriculum committees. While these committees were chaired by high school principals and department directors, Foster noted that "the members of the committees are made up mainly of teachers" (p. 143). Foster also noted that committees were given "absolute freedom to work out their own ideas and are not hampered in any way from above" (p. 143). These curriculum committees were to be permanent since curriculum revision was to be a continuous process. In order to provide maximum participation of teachers and to provide continuity in the work of the committees, Foster reported that "Pittsburgh plan calls for the retirement of one-third of the committee each year" (p. 143).

The most important responsibility of these committees, in Foster's (1925) perspective, was not the production of a course of study. The most important work of these committees was the continual revision of the curriculum:

Such permanent committees will find that one of their biggest jobs will come immediately following the printing of their report. They will want to know the reactions of the great body of teachers who will put the course into effect. . . . They will continue to hold regular meetings to discuss the suggestions, criticisms, and questions which will come up as a result of experience in the field. (p. 143)

In addition to the regular rotation of committee members, this continual solicitation and review of teachers' suggestions and criticisms constituted "real teacher participation in the making of curriculum" (p. 143), in Foster's perspective.

Foster (1925) noted two particular features of the Pittsburgh program which were intended to provide support for the work of the curriculum committees. The first was the provision of substitutes for teachers involved in committee work. Foster (1925) noted that the Pittsburgh plan for curriculum revision

contemplates the holding of many of these meetings during school hours, so that the members will be able to concentrate upon the work of the committee, being fresh, and not fatigued as at the close of a regular days work. (p. 143)

The provision of substitutes allowed maximum effectiveness from committee participants. The other provision for the support of the curriculum committees furnished curriculum consultants "to sit in conference with these committees to give expert counsel and advice" (p. 143). Both of these

features, i.e., provisions for substitutes and curriculum consultants to support the work of the committees, were becoming increasingly common features of the curriculum revision programs around the country during this period.

As an example of actual committee work, Foster (1925) described the work of the social studies committee. His description was based on actual committee reports. Committee reports indicated that "each item of discussion before the committee is presented by a departmental teaching group for criticism and suggestion" (p. 144). Foster pointed out that this was "another illustration of teacher participation" (p. 144). The first discussion of the committee focused on the nature of their curriculum work, i.e., "whether or not we should style ourselves as a committee on social sciences, social science, social studies, social study, history and civics, or history-civics" (p. 144). The committee decided that the nature of their work focused on social study. The social studies committee's next discussion centered on "the method of treatment of our field" (Foster, 1925, p. 144). Foster reported that the committee decided on "the problem method and, where possible, the project method" (p. 144).

Realizing that they had gotten off on a tangent, the social studies committee refocused by "making a brief digest of authoritative opinion relative to our field of work and making an analysis of some up-to-date practice that might guide us" (Foster, 1925, p. 144). This discussion brought

the committee to the problem of "objectives of the course in social study and how to determine them" (p. 144). The committee first identified "the things citizens do or are supposed to do and under what desirable ideals these things are done" (p. 144). Once these activities were identified, they were compared to certain junior high school objectives. The committee reported that the relationships they identified between the activities of citizens and the junior high school objectives became "our general objectives for our social study course" (p. 145). This work on the general objectives illustrated the accomplishments of the committee up until the time of Foster's article.

Moore (1925), a professor of education at the University of California, described a joint effort by nine school systems in southern California to revise their curriculums. While the primary purpose was to report on the work of the committees concerning the curriculum for elementary education, Moore (1925) briefly described, in the introduction, the efforts to involve teachers. Moore stated the reason for revising the curriculum was that it was

quite evident that our courses of study are an accumulation of much and sundry and that following them in a routine fashion involves great waste of effort on the part of teachers and vastly greater waste of effort on the part of students. (pp. v-vi)

The decision was made to revise the curriculum "to eliminate waste from our school programs" (p. vi).

The nine superintendents- five of whom changed during the course of the project- decided that the curriculum work would be a cooperative effort. Moore (1925) reported that

we felt that if the superintendents, on their own responsibility, were to bring about the necessary change, the teachers, not having had an opportunity to convince themselves of the reasonableness, would not be sufficiently committed to it to carry it out with the understanding, or with anything of the devotion, for which the undertaking seemed to call. (p. vi)

The decision was made to make the teachers responsible for the bulk of the work. Moore concluded that the only claim which could be made about the courses of study once they were developed was that the courses were "the effort of classroom teachers to study their job and to understand the objective which they strive to serve" (p. vii).

The plan followed procedures which were now relatively common among those systems involved in curriculum revision. Committees were created to "study and report upon each subject area in the elementary course" (Moore, 1925, p. vi). Teachers were appointed to these committees by the superintendents. There were 16 committees: arithmetic, art, civic and social education, English, industrial arts, kindergarten, manual arts, music, geography, history, home economics, hygiene, nature study and agriculture, physical education, reading and literature, spelling, and writing. The number of representatives varied between committees. The average number of committee members was ten with the range from six members on the industrial arts committee to 14 on the nature study and agriculture committee. A total

of 166 teachers participated on some committee. All committees were chaired by University of California personnel.

All of the committees met at the southern branch of the University of California where an overview of the work was given. Each committee was given a list of questions to guide their work:

What is your subject for? What is its aim or purpose? To what end should it be taught? What should be the objective of every teacher in giving instruction in it? What parts of it are of first-rate importance, as distinguished from the parts of it which are only of second-rate or third-rate value? What are its essentials? We ask you to skeletonize it, to outline its minimum essentials. (Moore, 1925, pp. vi-vii)

Moore reported that the work of the committees lasted about one and a half years (i.e., February 9, 1918 through July 1, 1919). The tentative courses of study were then distributed to the classroom teachers to "be tested by actual trial in the classrooms and revised by the combined wisdom of all the teachers in the schools" (p. vii).

Willard (1925), the superintendent of the Seattle school system, briefly reported in the general session of the June, 1925, meeting of the National Education Association on a curriculum revision project which had been in progress for two years. After giving a philosophical basis for teacher participation in deciding educational policy, Willard described the plans for

a large and very general participation on the part of teachers in determining the adaptability of proposed new material to our present teaching conditions, and in suggesting suitable activities, exercises, devices, and content- especially local content. (p. 112)

The main work group for curriculum revision in Seattle was the subject area committee. The subject area committees were composed of principals. Willard considered principals to be "teachers in spirit" (p. 114), so this may have been one justification for the absence of classroom teachers.

The subject area committees had the primary responsibilities

of making a careful study of all important reports, investigations, studies, and experiments that are available; of becoming familiar with the best local practice, and the practice of other systems; and of defining educational objectives which the various courses will aim to achieve. (pp. 112-113)

Working in cooperation and with assistance from "other members of the corps" (p. 113), the subject area committees propose revisions based on their investigations.

The role of the teachers in curriculum revision was more advisory. The classroom teacher was not assigned to subject area committees because the teacher had "a full day's work to do and is not asked to assume the additional burden of a general research student" (Willard, 1925, p. 113). Teachers were expected try out the proposals of the subject area committees and make suggestions for improvement. Teachers were "to study the proposals made by the committees, to try them out, to criticize, to correct, to enrich, and to adapt according to need" (p. 113).

Teachers were also called into conference with the subject-area committees to offer their particular insight. Subject-area committees

relied upon [teachers] to see that the best results of [their] experience and understanding go into the

courses, and that all new outlines before they are accepted are made understandable, workable, and detailed enough so as to leave no doubt as to meaning, aim or method. (p. 113)

The teachers' responsibility, then, was to make the theoretical proposals of the subject area committees practical for the classroom.

Fenton (1926), a teacher in the Seattle school system, also reported on the curriculum development program in Seattle. Fenton served as the secretary for the English subject committee. Other subject committees in the Seattle program included reading and literature, history and civics, geography and science, arithmetic, and special subjects. Special subjects included music, fine arts, Industrial Arts, writing, physical training, and Industrial Work (p. 91). Fenton reported that the Seattle program "has been participated in by practically the entire teaching force" (p. 91).

The organization for the Seattle curriculum development program was typical for the period, i.e., a central committee coordinating the work of several subject area committees. In the case of the Seattle program, the work of the subject committees was coordinated by the General Committee, according to Fenton (1926). In addition to coordination of the overall work, Fenton reported that the General Committee was responsible for "the general objectives and values that should govern curriculum making" (p. 91).

The six subject committees had three primary responsibilities, according to Fenton (1926). First, each subject committee was "to become familiar with with the best educational practice in its particular field, using every available means to this end" (p. 91). A second responsibility of the subject committees was to define educational objectives, prioritize these objectives, and assign them to particular grade levels. Finally, the subject committees, in cooperation with principals and other teachers, was responsible for proposing revisions and suggesting "standards of accomplishment" (p. 91) concerning the course of study.

Grabo (1926), a superintendent, presented the plan for teacher participation for the Oak Ridge public school system in Royal Oak, Michigan. The philosophical foundation for teacher participation centered on democratic practice. He was critical of attempts at democratic practice which were more show than substance:

these shows of democracy and pretended representation have only made the teacher more bitterly aware of the administrative rod. Teachers who slavishly carry out the course of study are expected to develop initiative in pupils; teachers who are held in fear of a yearly rating are accountable for a sympathetic evolution of pupils' work. (p. 300)

The vision of public schools as the institutions which were to introduce, teach and model democratic ideals was dependent on teachers to act as role models. Grabo questioned whether teachers could model democratic practice when many schools were operated in an autocratic fashion or

even in a superficially democratic fashion. He asserted that democratic practice had to go beyond rhetoric and superficial exercises. He pointed out that administrators were beginning to understand the importance of teachers participating in a real rather than a superficial manner.

The Oak Ridge plan was presented as an attempt to involve teachers in more than a superficial manner. Grabo (1926) stated that "for the teacher an ideal school must allow her full control of instruction and participation in institutional administration" (p. 301). The primary way in which teachers participated was through curriculum and instruction. Grabo asserted that "the teacher should be the court of appeal for all questions of curriculum" (p. 301). In this vein, Grabo stated that "our teachers write a course of study that justifies itself upon a basis of life activity" (p. 301).

Grabo (1926) provided no specific detail about how the faculty was organized for curriculum work except to say that the teachers worked as "a committee of the whole" (p. 301). This implied that either one committee representative of all teachers in the system or one committee made up of all teachers conducted the work on the course of study. Grabo categorized curriculum work under the heading "General Activities For All Teachers" (p. 302). Perhaps the faculty of the school system was small enough that work on the curriculum could be conducted most effectively in one of these ways. Grabo did not make this clear.

There were other activities which came under the heading of "General Activities For All Teachers" which included curriculum and instruction. This "committee of the whole" was responsible for training new teachers. Two training activities were suggested: duties as a classroom teacher and as a member of a committee. The "committee of the whole" was responsible for providing demonstration lessons. Two half days were provided each year for this committee to visit other schools. The committee was responsible for an exchange of teacher lesson plans. Each member of the committee had to conduct one teachers' meeting during the year. There was a variety of other activities listed by Grabo (1926).

In addition, the Oak Ridge plan presented opportunities for teacher participation in related areas. Seven teacher committees were organized around what Grabo (1926) termed "centers of teaching" (p. 301): health, home life, citizenship, vocational, school life, religious, leisure/recreation. The average number of committee members was three with a range of two members, on the school life and religious committees, to six members on the leisure committee. While membership on the committees was small, again suggestive of a small school system, teachers represented approximately 40% of the total membership of the committees. Other members of the committees came from administration and community groups. Grabo did not make it

explicit, but suggested that teachers chaired each committee.

These committees were involved in a variety of activities which included administrative tasks. For example, the health committee's "special activities and interests" included "building sanitation, heating, lighting, seating for defects, lunch room" (Grabo, 1926, p. 302). The school life committee's responsibilities included "teacher rating records" (p. 302). No "special activities and interests" directly related to curriculum and instruction were assigned to these committees.

A description of the philosophy, function, and purpose of the Cooperative Plan of Curriculum Revision detailed in the fourth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (1926) has already been discussed. While it was not clear if all of the participants in the Cooperative Plan of Curriculum Revision involved teachers in curriculum revision, many of the schools and systems (e.g., Boston, Cincinnati, Denver, Highland Park, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Oakland) which had previously reported their efforts to include teachers in curriculum revision were participants in the Cooperative Plan. Additionally, in Chapter III, entitled "How City, County, and State School Systems are Attacking the Problem of Curriculum Revision," the various approaches at curriculum revision of representative school systems were reported. Many reported teacher involvement in the work. For example, in the section on sources of

leadership for curriculum revision, several school systems reported teacher participation in the revisions.

In Bridgeton, New Jersey, the superintendent of schools initiated the program of curriculum revision by organizing committees of teachers. Each committee had for its adviser either a state supervisor, normal school, or university instructor. Two teachers were sent to a summer school, offering special work on the course in social studies, since that subject was to be introduced into the seventh and eighth grades of the Bridgeton schools on a new basis. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 29)

In Lynn, Massachusetts, it was reported that

committees of teachers varying in number from five to twelve were appointed to work under the general direction of their supervising heads. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 29)

The Department of Superintendence (1926) reported that committees of teachers in Johnston, Rhode Island, had been responsible for curriculum revision in prior years.

This year, a teachers' council, composed of a teacher from each grade and school building in the system has been organized. Through this council, the superintendent of schools carries on a curriculum revision program which he directly supervises. (p. 29)

Another example was reported from Shorewood, Wisconsin:

the heads of departments, English, mathematics, Music, etc. have one period set aside every day for supervisory purposes of all the work in the grades and high school, in each particular branch. These heads have committees of eight teachers working with them for the elementary school and also a committee for the junior-senior high school. The director of research and guidance consults with all committees and checks up their outlines. This organization works along through the year, doing as much as it can. At the close of each year the entire teaching force works for two weeks, checking on the difficulties of the year, and revising the work for the ensuing year in the light of past experiences. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 30)

Teachers in Baltimore, Maryland, participated in curriculum

work:

. . . local committees, composed of classroom teachers, heads of departments, and supervisors prepared tentative outlines. During the time that these preliminary courses of study were being tried in the classroom, the committees continued their work. An outside expert was secured, and with the cooperation of these adviser the committees revised the preliminary courses of study. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 30)

In the section of Chapter III which reported how committee members were selected (Department of Superintendence, 1926), additional examples of teacher participation in curriculum revision were reported. For example, "in Pueblo, Colorado, the majority of the committees are nominated by the teachers' association of the city, with the approval of the superintendent" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p.

32). In another example reported from Lawrence, Kansas,

the superintendent's office appointed subject committees, composed of outstanding teachers in the system. Committees functioned in such a way that they secured or tried to secure any contribution that any member of the staff could make. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 33)

While this section focused on how committee members were selected, it does speak to the fact that teachers were being selected to participate in curriculum revision.

Cities involved in the Cooperative Plan used a variety of techniques to prepare teachers for the work of curriculum revision:

In Pueblo, Colorado, committees composed of classroom teachers, under the direction of the superintendent of schools, carried on a course of reading, covering the research that had already been done in their respective subjects. These committees met regularly once a month for a year. At the end of that time, they submitted

preliminary reports. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 33)

In Millville, New Jersey, faculty committees were appointed with principals as chairmen. Each committee met over a period of a year once a month, usually in the evening. These meetings lasted for two or two and a half hours. Bibliographies of available curricular materials were furnished each committee. Members of the State Department of Education and experts in curricular activities of state normal schools and universities of Pennsylvania were consulted. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 33)

In the discussion of the preliminary work for curriculum revision conducted with teachers, it was noted that particular attention had been given to systems that did not have the financial resources available to larger school systems.

Another important facet of the procedures outlined in the fourth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (1926) was the provision of adequate resources for curriculum revision: "Good library facilities are essential to the success of a curriculum revision program" (p. 36). The primary purpose for providing resources was to aid the work of the committees which, as the Commission on the Curriculum suggested, were to be composed of teachers, principals, and supervisors:

There is probably no easier way to give teachers and principals the right background and a flexible mental attitude in approaching the problem of curriculum revision than by making easily accessible some of the best materials already in print. (p. 36)

A major concern which had been expressed by critics of teacher participation in curriculum work was the lack of knowledge and experience. At least part of the concern

could be addressed by providing adequate and easily accessible resources.

Examples of what member school systems of the Cooperative Plan on Curriculum Revision were doing to provide adequate resources were provided. For example, the Houston school system provided the staffs of all schools with

mimeographed copies of entire chapters or divisions of books or articles appearing in educational journals, representing significant points of view on curriculum construction. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 36)

In other examples, the Pueblo, Colorado, school system provided a resource file at the central office of "available material on the curriculum together with various courses of study from other cities for the use of course of study committees" (p. 36). The Melrose, Massachusetts, school system "purchased sufficient copies of the latest and most outstanding books on curriculum construction" (p. 36) to provide each school with a set. The Dayton, Ohio, school system provided resources on curriculum revision through the local public library.

Other measures to provide teachers with knowledge concerning curriculum revision had been taken by member systems of the Cooperative Plan for Curriculum Revision. In addition to public school systems being members of the Cooperative Plan for Curriculum Revision, approximately thirty colleges, universities, and normal schools were members. In addition to providing resources and expertise,

these member educational institutions provided teacher training. Not coincidentally, some of the same colleges and universities which served school systems that were members of the Cooperative Plan for Curriculum Revision were also members of the Cooperative Plan. Universities and colleges which were members of the Cooperative Plan included University of Alabama, University of California, Yale University, University of Chicago, State University of Iowa, Boston University, University of Nebraska, Dartmouth College, New York University, Teachers College of Columbia University, University of Oklahoma, and University of Pennsylvania.

Several examples of cooperative efforts between local public school systems and higher educational institutions to provide teacher training in curriculum revision were cited. The school superintendent of Canon City, Colorado reported that

the first thing we did in our program of curriculum revision was to study the question generally. We had as our leader a member of the faculty of the State Teachers College, and one from the Extension Department of the State University (Department of Superintendence, 1936, p. 38).

In this example, university faculty were brought in to conduct the preliminary curriculum work with the teachers of the school system.

In an example of several school systems pooling their resources to train teachers, three neighboring cities, Erie and Warren, Pennsylvania, and Dunkirk, New York, worked out an agreement with New York University to have a professor

from the School of Education conduct courses on curriculum revision with their teachers. Twenty-four teachers from grades kindergarten through seven from Warren, Pennsylvania, were involved. During the course work, these teachers met in grade groups with their respective chairpersons, the curriculum specialist, and the superintendent "to consider the application of the work to the various grades and departments" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 39). The superintendent of the Warren schools also reported that "cooperation with the towns of Dunkirk and Erie implies the exchange of teachers for observation, demonstration, and consultation purposes" (p. 39). In Erie, Pennsylvania, sixty teachers participated in the course work. The superintendent of the Erie schools reported that

it is our plan to have these sixty trained teachers head committees of teachers, representing the various branches, to work out those things which should be in well-balanced courses of study and eliminate all items which are not essential and have no local application. (p. 39)

Not only were teachers participating as members of various committees, but they were being trained to chair these committees.

Provisions were being made to give teachers the opportunity to review tentative course outlines. For example, in the Ashland, Kentucky, school system

course of study committees, composed of teachers and principals, formulate and mimeograph tentative plans concerning the work of each subject and place these in the hands of those who are teaching the subjects, asking them to give all the suggestions they can for improvements. On the basis of these suggestions we make our first revision. This process is continued

until we have built up what we think is an appropriate course. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 37)

It was suggested that submitting the tentative course of study to teachers for their suggestions was a common practice among participants in the Cooperative Plan. A typical curriculum revision process would have the tentative course of study reviewed by the superintendent and then "mimeographed and placed in the hands of the teachers for experimental use for a year" (p. 37). During this trial period, the committees would continue their work "by modifying, adding to, and eliminating topics suggested by the teaching corps" (p. 37).

Case studies of curriculum revision by representative members of the Cooperative Plan were provided. The program in Oakland, California, has already been reported on in detail. The program of curriculum revision in Darby, Pennsylvania, was cited as an example of a small city program. The curriculum revision program in Darby began with all teachers spending two hours per week in preliminary meetings. The superintendent reported that forty-five minutes of the two hours was deducted from school time while the remaining time was spent after school. As would be expected, most teachers devoted additional time.

The superintendent of the Darby schools reported the procedures followed in their curriculum revision program. All the teachers of Darby were first given "a list of abilities developed by Bobbitt and the teachers of Los Angeles" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 41). The

superintendent, then, introduced the project. Ten teacher committees were created "to study Bobbitt's ten classes of abilities" (p. 41). The task of the committees was to make a similar study of the community of Darby and create "a list of the abilities required by the people of Darby" (p. 41). Once the list of abilities for Darby were compiled, the list was reduced to "working units" (p. 41).

Teachers were next organized into nine subject area committees: "English, mathematics, languages, primary music, art, social studies, science, community mechanics, and commercial training" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 42). The subject area committees were responsible for developing the general aims, or goals, for each subject. These subject area aims were, then, "reduced to working units" (p. 42). Teachers, next, compared the "working-unit aims" to the "working-unit abilities" developed earlier (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 42). The purpose of the comparison was to match the aims with the abilities. Teachers compared abilities with subject aims by noting whether a major, a minor, or no contribution was made toward achieving the ability by a specific subject aim. The results of this analysis were distributed to teachers to provide perspective on "what subject was likely to duplicate work of another, and what useful abilities were not being developed through any group of subjects then in use" (p. 42). Finally, the teachers were organized into subject committees with sub-committees representing each of the

grades. The subject area committees' primary responsibilities were to select methods and appropriate resources for each educational aim. Each subject committee was advised by a subject area specialist.

Another case history of curriculum revision was offered for the Dayton, Ohio, school system which probably would have been considered a large system since it served a population over 100,000. The curriculum revision program for the Dayton schools focused on the subjects in grades one through four. Thirty-five teachers were selected by the elementary supervisor based on the type and amount of professional training of each teacher. A general meeting was held to provide an overview of the tentative educational aims and procedures for revising the course of study. Those people in attendance- one hundred and forty people were invited- divided into four groups representing each of the four grades being considered. The grade groups were then divided into subject areas based on areas of interest.

Four subject area sub-committees were organized within each grade committee: social studies, arithmetic, reading, and English composition. The grade committees and subject area sub-committees began their work by gathering resources related to the subjects being studied. Each subject area sub-committee met at least once a week. Once a tentative report from a subject area sub-committee was prepared, the sub-committee presented the report to the entire grade committee.

Correlation was provided in several ways. First, each grade group met periodically with other grades, i.e., "the first grade group met with the second grade group; the second grade group met with the third grade group" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 43) and so on. Second, the superintendent called a meeting, at the request of the grade committee chairs and suggestion of the subject-area sub-committees,

of all subject committees together with the supervisors of special subjects. The superintendent presided at this meeting, in which teachers freely expressed their views as to how the subjects of the first four grades could be better correlated. (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 43)

Emphasis on correlation of subject areas continued during the next year.

Once tentative courses of study were developed, they were submitted to the appropriate supervisors. The supervisors were responsible for editing the tentative courses of study. As editing was completed, the tentative courses of study were mimeographed. Copies were distributed to all teachers teaching that particular subject.

The tentative courses of study went through a trial period in all of the elementary schools in Dayton. While the preliminary courses were being tested, the grade committees and subject area sub-committees met to discuss possible changes. Revisions which were agreed upon were made to the courses of study. All teachers in grades one through four, then, were provided the opportunity to discuss the revised courses of study. All revised courses of study

were unanimously approved. Demonstration lessons were conducted for all teachers "so that every teacher got an idea of what the curriculum revision committees were working toward" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 43). The superintendent of the Dayton schools reported that "the revised copy of the course of study was unanimously accepted by the entire teaching corps of grades one to four" (p. 43).

Curriculum revision was also conducted separately for the fifth through eighth grades in the Dayton schools. The process was similar to those for grades one through four. Four grade committees of twenty-five members each were formed. Each grade committee was then divided into three subject area sub-committees: social studies, mathematics, and language. Three additional committees, the compiling committees, were formed to coordinate correlation of subjects. The subject area sub-committees each met as a group to discuss revision for their particular subjects with curriculum specialists. Six classroom teachers, who had not worked with any of the committees up until this time, were appointed by the superintendent to a committee responsible for editing the preliminary courses of study. Once the preliminary courses of study were edited, mimeographed copies were distributed to teachers in every grade teaching that particular subject.

While the preliminary courses of study were going through their trial period, the subject area sub-committees "began work on formulating tests for testing subject matter

in new courses of study. These tests were modeled after standardized tests" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 45). Once the compiling committees had reviewed the tests, they were printed and distributed to teachers. Subject area sub-committees also printed instructions for diagnostic testing of students. Classroom teachers conducted and scored the diagnostic tests. A summary and analysis of the results of the diagnostic testing were presented to the teachers for them to consider in relation to the preliminary courses of study. Recommended changes were made based on the discussion. Another series of tests was given to further refine the tentative courses of study.

The Commission on the Curriculum contended that state departments of education could play an important role in curriculum revision in local schools. The role of state departments depended on four factors:

- (1) whether or not trained superintendents and supervisors are employed throughout the state;
 - (2) training and experience of majority of teachers in the state;
 - (3) the degree to which counties and towns have progressed in developing local courses of study, and
 - (4) resources of state office in staff and equipment.
- (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 47)

The second factor was also an acknowledgment that teachers had a role to play in curriculum work.

Several examples of state participation in the revision of local courses of study and the role of local teachers were provided. The first example cited was from the state of Maryland. State Superintendent Cook (Department of Superintendence, 1926) contended that because "a state

department of education has no laboratory to test out a course of study . . . there should not be a state course" (p. 47). The state department's role, in Cook's perspective, was to "set up certain goals against which local units . . . may check their own courses of study" (p. 47).

According to the Commission on the Curriculum, the state of Maryland public educational system was centered around "a well-developed county unit system with forty-seven supervising teachers- from one to six in each county" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 47). Two-thirds of the supervisors salaries were paid by the state of Maryland. This apparently provided a higher level of state control over supervision and the monitoring of state goals. Supervision was viewed as one way in which equalization of educational opportunity could be provided all schools in the state.

Supervision also provided a means for state involvement in the construction of courses of study. Superintendent Cook asserted that "the making of the course of study is the most important instrument of supervision. We do not want a state course of study in Maryland; but we do want twenty-three county courses" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 47). The state facilitated at least three conferences on curriculum revision for superintendents and supervisors. Additionally, one of the state goals concerning curriculum revision was that each county would have at least four

meetings during the year. A portion of the time of each meeting was to be devoted to curriculum matters.

The state departments' goals in the subject areas were formulated by soliciting "the best course of study material from the best practice in the state" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 47). These materials were modified to allow use by all systems in the state. These tentative goals were submitted to the counties for critique after which suggested revisions were made to the goals. These goals were intended to provide counties a guide as they conducted their curriculum revision efforts.

Baltimore County, in Maryland, provided an example of how curriculum revision worked in this scheme. In preparation for curriculum revision, "age-grade progress surveys and the testing of every child . . . in reading and arithmetic" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 49) were conducted. Once the results were compiled, the county supervisors organized meetings with all elementary teachers. Teachers were given questions prior to these meetings to facilitate discussion. For suburban teachers:

What two or three subjects in our course of study give you the least help in your teaching? Select one of these subjects and outline briefly in written form:

1. How the subject fails to help you.
2. Your suggestions as to how this subject might be revised in order that it may be more helpful to you. (p. 49)

For rural teachers:

1. What is the teacher's responsibility in the revision of a course of study?
2. What three subjects in our curriculum have been given sufficient thought to justify selection for

- immediate detailed revision?
3. What definite suggestions do you offer regarding:
(a) Procedure for revision, (b) modification of content, and (c) activities as factors in the curriculum? (p. 49)

The responses of teachers were compiled by supervisors. Materials concerning curriculum revision that supervisors received at state conferences were mimeographed and distributed to teachers.

Committees of teachers were organized to conduct the revision of the elementary courses in reading and arithmetic. A group of seventeen teachers were selected to work with the six supervisors in developing a tentative outline. This outline was created on the basis of the suggestions for revisions collected from classroom teachers. Additionally, seven course of study committees, representing each of the first seven elementary grades, were created. Three teachers from each of these grades and every elementary school in the county were appointed to the committees. The committees worked on revising one subject (i.e., reading or arithmetic) at a time.

The six supervisors organized tentative materials and procedures to be used with the course outlines. Cook reported that "every teacher was asked to test out this material and make suggestions for its improvement" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 50). Grade meetings were held to discuss the tentative course outlines, materials, and procedures. Cook noted that "teachers told what topics in the tentative course they desired to have

left in, which ones they wanted taken out. They also suggested additional topics" (p. 50). The result of this cooperative work, according to the Commission on the Curriculum, was "a course of study in reading and arithmetic in which each of the 350 teachers of Baltimore sees the best of his own thinking reflected" (Department of Superintendence, 1926, p. 50).

The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1926) contained several notable examples of teacher participation in curriculum work. The Denver and Los Angeles curriculum revision programs in which large numbers of teachers participated have already been reported. Curtis (1926), an educational consultant for the Detroit public schools, described the program for curriculum-construction in Detroit. In a four-year period, 1921-1925, courses of study had been revised and published in 12 subject areas: English, spelling, arithmetic, social science, geography, art, music, health, nature study, vocational subjects, speech improvement, and code of morals. The system of cooperation was unique, according to Curtis, "not in its organization, but in the way it makes possible the participation of the entire system in actual curriculum-construction" (p. 199).

The revision of the spelling curriculum provided a typical example. While Curtis (1926) described six phases in the process, he pointed out that "no one actual course has exhibited all of the phases to be described" (p. 199).

The definition of the curricular problem constituted the first phase of curriculum revision in Detroit. In the example, a survey of the school system revealed a significant problem in spelling performance. Criticisms of the present course of study in spelling and suggestions for its improvement were solicited from the teaching staff. All the input which was received would be compiled and analyzed by the department of instruction. An examination of effective practices and experimental studies related to spelling in other cities would be conducted.

Teachers recognized as the most effective in spelling instruction were selected to form a committee which was chaired by the supervisor of spelling. The data which had been collected, i.e., criticisms of and suggestions for spelling curriculum and the survey of practices in other cities, was be turned over to the committee for their consideration. The committee continued to study the problem "until the major aspects of the problem had been clearly determined and formulated" (Curtis, 1926, p. 200). Once the committee had completed its work, the results were presented "to the supervisory council, and to those members of the [Detroit] Teachers College faculty interested in spelling, for confirmation and refinement" (p. 200). Curtis stated that once the final product was presented to the superintendent, it was "the joint product of all the educational forces of the city" (p. 200).

The second phase of curriculum revision in Detroit, according to Curtis (1926), was "experimental solution" (p. 200). Two problems were identified with the instructional program in spelling: "(1) lack of adaptation of words to grade and ability levels, and (2) lack of adjustment of methods of teaching to individual needs" (p. 200). After the plans and estimated costs had been submitted to the superintendent for consideration and approval, several schools were selected "to be put under the direction of the supervisor for spelling for experimental purposes" (p. 200).

The third phase of curriculum revision was "active experimentation" (Curtis, 1926, p. 200). The selected schools conducted experiments in spelling instruction under the supervision of the spelling supervisor. At the same time, other teacher committees collected, "the facts in regard to children's needs, differentiated in terms of age, grade, sex, intelligence, and social status" (p. 201). The results of their study were used to produce differentiated courses of study in spelling.

Actual construction of the course of study in spelling constituted the fourth phase of curriculum revision in Detroit. Curtis (1926) reported that new

committees would be formed and begin their labors of experimentation and trial. This time the emphasis would be upon preparing the materials and methods in the form best adapted to use in the city schools. (p. 201)

These committees were responsible for the creation of the tentative course of study in spelling.

The fifth phase involved the revision of the tentative course of study in spelling. A review period was provided for administrative and teacher review of the proposed course of study. The tentative course was distributed so that "every teacher in the system had inspected, studied, tried, and otherwise satisfied herself as to the possibilities or defects of the new plan" (Courtis, 1926, p. 201). At the end of the review period, suggestions and criticisms "from those who must do the actual work of teaching" (p. 201) were presented for consideration. Valid criticisms and suggestions were incorporated and the revised course of study submitted again for review. All objections were eventually addressed, according to Courtis.

The sixth phase involved the "training of administrative officers" (Courtis, 1926, p. 201). Principals who were convinced that the new course of study in spelling was an improvement were asked "to volunteer to try it out on a practical basis" (p. 201) in their schools. The spelling supervisor assisted the volunteer schools in preparation and training. Once the difficulties in the new course of study were worked out in the volunteer schools, the new course was adopted city-wide. Courtis noted that the result of the curriculum revision program at Detroit that was

of most worth is the stimulating effects upon the professional attitudes and activities of the rank and file of the teaching corps, and the resulting transformation for the better in the benefits received by children from their educational efforts. (p. 206)

Ultimately, teacher participation in curriculum development had to benefit the students through improved instruction and student performance.

One particularly advantageous and unique feature of the Detroit school system was the existence of the Detroit Teachers College. Curtis (1926) reported that the college "was created to provide training of new teachers and for the continued training of teachers in service" (p. 196). What the Teachers College enabled the Detroit school system to do was "to provide the city with a nucleus of teachers familiar with the ideals expressed in the new curricula and skilled in putting them into effect" (p. 196). New teachers, especially, could enter teaching in the Detroit school system already familiar with the curriculum being used. The Teachers College provided two services, in particular, related to curriculum construction for in-service teachers. As new courses of study were introduced, training could be provided for in-service teachers by staff who were knowledgeable about specifics of the new courses of study. In addition, the Detroit Teachers College provided a unique solution to the issue of in-service teachers being released to conduct curriculum work. The Teachers College enabled the Detroit school system to release "able teachers for work on committees . . . by the sending of teachers-in-training into the schools as substitutes for six-week intervals" (p. 198).

The Detroit Teachers College provided other advantages related to curricular and instructional improvement in the Detroit school system, according to Courtis (1926):

- (1) The orientation and assistance of all new teachers during their first year in the city. . . .
- (3) The intensive training, in special classes and for short periods, of teachers released from regular work on full pay for observation and instruction.
- (4) Part-time supervision and participation in curriculum-construction activities by Teachers College faculty members as assistants to supervisors. . . .
- (6) Special demonstration and observation lessons in practice schools and experimental schools. (p. 198)

The Detroit Teachers College provided the school system with a way to increase the effectiveness of new courses of study beyond participation in its development. The Teachers College provided the opportunity for teachers and principals to increase their skills and knowledge concerning methods and materials related to the revised curriculum.

The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1926) provided another example of public school teacher participation in curriculum work. Sipple (1926), the former superintendent in Burlington, Iowa, described the curriculum work in the Burlington schools. While Sipple's primary purpose was to describe the unit-activity curriculum, the discussion of how this was achieved included teacher participation. In his introduction, Sipple noted that for two years the elementary principals, supervisors, and teachers had worked on creating an instructional plan "that would place the more vital aims of the school in a commanding position" (p. 207). Sipple

stated that "we had taken the first important steps toward a cooperative solution to our problem" by achieving "a place of mutual confidence" and agreeing "upon fundamental educational beliefs"(p. 207). The elementary staff had taken two years in the preliminary work of curriculum construction to arrive at "a common point of view, including a formulation of the object of our search" (p. 207).

Sipple (1926) asserted that "the test of a curriculum, or of any other part of the school machinery, is the effect in the classroom" (p. 208). He thought the present curriculum to be unsatisfactory primarily because of the limitations imposed by a rigid time schedule, especially allotting a specific amount of time to the teaching of various subjects, and disjointed subjects. As time passed, the curriculum had become more disjointed as "'important facts' in various bits of subject matter" (p. 208) were continuously added while nothing was removed. These concerns posed a dilemma for teachers who

were asked to do all these worthy things and to continue with the old-line school subjects still in an important place in the program. She is asked to use developmental methods of teaching. But such methods require opportunity for children to investigate, to think, to express themselves, to develop their own individualities. She has the right to ask: 'How can I stick to a set program, have children do tasks in books on a schedule, and still meet the demands of progressive teaching?' (p. 209)

Additionally, teachers were expected to be subject-matter specialists but little emphasis was being placed on knowing about the learners themselves.

The whole apparent demand on the teacher is in terms of dissected out subjects. She has before her at all times the task of teaching geography, history, arithmetic. There is nothing to challenge her to find out what is happening to the children as human beings. She is asked to think in terms of school subjects. Her pupils are tested in their ability as subject learners. Such a teacher is encouraged to become a subject-matter specialist, rather than a specialist in human values. Specialists are needed But they are not needed as teachers of children. (Sipple, 1926, pp. 209-210)

While these concerns were not only curricular issues, Sipple believed that revision of the existing curriculum might begin to address some of these concerns.

Sipple's (1926) perspective suggested just how intimately teachers were connected to curricular and instructional issues. This connection between the curriculum and teachers required teachers to be involved in its development and required that they have wide latitude over its use with students. One of the characteristics of the organization of the Burlington curriculum, according to Sipple, was that

it gives milestones of progress. Teachers are not asked to build their own curriculum without guidance, yet they are given wide leeway so long as they keep their main objectives in view. (p. 210)

The Burlington curriculum was revised so that the subject areas were built around thematic units and was influenced by Kilpatrick's concept of the project method (see Kilpatrick, 1918). Sipple concluded that the curriculum plan created for the Burlington school system "demands a continuously growing curriculum, with administrator, supervisors, teachers, and pupils contributing toward its development" (p. 217).

The St. Louis program of curriculum revision presented another example of teacher participation in curriculum work. Cocking (1926) was appointed to be director of the program of curriculum revision, which began in the spring of 1924, for the St. Louis public school system. Cocking reported that there were three steps in the St. Louis curriculum revision program:

- (1) the setting up of the aims and objectives of the school system as a whole and for the divisions of the system in particular and the determining of a program of studies and time-allotment to be followed in achieving these aims; (2) the determination of content in the various programs of study looking toward the attainment of the accepted aims and objectives; and, (3) the installation of the revised curriculum in the various grades and divisions of the school system. (p. 241)

These three fundamental steps (i.e., determination of the goals and objectives, the determination of the content of the subject matter, and the installation of the curriculum) were common to many curriculum revision programs during the first half of the twentieth century.

Cocking (1926) reported that the first step, the determination of aims, programs of study, and time allotments, was begun in September of 1925. The Committee on the General Aims of Public Education was created to address this task. The membership of this committee was composed of a kindergarten-primary principal, an elementary principal, an intermediate principal, and a high school principal. Once the general aims of the school system had been developed, eight more school principals, two from each of the four divisions, were appointed to the Committee on

the General Aims. Their responsibility was now to formulate specific aims for each of the school divisions, i.e., kindergarten-primary, elementary, intermediate, and high school. A review committee of fifty principals was formed to examine the specific aims once these were formulated. The aims were revised based on the critique of the review committee. The revised aims were then presented to all principals, supervisors, and teachers in the St. Louis schools.

Cocking (1926) noted that "the committees felt that it was especially desirable to obtain from classroom teachers thoughtful and constructive suggestions," so a general meeting of all teachers in the system was held "for the purpose of explaining the curriculum program to the teaching body and requesting that teachers examine carefully the tentative report" (p. 243). Copies of the tentative educational aims were distributed at this meeting. The tentative educational aims were discussed in school faculty meetings. The suggestions and criticisms expressed by teachers were incorporated into the tentative aims. "Thus," Cocking pointed out, "the statement of aims was subjected to continual revision in the light of opinions expressed by teachers, principals, and supervisors" (p. 244).

The second part of the first phase of curriculum revision in St. Louis involved "the determination of the program of studies- or the offerings of the several divisions of the school system" (Cocking, 1926, p. 244).

The four sub-committees, each composed of three principals from each of the four school divisions, identified the subject offerings to be taught at each level. A subject was considered for inclusion in the program of studies, according to Cocking, "only when the subject could prove its usefulness in the attainment of the aims previously set up" (p. 244). As with the tentative aims, the tentative program of studies was submitted to teachers, principals, and supervisors for their consideration. The proposed program of studies was revised according to the criticisms and suggestions they received. Cocking pointed out that the first step of curriculum revision had been "largely administrative in character" (p. 244).

The second step of the program of curriculum revision in St. Louis involved the determination of the actual content of the program of studies. Cocking (1926) reported that "it was decided that this was the job of the classroom teacher, since the work obviously required a close and intimate knowledge of pupils and pupil activities" (p. 245). Teachers were selected for the committees based on

the kind and amount of training that each teacher had had, what major and minor subjects in college, the number of hours work in educational courses, and the years experience, together with the recommendation of his principal for specific units of work. (p. 245)

The committees were organized according to grade and subject. Three teachers were appointed to each committee with one of these teachers elected as chair. Cocking

reported that there were 147 grade subject committees in operation.

By board of education mandate, the chairs of these committees were released from all other duties so that they could devote their full attention to curriculum work. A "training school" (Cocking, 1926, p. 246) for curriculum revision was organized, under the tutelage of Cocking, for the chairs of the grade subject committees. The training agenda included discussion of curriculum-technique and a standard method of procedure for the grade subject committees. Once this was done, committee chairs began assembling bibliographies related to their particular subjects. These bibliographies were composed of

books, pamphlets, magazines, bulletins of various kinds, courses of study which are in operation in other cities, and available reports of research in the subject. (p. 246)

The chairs also conducted research in the St. Louis schools to assist in deciding on the content to be included. A research specialist was assigned to assist the chairs in conducting their research.

Cocking (1926) asserted that "one of the most important steps in the development of the program was the securing of an adequate library" (p. 246). The grade subject committees had numerous resources at their disposal. The St. Louis board of education maintained a regular teachers' library. Cocking noted that

as other materials are discovered which may prove of use to the curriculum committees, they are purchased by

the board of education and added to the teachers' library. . . . (p. 246)

The St. Louis Public Library maintained a teachers' section which proved useful to the teachers' committees. "A daily delivery" (p. 246) of materials had even been arranged from the public library to a central location for easy access by these committees. Cocking reported that "the Mercantile Library, a large private library in the city, has generously assisted in supplying materials for study" (p. 247). Other libraries, including the Washington University library, offered their facilities and resources. Cocking noted that two especially useful resources offered by these libraries were unpublished theses related to curriculum issues and courses of study published since 1920.

Once the teachers' committees had developed the tentative content for the program of studies, their work was submitted to all of the teachers of the school system for their critique. The committees' work was revised based on the suggestions submitted by teachers. The teachers' committees then consulted with educational specialists for further suggestions. Once the final revisions were made, the proposed content was published in loose-leaf form.

The following year was the trial year in St. Louis for the proposed courses of study. While the courses of study were being tried out in classrooms, the teachers' committees continued to meet "to consider the difficulties encountered and the constructive criticism" (Cocking, 1926, p. 247) that

the committees received during the trial year. Further modifications were made based on the additional suggestions.

Bersch (1927), a supervising teacher for Anne Arundel County, Maryland, school system, reported on the development of a course of study in English in which teachers participated. This article was an excerpt from a report filed by Bersch to the Maryland state superintendent of education Albert S. Cook. The report was not intended to detail curriculum work but the performance of supervisory duties. The work of teachers of the Maryland school systems, particularly Baltimore County, in curriculum development was also reported by the Department of Superintendence (1926). Bersch indicated that the scope of the work was to include all teachers in the Anne Arundel County school system.

Bersch (1927) noted several obstacles that had to be overcome in preparing the English curriculum. One was teacher preparation. About eighty-five percent of the teachers in Anne Arundel County had received teacher training in a normal school, college, or university, according to Bersch. Fifteen percent of the teaching staff had second and third grade certification. While none of the teachers had any experience in curriculum work all were familiar with the Baltimore County Course of Study since that was the curriculum being used in Anne Arundel County.

There were other obstacles which had to be addressed. Anne Arundel County covered a large geographic area. There

were twenty-four one teacher schools, twelve two teachers schools and fifteen graded schools spread across the county (Bersch, 1927, p. 382). Getting teachers together for discussion and cooperative work would be difficult. Disseminating information and receiving responses in a timely fashion would be difficult. Bersch reported that "practically every teacher carried a heavy teaching load . . . had little time to spend recording ideas for a course of study" (p. 382). Adding to the problems of geographic area and time, committee work would have to be done after school. Because of these problems, Bersch notified the state superintendent that "only a minimum [English course of study] could be hoped for" (p. 382).

There were some "positive factors looking toward success" (Bersch, 1927, p. 382). Bersch reported that teachers were questioning the curriculum being used by the school system: "Experienced, good teachers were found 'wondering why we had always had to use somebody else's course of study'" (p. 382). This suggested that some teachers might be interested in developing courses of study for use in the school system. Bersch noted that "the question of undertaking the work was left with the teachers and, by their unanimous vote, adopted" (p. 382).

Once the teachers of the school system had given their endorsement, Bersch (1927) organized the teachers into committees. Teachers were given their choice of subject areas (e.g., arithmetic, geography, or language) and grade

in which to work. The teachers were grouped according to their expressed preferences. Since English was to be the first course of study developed in the school system, the procedures Bersch described from this point related to the work on the English course of study. The general committee for the course of study in English was composed of the chairs of the three sub-committees (i.e., grammar, intermediate, and primary) and Bersch, as chair of the general committee. The subcommittees were chaired by teachers and composed of one representative from each grade in that particular school division. Bersch reported that seventy-six teachers participated in the curriculum work.

Bersch (1927) outlined the expectations for teachers involved in the curriculum work. Teachers were provided "uniform blanks for reporting" (p. 383) and asked to report the following four times during the year:

- Language goals attained within the period.
- Sources of language materials used.
- Activities of children requiring the use of language.
- Composition topics actually enjoyed by children.
- Language errors characteristic of grades. (p. 383)

Additionally, teachers were expected to conduct periodic diagnostic testing, contribute exemplary lesson plans, submit useful teacher-constructed tests, provide useful materials and resources, and analyze test data. All of this information was collected and compiled by the sub-committees. The sub-committee chairs were charged with the responsibility for seeing "that every teacher contributes something" and to "investigate failures to do so" (p. 384).

The sub-committee chairs were also responsible for planning "for a series of group teachers' meetings to be held during the year to unify and strengthen the committee work" (Bersch, 1927, p. 384). Four group teachers' meetings were held during the year. Each meeting lasted over the course of several days. Bersch included the general agendas for each set of meetings. In the November meetings, teachers discussed the need for a course of study; observed, analyzed, and discussed demonstration lessons; set goals; and, discussed the "problems involved in making our course of study and the plan of action" (p. 384). During the January meetings, the teachers' groups assessed the progress of the work to date. During the March meetings, various committees presented reports, these reports were discussed, and the "final selection of materials" was made (p. 384). The fourth series of meetings was canceled due to "unusual and unforeseen" circumstances which Bersch did not explain.

Proctor (1927), professor of education at Stanford University and consultant to the San Francisco school system, described curriculum revision in San Francisco's secondary schools. Proctor asserted that there were three methods in which to conduct curriculum revision in a school system:

One is to hire a full time director, release a considerable number of teachers from classroom duties, and an additional number from a part of their school work, and proceed to the task of revising the curriculum in an intensive, large scale manner. Another method is secure a full-time curriculum expert

from the outside, have him come into the system for a period from three to six months, put over a rush-order campaign and have the job all done and ready for the printer in less than a year. (p. 297)

The San Francisco school system used the third method of curriculum construction for which Proctor would eventually serve as a consultant. The first phase, which began in 1925, consisted of forty high school teachers participating in a university extension course, taught by Proctor, on curriculum revision in high schools. Proctor reported that "a beginning was made, in seven or eight subjects, of a course of study revision" (p. 298).

In 1926, under the guidance of Proctor, committees were formed to begin the work of curriculum revision. Proctor (1927) reported that

ten subject matter committees, and three committees to work on the problems of guidance, opportunity courses, and extra-curricular activities, were formed. The size of these committees varied from seven to twelve, and the total personnel comprised one hundred and fifteen teachers. (p. 298)

An administrative committee composed of high school and central office administrators was created to guide the work of the other committees.

The first meetings of the subject matter and special committees were devoted to making sure that the guidelines provided by the administrative council were clearly understood. Proctor (1927) met with each of these committees to outline procedures. From this point on, these committees met on a weekly basis. Proctor noted that "on every committee there were at least two teachers who had had

the course on curriculum construction during the previous year" (p. 299). The beginning work on curriculum revision which Proctor reported had been done during the curriculum construction course served as a starting point for the committees.

Once a committee had a tentative course outlined, copies were mimeographed and distributed to the teachers who would be teaching the subject. A general meeting of these teachers was held to introduce the tentative course of study and "to give them a chance to make suggestions for change or amendment before final adoption" (Proctor, 1927, p. 299). Proctor reported that the tentative course met with various responses as they were introduced:

Some have been severely arraigned, and some have been warmly commended, but on the whole the outcome has been beneficial to the final output of the course of study committees concerned. (p. 299)

It was interesting to note that Proctor described this part of the process as the "running of the gauntlet" (p. 299). As the ones who would use the revised courses of study, perhaps these teachers held the highest standards.

Curriculum revision continued to be a major focus of large school systems in California. Wilson (1927), a research assistant for the Long Beach school system, reported on the organization and procedures of the curriculum revision program in the Long Beach City schools. The organization for curriculum revision included the director of curriculum, the curriculum department research assistant, principals representing the various school

divisions, supervisors, teachers, and librarians. Consultants were used and of particular interest was the school system's use of Dr. L. Thomas Hopkins as a consultant for the curriculum department. Hopkins served as a consultant for the Denver school system under Superintendent Jesse Newlon during the initial years of the Denver Curriculum Project.

The superintendent of the Long Beach schools created a curriculum department and appointed a full time director who was to be responsible for the "administration and supervision of all phases of the curriculum program" (Wilson, 1927, p. 55). Wilson reported that the curriculum director

plans for the various conferences held by committees on curriculum revision, provides for the release of teachers who will write the courses of study and places for them to work, edits the manuscripts, arranges for the printing of the courses of study, and conducts a two unit extension course entitled 'The Curriculum and Curriculum Construction.' (p. 55)

Textbook evaluation and adoption were included as duties for the curriculum director because of the relationship between textbooks and courses of study.

The research assistant, the position Wilson held at this time, was primarily responsible for providing resources to assist with curriculum revision. The research assistant gathered relevant curriculum research and courses of study constructed for other school systems. The research assistant was responsible for distributing materials to and interpreting materials for the curriculum revision

committees. As the title suggested, the research assistant "initiates and evaluates researches in the Long Beach Schools" (Wilson, 1927, p. 55). The research assistant also worked with the supervisor of libraries to develop and maintain "a professional library of curriculum materials" (p. 55).

An administrative committee was created to develop the general guidelines for the work of the other committees. This committee was composed of fifteen principals, five each from the various school divisions, i.e., elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. The curriculum director was the chair of this committee. This committee developed

the aims of education in Long Beach, the aims of the subject branches, the program of studies for each segment, designating the general nature of the content of courses and outlining the general technique of instruction. (Wilson, 1927, pp. 55-56)

All principals were responsible for implementation of the new courses of study once they were developed.

Once this preliminary work was completed, teachers were selected, by supervisors and principals, and trained to do the actual writing of the courses of study. Wilson (1927) noted that the teachers were to "provide for the classroom viewpoint" (p. 56). The training included the extension course, taught by the curriculum director, which familiarized teachers

with what should go into an up-to-date course of study: aims, content, method and where to place it, charts, lesson assignments, standards of attainment and bibliography. (p. 57)

Once teachers had completed their training, Wilson stated that "they speak and understand the language of curriculum technique" (p. 57).

When the training was finished, the committees began the actual writing of the courses of study. Those teachers who participated in the writing were "released from other school duties while substitute teachers carry on their class work" (Wilson, 1927, p. 57). Committees were provided with the facilities and resources needed to conduct their work. Wilson reported that the actual writing of the selected courses of study was conducted at the beginning of the school year. Editing and printing took place during the spring and summer to allow the new courses of study to be introduced at the beginning of the following school year.

Whitney (1927), director of educational research at Colorado State Teachers College, discussed methods to promote the professional growth of teachers in service. He stated in the preface that this discussion would benefit new superintendents as well as classroom teachers "in the light of the movement toward the participation of classroom teachers, on the level of consultation and advice, in the wider duties of the administrative office" (p. vii). Whitney acknowledged the influence of Superintendent H. B. Wilson of the Berkeley, California, school system, who conducted curriculum revision projects in his system with major teacher participation (see Wilson, 1920, Salisbury, 1920, and Kyte, 1923); Dr. J.B. Sears, professor of

education at Stanford University, who conducted a widely-influential study on teacher participation in administration (see Sears, 1921); and, Dr. F.E. Spaulding, professor of education at Yale University, who involved teachers, as a superintendent, in administration, including curriculum development, through teachers' councils in Minneapolis and Cleveland. It should also be noted that Whitney served, for a time, as consultant to the Denver school system during the Denver curriculum revision project.

Whitney (1927) reported on a study he conducted to ascertain the methods used in representative school systems to promote and provide for the growth of teachers in service. A total of 105 school systems was included in the study. Data was disaggregated for small school systems (serving populations under 5,000) and large school systems. Data was compiled from 34 small school systems and 71 large school systems. Whitney noted that the data suggested that "systems pay more attention to teacher improvement as they become larger" (p. 153).

Whitney (1927) found that "twenty-five and twenty-six items of technic [of promoting growth of teachers in service] respectively are found among the two groups of systems reporting" (p. 153). Of the thirty-four small school systems included in the study, twelve percent (four of the systems) reported using curriculum making as a means for providing for the professional growth of teachers in service. Those systems using curriculum making as a means

to promote professional growth were Backus, Minnesota; Riverton, Minnesota; Red Lake Falls, Minnesota; and, Waupun, Wisconsin. Whitney noted that

it is encouraging to find . . . so many [small systems] requiring reading of educational literature, calling group conferences, stimulating teachers to visit and report, arranging for demonstration teaching and programs of standard measurement, and leading in curriculum revision. (p. 156)

Personal conferencing was the most common method (59% or 20 systems) of improvement in small school systems.

Of the one hundred and one large school systems included in the study, twenty percent (fourteen systems) reported using curriculum making as a means for providing for the professional growth of teachers in service. Those systems included Winnetka, Illinois; Minot, North Dakota; Greeley, Colorado; Grand Island, Nebraska; Fargo, North Dakota; Rock Island, Illinois; Oak Park, Illinois; Cicero, Illinois; Fresno, California; Berkeley, California; Denver, Colorado; Indianapolis, Indiana; Baltimore, Maryland; and, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Curiously, the most common method of promoting professional growth of teachers in service in large school systems was through pension and retirement plans (90% or 64 systems). While Whitney made it clear that salary and merit pay were reported separately, it did not explain how pensions and retirement plans promoted professional growth.

Whitney (1927) summarized the data for all systems participating in the study. The top ten methods for promoting professional growth among teachers for all systems

participating were, in rank order, personal conferencing, reading educational literature, visitations by superior officers, regular teachers' meetings, group conferences on specific problems, visiting other teachers, demonstration teaching, supervisory bulletins, measuring the results of teaching, and curriculum making (pp. 158-159). Whitney categorized all methods reported by the participants into two classifications: better methods for promoting professional growth and poorer methods for promoting professional growth. Curriculum making and administrative participation were categorized as better methods by Whitney.

The staff of the elementary division of the Lincoln School of Teachers College at Columbia University reported on their curriculum making experiences (Tippett, et al., 1927). The fifteen authors were all faculty members of the elementary section of the Lincoln School. A primary purpose of the Lincoln School was to "specialize in the development of better curriculum material or test the validity of that which is already in use" (p. 7). Since curriculum making was a goal, the intent of the authors was to provide a comprehensive report of the work of the elementary staff in curriculum making at the Lincoln School. As Tippett, et al., noted, "the enterprise has been a cooperative one by the staff of the elementary division of the school. Each has contributed, each has planned and criticized" (p. 1).

The cooperative curriculum making endeavor began when "a need for detailed analysis and exact checks upon

curricular activities" (Tippett, et al., 1927, p. 2) was realized by the elementary staff of the Lincoln School. To address this concern, the director of the school, appointed one elementary staff member to be relieved of teaching duties for one year in order to provide "for an analysis and interpretation of the work as contemplated" (p. 2). Additionally, this person would "act as chairman to assemble materials and to help carry the plan forward" (p. 2). Tippett, et al., noted that "all members of the elementary staff were to cooperate in the work" (p. 2). They reported that the selected staff member, the principal of the elementary staff, and the director of the Lincoln school met during the spring of 1926 to develop "a suitable proposed plan of work" (p. 2).

Once a tentative plan was developed, it was submitted to the entire Lincoln School faculty for criticism and discussion. Additionally, Tippett, et al., (1927) reported that the tentative plan

was more specifically criticized by the staff of the elementary division at its individual meetings, and definite suggestions incorporated and desirable omissions made. (pp. 2-3)

The elementary staff continued to review and modify the plan over the next year. As Tippett, et al., noted, "Many changes have been made in the original proposal, but changes always based upon group judgment" (p. 3).

The authors outlined their curriculum work over the year. The elementary staff's initial work focused on "the further study and criticism of the criteria by which units

of work had been selected" (Tippett, et al., 1927, p. 3). Each elementary teacher submitted a list of personal criteria for selecting units of study. The chairperson compiled these lists and categorized items under general headings. The elementary staff then reviewed the tentative criteria. Tippett, et al., reported that this "resulted in a proposal to formulate a set of statements which would include the criteria agreed upon as fairly basic" (p. 3). Eight criteria were decided upon. The first requirement was that the unit of study had to come from "real life situations and must be considered worth while by the child" (p. 31). A second criteria for judging the value of units of study was that the unit had to be rich in opportunities "for real purposing and real projects" (p. 32). A third guideline was that the unit of study had to provide for individual student differences through a variety activities (p. 33). A fourth standard was that the unit had to provide both for individual and group growth (pp. 34, 36). Fifth, the unit must provide connections to other units of study and "stimulate in the child the desire for a continued widening of his interests and understandings" (p. 37). The sixth criteria required that the unit "help meet the demands of society and must help clarify social meanings" (p. 38). A seventh guideline developed by teachers was that the unit being considered had to "be accompanied by progress in the use of such tool subjects [e.g., reading] as contribute to

that unit" (p. 39). Finally, the unit being evaluated had to "lead to the development of desirable habits." (p. 41) Tippet, et al., (1927) emphasized that "agreement, not compromise, is represented in the statement of criteria" (p. 3).

The criteria for selection of units of work was designed by teachers for teachers involved in curriculum work. Elementary teachers at the Lincoln School would use the criteria in the construction and/or selection of appropriate units of study. In other words, teachers would use the criteria to make curricular decisions. While the immediate intent was to serve the elementary staff of the Lincoln School, Tippet, et al., (1927) noted that "we have addressed ourselves more particularly to the hosts of classroom teachers" (pp. 5-6).

Cocking (1928), who served as director of curriculum revision in St. Louis (see Cocking, 1926), addressed "the elements of curriculum making in our public schools which are chiefly administrative" (p. 1). Cocking acknowledged the influence of Newlon, among others, in this work. Cocking pointed out that one thousand school systems were involved in curriculum revision at the time (p. 1). Because of the large number of school systems which were involved in curriculum revision at the time, Cocking proposed to identify the "administrative practices which would seem to give the largest returns for the outlay" (p. 1). According to Cocking, most curriculum research had focused on "aims

and objectives, and content" (p. 2) rather than on the administrative aspects of curriculum revision, i.e., "how to undertake a program of curriculum making, set up the machinery, carry it on, and make it perpetual" (p. 2). The purpose of his study, then, was to suggest procedures for conducting curriculum revision: "Our particular concern is to seek solutions as to what should be the particular steps in conducting a program of curriculum making" (p. 2).

Cocking (1928) studied the curriculum revision programs in twelve cities: Denver, Colorado; Houston, Texas; Long Beach, California; Madison, Wisconsin; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Oakland, California; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Port Arthur, Texas; Rochester, New York; San Antonio, Texas; Sioux City Iowa; and, St. Louis, Missouri. These cities were representative of school systems serving populations in the range of 25,000 to 1,000,000. Cocking reported that data was collected "through interview and correspondence" (p. 3). Thirty-six factors were studied which included factors directly related to curriculum development.

Cocking (1928) formulated ten composite statements summarizing his findings based on the replies to the surveys received from the twelve participating cities. Several of these statements spoke directly to teacher participation in curriculum work. For one, his study of the twelve school systems suggested that "all connected with the school system should have some definite part in curriculum making" (p.

34). His study also indicated that "participation in curriculum making is the most direct way to stimulate teacher growth" (p. 34). Finally, the responses of the twelve participating school systems suggested that "effective teaching is aided by having those who teach participating in determining what should be taught and how" (p. 34). Cocking surmised that, while incomplete, these statements indicated the reasons why an increasing number of school administrators were becoming involved in curriculum revision.

From this study, Cocking (1928) proposed forty-one principles which focused on aims and objectives, institution of the curriculum development program, participation in curriculum development, committee organization, and evaluation of curriculum programs. Cocking proposed that teachers primary duty in curriculum development was to serve on subject committees. He found that "ten of the twelve cities studied used teachers in this capacity" (p. 74). Their primary responsibilities included "determining aims, programs of study, and time allotments; determining subject matter; and, making objective tests" (p. 110). He noted with interest that four of the participating school systems assigned teachers to "conducting actual experimental work in connection with curriculum making" (p. 75). Cocking agreed that teacher participation was highly desirable. However, teachers should be given adequate preparation for curriculum work. He asserted that

just a few years ago, the principle was accepted that all connected with the school system should do work on the curriculum. As a result hundreds of totally untrained individuals were set at the task of curriculum revision. The results were not altogether wholesome. It is significant that our progressive systems are definitely making provision to train the workers in the technique of curriculum making. (p. 114)

Cocking concluded that "those working on the curriculum should be definitely trained in the principles of curriculum construction" (p. 113).

Webster (1928), assistant supervisor for elementary education in Grand Rapids, Michigan, reported on a curriculum development project in the early elementary grades, kindergarten through second, of the Grand Rapids school system. The project was begun, according to Webster, because "those in charge believed that teachers receive greatest benefit from a curriculum when they themselves take part in its construction" (p. 159). Webster reported that "of the one hundred and forty kindergarten and first grade teachers, twenty-seven kindergarten and twenty-four first grade teachers responded" (p. 159) to the request for volunteers to participate. Four second grade teachers were added, "to keep the work properly related" (p. 159), to bring the total number of participating teachers to fifty-five.

Ten committees were created to conduct the work. Webster (1928) recounted that each committee was composed of four to seven teachers including the chair who was also a teacher. Committee assignments were made based on "known

interests and abilities of the individuals in the various school subjects" (p. 159). Webster served as the general committee chair. The superintendent, various supervisors, and elementary principals served as consultants.

Since few of the teachers "had had either training or experiences in curriculum making" (Webster, 1928, p. 160), Webster felt it was critical that the whole group come to an agreement on "a few fundamental objectives" to serve as "guide posts" for their work (p. 160). In April of 1925, Webster held a general meeting to review and discuss such objectives. Modifications were made so that the general group could come to an agreement about these guiding principles. Essentially, these principles suggested that an appropriate education should provide for experiences which develop in students the qualities

which will best fit him to play his part in these various phases of life Home membership, Citizenship, Vocational life . . . , Leisure or recreational relationships, Ethical and spiritual relationships. (p. 160)

The student qualities identified by the teachers as necessary to

fulfilling [these] relationships were classified as

1. Health, physical and mental.
2. Power of control over situations.
3. Aesthetic appreciations.
4. Ethical and spiritual ideals. (p. 160)

These principles and qualities, once agreed upon, were to serve as guides for the teacher committees once they began the actual work of curriculum construction.

In addition to developing the general guidelines, Webster (1928) decided the teachers needed further "individual thought and study" (p. 160) to prepare them for the curriculum work. All participants were asked "to spend four weeks in reading outstanding works on curriculum construction" (p. 161). Webster provided questions to guide the reading which were based on the guiding principles developed earlier. Webster stated that the resulting reports suggested that the guided study was worthwhile. Webster reported that teachers "drew largely upon the educational philosophy of Frederick Bonser, Arnold Gesell, Patty Hill, James Hosis, and William Kilpatrick" (p. 161).

In order to focus the work completed to this point "to its specific application to the activities of the kindergarten and first grade child," Webster (1928) directed the general group discussion to "the means by which the qualities sought are to be secured" (p. 161). Webster asserted that the means could be discovered by determining

what language, art, and so forth have to offer [the student] which will satisfy his present interests, provide him with opportunities for activity and growth, and lay the foundation for future living. (p. 161)

This formed the problem that each committee would have to address when the actual work of curriculum construction began, according to Webster. This general discussion continued until the end of the 1926 school year.

The ten committees began the actual work of curriculum the following September of 1927. Webster (1928) reported that the initial work of the committees centered on the

formulation of aims for the specific subject each committee was to address. The subject aims for each committee were classified under these headings: home life, citizenship, vocation, leisure or recreational life, ethical and spiritual life (pp. 161-162). The committees struggled with stating the aims in terms of "actual child behavior" (p. 162), according to Webster.

After the aims were developed, the committees next formulated "the psychological principles underlying teaching procedure" (Webster, 1928, p. 162). Webster related that the committees divided these psychological principles into two groups:

In the first group were those underlying the presentation of experiences and these included general teaching principles for the subject itself. The second group provided for the social organization of the class. These made allowance for individual differences and suggested means for developing individual initiative and ability as well as group cooperation. (p. 162)

Webster stated that these psychological principles were emphasized rather than specific teaching methods "because of the conviction that the teacher should have freedom to vary her methods as long as they conform to correct educational principles" (p. 162).

The next step for the committees was "the selection of activities and outcomes" (Webster, 1928, p. 162). These were areas that "the value of the contributions which the classroom teacher is able to make to the curriculum became evident" (p. 162). Committees encountered three problems during this phase:

The first was 'What is the difference between aims and outcomes?'. . . .
The second problem was the page form to be used. . . .
The third problem was the division of labor to be used in each committee. (p. 162)

Each of these problems was addressed in turn and the committees completed the list of activities and outcomes for their subject areas. Once the activities were completed, each committee included illustrative projects which were selected from "the regular reports of work made by all teachers in the department" (p. 163).

Once this work was completed, Webster (1928) reported that all the committee members, except the chairs, were released from their curriculum duties. The chairs continued with "a comparison of the various courses with respect to content" (p. 163). They were charged primarily with eliminating repetitions and overlaps in content. While the major repetitions were addressed, Webster pointed out that, due to time constraints, not all were eliminated. However, Webster indicated that additional problems would be addressed during the trial period.

Copies of the tentative curriculum were distributed to all kindergarten and first grade teachers for their review. The tentative plan had been intentionally printed with wide margins to facilitate suggestions. Webster (1928) noted that during the initial review few suggestions or criticisms were received. According to Webster, the lack of suggestions or comments "became more disturbing to the general chairman and to the superintendent than a storm of

criticism would have been" (p. 163). Webster reported that further inquiry revealed that

the inexperienced teachers were finding the curriculum very helpful, but the older teachers who had not worked on its construction were not taking time to investigate it for either its good or its bad qualities. (p. 163)

Webster asserted that some attempt had to be made "to arouse thoughtful criticism and free expression of opinion, in order to prepare for the planned revision and to bring the curriculum into wider use" (p. 163).

In order to solicit those thoughtful criticisms and free expression of opinions,

twenty-four teachers whose experience ranged from one to twenty-five years and none of whom had worked on the first draft were asked to take part in an informal debate on the value of the new curriculum. (Webster, 1928, p. 163)

Two debates were eventually held. Webster reported that the debates achieved the intended purpose. That is, "the entire teaching staff was now aroused to genuine interest in the curriculum" (p. 164). Additionally, the information received from the debates provided the basis for the revision of the tentative curriculum.

The revision of the tentative curriculum began in March of 1927. A new committee of teachers was formed from those who had served on the original committees and from teachers who had participated in the debates. These teachers met once a week for ten weeks and were released from their teaching duties on these days. Webster (1928) reported that "their positions in school were filled either by kindergarten assistants or by paid supply teachers" (p.

164). While this release time was provided, Webster noted that there were still many hours of work done beyond what the release time covered.

Webster (1928) outlined the tasks of the revision committee. Their first task "was a comparison by the group of the various courses with each other" (p. 164). As Webster reported earlier, this task had been started by the original committee chairs but had not been completed. Webster contended that it was still "necessary to find a satisfactory method for unifying the courses and eliminating the duplications of content" (pp. 164-165). The revision committee decided to make social studies "the core of the curriculum and the other courses were subordinated to it" (p. 165). By categorizing all course activities under the major types of social activities (i.e., "adjustments to school life, interpretations of home life, interpretations of industrial life, and interpretations of civic life," p. 165), the revision committee was able to come up with a satisfactory method for unifying the curriculum and eliminating duplications.

The final two tasks for the revision committee centered around formatting and the addition of various features suggested by teachers. A change in the page format

reduced the size of the sheet, permitted a grouping of similar activities, provided a place for subject matter related to the activities, and eliminated the frequent repetition of out comes (Webster, 1928, p. 165)

During the process of soliciting suggestions for revision, teachers suggested the addition of several features for the

improvement of the curriculum. The suggested features which were added by the revision committee included "quantitative achievements for each course, page references, many typical projects, a suggested time schedule, and the much desired alphabetical index" (p. 165).

Webster (1928) noted that "the chief regret in regard to the curriculum has been the impossibility of having every teacher in the department take an active part in its construction" (p. 165). Both teachers and the curriculum benefited from their participation in its construction. Webster asserted that the professional growth of those teachers who did actively participate "was great" (p. 165). Teachers gained an "appreciation of the meaning and value of the curriculum" (p. 165) which could not have been achieved in any other way, according to Webster. Additionally, no other persons could "have contributed to the curriculum that sympathetic understanding of child nature and activity which is possessed by the teacher" (p. 165). Webster concluded that the "returns in teacher growth and efficiency" gained from teacher participation in curriculum construction were "incalculable" (p. 165).

Spangler (1928), supervisor for elementary schools in Logansport, Indiana, described her efforts to improve instruction through curriculum revision with elementary teachers. She asserted that before improvement of instruction could take place, the supervisor and teachers had to agree on "general and specific objectives and have

set up definite attainments for groups of different levels of ability" (p. 25). In effect, instructional improvement was directly related to the cooperative improvement of curriculum.

Spangler (1928) noted that curriculum construction was an "immediate need" (p. 26) of the elementary schools in Logansport when she began as a supervisor there. She viewed this as an "opportunity of working with teachers toward selecting objectives and attainments" (p. 26) and, as a result, bringing about "common understandings" (p. 26) about the curriculum which should, in turn, lead to instructional improvement. Spangler began the process by asking teachers to list objectives they had taught, activities they had used, and "actual accomplishments" (p. 26) during the first semester of 1927. Spangler noted several purposes for this initial activity:

The immediate purpose of this was to get all teachers to think in terms of general and specific objectives Furthermore, I hoped to collect a list of all activities being used and to create a greater interest in worth-while activities. My more remote purpose was to work out semester attainments for the average group hoping ultimately to enlarge upon this feeble beginning to include carefully weighed objectives, activities, and outcomes. (p. 26)

The teacher contributions that Spangler compiled would serve as the starting point for curriculum construction in Logansport.

Spangler (1928) asked for teacher volunteers to serve on grade committees to begin the actual work of curriculum construction during the first semester. At the same time, a

curriculum course was created and offered at the University of Indiana in which a number of teachers on the committees participated. Using the materials submitted by teachers, the class participants developed a tentative curriculum. This tentative curriculum was then submitted to the grade committees "for the purpose of bringing about a more perfect correlation and integration of the whole subject-matter" (p. 26). The work of the grade committees brought the curriculum construction project up to date.

Spangler (1928) reviewed the plans for curriculum construction from this point. Plans for the tentative curriculum to be tested in the classroom had been made for the following year, 1929. Mimeographed copies were to be distributed to teachers for their review and critique. Plans were also being made "to begin the scientific construction of tests to determine scientifically the suitability of [the tentative curriculum] to the average group [of students]" (p. 28). In conjunction with these plans, a course in test construction was being prepared through the University of Indiana. Spangler reported that "after the final selection of material for the average group," plans were also being made to adapt the curriculum for the "slow group" and "the gifted" (p. 28). Spangler noted that the grade committees would be a permanent feature as they continued to work on inspecting, evaluating, and recommending supplementary materials (p. 28).

While Spangler's (1928) discussion centered on the work of a city system in Indiana, teacher participation in curriculum work was also conducted at the state level in Indiana (Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1929). The Guiding Principles of Elementary Curriculum Revision for the State of Indiana outlined the organization and procedures for revision of the elementary curriculum. Under the method of procedure, the guide asserted that

a co-operative plan of curriculum construction should be followed. The participation of a large number of representative teachers, supervisors, administrators, professors of teacher training institutions will result in more extensive and more effective use of the courses of study. (p. 6)

The guide also outlined ways in which local schools would assist in the revision of the elementary curriculum. Many suggestions involved the participation of teachers, i.e., the release of teachers for curriculum work, the organization of local committees of teachers to conduct curriculum work, and the encouragement of individual teachers to make suggestions to curriculum committees (p. 7).

Cooperatively developed state courses of study were becoming increasingly popular during this period. Kyte (1928), professor of elementary education and supervision at the University of Michigan, discussed efforts to cooperatively develop a state course of study in New Mexico. It should be noted that, as an elementary school principal, Kyte participated in and reported on the curriculum revision efforts in Berkeley, California (see Kyte, 1923). Kyte

introduced the curriculum work in New Mexico with a brief discussion of the successful efforts in some city and county school systems to develop curriculum. These systems shared some common organizational characteristics which contributed to their success, according to Kyte:

1. Provision for all teachers to cooperate in the making of the courses of study.
2. Selection of a representative group of the teaching staffs to assume direct responsibility for the actual construction and editing of the courses of study.
3. Provision for adequate time and frequent meetings in order that a thorough piece of work in curriculum making will be achieved.
4. Utilization of the best curriculum materials available as aids to building sound courses of study.
5. Organization of the teaching staffs to provide for (a) criticism and further improvement of the committee's work, and (b) general recognition and acceptance of the courses of study. (p. 601)

Kyte pointed out that "some slight beginnings have been made to adapt [these] new techniques to the building of state courses of study" (p. 601). The effort in New Mexico was one example of these attempts.

Kyte (1928) reported that the curriculum revision for the state began in 1926, after much discussion, when

a representative group of members of the New Mexico Education Association was organized into a committee to consider the possibilities of revising the courses of study. (p. 602)

The discussion of this committee focused on organization for curriculum revision and how to secure the involvement of teachers around the state. The committee also arranged the for the cooperation of the State University of New Mexico and other educational institutions in assisting with the curriculum revision effort. One important service which was

offered by the state university in particular was the training for curriculum revision provided the participants.

Kyte (1928) reported that "organized efforts in curriculum study and curriculum revision were begun in the summer sessions of the higher institutions of learning" (p. 602). A typical example was a course Kyte taught for the University of New Mexico. The course was designed to train participants in "studying critically the literature on curriculum making" and to guide participants in "working out a technique for building courses of study" (p. 602). According to Kyte, the class also studied "philosophies of education, modern methods of teaching, scientific determination of subject-matter" (p. 602). Kyte noted that eight teachers, eight administrators, and twenty university students participated in the course. Kyte also noted that "the group was representative of various parts of the state and of sizes and types of communities and school" (p. 602).

Kyte (1928) divided the class into committees and "assigned the work of reading, evaluating and integrating the curriculum literature regarding a subject of the elementary school" (p. 603). Each committee's findings were presented as formal reports. These reports were presented to the class and other invited individuals which included

officers of the New Mexico Educational Association, officers of the state department of education, the presidents of the other educational institutions, city superintendents, county superintendents, and others. (p. 603)

The reports were received favorably by those attending the presentation as there was interest in continuing the curriculum work.

As a result of the class' work, plans were made both by the New Mexico Educational Association and the University of New Mexico to continue the curriculum work. Curriculum and curriculum revision were the focus of the 1927 meeting of the New Mexico Educational Association. The University of New Mexico offered a second course in curriculum revision in which the focus was the revision of the elementary language curriculum. In preparation for this class, lesson plans were solicited from teachers around the state through educational journals and system superintendents. A collection of exemplary courses of study from around the country and language textbooks was begun at the university library.

The course began during the summer of 1928 with twenty-one students. Eleven of these were students in the original course. Kyte (1928) reported that this "class was as representative of New Mexico districts and teaching staffs as the one of the previous year" (p. 605). The class first "agreed upon the majors units to be included in the course" and "the major divisions of work to be done" (p. 606). The students were then divided into "eight interlocked committees" (p. 606). The committees were interlocked by having one student serving on more than one committee which, according to Kyte, provided for "unified, cooperative

thinking" (p. 606). The work was coordinated through joint committee meetings, chair reports to the class, and Kyte acting as "coordinating advisor" (p. 607). Once a tentative language course of study was developed, the University of New Mexico published "the course of study as a monograph of the College of Education" (p. 609). The tentative course was then distributed to school systems for the purpose of "trying out the course of study and obtaining the criticisms and suggestions of the teachers" (p. 609).

In another example of teacher participation in curriculum development in the state of Maryland, Holloway (1928) reported on an experiment he conducted to determine the effects of teacher participation on teachers and students. In the statement of the problem, Holloway asserted that

the efficiency, the enthusiasm, and the professional spirit of the teaching staff are determined in large measure by the character of the curriculum and the manner in which it is made and administered. (p. 1)

According to Holloway, several problems confront administrators considering curriculum revision:

Should the teachers participate in curriculum making?
What will be the effect of teacher participation upon the professional knowledge and skill of the teachers?
How will such participation affect the progress of the pupils in the common school branches? (p. 1)

These were the problems Holloway wanted to address in his experiment.

Ten counties in the state of Maryland participated in the study. In four of these counties, Holloway (1928) calculated the correlation between teachers' "contributions

to courses of study" and student achievement (p. 1).

Holloway reported that

in the remaining six counties, the equivalent-groups methods was used, whereby a group of teachers, known as the experimental group, should actively engage in the preparation of courses of study, while a control group, as nearly equivalent to the experimental group as possible should undergo the usual course of supervision but give no attention to curriculum making. (p. 2)

Schools in all ten counties determined "the standings of children in seven school functions" (p. 2). The experimental group of teachers from the six counties and all teachers from the other four counties then began "six months of intensive work on units of curricula" (p. 2). The standings of all students was assessed again at the end of the six month period.

Holloway (1928) reported significant improvement in students and teachers in the experimental groups, those engaged in curriculum development. According to Holloway, both the experimental groups and the control group of teachers showed progress in 'professional spirit, attitude, and teaching skill" (p. 2). However, the experimental groups showed progress at "a faster rate" (p. 2) than the control group. Students in the experimental groups showed "slightly higher gains in the functions tested" (p. 2) than the students in the control group. This led Holloway to assert that the professional growth of the teachers and higher levels of student achievement "were so great that it was worth while for teachers actively to engage in the formulation of courses of study" (p. 3).

Holloway (1928) drew several pertinent conclusions from his study. First, "true democracy in supervision requires that all teachers participate . . . in all activities that have to do with the improvement of classroom instruction" (p. 3). Holloway contended that curriculum development was one of these activities. Second, teacher participation in curriculum work was "a most effective means of securing professional growth of teachers in service" (p.3). Third, "every teacher may be expected to make some contribution to the curriculum" (p. 3). The quality and amount of contributions were dependent upon the individual character and ability of each teacher. Fourth, Holloway asserted that "the final measure of the efficiency of any administrative or supervisory instrument is the extent to which it benefits the children" (p. 3). An externally-developed curriculum would be less beneficial to students than a curriculum in which teachers participated in its development because "it does not stimulate the intelligent and enthusiastic support of the average classroom teacher" (p. 4). Finally, Hollway reported that participants were

practically unanimous in their belief that teacher participation in curriculum making tends to make such teachers more efficient as classroom instructors than if supervised in the 'usual way.' (p. 4)

Teacher participation in curriculum development was an effective means of supervision.

English (1929), assistant superintendent, outlined the procedures for curriculum revision used in the Raleigh, North Carolina, school system. English emphasized two key

factors in the Raleigh program. A first consideration was the involvement of the teaching staff. English maintained that "if teachers are to be in sympathy with the program and ready and willing to try the course in the class room they must have a share in the work" (p. 118). The second factor was the long-term commitment to curriculum revision. English noted that "it was agreed by both administrators and teaching staff that the program should be carried on over a period of ten or twelve years" (p. 118). This was an unusual, though not unheard of (the Denver program was a notable example), commitment considering the political uncertainties of the superintendency. The publication of this article marked the sixth year of the Raleigh program, according to English.

English (1929) reported that "a steering committee was organized to direct and act as clearinghouse for the various committees" (p. 118). The steering committee was composed of the superintendent, English, and several college professors: Dr. Thomas Alexander of Teachers College, Columbia University; Dr. M.R. Trabue, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Dr. Shelton Phelps and Lucy Gage of Peabody College, Nashville (p. 118). The first two years marked the organizational period for the Raleigh plan, according to English. The steering committee began by introducing the idea of curriculum revision to faculty members of the school system "to enlist their active interest in the experiment" (p. 119).

The steering committee, then, supervised "a survey of the field of curriculum revision" conducted by "interested teachers" in the school system (English, 1929, p. 119). The information they collected provided a foundation to begin their work. Additionally, the steering committee arranged for consultants to meet with the teaching staff, during the initial or "organizational" (p. 119) period , and with various committees throughout their work. English reported that seventeen consultants, including members of the steering committee, had met with various committees: Dr. Frank McMurry, Dr. Lois C. Mossman, James Tippet, Dr. Laura Zirbes, and Dr. Gerald S. Craig, all of Teachers College, Columbia University; Drs. S.C. Garrison and Charles McMurry of Peabody College for Teachers; Dr. Charles Judd and Agnes Rice of Chicago University; Dr. Ernest Horn of the University of Iowa; Dr. K.C. Garrison of North Carolina State College; and, Drs. John W. Carr and Karl Zener of Duke University (p. 119).

Teacher committees were organized in the third year of the Raleigh program. The committee work continued for the next three years. These general committee were organized around subjects. Teachers volunteered for the general committees on which they wished to serve. Each general committee was composed of representatives from each of the school levels, i.e., elementary, junior and senior high schools. Teachers chaired these committees. Committee work was conducted after school.

The work of the general committees began with research focused on developing objectives "for the educational program of the system, in the different subjects of the course, and for the different grades" (English, 1929, p. 119). English noted that "a professional library was started . . . and has been added to from year to year as the need for books and helps on different subjects has arisen" (p. 119). The committee work continued into the fourth year with the creation of subject-matter committees. The work of the subject-matter committees was more specific to grade levels and focused on "school subject objectives, subject-matter requirements, correlations, materials and methods to be used, and possible outcomes" (p. 120). During the fifth year, English reported that "integrating committees" were created to "see that there were no omissions or overlappings, and that the entire program for any given grade had unity and coherence" (p. 120).

English (1929) noted that, during the six years of the Raleigh program, more progress had been made on the elementary than on the high school curriculum. English attributed this to the high degree of departmentalization within high schools. To address this, the high school teaching staff developed a "'Visualized High School Program'" (p. 120) which utilized a color-coded system for coordinating major topics within courses taught at the high school level. The color-coded topics were displayed on a

large board to help participants visualize possible sequences.

Many of the results of the Raleigh Curriculum Program were still forthcoming, according to English (1929). Student progress was being carefully recorded to evaluate the impact on student performance. English noted that

when the children now entering school for the first time have completed high school we shall have a very accurate record of the growth of the individual pupil under the new program to check against the results obtained under the old course of study. (p. 121)

The impact on teachers was more immediate. English asserted that "the thesis had been developed . . . that the program should come from within the school; that it should be the program of the teachers" (p. 120). Because of this perspective, English reported that the Raleigh Curriculum Program had resulted in "a better spirit among the members of the staff, has stimulated professional growth on the part of all concerned" (p. 121). While student results were still pending, the impact on teachers had been positive.

Summary

The third decade of the twentieth century was a significant time in the rhetoric and practice of teacher participation in curriculum development. Although, it found acceptance, the idea of teacher participation would never be the dominant conception for several reasons. The preeminent conceptions of administration and management required clear delineation of administrative and management responsibilities. In educational administration, curriculum

development was considered an administrative responsibility. Teacher preparation for curriculum work continued to be a concern raised in the literature. Despite these obstacles, the concept of teacher participation in curriculum development was becoming *one* of the dominant themes in the literature.

That teacher participation was becoming one of the dominant themes was best evidenced in the practices during the period from 1920 through 1929. As noted in the previous chapter, the practice of teacher participation was increasing significantly during the last half of the second decade of the twentieth century. This trend continued during the third decade. This was evident to many educators at this time. For example, Sears (1921) conducted a widely-cited study of teacher participation in public school administration in which he concluded that "teacher participation in school administration is already a settled matter, justified by both theory and practice" (p. 113). Updegraff (1921), as a result of his study of teacher participation in curriculum development, suggested that teacher participation was a permanent feature in the operation of the schools by this time. Newlon (1929) alluded to the Denver Curriculum Revision Program as an example "of participation that is both widespread and very genuine in character" (p. 696). Lull (1929) observed that teachers "have been participating more and more in curriculum making" (p. 290). Not only was the practice of

teacher participation in curriculum development widespread by this time, but it was becoming evident to some that the practice had had positive benefits for education. For example, Morgan (1929) asserted that the advances in education during the period from 1920 through 1929 could be attributed to teacher participation, i.e., "the ideal that the entire profession and not merely a small group within it shall determine educational policy and practice" (p. 16).

Examples of the practice of teacher participation in curriculum development were numerous during the third decade of the twentieth century. Ortman's (1921) widely-cited study of thirty teachers' councils suggested that that the participation in curriculum development and other decisions concerning curricular and instructional issues to be common tasks among the teachers' councils he studied. In another widely-cited study of teachers' councils, Sears (1921) examined the practices of teachers' councils in seventy schools and found curriculum work to be a common task of the councils. Gardner (1920) studied the practices of teachers' councils in New York, Boston, Toledo, Minneapolis, and Portland. Teachers' councils were a common method for involving teachers in administrative concerns at the time.

In addition to those studies conducted by Ortman (1921) and Sears (1921), other studies investigated teacher participation in curriculum work and other related factors. For example, Updegraff (1921) examined "the chief form in which teacher participation had been manifested up to that

time- namely, the part taken by teachers in the making of the course of study" (p. 404). Updegraff (1921) asserted that the study "had proved conclusively" that teacher participation was an effective practice that "should be adopted by city school systems generally without regard to size" (p. 405). Updegraff (1921) also concluded that the practice had proven beneficial "to the schools, to the teachers, to the superintendents as well as in the making of the course of study and in the improvement of methods of teaching" (p. 405). In another study which concerned teacher participation, Whitney (1927) investigated the various methods used in school systems to promote the professional growth of teachers. Whitney examined 107 school systems and found that teacher participation in curriculum work was one way in which professional growth was promoted. Cocking's (1928) study of administrative practices in curriculum development in twelve school systems (i.e., Denver, CO; Houston, TX; Long Beach, CA; Madison, WI; Minneapolis, MN; Oakland, CA; Oklahoma City, OK; Port Arthur, TX; Sioux City, IA; and St. Louis, MO) led him to propose as a fundamental principle of curriculum making the involvement of teachers. These and other studies were evidence of the growing trend and interest in teacher participation in curriculum work.

Curriculum revision continued to be a major vehicle for promoting teacher participation. Evidence of practice was found in both large and small school districts. Minor

(1922) reported on the curriculum revision work of teachers in Anderson, Indiana. Willard (1923) detailed the procedures and activities for teacher participation in curriculum revision in the Cleveland Heights, Ohio, school system. The Cincinnati Program of Curriculum Revision which included the participation of teachers in curriculum revision was described by Logan (1924). Davis (1924) reported on the curriculum revision work involving teachers in Norfolk, Virginia. Foster (1925) documented the curriculum work of teachers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Newlon and Threlkeld (1926) and Threlkeld (1925) described the Denver Curriculum Revision Project considered by many as the preeminent example of organized teacher participation in curriculum development. The practice of teacher involvement in curriculum revision in the Seattle, Washington, school system was documented by Fenton (1926) and Willard (1925). Grabo (1926) reported on the curriculum revision conducted by teachers in the Oak Ridge school system of Royal Oak, Michigan. The curriculum revision work of elementary teachers in Grand Rapids, Michigan was recorded by Webster (1928). English (1929) detailed the curriculum revision work of teachers in Raleigh, North Carolina. School systems throughout the state of California involved teachers in curriculum work through various methods. These school systems included Los Angeles (Floyd, 1924; Salisbury, 1920), Oakland (Winn, 1920), Berkeley (Wilson, 1924; Kyte, 1923; Wilson, 1920), San Francisco (Proctor, 1927), and Long Beach

(Wilson, 1927). In all of these examples, large percentages of the teachers, relative to the size of the school system, were employed in the curriculum work.

An increasing number of state departments of education were initiating programs to involve teachers in the revision of state courses of study. Several local systems instituted programs which occurred in conjunction, or at least at the same time, with state programs of curriculum revision. For example, the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction published a guide for the revision of the state curriculum (see State Department of Public Instruction, 1928) which outlined how teachers would participate in curriculum revision at the state and local levels. At the same time, teachers in Indiana schools, such as the elementary teachers of Logansport, Indiana, (see Spangler, 1928) were involved with curriculum revision at the local level. In Maryland, the approach was different because of the size of the state and the number of school districts, but the state instituted a curriculum revision program utilizing state school supervisors (see Holloway, 1928). Bersch (1927) described how this worked in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Because of New Mexico's school districts were largely rural, the state sought to guide curriculum revision for local systems through a cooperative effort of the state teachers' association, the state department of education, and the state university (see Kyte, 1928). The trend toward cooperatively-developed state courses of study was becoming

increasingly evident during the period from 1920 through 1929. These were the precursors of curriculum revision programs during the 1930s, in states such as Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, and Kansas, which would involve teachers to varying degrees in the curriculum revision work.

Educational administrators and professors of education were still the primary advocates for teacher participation in curriculum work, e.g., Bonser (1920), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University; Clark (1920), the school superintendent in Sioux City, IA; Wilson (1920), the school superintendent in Berkeley, CA; Blanton (1920), the state superintendent in Texas; Salisbury (1920), the assistant superintendent in Berkeley, CA; MacDonald (1921), a professor of vocational education at the University of Cincinnati; Updegraff (1921 & 1922), professor of educational administration at the University of Pennsylvania; Minor (1922), the instructional supervisor in Anderson, IN; Gates (1923), the superintendent of Grand Island, NE; Longshore (1925), a principal in Kansas City, MO; Willard (1925), the superintendent in Seattle, WA; Hunter (1925), the superintendent in Oakland, CA; Cox (1925), a professor of education at New York University; Johnson (1925), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University; McSkimmon (1925), the principal at Pierce School in Brookline, MA; Briggs (1926), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University; Harap (1927), a professor at the Cleveland

School of Education; Counts (1927), a professor of education at the University of Chicago; Rugh (1927), a professor of education at the University of California; Threlkeld (1928), the superintendent in Denver, CO; Gist (1928), a principal in Oakland, CA; Uhl (1928), a professor of education at the University of Wisconsin; and, Charters (1929), the director of educational research at Ohio State University. That educational administrators and professors of education were the primary advocates might be attributed to several influences. They had greater access to prominent educational journals, so their perspectives appeared in print more often. Some writers suggested that the curriculum revision movement was a creation of progressive educational administrators (e.g., Kliebard, 1995). The implication being that educational administrators were perhaps more interested in curriculum revision or had a greater stake in educational improvement (e.g., Callahan, 1962) because of increasing pressures to improve the schools. Finally, the power structure may not have lent itself easily to teacher advocacy or initiation. Teachers, both individually and collectively, had not become assertive enough, up until this time, to either advocate or initiate their participation in curriculum work.

The fact that educational administrators and professors of education were the ones endorsing and initiating programs to involve teachers in curriculum work was not escaping notice and criticism. There was increasing speculation that

teachers perhaps should be the ones to initiate curriculum revision rather than administrators (e.g., Peterson, 1925, Adair, 1922; and, Stillman, 1920). There were also those who suggested that teachers were already the primary impetus for the curriculum revision movement. For example, Sears (1921) indicated that even though the movement was "being fostered by leading educational administrators throughout the country," teachers were proving to be the "principal agitators in the movement" (p. 29). While the work was initiated by administrators, increasing numbers of teachers were advocating their participation in curriculum development, e.g., Fenton (1926), a teacher in Seattle; Peterson (1925), a Cincinnati teacher; Jacobson (1924), a teacher in Los Angeles school system; Adair (1922), a teacher representative on the National Education Association's Committee on the Participation of Teachers in School Management; Rice (1920), a teacher at Hollywood High School in Los Angeles; Koons (1920), a teacher in Allentown, PA; and, Skinner (1920), a teacher at Jefferson High School in Portland, OR.

While the growth in teacher advocacy could be attributed to the increasing number of opportunities to be published in prominent journals, teachers were becoming more assertive and vocal about those issues they believed affected them most directly. This was evidenced by the growth in numbers, size, and influence of teachers organizations. The endorsement of teachers' organizations

for teacher participation in curriculum development certainly was evident, if not increasing, e.g., Stillman (1920), the president of the American Federation of Teachers; Winn (1920), the president of the Seattle Grade Teachers' Club; Adair (1920), the president of the National League of Teachers' Associations; Gardner (1920), the president of the Milwaukee Teachers' Association; and, MacGregor (Department of Superintendence, 1924), the president of the Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association. The growth of teachers' organizations during the first quarter of the twentieth century was greatly influenced by and closely paralleled the general labor movement occurring at this time. Teachers' organizations became more vocal about teachers' rights and responsibilities, such as curriculum development, spurred on by the activities of labor organizations during this period.

Numerous publications were devoted entirely to curriculum and the work to revise the curriculum during this time. Several yearbooks of the Department of Superintendence focused on curriculum revision, e.g., The Elementary School Curriculum (Department of Superintendence, 1924), Research in Constructing the Elementary School Curriculum (Department of Superintendence, 1925), and The Nation at Work on the Public School Curriculum (Department of Superintendence, 1926). The fourth yearbook (Department of Superintendence, 1926), in particular, documented efforts of school systems to involve teachers in various curriculum

activities. These school systems included Darby, PA; Dayton, OH; Pueblo, CO; Lawrence, KS; Ashland, KY; Erie, PA; Warren, PA; Dunkirk, NY; Millville, NJ; Bridgeton, NJ; Lynn, MA; Johnson, RI; Shorewood, WI; and, Baltimore, MD. The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1926) included examples of curriculum revision programs which included teachers as participants. For example, Curtis (1926) described teacher participation in the curriculum revision program in Detroit. Sipple (1926) reported on the curriculum revision work in which teachers were a part in Burlington, IA. The St. Louis curriculum revision program which involved teachers was documented by Cocking (1926).

As the practice of teacher participation in curriculum development became increasingly widespread, certain facets of practice were becoming more concrete. Published accounts served to influence the procedures and organization for curriculum work in other schools and systems. Various authors proposed guidelines based on theory and practice. Salisbury (1920) outlined a seven-step process for curriculum revision based on her experiences in Berkeley, California. Numerous other authors proposed guidelines and principles based on their actual experiences (e.g., Jacobson, 1924; Wilson, 1924; gates, 1923; and Minor, 1922). Teachers' councils and teacher committees were the most common methods of organizing teachers for curriculum work. Other features of curriculum revision programs such

as professional development for curriculum work, provisions for clerical staff, provisions for release time for teachers, and provisions for professional libraries to support the curriculum work became more common in practice (e.g., Cocking, 1926; Department of Superintendence, 1926; Newlon & Threlkeld, 1926; and, Threlkeld, 1925).

The growth of city and county school systems during the third decade of the twentieth century resulted in efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work primarily at the system level. The progression from school to system-level involvement seemed natural as the responsibility for the curriculum moved from the school to the system-level. Ortman (1921) studied thirty teachers' councils which were organized at the system level. A common task of these councils was to make recommendations concerning curriculum and instruction. Sears (1921) studied the participation of teachers in school administration in seventy school systems and concluded that curriculum work was a common administrative task that teachers were asked to participate. Other system-level efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work included: Cleveland Heights, OH (Willard, 1923); Berkeley, CA (Kyte, 1923; Salisbury, 1920; Wilson, 1920); Cincinnati (Logan, 1924); Los Angeles (Floyd, 1924); Norfolk, VA (Davis, 1924); Pittsburgh (Foster, 1925); Seattle (Fenton, 1926; Willard, 1925), Royal Oak, MI (Grabo, 1926); Detroit (Courtis, 1926); Burlington, VT (Sipple, 1926); St. Louis (Cocking, 1926); Anne Arundel

County, MD (Bersch, 1927); San Francisco (Proctor, 1927), Long Beach, CA (Wilson, 1927); Grand Rapids, MI (Webster, 1928); Logansport, IN (Spangler, 1928); and, Raleigh, NC (English, 1929).

Just as the transition from school to system-level responsibility for the curriculum resulted in increased teacher involvement at the system-level another similar transition was beginning to develop toward the end of the third decade of the twentieth century. Responsibility for curriculum development was beginning to move from the system level to the state level. This seemed particularly true in states with rural populations. Demands for uniformity and limited resources may have been causes for this. State programs for curriculum development which involved teachers included: Maryland (Holloway, 1928); New Mexico (Kyte, 1928); and, Indiana (Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1929). State-level involvement of teachers in curriculum work would continue through the fourth decade of the twentieth century.

The step in the process of decision-making when teachers became involved depended on how teachers were involved. While teachers' councils continued to be primarily advisory in nature, Ortman (1921) found in the thirty councils that he studied that there were three common relationships. The most common relationship was one in which the superintendent dominated the teachers' council even to the point of appointing members. While still

advisory, the other two relationships identified by Ortman (1921) ideally created a more collegial relationship. One of these practiced by some councils examined by Ortman had teachers' councils working parallel to the superintendent, working cooperatively whenever possible, but reporting separately to the board of education. Other teachers' councils were recognized by the board of education as participants with the superintendent in deciding educational policies. Ideally, the teachers' councils recommendations were evident in the superintendent's recommendations to the board of education.

While teachers' councils were still a common means for involving teachers, collaborative curriculum work was increasingly being accomplished through curriculum revision projects which organized teachers into committees. The evolution from councils to committees was important in that teachers' curriculum work appeared to be moving from being advisory in nature to playing a direct role in the creation and revision of the curriculum. This evolution could already be seen in Ortman's (1921) study. The committee work of teachers involved in the work of the numerous curriculum revision projects during the 1920s provided teachers opportunities to directly influence curriculum development.

Most teacher involvement in committee work came at the production step of the process, i.e., the actual development of subject area objectives, development of instructional

activities, and identification of appropriate resources (e.g., Wilson, 1927; Cocking, 1926; Moore, 1925; Threlkeld, 1925; Davis, 1924; Floyd, 1924; and, Logan, 1924). In these cases, teachers seldom initiated revision of the curriculum. This was almost always decided at the system level, usually by the superintendent. In many of the cases, the guidelines for the work were worked out administratively. Participation was equally divided between voluntary and involuntary participation on the part of the teachers.

There were instances, however, where teachers were involved from the inception (e.g., Foster, 1925) and even initiated the curriculum work. In several instances, the work was initiated with curriculum study which involved all teachers in the system (e.g., Spangler, 1928; Proctor, 1927; and, Willard, 1923). There were examples in which teachers initiated curriculum revision when they questioned the effectiveness of the current curriculum (e.g., Bersch, 1927; Tippet, et al., 1927; and, Kyte, 1923). In all of these examples, teachers also were involved in the production phase of curriculum revision.

As in the previous decade, there were a variety of purposes which were intended from the participation of teachers in curriculum development. Once again, though, a primary purpose for teacher participation during the 1920s was to promote the professional growth of teachers (e.g., Webster, 1928; Whitney, 1927; Foster, 1925; and,

Threlkeld, 1925). This was not surprising since a primary concern also continued to be the preparation of teachers to do curriculum work. Promoting and modeling democratic ideals were probably proposed as often as professional growth as purposes for teacher participation in curriculum work (e.g., Grabo, 1926). Other stated purposes for teacher participation in curriculum work included: to facilitate instructional improvement (Spangler, 1928), to promote effective use of the curriculum (Threlkeld, 1925), and for the contributions that teachers could make to curriculum development (Williard, 1923). These would continue to be the most common purposes proposed for teacher participation through the 1930s.

CHAPTER V: THE PRACTICE MATURES, 1930-1939

Conceptions of curriculum broadened during the 1930's. The definition of curriculum expanded beyond the narrow definition of a printed course of study which was common in the early part of the twentieth century. Discussions of curriculum in the literature of the 1930's ranged "from the philosophical to the procedural, interpretive, and action-oriented" (Schubert, 1980, p. 70). Many writers were coming to the realization that teachers and curriculum were not easily separated, particularly in practice. Definitions and conceptions of curriculum expanded to include discussions of "teaching, instruction, methods, guidance, materials, administration, organization, and extra-curricular" (Schubert, 1980, p. 70).

New curriculum terminology appeared during the 1930's. For one, the appearance of terms such as curriculum research, curriculum investigation, curriculum enrichment, and curriculum study came to describe various facets of curriculum work being espoused during the period. Curriculum study was perhaps the most notable in discussions of teacher participation of curriculum work, particularly in the state curriculum programs. The term curriculum

development also came into common usage during this period, according to Schubert (1980). Schubert (1980) noted that "the use of curriculum development became highly prominent during the next two decades, almost becoming synonymous with curriculum study at large" (p. 77). It would also become synonymous with early terms such as curriculum revision, curriculum construction, and curriculum building. All of these terms were used at various times to describe the work of teachers.

During the 1930's, the proliferation of curriculum programs involving teachers that was evident during the 1920's continued and expanded to state curriculum programs. Caswell (1937) noted the increase in curriculum programs in which teachers participated. He maintained that curriculum programs of the 1930's were stressing more frequently that

teachers can improve the curriculum only as they broaden their insights, deepen their interests, and improve their technics. Consequently, emphasis is placed on voluntary participation, democratic procedures, provision of varied experiences which contribute to the growth of teachers, and curriculum changes which emerge from the classroom. (p. 123)

Numerous reports from the field supported Caswell's contention. Notable examples included the curriculum work of teachers in Evansville, Indiana (Spears, 1937) and Glencoe, Illinois (Misner, 1938; Glencoe Public Schools, 1938). In addition to the fact that both were well-documented examples of teacher involvement in curriculum work, they were also notable for another reason. Schubert (1980) noted that a significant number of curriculum books

published during the 1930's concentrated on curriculum development in particular schools or school systems. Spears (1937) and Glencoe Public Schools (1938) were examples of works which Schubert (1980) suggested were "forerunners of current case study approaches" (pp. 71-72). These and other examples provided details about curriculum programs which until the 1930's were difficult to glean from reports published in educational journals.

The 1930's also saw an increase in the number of studies, particularly in the use of surveys, to examine curriculum thought and practice. This was especially true in regards to studies and surveys of teacher participation in curriculum development. Schubert (1980) maintained that the increase in these studies could be attributed to "a desire to discover more wide-spread information" and "to make curriculum knowledge more readily available" (p. 72). The increase in the number of studies also suggested that the various methods of including teachers in curriculum work were being recognized as significant practices in curriculum development.

Numerous state curriculum programs provided for significant teacher involvement during the 1930's. Kliebard (1995) asserted that:

by the 1930's, influenced by the increasingly popular notion that curriculum revision should be undertaken by the participants who would be called upon to implement the innovations, some states initiated major programs of change built substantially on the Denver model. By far the most famous of these was the Virginia Curriculum Program initiated in 1931. (p. 191)

The Virginia Program provided for the involvement of approximately 10,000 teachers (see Burlbaw, 1991). However, there were other state curriculum programs in which teachers played significant roles during the 1930's. Heaton (1937) reported that 5,000 teachers participated in the state of Alabama's curriculum development program and thirty thousand teachers participated in Texas' program. Morrow (1938), the director of curriculum research for the State Department of Education of Georgia, related that, as of 1938, approximately 11,000 teachers had participated in the curriculum study provided for through the state of Georgia's curriculum development program. Spears (1940) indicated that he chose Georgia's program to include in his study because of its "faith in teacher participation" (p. 13). Other states with curriculum programs in which teachers played a significant role included Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, Kansas, New Mexico, and Oregon. The developments during the 1920's which saw the significant growth of local curriculum programs to involve teachers in curriculum work continued during the 1930's and expanded to include state curriculum programs.

The Rhetoric of Teacher Participation

During the 1930's, educators continued to look to business and industry for methods to improve public education in the United States. While Callahan (1962) suggested that educators were forced to look to business and

industry because of public pressures, there were progressive practices in the business sector which went beyond efficiency, standardization, mass production, and cost effectiveness. After all, the progressive movement had a broad influence which included business and industry. As Bonser (1920) contended public schools might learn from progressive democratic practices being utilized by some business and industry. This trend of looking to business and industry continued in the 1930's.

Carpenter (1932), a professor of education at the University of Missouri, contended that it was not necessary to create a complex organizational structure to provide meaningful opportunities for teacher participation in the determination of school policies. As evidence, he offered an informal survey of nineteen superintendents from Missouri, Kansas and Colorado which he conducted. At this time, attention was being given to the suggestion system- essentially the use of suggestion boxes- which was being used at the National Cash Register Company. The superintendents participating in the survey were asked to implement this suggestion system in their school systems and to report the results. Specifically, the participants were asked about how suggestions were solicited and encouraged, the number of suggestions received monthly, the nature of the suggestions, the number of suggestions adopted as procedures and policies, and the effect on the attitudes of teachers (p. 235).

In regards to curriculum development, Carpenter (1932) reported that curriculum was one of the areas in which the superintendents reported suggestions for improvement.

Carpenter stated that:

the fact that so many of these suggestions were immediately adopted or were recommended to the board of education for adoption as permanent policies indicates the value of these suggestion. (p. 236)

The total number of suggestions (n=795) received during the year and the wide variety of topics (n=120) addressed indicated to Carpenter, at least, that "classroom teachers are intensely interested in the administrative problems of the school" (p. 236). Ninety-three percent (14 out of 15) of the superintendents participating in the survey reported that they had seen an improvement in the "professional attitude of the teachers" (p. 236) as a direct result of the suggestion system used. Carpenter's point was that teacher participation in the determination of school policies, such as decisions related to curriculum, could begin immediately and with little effort. There were also immediate benefits to the school and system that could be realized from teacher participation.

The discussion of whether teaching constituted a true profession also continued during the 1930's. The issue of adequate teacher training also continued to be a concern. Kandel (1932), an education professor at Teachers College of Columbia University, asserted that teaching was more of a trade than a profession. Kandel contrasted a trade and a profession:

a trade requires its practitioners to work undeviatingly on the basis of set rules, regulations, and prescriptions; a profession implies independent thinking, judgment, discrimination, on the basis of certain principles. (p. 386)

He maintained that the status of teaching remained "a hangover from days when there was relatively little training and teachers had to be supported on crutches supplied by those superior to them administratively" (p. 386). Kandel suggested that the administrative "crutches" were devices such as externally-developed courses of study which were highly prescriptive, textbooks which were prescribed by the courses of study, supervision intended to enforce the prescriptions detailed in the course of study, and standardized testing.

Kandel (1932) asserted that "the administrative system lends itself to a perpetuation of these conditions" (p. 386). While, in Kandel's perspective, administration was intended "to release the teacher to do his proper work under the best possible conditions" (p. 386), the adaptation of the model of administration in industry had served to make education less effective. Kandel contended that education was "more ineffective the more standardized it becomes" (p. 387). As more administrative devices and structures were created to standardize and control education, teachers became less effective in educating children. Kandel asserted that "the root of the trouble lies in the facts that our conditions have been imposed upon us by tradition .

. . and that a philosophy of administration has not emerged" (p. 387).

Kandel (1932) suggested that the way to professionalize teaching- and to make education more effective- was to involve teachers in curriculum development. He cited examples in other countries, such as England and Germany, in which teachers and principals were allowed "professional self-determination" (p. 387). While Kandel's example of professional self-determination was specific to practice in England, the implication was that this should be the practice in the United States. Kandel described "professional self-determination" as the opportunity in which

each teacher shall think for himself, and work out for himself, such methods of teaching as may use his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the needs and conditions of the school (p. 388)

Specifically, Kandel asserted that this would mean that "each school is expected to make up its own curriculum, course of study, and time-table subject" (p. 388)

Professional self-determination, a major step toward professionalizing teaching, entailed teacher involvement in curriculum development.

Windes (1932), a professor of education at the University of Virginia, identified trends in high school curriculum construction since the turn of the century. A major trend, according to Windes, was the cooperative development of the curriculum. The questions raised in modern curriculum making required the involvement of

numerous participants, in Windes perspective. Windes noted that

it is small wonder, therefore, that curriculum making has become a matter of committee procedure involving co-operative effort on the part of school administrators, educational psychologists and theorists, subject matter specialists, instructional supervisors, and classroom teachers. No present day program of curriculum making in a comprehensive school system is being attempted which does not involve careful committee organization through which the various special workers are brought into proper relationship one with another. (p. 346)

Windes concluded that curriculum development was progressing from the "older methods wherein an individual retired to his study and produced a course of study out of the inner man" to more modern methods whereby curriculum was developed through "the pooling of expert opinion" (p. 347) of which teacher participation was to be a part.

Because the "absence of a completely organized methodology has left curriculum revision to individual ingenuity" (p. v), Harap (1932), professor of education at Western Reserve University, proposed an organized procedure for curriculum development. Although he did not identify the schools or systems utilizing the procedures he proposed, Harap asserted that

this is not a theoretical treatise. It developed as a result of actual experience in making courses of study. The actual steps in the process were recorded and later became the basis of instructional material presented here. The illustrations are drawn from actual curriculum investigations and courses of study. There is not a single step in the technique proposed here for which a pragmatic illustration cannot be found. (p. v)

The process Harap proposed was based on actual practice in the field.

The most pertinent part of Harap's (1932) process related to the examination of teacher participation in curriculum development was found in his discussion of the composition of the curriculum committee which occurred very early in the process. Once a decision had been made to revise the curriculum, the question of who would do the work had to be answered. While Harap suggested that there were any number of ways the superintendent might determine who would participate, he proposed some guidelines for making this determination. Teachers were to participate to provide a practical perspective. Harap asserted that the curriculum development process "should include classroom teachers who will think in terms of actual conditions" (p. 6). Curriculum work was a cooperative process, in Harap's perspective, so there were to be others working in collaboration with teachers. Harap (1932) indicated that the "most capable and most industrious" should be selected to participate in curriculum development (p. 6). The person selected to chair the central committee should have some expertise in the "technique of curriculum making" (p. 6). Since curriculum work would require teacher training, the person who would be responsible for that training would need to be a part of the central curriculum committee. Principals and supervisors should serve to "represent the administrative point of view" (p. 6). Finally, the central curriculum committee "should include persons who have the

authority to call upon many teachers for assistance at any step of the process of revision" (p. 6).

In a text on high school administration, Edmonson, Roemer, and Bacon (1932) addressed curricular and instructional problems that principals might encounter. Edmonson was the dean of education at the University of Michigan. Roemer was a professor of education at George Peabody College for Teachers. Bacon was a principal at Evanston Township High School in Evanston, Illinois. Interestingly enough, the authors pointed out that they perceived their text to be an "especially valuable" reference for "high school principals and teachers" (p. v). Curriculum research and related terms (e.g., curriculum investigation) were coming into wide use in the 1930's. The terminology used for curriculum work (e.g., curriculum/course of study construction, curriculum/course of study revision) usually suggested curriculum development on a larger scale (i.e., a school-wide or system-wide program or project).

While these terms will be used interchangeably with curriculum construction or revision, curriculum research was suggestive of curriculum work on a smaller scale possibly by individual teachers or small groups of teachers, such as in a department within a high school. Edmonson, Roemer, and Bacon (1932) described curriculum research as experimentation with new materials and new methods particularly in regards to low-performing students (p. 24).

As to who would be appropriate for conducting curriculum research, Edmonson, Roemer, and Bacon asserted that

choosing a committee from the high school staff is a particularly good method of initiating a curriculum-research movement. If curriculum adaptation is really to become effective, the teachers must be active participants in the process of reconstruction. Departmental committees in the large school can do much of the detailed work. Individual teachers will need to carry this load in the small schools. (pp. 248-249)

Note that the authors used curriculum *adaptation* and curriculum *reconstruction* with curriculum research.

Regardless of the terminology, the fact remains that the authors maintained that curriculum development was only effective if teachers were active participants in the work.

Graves (1932), Commissioner of Education and President of the University of the State of New York, discussed curriculum work as a component of school administration. The most significant development in regards to the curriculum, according to Graves, were the widespread efforts in curriculum revision. Most city school systems were revising or had revised their courses of study, according to Graves. He noted that "the present activity in curriculum revision is demanded by the failure of American life and the neglect of the pupil's nature" (pp. 30-31). Graves attributed the beginning of the curriculum revision efforts to Dewey, and his work at the University of Chicago Elementary School, who he called "the first prominent reformer in this field" (p. 32).

As to who was or should be a participant in curriculum development, Graves (1932) stated that "it is obvious . . .

that curriculum revision has become a cooperative enterprise" (p. 43). He asserted that "the original [curricular] proposals should be formulated by committees of teachers and passed up . . . for final approval, modification, or rejection" (p. 44). He advocated a central committee made up of teachers and administrators should guide the work and organize sub-committees "whose members are closely in touch with the various grades or departments" (p. 44).

Graves (1932) indicated that cooperation would be promoted and enhanced by providing for teachers adequate training in curriculum revision techniques. Pre-service teachers would receive training in colleges and universities. Several ways were suggested for in-service teachers to receive training:

(1) by reading the best books on the curriculum, (2) by helping to analyze present American life needs, (3) by becoming familiar with the local environment in which pupils are growing up, (4) by evaluating the existing local course of study, (5) by familiarizing themselves with the best current practice, (6) by studying the abilities, interests, and growth wants of developing children, and (7) by bringing to bear on the problem of curriculum revision the results of their experience as to what is practical and advisable in the way of classroom procedures. (p. 47)

This training was to be done under the supervision of specialists. Graves cited an example of in-service training being conducted during a state-wide curriculum revision project conducted in New York. Graves reported that "in 1930-32 more than eight hundred teachers cooperated in preparing a new course of study in English for secondary

schools of New York" (p. 47). No further references were provided.

In an address to the California Society of Secondary Education, Almack (1933), a professor of education at Stanford University, discussed the principles of curriculum construction which, in his view, had emerged over the last twenty years. He traced the curricular reform movement to the turn of the century and attributed it to several factors. The "new objective tests" allowed teachers to more effectively evaluate methods and materials (p. 143). This allowed experimentation with new concepts of curricula. Almack asserted that the creation of the junior high school was another influence and was "itself a curricular revolution" (p. 143). The end of World War I brought about an examination of schools and curricula. These developments led to such a high level of curricular reform activity after 1920 that Almack asserted that "the school which has not undertaken a partial or whole sale revision of its curriculum is the exception" (p. 144).

Almack (1933) contended that curriculum revision should be a cooperative activity and suggested that the activities since 1920 had largely been cooperative in nature. In fact, he maintained that "most the credit for the new curriculum must go to the teachers" (p. 144). He based this claim on four suppositions. Teacher participation produced a better curriculum. Almack maintained that wide participation capitalized on the "minds, experiences, and abilities of the

many" (p. 144). Teacher participation recognized what Almack described as "an essential principle of democracy, namely, that those who do the work shall determine the conditions under which it shall be done" (p. 144). Teacher participation also recognized what Almack called a "common-sense idea," (p. 144) that is, curriculum development should be done by those who know the students the best. Finally, teacher participation in curriculum development gave teachers "the experience and training they must have to put the new plan into effect" (p. 144). Almack noted that school systems in California, e.g., Santa Barbara, Berkeley, and Los Angeles, had been leaders in the curriculum revision movement and in the move to involve teachers (see for example, Floyd, 1924; Wilson, 1923; Salisbury, 1920; Gardner, 1919; and, Hunter, 1918a).

Sears (1933), a professor of education at Stanford University, discussed the role of research in curriculum making. It should be remembered that Sears was the author of a widely cited study on teacher participation in school administration (see Sears, 1921). For the purposes of his discussion on the role of research, Sears defined curriculum as "those stimuli which the school consciously selects and systematically applies as a part of the teaching program" (p. 147). With this definition in mind, Sears established several propositions to illustrate how research would be used in curriculum making.

Sears' (1933) first proposition was that in order for a curriculum to be considered effective it had to be effectively utilized. In order for a curriculum to be effectively utilized, Sears asserted that "it must be thoroughly comprehended by those who use it, and must be supported by good teaching methods and equipment" (p. 150). Directly connected to this idea was Sears' second proposition that "the curriculum should be made by those who are responsible for instruction" (p. 150). For teachers to understand and intelligently utilize the curriculum, they must have a part in its development. Sears' final proposition was that the result of a successful curriculum revision program was two-fold: improved student achievement and teacher morale.

Teachers had a role to play in curriculum research, in Sears' (1933) perspective. Sears proposed that some administrative office, e.g., the system research bureau in larger systems, should direct the research. However, he also maintained that "every member of the staff should be drawn into it" (p. 153). Curriculum research was the one part of an effective curriculum revision program that would "do the most to develop an understanding of the curriculum" (p. 153), in Sears' view. Since curriculum research was a relatively new area, Sears noted that few, if any, teachers would have the proper training to conduct research. Sears called for research to become a part of teacher training programs to prepare them for this responsibility.

In a discussion of the problems in school administration, Norton (1933) identified ten trends of the "more progressive courses of study" (p. 173) since 1920. The trend of most "far-reaching importance" (p. 181), according to Norton, was the cooperative development of curricula. Norton noted that

curriculum reconstruction is now recognized as a task of such complexity and difficulty that it requires the co-operative effort of a group possessing wide ranges of knowledge and varying experience, as well as special abilities and forms of training. (p. 181)

Norton cited Horn and Counts (see Counts, 1927, and Horn, 1923) as sources for who should participate in curriculum development. It will be remembered that both cited the classroom teacher as a participant.

Norton (1933) agreed that teachers were crucial to any efforts at curriculum development. He noted that while few schools and systems had the resources to involve all participants recommended by experts, "practically all schools which have produced outstanding courses of study have made large use of the contributions of teachers" (p. 182). Teachers knew the "strengths and weaknesses of existing courses" and they had a better "understanding of the capacities, needs, and interests" of the students (p. 182). Additionally, Norton pointed out that teacher participation in curriculum development offered "the best guarantee" that the new curriculum will be understood and effectively utilized (p. 183).

The Department of Superintendence (1934) devoted a chapter of the twelfth yearbook to the issue of teacher participation in school administration. In the brief history of teacher participation, it was asserted that

The rapid growth of public education, the presence in the teaching corps of large numbers of untrained teachers, the necessity for economical and efficient organization, tended to develop school systems with autocratic and mechanical characteristics. (p. 157)

This trend, however, was changing as "an active movement toward cooperation in the formulation of school policies" (p. 157) had begun.

Conceptions of human growth and freedom formed a psychological basis for teacher participation in school administration. According to the authors there was a psychological need for "freedom of thought and action" and for the "opportunity to grow" (Department of Superintendence, 1934, p. 157). The authors contended that "creative work and teacher growth are obtained best when the teacher has freedom to initiate plans of procedure and to apply his own ideas and ideals" (p. 157). It was pointed out that this was especially true in the case of curriculum development.

Curriculum development was one of the chief opportunities for teacher participation, according to the authors (Department of Superintendence, 1934). Four reasons were given for teacher participation in curriculum revision. Teacher participation resulted in: a better product, more intelligent use of the curriculum, excellent in-service

training for teachers, and a sense of satisfaction for teachers (p. 163). Teachers were primarily employed in the "creative or productive phases" of curriculum development (p. 163). The authors noted that production committees were almost always composed of classroom teachers. As an illustration, the work in the Kansas City, Missouri, schools was highlighted. It was pointed out that one-half of the teachers in the elementary and high schools had been active participants in the curriculum revision program there.

The authors concluded that teacher participation in school administration was based "upon sound democratic principles" (Department of Superintendence, 1934, p. 184). Additionally, teacher participation was viewed as "essential and practical in efficient school systems regardless of size" (p. 185). The authors asserted that this was especially true in such activities as curriculum development and research.

Newlon (1934), professor of education and director of the Lincoln School at Teachers College of Columbia University, in his discussion of educational administration asserted that teachers should participate in deciding educational policy. His primary thesis was that the traditional conception of educational administration had to change to a more progressive conception which considered the social implications of educational administration. It will be remembered that Newlon, as superintendent of the Denver

schools, was responsible for initiating the Denver Curriculum Revision Program (see Newlon & Threlkeld, 1926).

Newlon (1934) attributed what he viewed as the current lack of involvement of teachers primarily to "the limitations of the prevailing theory of administration and . . . to the inadequacy of their general and strictly professional education" (p. 183). Part of teachers' professional education included "the status of participants in the consideration of larger policies" (p. 183). Since teachers had been denied these opportunities they had

gained in service little understanding of broader educational and social problems and consequently have been unable to cooperate effectively . . . in the solution of these problems. (p. 183)

Additionally, and contrary to some current conceptions of progressive administrators at this time, Newlon contended that the business concept of efficiency in educational administration had served to lessen the professional status of teachers. He asserted that in order for teachers to participate meaningfully, "the old concept of administration . . . must be consigned to oblivion" (p. 200). This still presented a problem for administrators because "a program that accords a truly professional status to teachers imposes a much more difficult and easier task on the administrator" (p. 200). The task for the administrator became, then, that of "organizing the staff for the study of the most important educational problems, of releasing leadership, whether in the teaching body or administrative group" (p. 200).

Curricular issues were some of the most, if not the most, significant educational problems of the time.

Newlon (1934) noted that while curriculum revision had been one of the primary techniques in providing opportunities for teacher participation and further professionalizing teaching, there was still much confusion about the role of teachers. He pointed out that in many texts the authors

never quite squarely face the question of how much latitude should be accorded the teacher, of how obvious the need for effectiveness in teaching can be reconciled with a large amount of freedom for the teacher. (p. 195)

Additionally, the actual practice of teacher participation in curriculum work, according to Newlon, had only provided "nominal" opportunities in most cases (p. 185). Still these efforts had provided "somewhat greater freedom" (p. 218) to the teacher. Teacher participation in curriculum work still had much progress to make, in Newlon's view.

Douglas and Boardman (1934), both professors of education at the University of Minnesota, also noted the trend toward the cooperative development of curricula and discussed the benefits cooperative development. They asserted that a "definite trend may be noticed in the direction of utilizing the co-operation of the teachers in formulating the local courses of study" (p. 324). Whether teachers were adequately trained to participate did not "affect the desirability of co-operative procedures in curriculum construction" (p. 324). The value of their

contributions and the probability that they would better utilize the new courses outweighed the issue of inadequate training.

Douglas and Boardman (1934) identified four benefits of teacher participation in curriculum development. The most important benefit, according to the authors, was that teachers would gain a better understanding "of the practical objectives of secondary education" (p. 325). Note that this was a much broader benefit than simply understanding the newly constructed curriculum, which was the second benefit recognized by Douglas and Boardman. A third benefit they noted was that teacher participation would encourage a "new way of thinking of the nature of subject matter" (p. 325). The final benefit was

a mastery of the fundamental principles and facts upon which all method must be based- the specific objective of the course, the special contributions of various units of subject matter, the contribution of the course to the more general objectives of secondary education, the nature of the learning process, and the types of activities which will attract young people to whole-hearted activity. (p. 325)

This mastery or understanding would help teachers to "develop effective methods, with relatively little outside direction" (p. 325).

Otto (1934), a professor of education at Northwestern University, advocated teacher participation in curriculum construction in his discussion of the organization and administration of elementary schools. The most significant hindrance to teacher participation, in his view, was the inadequate training and preparation of most teachers for

curriculum development. Otto asserted that there was an urgent need for adequate training and preparation, not only to allow their effective participation in curriculum work, but also because it was the teacher "who administers to children through her thought, word, and action the educational theories and policies of the school system" (p. 109). As the significance of this relationship between the teacher and the curriculum was recognized, the urgency of adequate teacher preparation increased.

Additionally, as the significance of the relationship between the teacher and curriculum was recognized, teachers were increasingly being asked to participate in curriculum development. As an example, Otto (1934) cited the Denver Curriculum Revision Program. Otto pointed out that "a course of study which no classroom teacher sees until it is handed to him in final printed form is an anachronism" (p. 109). Otto asserted that numerous authors, including Newlon, were recommending that "teachers assume a part in curriculum construction" (p. 109). In addition to the benefit of an improved curriculum, many of these authors suggested that teacher participation resulted in professional growth which manifested itself in improved classroom instruction.

Cox and Langfitt (1934), professor and instructor of secondary education, respectively, at New York University, also advocated teacher participation in curriculum development in their discussion of high school

administration and supervision. They defined curriculum as "what happens within the reaction systems of children in connection with the class work" (p. 553). In this conception, teachers were critical because of their role in creating most of the learning situations that students are provided in school. The authors asserted that because of this critical role "teachers are inseparable from the curriculum, i.e., they must create it in some degree or they cannot execute it" (p. 553).

Cox and Langfitt (1934) contended that because of the realization that teachers and the curriculum were inseparable education had entered a period of "democratic scientific participation in curriculum making" (p. 552). Democratic scientific participation in curriculum making was defined by the authors as

the well-publicized formal efforts to encourage or induce teachers to undertake the revisions of syllabi, the determinations of objectives, the differentiations of course content or goals for pupil groups of varying abilities or curriculum interests, and the refinements of teaching procedures. (p. 552)

Cox and Langfitt defended the use of the term "scientific" in the description because of the "sociological analyses activities" (p. 552) involved in determining various factors in the curriculum. Interestingly, they also noted that scientific was commonly used as a synonym for "up-to-date, respectable, or efficient" (p. 552). Teacher participation was justified, according to Cox and Langfitt, by the assumption that "modifications can be facilitated if teachers understand their nature and purposes" (p. 552).

This understanding would be best promoted, in the authors view, by providing for "teacher-sponsorship and teacher-creativity in curriculum construction" (p. 552).

Goetting (1935), professor of education at Oklahoma Baptist University, concluded that the increasing importance that the curriculum was taking on required that teachers' professional development to "provide fundamentally for an orientation and a continuous reorientation to the problems of the curriculum" (p. 26). Goetting contended that the conceptions of teaching and the role of the teacher had changed since the turn of the century to a conception of teaching as "a venture in social and human engineering requiring a professional preparation and skill of the first rank" (p. 15). A "fundamental obligation" (p. 16), as Goetting described it, of this new conception of teaching was that teachers were formally prepared for curriculum development.

Goetting (1935) asserted that "every teacher is a curriculum builder in her own right" (p. 16) and that the recognition of this was gaining acceptance. This recognition was evidenced, according to Goetting, by the increasing number of curriculum revision programs in which teacher participation was a key provision. Goetting pointed out that recognition was also evidenced in the fact that even the most conservative administrators "will not permit the advance determination of the curriculum to its minutest details" (p. 16). Even the most prescriptive of curricula,

Goetting asserted, allowed for some initiative on the part of the teacher in deciding the details which are "dictated by the actual teaching situation" (p. 16). The actual day-to-day teaching situation was where teachers came into their own as curriculum builders, according to Goetting.

As the concept of teacher participation became more generally accepted, texts written to address teacher administrative responsibilities began to appear. For example, Overn (1935), a professor of education at the University of North Dakota, developed a guide for teacher administrative responsibilities. He noted that

the administration of American public schools is developing as a cooperative service of administrators and teachers in which the latter are performing more and more important functions. (p. 3)

Of the three phases of teacher participation in administration identified and discussed by Overn, the second phase, participation in internal school control, related directly to curriculum development. Curriculum development, according to Overn, was a "fertile field for research and study by classroom teachers" (p. 199).

Curriculum development was an important responsibility of administration in which teachers should participate. Overn (1935) asserted that teachers had "such intimate contacts with guidance and the learning processes of pupils that he should share intimately in all revisions or completions of the curriculum" (p. 20). He also contended that "the best results will be obtained in curriculum building when all teachers are included in the project" (p.

199). Teachers would benefit from the research and classroom experimentation necessary for curriculum work. Classroom instruction would benefit because teachers would "use the curriculum intelligently" (p. 200). The curriculum itself would benefit from the cooperative efforts of administrators and teachers.

Kilpatrick (1936), professor of philosophy of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, examined the curriculum revision movement. Kilpatrick was responsible for developing the highly influential Project Method (see Kilpatrick, 1918) as a method for curriculum development in which teachers played a critical role. Kilpatrick attributed the reason for the widespread efforts to revise curricula to several "significant new developments" (p. 13). The first development Kilpatrick noted was a "modern notion of change" (p. 14). In this modern conception of change, it was acknowledged that the rapidly changing civilization had resulted in corresponding social problems which in turn called for innovative solutions. It was the schools' responsibility to provide an adequate social education to provide the nation's citizens the means to intelligently confront these social problems (pp. 14-15).

A second influence was that of science on education. Kilpatrick (1936) asserted that educators misapplied science and the scientific method in their efforts to be objective:

They analyzed life into small separate pieces as impersonal as possible- facts, habits, skills- and studied these in separation, as if they could put them back together in persons and life. They called these

small pieces 'educational objectives,' and would make a curriculum out of them. (p. 16)

While leading scientists had begun to reject this approach, many educators were still operating under its influence especially in their approach to curriculum.

Developments in psychology were a third influence noted by Kilpatrick (1936). Psychology itself was unduly influenced by the approach to science of which Kilpatrick was critical. In regards to education, this psychology had "seized avidly upon 'standardized tests'" (p. 17) as a means of evaluating educational objectives which had been determined scientifically. A new concept of psychology and education was emerging, however. Kilpatrick stated that this new psychology was based on biology rather than physiology. In other words, according to Kilpatrick, an "organismic" approach was replacing the old behavioristic psychology. Kilpatrick noted that

learning is increasingly seen as creative of its own subject matter, not simply an acquisition of what was already there.

Education thus becomes primarily the conscious pursuit of personally felt purposes with ever more adequate self-direction as the goal. (p. 18)

This was the foundation for Kilpatrick's earlier thesis on instruction, the project method (see Kilpatrick, 1918).

This new thinking changed the approach to curriculum development. Kilpatrick detailed much of this in his writing on the project method. As he stated in Remaking the Curriculum

The unit of curriculum construction becomes . . . an instance of self-directed purposive living, not as

formerly a selected portion of subject-matter-set-out-to-be-learned. (p. 18)

The teacher played a critical role as he noted in The Project Method (Kilpatrick, 1918).

The socio-economic situation brought on by the Depression of 1929 was the last major development to influence the curriculum revision movement. This situation was really a part of the rapid social changes Kilpatrick (1936) discussed previously. In addition to the economic effects of the depression, many social changes were directly attributed to the depression. These socio-economic changes, as with other social changes that were taking place, required a social education that prepared students as citizens to deal intelligently and effectively with these problems. Kilpatrick termed this "social intelligence" (p. 20).

These new developments resulted in new definitions of curriculum and re-evaluations of the existing curricula. Kilpatrick (1936) defined curriculum as "all of the child's life for which the school carries responsibility" (p. 47). The basis, then, for curriculum development became actual life situations rather than "subject matter to be learned" (pp. 47-48). In other words, the basic "unit [for curriculum development] is an actual instance of child living" (p. 48). In Kilpatrick's perspective, then, the curriculum had to "be educatively conceived and educatively directed" (p. 48) by the teacher.

Kilpatrick (1936) perceived the teacher's role to be that of intelligent and sensitive guide. He noted that

the successive activity-experiences which make up the curriculum are to be chosen by the class-teacher group; the teacher is the expert, but the class will learn better how to choose as they think and act responsibly. (p. 66)

In order to act effectively as guide for the group, the teacher must "organize for a sufficient aggregate of life-and-education values by means of which to guide each step and stage of the developing process" (p. 66). This work could only be done effectively through cooperative planning with other teachers, according to Kilpatrick.

Osburn (1936), a professor at State Teachers' College in Millersburg, Pennsylvania, outlined the criteria for curriculum construction in vocational education. Of the criteria he listed, one noted the trend toward cooperative development of curriculum. Osburn stated that provisions should be made for the "democratic selection of curriculum content" (p. 231). The purpose for democratic selection was so that the curriculum "may be a wholesomely developed piece of work rather than one that is imposed from administrative heads" (p. 231).

The theme of the November, 1936, issue of Curriculum Journal was curriculum development in city schools. Democratic participation, particularly by teachers, was an idea common to many of the articles. For example, Cutright (1936), the assistant superintendent for instruction in the Minneapolis school system, identified factors, or

"determiners of the curriculum" (p. 6), which must be considered in curriculum work. Most notable of these factors was the selection and professional development of the participating teachers. While the selection of the appropriate participants was important, Cutright contended that "equally important is some plan for the continuation of teachers' training while in service" (p. 7). Because the curriculum "develops and is put into operation in the classroom," the effective utilization of any curriculum was dependent upon "the inclusion of the entire teaching group in training activities" as part of the activities of curriculum construction (p. 7). Cutright asserted that

it is only through the elimination of the wide and sometimes contradictory differences in conceptions of the purposes of education, in knowledge of how learning takes place, in attitudes toward subject matter and children that a continuous educational program may be put into effect. (pp. 7-8)

These issues would be part of the professional development plan of a comprehensive curriculum development program. By taking this factor into consideration, along with the other factors Cutright identified, she contended that "the results secured are more permanent and wide-spread" (p. 8).

In keeping with the theme of curriculum development in city schools, Parker (1936) discussed the organization of city school systems for curriculum work. In regards to teacher participation, Parker maintained that the organization for curriculum development must be such that

it makes possible for the entire staff a significant opportunity to study and discuss all available sources of ideas and principles and actually to attempt

exemplification of resulting ideas in the classroom.
(p. 9)

In other words, curriculum development was a "learning experience" (p. 9) in which the entire staff must be involved. As with Cutright, professional development was a critical factor.

While professional development was an ongoing feature of a curriculum development program, there were three phases of a curriculum development program, according to Parker (1936), which presented additional opportunities to involve the entire teaching staff. The initial phase, in which "definite study and discussion of directions and ways and means of proceeding in certain directions" (p. 10) were to take place, provided one opportunity. The "installation of new course of study materials" (p. 10) comprised a second opportunity. The third opportunity was found during the evaluation and revision of the curriculum. Parker noted that this stage, evaluation and revision, should be on a continuous basis.

There were also components of curriculum work which were not suitable for participation by the entire staff. Two, in particular, were noted by Parker (1936)- "the actual production of . . . and the try out of course of study materials" (p. 10). While it was not feasible for all faculty members to be involved in the actual production, e.g., writing and assembling, of materials, all faculty members would be encouraged to "contribute to the thinking" that went into production (p. 10). In regards to the try-

out period, Parker was not willing to suggest a definitive number of participants, but pointed out that it was "desirable to increase the numbers to the fullest extent possible" (p. 10). Even though it was not logistically feasible for all teachers to participate, teachers were to participate even in these stages of curriculum work.

In addition to organization for curriculum development, effective leadership for democratic participation in curriculum development was also addressed in the November, 1936, issue of Curriculum Journal. Brown (1936), a central office administrator in the Los Angeles school system, asserted that "an effective program of curriculum development demands extensive use of democratic procedures" (p. 16). Since cooperation was a common expectation for students and teachers, the same expectation should hold true for administrators and teachers. A part of the educational philosophy of the Los Angeles school system, according to Brown, "points toward a school organization which depends less and less upon authority and more and more upon cooperative procedures" (p. 16). Brown maintained that the success of any curriculum development program depended on this.

Leadership in curriculum development was not dependent upon administrators. One responsibility of administrators was to seek out and develop leaders in all areas of a school or system. In order for this to happen, administrators had to "bring teachers . . . into effective and stimulating

group relationships. Out of these contacts and inter-stimulation, a multiplicity of leaders will be developed" (Brown, 1936, p. 17). In this way, teachers would begin to share in the leadership in curriculum development. Brown pointed out that teachers "will come forward and in the truest sense become guiding forces in curriculum development. A leadership diffused and widespread is the type most desired" (p. 17). The "essence of the cooperative approach," Brown maintained, was the "constant alternation of leadership and followership, as between teachers and teachers, and teachers and supervisors, resulting in a stimulating interplay" (p. 19).

There were hazards in curriculum development, particularly concerning teachers, that administrators needed to be prepared to address. One pitfall was the tendency "to carry forward the instructional improvement far in advance of the average classroom teacher" (Brown, 1936, p. 17). This could especially be a problem in larger schools and systems. Another administrative problem identified by Brown was the tendency "either to over-regiment teachers and standardize materials on one hand, or to lack any common foundation, any general point of reference" (p. 18). Balancing between flexibility and guidance was "an eternal problem in any democratic approach to curriculum building" (p. 18), according to Brown.

In summary, Brown (1936) emphasized six points. First, the extent of teacher participation in curriculum

development was directly related to the effectiveness of classroom instruction: "The more extensive the participation of teachers, the more effective will be the resulting improvements in classroom teaching" (p. 20). A second point was that, while there were stages of curriculum work which were more administrative in nature, e.g., editing materials, "cooperative undertakings of all groups working on an equal basis in the interests of curriculum betterment" (p. 20) had to take priority. Brown's third point was that the "true" curriculum leader, whether administrator or teacher, created an environment which facilitated "continuous professional improvement" (pp. 20-21). Fourth, democratic procedures demanded that a "constant balance needs to be maintained between flexibility and stability" (p. 21). Procedures for curriculum development needed to be constantly reviewed and evaluated to insure that the changing needs of the school or system were being addressed. The fifth point was that curriculum development could "be effective and still follow democratic procedures" (p. 21). This was contingent, however, on "full cooperation" (p. 21) and effective leadership. Brown's final point was that in order "to secure the best results for curriculum revision," teachers' needs and opinions had to be taken into full consideration (p. 21).

While texts developed with the intent of assisting administrators with curriculum work were commonplace, the number of texts with the expressed intent of assisting

teachers with curriculum development were increasing as the concept of teacher participation became more widely accepted. Draper (1936), a professor of education at the University of Washington, asserted that "every teacher . . . should know the techniques of constructing a course of study in his particular field" (p. viii). Because training for curriculum work for teachers in colleges and universities was not widespread, Draper intended his text as a guide to curriculum work. He created his text with this expressed intent: "The present volume has been developed to assist the teachers at all levels in the organization of their teaching materials" (p. viii). He noted that the text would be particularly helpful to teachers who were interested in curriculum revision, but did not have "the direction of a research expert or advisors in curriculum or academic fields" (p. ix).

While Draper's (1936) focus had been on teachers, his last chapter addressed the relationship between administrators and teachers in successful curriculum work. He noted that "the establishment of a curriculum revision program necessitates the inclusion of representatives from every division of the educational staff" (p. 813). The superintendent, while responsible for the overall program, should pay particular attention to providing adequate financial resources and comprehensive training for all participants. The expert in curriculum construction, who Draper noted was usually an assistant superintendent in

larger systems, would act as liaison between the superintendent and those involved in the actual work, and would guide the work by consulting with the various committees. Principals were primarily responsible for serving on committees and facilitating the work of teachers within their schools. Supervisors were to serve on committees, particularly those responsible for developing objectives, learning activities, and measurement instruments. They also were to be responsible for assisting with the try-outs and evaluation of the new courses of study. It was especially important, though, that as many teachers as feasible participate. Draper (1936) pointed out that

since the organization and revision of courses of study is for the purpose of improving teaching . . . and stimulating professional activity of all teachers, it is essential that as many as possible of the corps be included in the program. (p. 816)

Draper identified three activities which might serve to accomplish this: serving on committees responsible for studying and revising courses of study, conducting research studies, and critiquing new courses of study (p. 816).

In their text on the principles of curriculum development, Norton and Norton (1936) pointed out that one of the major trends in curriculum work was the "tendency to bring a great variety of workers . . . and particularly to recognize the contribution that the classroom teacher has to make" (p. 547). One influence which had brought about this change, according to the authors, was the emerging

differentiation between curriculum and course of study.

Norton and Norton asserted that the traditional procedures for curriculum development

become increasingly unacceptable as one distinguishes the curriculum- the sum total of the numerous events which compose a child's life and from which he learns- from the course of study, which is merely one of a series of aids to the teacher in making the curriculum significant. Under this conception, curriculum revision begins with the classrooms and life of the school. (p. 562)

For those schools and systems operating under this conception of curriculum and curriculum revision, would consider teacher participation an indispensable part of the process.

Evidence of this trend, according to Norton and Norton (1936), could be found in the numerous studies examining teacher participation. For example, the authors cited the study conducted by Trillingham (see Trillingham, 1934) in which, they asserted, it was found that

more than a third of the cities over 30,000 in population attempt to use all teachers, and a majority of cities of this size provide for the participation of a substantial percentage of teachers. (p. 562)

Norton and Norton also cited Harap's third survey of curriculum (see Harap, 1935) in which, they maintained, was reported "the almost universal use of committee procedure in which the teacher plays the most important role" (p. 563). A final example was noted in the work by Caswell in the Virginia Curriculum Revision Program in which "in a single year as many as 10,000 teachers have actively participated" (p. 563). These and other examples made it clear, at least

to the authors, that there was a definite trend toward democratic participation of teachers in curriculum development.

Even though a trend was apparent, there was still "considerable disagreement as to the particular role which the classroom teacher should play" (Norton and Norton, 1936, p. 563). One role for teachers that the authors endorsed was that of leadership in curriculum work. The authors again cited Harap's (1935) third survey of the curriculum in which he found that teachers chaired curriculum committees more frequently than any other position in a school system. Norton and Norton (1936) noted that in recognition of this, many school systems were providing teachers opportunities to "equip themselves for leadership in this field" (p. 563). In addition to chairing curriculum committees, Norton and Norton reported that teachers' roles included developing procedures, creating units of instruction, and conducting curriculum research and experiments.

However, there were other roles that were in question. For example, Norton and Norton (1936) noted, in citing Caswell and Campbell (see Campbell and Caswell, 1935), that some authors contended that it was "absurd to expect large numbers of teachers to be concerned with the actual writing of courses of study" (p. 564). It was questionable whether most teachers had adequate training for the task. Additionally, this particular task was very time-intensive. Nevertheless, there were schools and systems which involved

teachers even in this phase of curriculum development. As the authors pointed out, the final word on the appropriate roles for teachers in curriculum development was still to be decided.

Regardless of roles, mass participation was not enough, in the view of Norton and Norton (1936). They asserted that an "effective program involves participation and contributions by a great variety of workers" (p. 564). Meaningful, and democratic, participation, according to the authors, meant that

all persons who are concerned with a program, and have contributions to make toward its advancement, find themselves co-operating in a manner which is satisfying to themselves and which results in maximum progress for the program. (p. 564)

Meaningful teacher participation was essential, but often difficult to achieve in actual practice.

In another text on the principles of school administration, Reeder (1936) asserted that, as a task of school administration, modern curriculum development required a cooperative approach. As did other authors, Reeder also noted the current tendency toward democratic participation in curriculum development. Reeder suggested that "in small school systems . . . it is usually best to have the whole [faculty] work on one subject at a time" (p. 426), while in larger systems a committee would be appointed for each subject area. The composition of these committees would determine their effectiveness. Again, in larger systems representatives from each of the "various personnel

groups" (p. 426), i.e., teachers, principals, supervisors, would serve on each committee. The size of the committee would be large enough to allow "the points of view of several persons" (p. 426). Reeder suggested five to nine members as the ideal. However, he contended that curriculum development should not "be entirely a committee function. The suggestions and the criticisms of all members of the educational department . . . should be sought and welcomed" (p. 428). As an example, Reeder noted the curriculum revision project in the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, school system which was "bringing every educational employee in the county into cooperation on the project" (p. 428).

The fourteenth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (1936), addressed the revision of the social studies curriculum and recommended cooperative procedures for its accomplishment. One reason was that teacher participation in curriculum development was "producing curriculums which are more flexible and better adapted to local needs" (pp. 12-13). Additionally, the authors noted that

experience in the past few years has been that preparation of curriculum materials by teacher committees increase the educational understanding of those participating in the work, and hence improves the quality of instruction in the classroom. This statement is particularly true when certain weaknesses of the procedure, such as lack of adequate scholarship on the part of committee members, are adequately provided for. (p. 14)

Teacher participation in curriculum work resulted in better curricula, better utilization of the new curricula, and improved instruction in classrooms.

Adequate scholarship was a primary concern of the authors (Department of Superintendence, 1936). They contended that in many curriculum development programs participants "on course-of-study committees plunge directly into the work of writing materials without sufficient preliminary preparation" (p. 234). In order to adequately prepare participants, the authors suggested several preliminary steps in preparation for curriculum work. The first step suggested was the "presentation and discussion of the large problems with which the committee is faced" (p. 234). Possible problems would initially be presented by the superintendent and would include issues such as completion time, the present status of the curriculum, and size of the community. The second step involved the preparation of "selected bibliographies of adult material for committee members and teachers" (p. 235). In addition to providing perspective on the larger issues, these bibliographic materials would provide pertinent resources for the preparation of courses of study. Third, the authors stated that the committee should develop questions which would serve as guides for committee members and teachers to the major concepts in the unit of study. From these questions, the committee would determine the essential or major concepts inherent in the unit of study. Identification of

these key concepts constituted the fourth preliminary step. The fifth step involved considering adaptations which would be necessary to help all students to be successful. This included providing teachers with "a wealth of highly selected materials and suggested activities" (p. 236) to help teachers in meeting the needs of all students. In the final step, a summary of "the point of view" (p. 236) of the committee would be developed. The authors stated that the "summary should include, not only the materials . . . , but some of the discussion thru which the committee arrived at its conclusion" (p. 236). These steps would serve to adequately prepare and orient all committee members for the primary work of the revision of the social studies curriculum.

Kyte (1936), a professor of education at the University of California, asserted that curriculum revision was "an important means for training teachers in service" (p. 22). Earlier, it will be remembered, Kyte conducted one of the first notable studies of teacher participation in curriculum work (see Kyte, 1923). In his current piece, Kyte contended that, in order for them to do their job effectively, teachers needed "detailed help regarding the references, supplies and equipment to be selected for use" (p. 23). This would be achieved most effectively through teacher involvement in teacher participation. Kyte's conception of curriculum development had "as its sole purpose the maximum

development of every teacher into the most professionally efficient person he is capable of becoming" (p. 23).

Kyte (1936) outlined the steps in curriculum revision which indicated "the most important phases of in-service training that are involved" (p. 23). In Kyte's conception of curriculum revision, the curriculum work was to be conducted as "a constructive supervisory procedure" (p. 23). The first step involved making teachers aware of the need for curriculum revision. This step was critical, in Kyte's perspective, because "the success of in-service training . . . depends markedly upon the care and thoroughness with which the initial step is taken" (p. 23). The second step consisted of planning the procedures to be followed in curriculum revision. While this step was primarily completed by administrators, Kyte maintained that "some means must be found . . . to provide for participation in the planning by all members of the educational staff" (p. 23). Organization of the faculty and staff for curriculum revision constituted the third step. The fourth step was conducted by the various committees created and consisted of the cooperative development of: an educational philosophy, specific objectives, teaching procedures, and guidelines needed for instruction (p. 24).

Many authors attributed the origins of the thinking and practice of teacher participation in school administration to the work of John Dewey (e.g., Newlon, 1929). As early as the turn of the century, Dewey's writing (see Dewey, 1903)

and work in the University of Chicago laboratory school (see Mayhew & Edwards, 1936) were evidence of this. Dewey's thinking on the subject had not changed significantly in after thirty-five years. Dewey (1937), now professor emeritus of philosophy at Columbia University, continued to endorse teacher participation in educational administration. Dewey emphasized that democracy was much more than a form of government. Democracy, he asserted, was "a way of life, social and individual" (p. 457). A fundamental concept of democracy as a way of life, according to Dewey, was the

necessity for the participation of every mature human being in formation of the values that regulate the living of men together which is necessary from the standpoint of both the general social welfare and the full development of human beings as individuals. (p. 457)

Participation was basic to democratic practice.

Dewey (1937) noted that he could not now state, as he asserted in 1902, that there was no school system in which democratic practice could be found: "There has been in some places a great advance in the democratic direction" (p. 460). However, Dewey also noted that "democratic methods of dealing with pupils have made more progress than have similar methods of dealing with members of the teaching staff" (p. 460). Dewey asserted that what was appropriate for students was even more so for teachers. The question this posed was: "What are the ways by which can be secured more organic participation of teachers in the formation of the educational policies of the school?" (p. 461).

Arguments against teacher participation in administration included teacher apathy and lack of preparation on the part of teachers. Dewey (1937) addressed these concerns. First, he contended that

absence of participation tends to produce lack of interest and concern on the part of those shut out. The result is a corresponding lack of responsibility. (p. 461)

Autocratic and bureaucratic practices bred the very teacher apathy that many administrators were concerned would influence their participation, according to Dewey. Dewey further contended that

where there is little power, there is correspondingly little sense of positive responsibility. It is enough to do what one is told to do sufficiently well to escape flagrant notice. About larger matters, a spirit of passivity is engendered. (p. 461)

If administrators wished to engender a sense of responsibility and passion, the implication was that expanding teacher participation rather than restricting it was one direction.

Inadequate teacher training was another issue regularly raised in response to calls for teacher participation in educational administration. Dewey (1937) noted that a corollary to this assertion was the "accompanying belief that natural selection has operated to put those best prepared to carry the load in positions of authority" (p. 461). This issue was similar in nature as that of teacher apathy. Dewey noted that the "incapacity to assume the responsibilities involved in having a voice in shaping policies is bred and increased by conditions in which that

responsibility is denied" (p. 461). The positive expression of this was that "the best way to produce initiative and constructive power is to exercise it" (p. 461). Dewey added that if it was too much to expect teachers to participate in making decisions concerning school policy, then it was also too much to expect them "to have the intelligence and skill that are necessary to execute the directions given them" (p. 461). This argument could be applied to curriculum development. If teachers were incapable of participating in curriculum development, then they were incapable of intelligently utilizing the curriculum in the classroom.

Strayer (1937), a professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, proposed reasons for teacher participation in school administration. He first reasoned that when teacher participation in school administration was questioned, the real issue was

whether those immediately responsible for the educative process should contribute to the determination of those policies which make possible the realization of the purpose for which the schools are organized.
(p. 457)

The answer, at least to Strayer, was obvious: "teachers must participate in the development of administrative policies" (p. 457). There were, however, other perspectives, according to Strayer, which would support the idea of teacher participation. The accomplishment of the primary purpose of education, i.e., the preparation of students for participation in a democracy, required intelligent and skillful teachers. If it was accepted that

teachers were capable of accomplishing this purpose, then teachers were capable of participating in deciding administrative policy. Strayer reasoned that

to deny teachers participation in the development of administrative policy would be to propose that they could transmit to children ideals and practices unknown to them in their daily occupation. (p. 458)

The same logic which dictated that teachers were incapable of participation in school administration, would hold that the same teachers were incapable of effectively teaching students. By extension, then, the same logic which stated teachers were incapable of participation in curriculum development suggested that they were incapable of effectively using the same curriculum in their classrooms. Strayer suggested that this logic did not hold up to close scrutiny.

Strayer (1937) made a distinction between development of policy and implementation of policy. Teachers were to participate primarily in the development of administrative policies. Teachers' involvement focused on "policies which had to do with the development and improvement of our system of education" (p. 458). In Strayer's perspective, those policies which teachers should participate in the determination of included

the organization of schools and classes, . . . the curricula to be developed, and . . . procedures which will contribute to the realization of the purposes or objectives commonly recognized. (p. 458)

Curriculum work was a suitable and necessary area for teacher participation. Strayer asserted that

no one today would propose that a reorganization of the secondary school curricula could be carried out successfully without the co-operation of those teachers who know intimately the needs and capacities of high school students. (p. 459)

Strayer noted that acceptance of this idea was evidenced by current practices, such as giving teachers release time, in curriculum work.

Strayer (1937) also contended that teacher participation in the development of administrative policies was a "right and obligation . . . that should be recognized" (p. 461). The attitude of some that teacher participation was a privilege, rather than a right, was "a false conception of the relationship which should exist between the administrative staff and teachers" (p. 461). Strayer maintained that democratic administration required that "the best thought of all teachers be made available to administrative officers and to laymen who have been given responsibility for the determination of policy" (p. 461).

Rugg (1937), a professor of education at Colorado State College of Education, asserted that

teachers, administrators, and even pupils- working together- with the same amount of energy and infinitely more profit to the school and to themselves may develop new and significant organizations of [curriculum] materials. (p. 205)

Because there was "yet too little scientific evidence on which to base in detail the selection of the whole curriculum," the contributions of teachers to curriculum development could "result in selection of experience of greater use , 'suitability,' and 'carryover' than mere

'adherence to authority'" (p. 205). Teachers contributions to curriculum work were as valuable, if not more valuable, as any other resource available at the time. One contribution, in particular, that teachers could make was to "be critical, very critical, of what is taught, even when such teaching or learning is based on a textbook or course of study" (p. 206).

Rugg (1937) contended that college coursework was one way in which teachers could be prepared for curriculum work. He described the method he used in one of the college courses he taught. Pre-service teachers were asked to write an actual unit of study. Rugg noted that students had to follow specified procedures to develop their units. The procedures included:

(1) the development of a selected bibliography of pertinent literature of the field; (2) the making of a detailed working outline; (3) the preparation of the first draft of the unit with the details of the actual reading materials, exercises, activities, and procedures; and (4) the revision and even complete rewriting of the unit after criticism. (p. 206)

Pre-service teachers were also required to include specific components as part of their units of study. They components included a title, introduction, table of contents, objectives, learning activities, summary, end-of-unit test, and bibliography (p. 206).

Rucker (1937), an official with the Springfield, Missouri, school system, reported on the principles in curriculum making which had evolved from the curriculum work conducted in Springfield. He noted that these principles

had "not been imposed on teachers but serve in focusing their study of curriculum reconstruction upon significant areas" (p. 215). Several principles related to teacher participation. One principle stated that

a desirable curriculum development program should be carried on in the light of the best psychological and physiological research available from the standpoint of the child, the teacher, and the parent. (p. 215)

A second principle asserted that "curriculum revision is a cooperative enterprise in which the entire teaching staff should participate wholeheartedly and understandingly" (p. 215). The final principle which related to teacher participation maintained that a primary purpose of curriculum revision was to facilitate professional growth "rather than to develop special devices and methods" (p. 216).

Rankin (1937), the assistant superintendent of the Ann Arbor, Michigan, school system, described the characteristics of an effective curriculum development program. The first characteristic that Rankin noted was that "curriculum development, ideally, is carried on democratically. There is widespread participation in the process" (p. 569). A second characteristic of an effective curriculum program, according to Rankin, was that the materials developed were "flexible and adaptable to the needs of the many different individuals" (p. 569) that will be served by the materials. Teachers must have the freedom and authority to adapt the curriculum materials, developed as the result of "group thought and experimentation" (p.

569), to the needs of the students. Effective curriculum programs were also characterized by "planning which is done in such a way that the plan is accepted understandingly and wholeheartedly by all those who are to share in working it out" (p. 570).

While state and system curriculum development programs were receiving more and more notice, Gumlick (1937) noted that there was still much curriculum work that teachers could do within the school. She asserted that "curriculum development must take into account the differences existing in individual schools" (p. 267). She further contended that, regardless of how democratic the procedures were in developing the curriculum, the curriculum

can at best only suggest large areas of experience within which particular groups should work. It remains for the individual school to select and adapt the phases of the suggested areas which will meet its peculiar needs and interests. (p. 267)

As with other writers (see McMurry, 1915), from Gumlick's perspective the school was still considered the basic unit for curriculum development.

Gumlick (1937) described some ways in which teachers might adapt the curriculum to the needs of the school. First, Gumlick suggested that "an individual school should make use of the worth-while experiences of members of its faculty members or pupils" (p. 268). Another suggestion was for teachers to record and share the adaptations of the curriculum they made in their individual classrooms. She contended that

individual schools could contribute much if members of the faculty . . . would keep and make available the records of their curriculum activities Many worthwhile experiments are lost because no records are kept. (p. 269)

One final suggestion was that teachers within schools could form curriculum study groups or committees to investigate ways in which the curriculum might be adapted to school needs. Gumlick indicated that teachers could contribute much by "constituting themselves into committees to study and experiment with changing ideas of the curriculum" (p. 269). In Gumlick's conception, teachers were to be leaders, within the school, in curriculum adaptation and development.

Harris (1937), professor of education and philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, acknowledged the importance of teacher participation in curriculum development in his discussion of curriculum and cultural change. He asserted that

we now realize more fully than ever before that curriculum development is vitally influenced by the immediate notions and standards of the teacher In final analysis organized materials can be no better than the insight, convictions, and initiative of the teacher. (p. vii)

Therefore, no improvement of the curriculum was possible without the active participation of teachers.

Also, central to Harris' (1937) conception of curriculum development was the idea that

each of us shall become such profound students of social life that there shall come to all of us in varying degree the perception of new possibilities of achieving for the young a more intelligently self-directed existence. (p. 442)

In this sense, Harris asserted that curriculum development had individual and multiple perspectives, and was experimental in nature. Curriculum development was individual in the sense that the teacher had to use his or her individual knowledge and judgment to aid

the child in participating more fully and intelligently in his own education by so managing things that he shall be encouraged to use environmental forces and master them instead of submitting to their pressure. (p. 443)

Harris contended, also, that curriculum development was multiple, in that, "there will be as many curriculums as there are teachers and separate groups of children" (p. 443). Finally, curriculum development was experimental. Curriculum development had to focus on

those problems of present concern which emerge in the thick of individual and group participation and which are aided by both the contemporary social context of events and historic sources of illumination and guidance. (p. 443)

Since the contexts of these was always changing, no fixed curriculum would be useful. Curriculum development would be a continual, on-going process.

This conception of curriculum development required a different approach to the practical side, to procedures, in curriculum development. Harris (1937) asserted that many programs for curriculum development seemed "to begin at the wrong end of the problem. They wish to bring something to the teacher some new selection or arrangement of materials to be taught to the child" (p. 446). They missed a more fundamental aspect of curriculum development, "the task of

aiding the teacher in self-criticism" (p. 446). Harris attributed this omission to several factors: an inadequate understanding of the nature of curriculum development, the difficulties inherent in working with groups of people, "the sanctions of existing administrative policy and the resources of most supervisory techniques" (pp. 446-447).

One "fundamental" problem in curriculum development, according to Harris (1937), was "the primacy of [administrator] interest in the smooth coordination of administrative function" (p. 447), i.e., the quest for an efficient curriculum development process. The focus on efficiency resulted in an environment where

procedures and progress [of curriculum development] are judged, not in terms of the extent to which the standards of teachers are revised on the basis of their own consenting disposition and intelligence, but in terms of some set standard of conformity, excellence, or achievement. (p. 447)

Teacher judgment, intelligence, professional growth, and initiative were sacrificed at the expense of having an efficient process.

There were two basic approaches to the preparation and evaluation of curriculum materials, according to Harris (1937). He characterized the first approach as the focus on

whether results square with adopted standards, whether certain known or stated objectives have been reached, and whether any given procedure fits well into some larger organization or accepted scheme of reference. (p. 449)

This approach de-emphasized the value of teacher participation in the development of the curriculum. The second approach, Harris explained, assumed that

if teachers are encouraged from the outset to understand what they do, to make genuine criticisms of it, and to see new possibilities in it, course-of-study organization may become a true function of their professional growth. (p. 466)

In this approach, emphasis was placed on the possibilities of practice rather than standard practice. Harris called this the "principle of relativity" (p. 466). Harris noted that curriculum development was a natural part of teaching:

Fundamentally, every teacher engages in the making of the course of study which he really uses whether administrators will it or not. The teacher is constantly constructing and reconstructing whether for good or ill. This cannot be prevented, so long as the teacher is allowed to express any individuality whatever. (p. 466)

No administrative procedures or organization would change the teachers adaptation of the curriculum in the classroom. If one accepted Harris' assertion, then the way to affect the curriculum was to work with teachers in the classroom "helping them to use more and more critical thinking in connection with children's experiences" (pp. 466-467). This approach would result in "a more genuine, organic connection between the course of study and what is done about it" (p. 467).

Harris (1937) reminded readers that the principle of relativity implied that

materials and instances of practice should not be reported as data for constructing courses of study or in order to indicate the extent to which they meet some given norm of excellence. And of course they should not be reported in order that they may be followed or duplicated. (p. 467)

The purpose of reporting or recording particular practices or materials, in Harris' conception, was to indicate a

"particular teacher's way of growing" and "to enrich [another] teacher's thinking" (p. 467) not to dictate a particular practice or materials. Harris noted that "merely to approve or disapprove may fail to stimulate effort" (p. 468). To enrich a teacher's thinking about possibilities, on the other hand, was "conducive to growth" (p. 468).

The second approach made administrators and teachers equals in curriculum development. Cooperative practice, Harris (1937) asserted, became a necessity (p. 468). Rather than creating an entire course of study, it was preferable to develop "fairly small administrative units" so as to "prevent impersonal relationships and to make possible a maximum of face-to-face participation" (pp. 468-469). Harris noted the work of Tippett in the Parker School District of Greenville, South Carolina (see Tippett, 1936) as illustrative of the second approach. The greatest need in educational administration, according to Harris, was a philosophy of teacher participation. Harris contended that the development of this philosophy had been inhibited by efficiency in educational administration and "excessive objectivity in educational science" (p. 469).

Linder (1938), the principal of the Palo Alto, California, Senior High School, presented "a simple statement on the nature curriculum development as a preliminary orientation for school authorities and teachers" (p. 27) beginning a curriculum development program. Linder noted that the questions he addressed were those heard

primarily from teachers. The questions posed by Linder that were most pertinent to the consideration of teacher participation in curriculum development were: "By whom should the curriculum be developed?" and "What are some of the most important criteria of a good curriculum-development program?" (p. 28).

Linder (1938) asserted that "the building of the school curriculum is a co-operative procedure" (p. 28). A wide range of participants, including teachers, should take part in the curriculum work, according to Linder. He emphasized that it was "important that no sources of assistance be overlooked" (p. 28). However, the actual work of curriculum construction, he maintained, would "be accomplished by teachers under the direction of those assuming responsibility for the working of the curriculum" (p. 28). While the extent or level of participation would be up to the individual teachers, Linder asserted that no teachers "should be without active interest in the program" (p. 28).

Linder (1938) identified four criteria for an effective curriculum development program. Effective and qualified leadership to guide the program was one criteria of an effective curriculum development program. A second feature of an effective program was that the participation of all teachers was crucial. Linder noted that the ultimate effectiveness of the curriculum would be "pretty much limited to the degree to which all [teachers] participate" (p. 28). A third criteria for an effective curriculum

development program was closely related to participation by all teachers. One way in which teachers would participate was to give constructive criticism of proposed courses. Linder asserted that teacher suggestions and criticism were important: "The most fruitful source of constructive criticism will be from teachers actually using the tentative curriculums in the classroom" (p. 28). The last criteria identified by Linder related to professional development. As with many programs, professional growth, particularly of teachers, was a primary goal. An effective curriculum development program, then, according to Linder, should result in "professional growth throughout the system" (p. 28). Three of the four factors critical to an effective program of curriculum development, in Linder's perspective, related directly to teacher participation and growth.

The theme of the April, 1938, issue of Educational Method was cooperation. Curtis (1938) summarized his theory of cooperation. The most basic definition of cooperation, in Curtis' conception, was simply "working together" (p. 349). The deciding factor was the impetus for cooperation. Curtis noted that "the motives which cause men to work together vary all the way from might to love" (p. 349). He identified five forms of cooperation: compulsion, compromise, bargaining, leadership, and brotherhood (p. 349). The highest of these, democratic cooperation based on brotherhood, was the form that should be the goal of educators, according to Curtis.

Unfortunately, Curtis noted, there were few examples in practice of this level of cooperation.

Curtis (1938) contended that the lack of examples should not be surprising. He maintained that "in the past all of us have been operating on the competitive basis" (p. 350). Curtis cited the use of Robert's *Rules of Order* as illustrative of his assertion. He noted that such methods controlling group interactions "were evolved from situations in which men were actuated by personal competitive and not social motives" (p. 350). In contrast, democratic cooperation required

unity in terms of common purpose, respect for individual differences, a belief that group planning and group action can result in achievements better than any single individual. (p. 350)

Democratic cooperation, Curtis asserted, sought "to harmonize conflicts of opinion and to secure unity through understanding and the discovery of truth" (p. 350). A final characteristic of democratic cooperation was that "all must participate in deliberations, all must work for the good of each, and each person must desire his good only as it is achieved in the good of all" (p. 350).

Hanna (1938), a professor of education at Stanford University, asserted that teacher participation was the most effective method of curriculum development. Hanna suggested that there had been three general procedures for developing curriculum: by curriculum specialists or experts, by a central curriculum committee, or through the cooperative efforts of the entire teaching staff (p. 142). Hanna

maintained that participation in curriculum development by the entire faculty could "be justified on the assumption that what goes on in the classroom can be no better than the insight and the artistry of the classroom teacher herself" (p. 142). Wide participation in curriculum development provided the professional growth necessary for improving classroom instruction.

Hanna (1938) described current curriculum programs in which professional growth was the primary concern. Many were beginning to conduct curriculum work in three-year cycles. The first year in many of these programs was devoted to curriculum study. Hanna noted that

teachers entirely on a voluntary basis, organize themselves into reading and discussion groups. . . . they read in the fields of science, philosophy, psychology, the arts, human relations, and a broad study of the culture of which we are a part. (p. 143)

In the second year of the cycle, teachers applied what they had learned to creating new learning experiences for students. The bulk of the actual curriculum work was done at this time. Hanna related that during this period "teachers are busy experimenting, trying this and that, keeping careful records of successful pupil learning experiences" (p. 143). These records were then submitted for review, revision, and eventual publication. In the third year, Hanna explained that most of the teachers in a school or system were involved in "a general try-out . . . of these widely gathered, successful experiences" (p. 143). During the course of this three-year cycle, Hanna asserted

that wide teacher participation in curriculum development was achieved.

Professional growth was an important end result of this wide participation, according to Hanna (1938). Teachers who had had the opportunity to make suggestions and try-out tentative courses in their classrooms were more willing to accept the final courses of study. Hanna asserted that

to the degree that teachers have had some share in the building of this kind of suggested course of study, there is a readiness on their part to accept the group result. (p. 144)

In Hanna's conception, curriculum development, therefore, led to

the leadership of the professional group in their own personal growth and development, . . . and . . . [to] an attempt to translate these new insights into growth and newer experiences for pupils. (p. 144)

The professional growth which resulted from these experiences was more important than the actual courses of study because the professional growth would have a direct effect on the classroom.

Engelhardt (1938), a professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, contended that, while teacher participation was desirable, widespread participation in school administration might "deny leadership in other areas of service for which teachers are better trained and in which leadership qualities are sorely needed" (p. 12). He asserted that the "purpose of teacher participation in administration should be to conserve the skills and expertness of the teacher in his special realm"

(p. 17), among other things. He explained that "the increase in size of administrative units, and the multiplication of administrative tasks" made it impractical for any meaningful widespread teacher participation without interfering with the instructional responsibilities for which teachers were hired (p. 12). Engelhardt suggested that selective participation of teachers was more desirable than widespread participation in school administration.

Engelhardt (1938) contended that administrative problems could be divided into two categories: "those which remotely affect the service areas of other workers in school systems, and those which directly impinge upon their work" (p. 15). He reasoned that teacher participation would be better served by preparing teachers "to contribute significantly to those areas which are most immediately associated with the teaching process itself" (p. 15). One of those areas was curriculum development. However, the methods of involving teachers in curriculum development, according to Engelhardt, were generally inappropriate:

Teacher participation in administration has altogether too frequently been thought of as a sidetracking of teacher activity into a field where much clerical or detailed work is to be done and little responsibility is to be given. Teacher participation in curriculum making has often taken upon itself this characteristic. (p. 17)

Engelhardt's emphasis was on the lack of responsibility given teachers in curriculum work. This is a lesson still unlearned. Teachers meaningfully engaged in curriculum work, while given the requisite responsibilities, would

constitute an appropriate area for participation, in Engelhardt's conception.

Reinoehl (1938), a professor of education at the University of Arkansas, maintained that teacher participation in school administration was increasing significantly. He noted that teachers were participating in numerous ways, one of which was curriculum revision. Teachers, according to Reinoehl, had become research workers by developing, experimenting with, and evaluating curriculum materials within their classrooms. Through these activities, Reinoehl asserted that teachers had "come to assume a large share of responsibility . . . in producing new and better courses of study" (p. 71). He concluded that the development of new instructional materials adapted to specific needs of students and schools "required the cooperative efforts of all in the line of duty from teacher to curriculum consultant" (p. 71).

The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association (1938) published its eleventh yearbook, the theme of which was cooperation. Courtis (1938), professor of education at the University of Michigan, served as chair of the committee which produced this yearbook. His conception of cooperation served as the theoretical basis for the text. He asserted that there was "a need for analysis of [cooperation's] many forms into elements, and for the generalizations of basic concepts and principles" (p. 19). Cooperation, according to

Courtis, "signifies merely 'working together'" (p. 19). However, cooperation could be carried out on many different levels. Courtis identified eight levels of cooperation from reaction, the lowest level, to democratic, the highest level. Democratic cooperation was the level which educational organizations should work toward, according to Courtis.

Courtis (1938) asserted that democratic cooperation was dependent on several factors: unity and group consciousness, regard for the individual, and a conviction the human condition could be improved through cooperative effort (p. 31). Democratic cooperation was characterized by a group consciousness on the part of every member of the organization, in Courtis' conception. The responsibility for leadership would be assumed by all members, but "would also be ready to act under direction as a follower when group planning was at an end" (p. 30). Courtis described leadership as "a function, not a person" (p. 30) which would pass from member to member depending on the contribution they had to make. Organization and officers within the organization would only be required for "purposes of coordination, execution, and record as determined by the group" (p. 30). Democratic cooperation was also characterized by three phases of activity:

- (1) a creative planning phase in which all would participate as equal leaders;
- (2) an action phase in which one would serve as agent to direct the carrying out of the group thinking and planning; and,
- (3) a reflective phase in which all again would participate

as equals in appraising the results of action and in making generalizations. (pp. 30-31)

Democratic cooperation required cooperative planning and evaluation of actions carried out by the organization.

Also in the same Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction yearbook on cooperation, Misner (1938), superintendent of the Glencoe, Illinois, school system, discussed cooperation in administration and supervision. Misner noted that cooperation had always been a valuable element of school administration. However, he asserted that

in too many situations . . . cooperation has been interpreted and used by administrators as effective means to get teachers to cooperate with them in executing policies and plans that the administration desired to be carried out. (p. 81)

Courtis, according to Misner, identified this level of cooperation as "compulsion" (p. 81). The ideal, for educational organizations at least, was democratic cooperation which redefined the role of administration and how cooperation manifested itself in schools. The role of administrators, in the conception of democratic cooperation, became that of "service agencies designed to facilitate the teaching-learning process" (p. 85). Administrative responsibilities, in this conception, included

providing opportunities for group purposing and group planning . . . coordinating the activities of the group and [executing] policies that have been cooperatively formulated. (p. 85)

The focus for administration became, then, facilitating the group process to improve instruction in classrooms.

One criticism of democratic cooperation was that it was an inefficient method for operating a school or system. Misner (1938), a superintendent himself, addressed this issue. He attributed the crux of the problem to the "restricted meaning" (p. 88) which was given to the term efficiency. Misner pointed out that, in actuality, democratic cooperation "could result in a higher level of efficiency" (p. 88) through purposeful activity, planning, flexibility, and discipline. For example, Misner noted that increasing recognition was being given to the "importance of purposing as a major factor in effective learning and acting" (p. 88). Additionally, he pointed out that

in organizing curriculum experiences . . . , modern educators believe that persons act more intelligently when they have been given the opportunity to determine and define individual and group purposes. (p. 88)

Simply put, intelligent action was more efficient than unintelligent action. In regards to planning, Misner asserted that

democratic cooperative organization . . . will achieve a higher level of efficiency because it will seek and secure a wide range of creative contributions in group planning. (pp. 89-90)

Democratic cooperation was more efficient because it provided more alternatives to choose from when seeking solutions to problems. The contention that democratic cooperation was less efficient than other methods of administration, in Misner's view, was false.

In an introductory text on the principles of school administration, Cooke, Hamon, and Proctor (1938) asserted

that while curriculum development was chiefly an administrative responsibility, "teachers should participate as much as possible in the actual work of making or revising the curriculum" (p. 269). Cooke and Hamon, professors of education at George Peabody College, and Proctor, a professor of education at Duke University, suggested that "the best results are obtained in curriculum construction when all teachers participate in the project" (p. 269). They reasoned that curriculum which was cooperatively developed was "more likely to be accepted and supported by all [teachers] than [a course of study] which has been handed down by the administration" (p. 269). Additionally, they contended that in the try-out and evaluation phases of curriculum development teachers' services were indispensable.

Cooke, et al., (1938) further asserted that "in actual practice, very few superintendents completely ignore the teacher as a force in curriculum making" (p. 271). They cited a study, which Cooke co-authored (see Cooke and Schmitz, 1932), as evidence:

Cooke and Schmitz reported that sixty-one percent of the teachers have complete responsibility for making the courses of study; twenty-seven percent are asked to offer suggestions regarding the course of study; ten percent serve as members of curriculum committees; while only two percent have no participation in making the course of study. (p. 271)

Cooke, Hamon, and Proctor noted that "a large number" (p. 271) of administrators, and professors of education, indicated a preference for teacher involved through

curriculum committees rather than granting complete responsibility to teachers. They further noted that of these groups of respondents, administrators and professors of education, there was unanimous agreement that teachers should participate in some capacity in the development of the curriculum (p. 271).

Curriculum development was considered by an increasing number of authors to be the primary, and most effective, vehicle for promoting cooperative supervision. Myers, Kifer, Merry, and Foley (1938) asserted that

the professional improvement of teachers in service is a cooperative responsibility to be discharged by supervisors. One of the finest opportunities for cooperative professional service leading to professional growth and improvement is that which relates to the changing curriculum. (p. 133)

Myers, a professor of education at New York University, Foley, a supervisor with the Connecticut State Department of Education, and Kifer and Merry, professors of education at State Teachers College in New Haven, Connecticut, maintained that curriculum development was an effective method for promoting professional growth. Since supervision was concerned with the professional growth of teachers, curriculum development could be effectively used to that end by supervisors.

For one thing, curriculum development was a convenient method. Myers, et al., (1938) cited the number of school systems which were involved in curriculum development programs. The authors noted that the tenth yearbook for the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (see

Joint Committee on Curriculum, 1937) reported that curriculum development programs were in progress in

well over seven tenths of the cities with populations above 25,000 . . . which responded to the inquiry, and . . . in nearly one half of the school systems located in communities with populations of 5,000 to 25,000.
(p. 133)

Myers, et al., (1938) noted that, in most of these programs, "the classroom teacher occupies the key position" (p. 133). This trend toward teacher participation in curriculum development provided supervisors with an excellent opportunity.

Additionally, teacher participation in curriculum work promoted effective utilization of the curriculum in classrooms. More effective use of the curriculum should result in improved classroom instruction, which was the goal of supervision. Myers, et al., (1938) asserted that "past experience has taught us that a curriculum in which teachers have had no part will be a curriculum which teachers do not use" (p. 134). If the curriculum was not being used, then little, or no change, could be expected in classroom instruction.

Myers, et al., (1938) acknowledged the interrelationship or interdependence between the curriculum and the classroom teacher. Just as the curriculum could be used for professional growth, the curriculum could be no better than the developmental level of the teacher who used it:

Increasingly, it is being recognized that a curriculum can be no more advanced than the educational attitudes,

beliefs, and knowledge of the teachers who are to use that curriculum. (p. 134)

Therefore, it was incumbent on supervisors to facilitate professional growth among all teachers. Widespread participation of teachers in curriculum development would serve the dual purposes of improving the curriculum and promoting teacher growth.

In a discussion of administration in town and village schools, Goodier and Miller (1938) agreed with the assertion in the twelfth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (see Department of Superintendence, 1934) that "each city should have its own course of study, a program prepared by teachers and supervisors and constantly revised by them" (p. 147). In a small school system, the authors contended that it was the superintendent's responsibility to "organize curriculum study by his teachers as part of his regular duties" (p. 147). Goodier and Miller provided several suggestions for an effective curriculum study among these was utilizing the entire faculty in the work and adjusting the duties of teachers involved in the work. Adjusting the teaching load was advisable since adding curriculum work to an already heavy teaching load would result in an indifferent or antagonistic faculty (p. 149). In regards to widespread involvement, they reasoned that

the larger the [number of teachers participating], the greater the contribution, the more extensive the try-out experiments, and the more interest aroused the more the teacher growth. (p. 225)

Widespread teacher participation would result in a better curriculum and widespread professional growth. Professional growth, in particular, was a supervisory task.

Supervision was considered an administrative function. In smaller schools and systems, superintendents and principals had to perform supervisory duties. As with other writers, Goodier and Miller (1938) considered curriculum work to be an excellent means of supervision:

there are few professional tasks which will contribute more to the growth of teachers . . . than the well-planned arrangements for teachers, administrators, and specialists to work together upon curriculum construction. (p. 223)

The activities involved in curriculum development, e.g., identifying objectives, creating activities and procedures, gathering resources, could be effectively used by administrators and supervisors to improve classroom instruction, the authors' view. The cooperative process, itself, i.e., teachers and supervisors working together on curricular problems, could serve to improve classroom instruction.

Curriculum development as a method of supervision continued to be a common theme. Smith and Speer (1938), research director for the New York Board of Regents and professor of education at New York University, respectively, suggested that a key principle of supervision was that supervisors and teachers should work cooperatively in formulating, evaluating, and improving the curriculum. They identified several factors that supervisors should be

concerned with when working cooperatively with teachers. One factor was the amount of time required in curriculum work. Smith and Speer suggested that supervisors allow teachers to "devote a portion of the instructional schedule to this work" (p. 288). Teacher preparation was another factor. The authors noted that teachers should not be expected to develop or use curriculum effectively "without systematic preparation" (p. 288).

In their text on supervision, Barr, Burton, and Brueckner (1938), professors of education at the Universities of Wisconsin, Southern California, and Minnesota, respectively, also asserted that teacher participation in curriculum development was an effective means of professional development and growth. This method was "rapidly growing in importance" (p. 700), according to the authors. They noted that this trend was "an outgrowth of the growing emphasis upon democracy in school administration" (p. 700). Barr, et al., reported that committee organization was the most commonly used method for involving teachers and could be used "in any subject, area, or division of the school system" (p. 701). They pointed out that

numerous illustrations of the means ordinarily employed in securing teacher participation in these important school activities can be found in the literature of education. (p. 701)

Those that they noted, in particular, were the state programs in Arkansas, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Virginia.

Eldridge (1939), the superintendent of the Greeley, Colorado, school system, made a distinction between "teacher participation in administration" and "administration by teachers" in addressing the issue of the extent to which teachers should participate in school administration (p. 29). He defined administration as "the organization and direction of personnel and material for the purpose of providing maximum educative experiences for the learner" (p. 29). Eldridge contended that "the teachers' function in administration may be educative or executive" (p. 29). If the teachers' function was executive then teachers would "interview teacher applicants, pass upon the budget, evaluate administrative policies, and assume other administrative functions" (p. 29). If the teachers' function in school administration was educative the teachers would "take appropriate steps to secure more information relative to existing and anticipated administrative policies" (p. 29). Administrators would "seek teacher judgments relative anticipated administrative changes in such matters as the revision of the salary schedule, group insurance, and retirement" (p. 29). Eldridge concluded that "if school administration were conducted along democratic rather than autocratic lines there would be no issue regarding teacher participation" (p. 32). He noted, as an example, curriculum development which in order "to be most effective, must be based on teacher participation since no

curriculum is stronger than the teaching staff which administers it" (p. 32).

In the third yearbook of the John Dewey Society, Caswell (1939), professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, discussed administrative considerations in curriculum development. Caswell explained that the concept of curriculum and curriculum development presented in this volume required a change in the perspective of the role of the teacher:

Rather than considering curriculum improvement a primary concern to committees only, this concept implies that all teachers are curriculum workers and directly associated, by the very nature of their work, with curriculum improvement. It is impossible to isolate a teacher through any administrative organization from curriculum work. (p. 456)

The other "indispensable requirement" (p. 456) of curriculum development was the students themselves. Caswell asserted that any program for curriculum development which ignored these fundamental factors was inadequate. Caswell also asserted that "any program which attempted to 'sell' teachers a type of organization or particular techniques developed apart from actual classroom situations" (p. 457) was also insufficient. Effective administrative plans, then, required classroom experiences guide committee organization and the production of materials (p. 457).

Caswell (1939) provided general administrative guidelines for effective curriculum development programs. The first guideline was that "plans and programs should arise to meet needs which emerge from group thinking" (p.

458). He noted that for teachers to participate effectively in curriculum development "the need or difficulty which give rise to plans and programs must be felt by them and recognized as a guide to action" (p. 458). The second guideline that Caswell proposed was that "plans and procedures should be developed in terms of the needs, problems, and resources of a given situation" (p. 460).

Caswell contended that

since intelligent participation can only be in terms of problems and issues recognized by the group, there must be developed for each situation a plan and procedure adapted to its needs and resources. On no other basis can teachers work effectively in a program of curriculum improvement. (pp. 460-461)

The final guideline for an effective curriculum development program was that "aspects of administration should be developed only as actual problems arise" (p. 461). Caswell noted the tendency in many programs to lay out "an elaborate organization of committees and consultants" (p. 461) prior to any real curriculum work being done. He explained that there were three problems with this practice. Many teachers are detached from the actual work because they are not a part of any committee. Another problem was that "organization projected in advance of needs leads to many useless committees" (p. 461). The third problem, according to Caswell, was that committees planned in advance made "it impossible to select committee membership wisely for choice of membership must be largely by chance" (p. 462).

In sum, advocacy for teacher participation in curriculum development continued to be commonplace in the

educational literature during the 1930's. Many of the advocates were now familiar names in the curriculum field, e.g., Newlon, Cutright, Kilpatrick, Dewey, Harap, Sears, Kyte, Courtis, and Caswell. Many of the reasons given, during the 1930's, for teacher participation were now common themes: democratic ideals required democratic practice (e.g., Dewey, 1937; Strayer, 1937; and, Brown, 1936), progressive educational administration required teacher participation (e.g., Washburne, 1935; Newlon, 1934), participation improved the professional status of teaching (e.g., Kandel, 1932), participation further the professional growth of teachers (e.g., Hanna, 1938; Kyte, 1936; Parker, 1936; Department of Superintendence, 1934; and, Sears, 1933), etc. Additional justifications were emerging such as teacher participation resulted in more effective curricula (e.g., Rugg, 1937; Department of Superintendence, 1936; Department of Superintendence, 1934; and, Sears, 1933) and improved instruction (e.g., Department of Superintendence, 1936; Department of Superintendence, 1934; and, Sears, 1933). As conceptions of curriculum broadened and as the teachers' relationship to the curriculum was explored, the teachers' role as participants was acknowledged. As Schubert (1980) noted, much of the curriculum rhetoric of this period focused on trends in the curriculum field one of which was teacher participation in curriculum development (e.g., Norton and Norton, 1936; Department of Superintendence, 1934; Douglas and Boardman, 1934; Almack,

1933; Norton, 1933; Graves, 1932; and, Windes, 1932).

Principles of curriculum development were another common theme in the educational literature of the 1930's. Many of these discussions included teacher participation as a crucial principle of curriculum development (e.g., Rucker, 1937; Brown, 1936; Kyte, 1936; and, Sears, 1933). Advocacy, both from practical and theoretical perspectives, were widespread in the educational literature of the 1930's.

The Appearance of State Curriculum Programs

As in previous decades, teacher participation continued to be considered such a significant practice that researchers continued to investigate various aspects of it. These studies continued during the 1930's. The study by Cooke and Schmitz (1932) of teacher involvement in curriculum development in Missouri schools was one example. The questions for Cooke and Schmitz, who were professors of education at George Peabody College for Teachers, were not whether teachers should and did participate in the administration of the schools. They asserted that "some form of teacher participation in administration has existed as long as administrative positions have existed" (p. 44). For Cooke and Schmitz, whether teachers should participate and had participated had already been addressed by researchers such as Sears (1921) and Updegraff (1922). This was the basis for their contention that organized and formal participation of teachers had begun at about the turn of the century. Since these questions had been answered, at least

in the minds of Cooke and Schmitz, the questions of current concern should focus on the extent and the form of teacher participation.

Cooke and Schmitz (1932) investigated the extent and form of participation of 243 teachers in the administration of fifty-five high schools in Missouri. Questionnaires examining nine administrative functions, one of which was "the making of the course of study" (p. 45), were sent to teachers. As a means of validation, copies of the questionnaire were sent to administrators of the schools once the teacher questionnaires were returned. In addition to the nine administrative functions, teachers and administrators were asked whether teachers should participate in the administration of schools. Finally, fifty professors of educational administration were sent abbreviated versions of the questionnaire to elicit their opinions concerning the desirability of teacher participation in school administration.

In regards to the participation of teachers in the making of the course of study, Cook and Schmitz (1932) concluded that "practically all the high-school teachers participate in making courses of study as outlines" (p. 49) for their academic subjects. The scope of this participation was limited, however, "to the offering of suggestions and to serving on a committee" (p. 49). While teachers indicated that "they desire complete responsibility for this function," the majority of administrators and

professors indicated that teacher participation should be limited to serving on committees (p. 49).

As has been stated, the curriculum revision movement was one catalyst for teacher participation in administration especially in curriculum development. The activity and extent of the curriculum revision movement had progressively increased since the turn of the century. Bruner (1932), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, reported on the progress of the curriculum revision movement during the decade from 1920 to 1930. The growth in elementary school curricula was enormous. According to Bruner, "fewer than 1,500 courses had been published in the United States" before 1920; however, "since 1925 more than 30,000 courses have been collected in one laboratory alone" (p. 400). He added that "in 1931 more courses were produced than in any other year" (p. 403). The curriculum revision movement, particularly at the elementary level, had become widespread in the United States by the first quarter of the century.

Bruner (1932) suggested that teacher participation in curriculum development was a part of this enormous growth. He reported that

literally thousands of teachers, supervisors, and administrators all over the country . . . are seeking materials and methods for improving the various curricula and constructing and revising courses of study (p. 400)

Bruner cited an example each of a state program, a city, and

a county program of curriculum revision. In each example, teachers played a significant role in curriculum development. In 1929, a curriculum revision program was begun in South Dakota as a joint project of the state department of public instruction and the state teachers' association. The program was initiated by the state teachers' association with "the central theme" of its annual meetings in 1929 and 1930 being "'Curriculum Construction'" (p. 404). After the state teachers' association meeting in 1929, state executive committees for elementary and secondary schools were created and composed of professors of education, superintendents, principals, and teachers. These two committees studied the literature on curriculum development and summarized their findings in a state bulletin, "Preliminary Reports on Approaches to and Theories Regarding Curriculum Construction, and General Aims and Guiding Principles of Education for the State of South Dakota" (p. 404). Subject area committees for kindergarten through twelfth grade were created and composed of principals and teachers from around the state. The state department of public instruction provided "abstracts of practically all the worthwhile materials on what and how to teach" and "copies of judged outstanding courses of study" (p. 404) in each committees' respective field. Bruner reported that suggestions had been submitted by "over 500 committee members" (p. 405). Considering the number of teachers in South Dakota in 1929, this number represented

considerable participation. As of 1932, a series of state-sponsored meetings were being held in each county to familiarize every teacher with the new course of study and "methods for their installation" (p. 405).

Bruner (1932) cited the program in Houston, Texas, begun in 1926, as an example of a city program of curriculum revision. The first year of Houston's program was spent familiarizing the teaching staff with the principles of curriculum construction and local educational issues. Subject area committees were created and produced "over 300 curriculum bulletins" (p. 405). Experimental schools, which were described as "curriculum schools" (p. 405), were established to test the recommendations of the subject area committees before these were distributed to all city schools. These experimental schools were paired with control schools, or "check schools" (p. 405), which used the previous or traditional curriculum. Bruner cited the Houston program as "one of the most far reaching and valuable curriculum experiments ever set up in public schools" (p. 405).

Bruner's (1932) final example, that of a county program for curriculum revision, was found in the curriculum work of the Allegheny County, Maryland, schools which began in 1929. Bruner suggested that the Allegheny program was similar to those programs he described for South Dakota and Houston. In addition, Bruner reported that many of courses of study units were developed by teacher committees from work

submitted by county teachers. Those course of study units which were not developed by teachers were submitted to teachers to test in classrooms and to offer suggestions for improvement.

Maxey (1932), a faculty member with East St. Louis Senior High School, discussed teacher participation in school administration and described the practice in East St. Louis. Maxey, as had Cooke and Schmitz (1932), contended that whether teachers should participate in school administration was no longer in question. Maxey asserted that "teachers always have been called upon to perform a certain number of administrative duties" (p. 400). Unlike Cooke and Schmitz, however, Maxey maintained that the question had been answered "by State statutes and local school boards" (p. 400). There were several new questions which currently needed to be addressed, according to Maxey:

Why do [teachers] respond so grudgingly, so inefficiently and without any understanding of the real reason why they are asked to do 'so many unnecessary things?'. . . . The other question is threefold in its nature: 'How shall teachers be informed of their real duties, what are these duties, and how may they best be performed?' (p. 400).

The answers to these questions provided some insight to the practice at East St. Louis Senior High School.

Maxey (1932) contended that the primary reason for the unsatisfactory response of teachers to participation in administrative duties was because "many teachers do not know what constitutes their full duty" (p. 400). Maxey maintained that a knowledgeable faculty was the

responsibility of both the principal and the teachers. The principal was responsible for guiding and directing teachers "towards a full understanding of their duties and responsibilities so that they may render the maximum amount of service" (p. 401). The teachers' responsibilities were to have "a desire to be informed" and to be "willing and capable to make suggestions" (p. 401).

The principal was also key to determining the extent of teacher participation. Ultimately, the extent of participation would be "determined by the policy of the school" (p. 402), according to Maxey (1932). For the principal of "vision and great foresight" (p. 402), the extent of participation would not be an issue. How to bring about the "most desirable teacher participation in the administration program" (p. 402) would be the issue. Maxey suggested that curriculum development was the best method for involving teachers in school administration.

The departmental organization of East St. Louis Senior High School, Maxey (1932) maintained, provided the structure for successful teacher participation. This departmental structure allowed "all departments to take part in any important achievement . . . , but at the same time there is much opportunity for independent work within the department" (p. 403), according to Maxey. She reported that the most significant work achieved through this departmental structure at East St. Louis Senior High School was the "thorough reconstruction of the curriculum" (p. 403). The

initial revision began in 1928 and lasted four years. Maxey noted that since this initial revision, "there has been constant partial revision to secure a more effective course of study" (p. 403). Maxey concluded that a primary challenge of teacher participation at East St. Louis Senior High School was establishing "a proper balance . . . between administrative and real teaching duties" (p. 404).

While some questioned comparisons between public schools and private and laboratory schools for various reasons, practices in private and laboratory schools also continued to be acknowledged resources for examples of teacher participation in curriculum development. Hopkins (1932), a professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, described curriculum making by teachers at the Lincoln Elementary School of Columbia University. Curriculum making had also been documented previously by teachers at the Lincoln Elementary School (see Tippett, et al., 1927). It will be remembered that Hopkins was a consultant in the Denver curriculum program during its inception in 1925. Hopkins reported that teachers at the Lincoln School began curriculum development using any one of three methods which focused on the interests of children. The first method entailed the teacher beginning curriculum development by recognizing "certain areas in which the genuine interests of children of that age are usually located" (p. 410). By using generally acknowledged interests of children, the teacher was able to conduct

preliminary planning during the summer. Hopkins described the preliminary planning of the teacher as such:

In this process of preparation, [the teacher] lists all types of different possible activities to give breadth; she plans a number of orienting experiences as approaches; she designates the subject matter most helpful in enriching the different activities; she defines tentative objectives to be achieved; she indexes sources of materials for the pupils and herself (p. 410)

Hopkins continued with an extensive list of activities which would generally be acknowledged as appropriate activities for most any curriculum development project.

In the second method, the teacher began "by accepting the immediate and remote experiences of the children" (Hopkins, 1932, p. 411) as the focal point for the curriculum. The teacher might begin the year by asking students to describe their summer. As students related their experiences, these might suggest areas of study to the teacher:

The visit to the seashore during the summer suggests a study of sea life; the trip to Europe calls for water transportation; the vacation in the mountains creates some demand for a unit on science (p. 411)

To distinguish between what Hopkins described as "real, genuine, purposeful interests" and "temporary, cursory, capricious interests" (p. 411), the teacher would provide preliminary information and experiences for a suggested area of study. The teacher would then evaluate the level of continuing interest to determine whether the suggested area was suitable for expanded study.

While the third method capitalized on the interests of students, it did not utilize immediate interests. In the third method, the teacher might consider experiences and units used with previous groups and "decide that a certain unit is necessary to give richness, area, or breath to [student] experience, or to fill in what appear to be important gaps" (Hopkins, 1932, p. 411). In attention to student interests, student educational needs would be considered in planning the curriculum. As with the first method, this method allowed the teacher time for preliminary planning.

Hopkins (1932) highlighted additional characteristics of curriculum development at the Lincoln Elementary School. One characteristic could be found in continuous planning on the part of the teachers. This continuous planning, according to Hopkins, was evidenced by the

clarification of objectives, addition of newly found activities and materials, expansions of activities originally conceived, changes of procedure to harmonize with the developing interests of learners, and reevaluations of the processes and results of pupil growth. (p. 412)

Another primary characteristic of curriculum making at the Lincoln School was that a complete record of the development of the unit by the teacher is recorded. This allowed for analysis and research on many different facets. An additional feature were the numerous resources at the teachers disposal for assistance in curriculum development: "librarians, elementary school assistants, special teachers, elementary school principal, and members of the research

staff" (pp. 413-414). Hopkins concluded that one of the chief characteristics of curriculum development at the Lincoln Elementary School was that "the major responsibility for the selection, organization, development and teaching of the units rests with the classroom teacher" (p. 414).

Harap and Bayne (1932) continued a survey of public school curriculum begun by Harap in 1928. Harap, a professor of education at Western Reserve University, and Bayne, a faculty member of Collinswood High School in Cleveland, Ohio, "analyzed 317 course of study bulletins from 72 school organizations" (p. 47) for this particular study. Harap and Bayne noted that the courses of study they analyzed represented "every part of the United States" (p. 47).

One of the features for which each course of study bulletin was analyzed were the administrative arrangements for curriculum development. Harap and Bayne noted that "the most revealing conclusion from our analysis is the important role that the teacher plays in curriculum construction" (p. 49). They found that in addition to serving "on most curriculum committees" (p. 49), teachers also played a significant role in leadership. According to their analysis, Harap and Bayne found 178 cases in which teachers "either headed the project or shared in the leadership with administrative officers" (p. 49). This represented fifty-six percent of the curriculum bulletins analyzed by Harap

and Bayne. They went on to add that teachers were the leaders

in the building of single courses of study more than three times as often as any other school officer and as frequently as all administrative and supervisory officers combined. (p. 49)

Surprisingly, the principal, in Harap and Bayne's analysis, was the least likely of any participant to chair a curriculum committee.

Lide (1932a and 1932b), a researcher for the National Survey of Secondary Education, reported on a much more comprehensive study of "the plans and procedures for curriculum-making [in secondary schools] on a city-wide, county-wide, and state-wide basis" (p. 751). One hundred sixty-two responses representing 129 city systems and 33 individual secondary schools were included in the study, according to Lide. He examined four areas: organization for, participants in, procedures for, and an evaluation of each of the curriculum construction programs.

As factors he considered in organization for curriculum construction, Lide (1932a and 1932b) reported on the plan for curriculum making, who directed the program, who participated in curriculum construction, the committees created for curriculum construction, and the total cost of the program. Respondents indicated that slightly more schools were involved in the revision of old curricula versus the creation of new curricula. Most respondents indicated that some administrator (e.g., superintendent, assistant superintendent, or principal) within the system

usually was responsible for the program. Lide reported that practically all respondents indicated that superintendents, principals, and teacher had a part in curriculum revision (Lide, 1932a, p. 94). Specifically, 107 respondents indicated that teachers were involved in activities such as "revising content in subject areas, suggesting teaching procedures, organizing or conducting experimental classes, or trying out courses before adoption" (Lide, 1932b, p. 754). This represented 66% of the responding schools and systems. Committee organization consisted most often of a "steering committee and 'production' committees in charge of revising materials and methods of instruction in the various subject fields" (Lide, 1932b, p. 752). Production committees were composed largely of teachers and usually chaired by a teacher- the subject department chair.

Lide (1932a and 1932b) examined two factors related to the participants involved in curriculum making: the elements included in the curriculum construction program and participants responsible for each element. The survey suggested twenty-two elements which were considered a part of a comprehensive curriculum revision program. Of the twenty-two elements of curriculum making suggested by the survey, Lide (1932b) noted that "only eleven of the twenty-two elements were reported to form a part of the program by as many as half" (p. 753) of the respondents. Lide (1932b) contended that revision of materials and methods of teaching "required the most detailed work" (p. 755) of any of the

elements. He reported that "this responsibility was delegated to special subject or 'production' committees more often than any other group" (p. 755). Since teachers made up the majority of most production committees, this suggested that teachers most often were responsible for the most detailed part of the work of curriculum development.

The survey respondents were asked to evaluate their programs. Lide (1932a and 1932b) noted that because of the variety of conditions that could affect each curriculum construction program it was necessary to report only the general conclusions given by the largest number of respondents. Three general conclusions were most pertinent to the examination of teacher participation in curriculum development. Many respondents indicated that "it is desirable that the range of participants be as wide as possible" (Lide, 1932b, p. 758). As noted previously, Lide reported that teachers were involved in curriculum development in nearly seventy percent of the school and systems that responded. Since teachers frequently were responsible for the most detailed work involved curriculum making, respondents indicated that funding should be budgeted for the employment of substitutes for teachers and for extra clerical help. The most significant obstruction to curriculum development, according to the respondents, was the lack of or inadequate teacher preparation. The most significant benefit of a program of curriculum construction or revision was teacher professional growth.

Hamrin (1932) studied the administration and organization of 274 high schools to determine if the organization and administration of high schools helped or hindered in the achievement of the schools' goals. Hamrin noted that several factors had added to the complexity of school organization and administration. The period prior to 1910 had been marked by an increase in the number of high schools, while the period following 1910 had "been characterized by an increase in the size of high schools" (p. 1), according to Hamrin. In addition, the student population of the schools had become much more diverse, especially socially and economically. Finally, the offerings and facilities of the high school had expanded to better serve this diverse population. As a result, the administration and organization of high schools had become a much more complex problem.

Hamrin (1932) stated three general aims of the study. First, she analyzed high school organization to determine the general structure of the organization. Next, the duties and responsibilities of various members of the organization were determined. Finally, the administrative control over these duties and responsibilities was evaluated (p. 4). The control of general administrative functions is of particular interest to teacher participation in curriculum development.

Hamrin (1932) noted that in addition to working with teachers and pupils there were a number of other activities which had to be performed of which curriculum work was one.

Curriculum work in high schools included the testing program, student failures, as well as courses of study, in Hamrin's analysis. In regards to work on the courses of study, Hamrin found that

in no group of schools . . . were there more than 24 per cent of the schools who had delegated this responsibility to any one person or group of persons. Teachers lead, however, followed by others in this order: department heads, principals and department heads, curriculum committees, and the principal. (p. 105)

Twenty percent (55 schools) of the total sample reported assigning the preparation of the courses of study to teachers and committees of teachers.

The emphasis on locally developed curriculum began a gradual shift from city systems to state departments of education beginning in the late 1920's. This was probably attributable to a combination of factors, particularly the increasing demands for standardized curriculum and the increasing intrusion of state legislatures into the educational arena. Regardless of the causes, a significant increase in the number of state curriculum development programs was evident during the 1930's. Many of these state programs provided for the participation of teachers through a variety of methods. Perhaps the most famous of these state programs was the Virginia Curriculum Revision Program which was initiated in 1931 (see Burlbaw, 1991). The Virginia program has already been discussed at length in the introduction to this paper.

Caswell (1934), professor of education at George Peabody College for Teachers, directed the Virginia program and was responsible for a number of state programs, particularly in the South. In an address at the University of Kentucky, Caswell discussed the current state curriculum development programs. Caswell acknowledged the state of Kentucky's recent initiation of a state-wide curriculum development program along with other recently initiated programs in Mississippi, Texas, Georgia, and Tennessee. On-going state programs acknowledged by Caswell included Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Missouri.

Caswell (1934) identified several developments in these programs which he thought to be significant to the work beginning in Kentucky. One development was the changing conception of what a state-wide curriculum development program should entail. The idea he suggested which had dominated until recent years was that state curriculum development was "solely the preparation of state courses of study" (p. 41). What was really changing was the conception of curriculum at the state level. As an example, Caswell quoted a bulletin used in the Virginia program:

The term "curriculum" . . . refers to all of the actual experiences which children have at school under the guidance of their teachers. Thus, when we say we wish to revise the curriculum we mean that we actually wish children to be provided with new and enriched school experiences. (p. 42)

Caswell asserted that if one accepted this conception, then "every teacher in a state is a curriculum maker" (p. 42).

If this was true, then, the ability of each teacher and the level of support provided each teacher in the state mediated the quality of the curriculum being delivered. The challenge for state departments of education became

one of providing . . . all types of guidance for all teachers in the state to the end that the curriculum as it actually develops will achieve optimum educational outcomes. (p. 42)

This changing conception of curriculum required that state departments of education provide preparation, training, and guidance. The tendency toward support by state departments of education in curriculum work was of the developments noted by Caswell.

Another development in state curriculum development programs identified by Caswell (1934) was "the matter of administrative provision to carry the work forward" (p. 45). In traditional state programs, a small group of people were usually responsible for producing courses of study, so there was need for any type of on-going organization for curriculum development. Caswell contended that in the more progressive state programs, however, "there is a decided tendency to employ a type of organization which will function as a regular part of the educational program of the state" (p. 45). This was characterized by state departments of education taking a leadership role in these programs; state departments establishing relationships with local systems through regular administrative officers; local systems establishing organizational structures to perform the curriculum work; and, teacher-training institutions

providing centers for study, experimentation, and consultation (p. 45). The goal, for Caswell, was to provide an organizational structure which provided support and guidance in a line from the state department of education "through the local units to the individual schools which will not pass out of existence the moment the intensive phases of the program are completed" (p. 46).

A final development of the current state programs, according to Caswell (1934), was the tendency to involve large numbers of teachers in the curriculum program. Caswell asserted that while participation by large numbers of teachers, even all teachers, in a state was important, it was not important, or practical, for large numbers of teachers to work directly on the preparation of courses of study. He referred back to the new conception of teachers as curriculum makers. He noted that "it is assumed that [the teacher] should be continuously preparing curriculum materials for his own use" (p. 47). While large numbers of teachers might not participate in the actual writing of the courses,

the materials which they develop in their classrooms for their own guidance in developing the curriculum of their classrooms may be employed to advantage by the committee which is preparing a course of study. (p. 47)

Caswell contended that the course of study was "merely a means of selecting from the materials so prepared what may be valuable for teachers generally and making it available to them" (p. 47). In those states where this new conception

was accepted, wide participation by teachers in a variety of activities in the curriculum program, which included more than the writing of courses of study, was necessary. The efforts of these states, according to Caswell, were directed to increasing the abilities of teachers to effectively utilize those materials provided for their support.

Trillingham (1934) examined the administration of curriculum programs throughout the country. Trillingham's study focused on

those phases of curriculum programs for which school superintendents are particularly responsible, such as the establishment of curriculum programs, their organization, the determination of duties to be performed, their delegation to staff members
(p. 2)

Questionnaires were sent to 150 superintendents of city school systems with populations over 30,000. Trillingham reported that 100 schools in 38 states participated in the study. The geographic representation was fairly balanced. Trillingham analyzed the questionnaires and determined the geographical distribution: "Far West, fifteen; Middle West, eighteen; Great Lakes Region, seventeen; East, seventeen; New England, eleven; and South, twenty-two" (p. 18).

In regards to teacher participation in curriculum work, Trillingham (1934) noted several findings. Superintendents generally based their selection of participants on "strong teaching ability, special interest in curriculum work, and substantial college training" (p. 32). However, Trillingham found that numerous systems involved all teachers in some

way in the curriculum revision program. For example, the superintendent in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, reported that the "entire teaching and supervisory force do the curriculum work" (p. 33). Other examples, recorded by Trillingham included:

Lynchburg used its entire staff of 260 teachers in curriculum work in 1931-1932. Joliet, Illinois, uses about 150 special workers and 150 others that cooperate in various manners. Little Rock utilizes its entire staff of 450 teachers. Houston, Texas, uses about 25 workers directly, and approximately 200 others in tryout work and in special committee meetings. . . . Denver uses the services of over 300 persons in its various committees. Erie, Pennsylvania, employed its entire staff in curriculum work in 1932-1933 Grand Rapids, Michigan, has used about 350 people the past three years Louisville, Kentucky, engages about 135 individuals in the high schools, and 160 in the elementary schools work. (p. 40)

There was obviously great variation in the city programs. Trillingham suggested that the variation could be a function of the scope of the program, administrative philosophies, and finances (p. 40).

Trillingham (1934) also reported on the extent of teacher participation in curriculum programs. Trillingham found that the extent of teacher participation had an inverse relationship to the size of the school system: "As American cities grow larger in population, the tendency is away from the participation of the entire instructional staff in the curriculum activities" (p. 40).

Thirty-six percent of the superintendents responding to the question on the extent of participation (n=33) indicated that they make an effort to involve all teachers in curriculum work. This practice appeared most common for

cities with populations between 30,000 to 100,000, the smallest group of cities Trillingham studied. The two greatest factors influencing the extent of teacher participation, according to Trillingham, were the scope of the program and the philosophy toward teacher participation.

Trillingham (1934) concluded that practice and opinion varied "as to the number of individuals to be used in the curriculum program, and as to the advisable extent of teacher participation" (p. 151). He found that the number of teachers participating in a single year varied from three to six hundred, with median number being seventy-five. While smaller cities (population from 30,000 to 100,000) used fewer teachers, they tended to use larger percentages of their staff for curriculum construction. He noted that in the largest cities participation of large numbers of teachers became a logistical problem. Trillingham asserted that teacher growth was secondary to the primary purpose of improving curriculum. With this in mind, he pointed out that extremes should be avoided:

The extremes of endeavoring to have all teachers produce course materials even though not adequately trained for the task, or of having a few experts prepare courses of study without regard for teachers who will later use them, should be avoided. (p. 151)

Nevertheless, every teacher should be involved in efforts to bring understanding of "the basic philosophy of education adopted, the subject aims and objectives, and the proper use of the new courses of study" (p. 151).

Washburne (1935), superintendent of the Winnetka school system in Illinois, described how teacher participation manifested itself in the Winnetka schools. He asserted that participation was the hallmark of progressive administration and progressive administrators secure "the participation of teachers in matters of curriculum, method, and research" (p. 219). While teachers and others participated in all aspects of administration, curriculum development was a key feature of teacher participation in Winnetka.

Washburne (1935) described the general process for teacher involvement in curriculum development. The principals of each school and the superintendent held regular meetings with grade and departmental groups. The principal or superintendent usually chaired their respective meetings. Washburne noted that the teachers were "most outspoken in their opinions" (p. 220). All questions before these groups were decided "either by majority vote or by reference to active research" (p. 220). The superintendent or principal only voted in cases of a tie. Washburne pointed out that "most research done in the Winnetka Schools has its origin in the grade and department meetings and is in part conducted by the teachers themselves" (p. 220). The entire curriculum was developed and continually revised in this way, according to Washburne. He reported that various groups were currently working on math, health, and science curricula for the Winnetka schools (pp. 220-221).

Brogdon (1935), a supervisor in the Guilford County, North Carolina, school system, described the cooperative effort to develop a health curriculum for the elementary schools of the system. The consolidation of eighty-six small rural schools into thirty larger schools posed numerous considerations in the development of a health curriculum. One problem was bringing together the numerous faculties for curriculum work. Brogdon reported that 235 elementary teachers participated in the project.

Brogdon (1935) outlined the process followed by the teachers in developing the health curriculum. Under the direction of Brogdon, the teachers decided on the principles which would guide the project. Next, the teachers analyzed the school conditions and compiled a list of the school factors which affected the students' health. In addition to general school conditions, the teachers examined specific situations which arose in the school daily, e.g., bus transportation and recess, and potential problems which might occur in each situation. Once outlines for new programs had been developed, Brogdon reported that teachers enlisted the assistance of the students and parents in "planning, refining, and carrying out the various details" (p. 562). These efforts, according to Brogdon, resulted in health education becoming a "daily program of living for most of the children in this school system" (p. 564).

In his third survey of courses of study, Harap (1935) continued to find that teacher participation in curriculum

development was widespread. Harap reported that "over 300 courses of study from about 125 school organizations were analyzed" (p. 641). Courses of study came from all states and were distributed geographically as follows:

New England, 21; Middle Atlantic, 53; East North Central, 41; West North Central, 34; South Atlantic, 22; East South Central, 2; West South Central, 33; Mountain, 9; Pacific, 47; and, Philippine Islands, 5.
(p. 641)

Harap noted an increase in the number of courses produced in the Middle Atlantic, West South Central, and Pacific states since his last survey.

Harap (1935) reported on the administrative tendencies evident from his analysis of courses of study. One tendency he found was "the almost universal practice of committee procedure" (p. 644). He noted that the production and executive committees were almost always found in the programs of schools and school systems. Production committees were frequently reported by other authors to be the committees which typically were composed of and chaired primarily by teachers. This observation was evidenced, at least indirectly, in Harap's findings. Additionally, Harap found that, in the schools studied, teachers more frequently served as chairs of curriculum committees than any other group including superintendents and principals. His findings led him to conclude that "the teacher continues to play the most important role in curriculum revision" (p. 644).

The October, 1935 issue of the Journal of Educational Research was devoted to the "participation of the field

worker in educational research" (p. 81). In this issue, Leonard (1935), a professor of education at the College of William and Mary, reported on a study he conducted to examine the extent and character of teacher participation in state curriculum programs. Eleven states participated in the study: Virginia, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, California, Pennsylvania, Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Iowa, and Texas (p. 118). Surveys were sent to the state directors for curriculum work in each state.

Leonard (1935) reported his findings on teacher participation in recent state programs. For example, he noted that a group of southern states, i.e., North Carolina, Virginia, Arkansas, Texas, Florida, and Mississippi had recently started curriculum programs. He found several similarities between all of these state programs. First, Leonard noted that all of these states "endeavored to enlist every teacher in some phase of the program" (p. 119). Another similarity between the state programs was that each state began by involving all teachers in curriculum study. Materials were prepared by the states to guide the teachers in their curriculum study groups.

Once the actual curriculum work started, a third similarity between these states was that each provided materials to guide the teachers in curriculum development or, as Leonard (1935) described it, production work (p. 119). Leonard reported that many of the materials used to guide curriculum study and development were developed by

teachers. A fourth similarity that Leonard found was that "in all of these programs the bulk of the production was done by teachers" (p. 119). The fifth similarity that Leonard noted was that each state "used a similar state organization utilizing college and university groups, public school teachers, and groups of laymen" (p. 119).

The last similarity identified by Leonard (1935) focused on committee composition. Leonard found that although teachers were represented on central curriculum committees, "they were in the decided minority" (p. 121). Membership on these committees was composed primarily of university professors, school system administrators, and state department personnel. On the other hand, the production committees were comprised primarily of teachers. Leonard used the state of Virginia's organization for curriculum work as a typical example (see Figure 5.8). Teachers played a major role in curriculum work in the southern states Leonard surveyed.

Leonard (1935) provided other examples of teacher participation in the state programs. In California, Leonard pointed out that "the courses of study . . . are county, not state, products" (p. 121). The state department of education would publish these materials and distribute them to teachers around the state. A well-known example, according to Leonard, was the *Teachers' Guide to Child Development* published for kindergarten and primary grades. Leonard found that 135 members, 77 (64%) of which were

classroom teachers, served on the curriculum committees which produced this course of study. Other excellent examples of teacher participation, according to Leonard, could be found

in the preparation of aims by the Virginia committee, under the chairmanship of Fred M. Alexander of Newport News, Virginia; of experimental work under the direction of George J. Oliver of Northampton County, Virginia; and of social problems analyses worked out by teachers at the University of Mississippi in the summer session of 1935. (p. 123)

Teacher participation in state programs took a variety of forms and occurred at varying levels.

Leonard (1935) summarized the findings of his study. First, he noted that "state departments are seeking to enlist all teachers in some participation activities as a form of in-service training" (p. 123). This was most commonly done through the study course. Leonard noted that this was the only phase that all teachers were actually ever involved in any state program. Second, state production committees were composed primarily of teachers. A third general finding, in contrast to the second, was that teachers were generally under-represented on state executive committees. Fourth, Leonard found that teacher work on state production committees included such tasks as

- a. Teaching and writing units of work for publication.
- b. Analyzing and organizing teaching materials to be included in courses of study.
- c. Analyzing and compiling stated aims, reports of research, prepared courses of study, and statements of philosophies and psychological principles.
- d. Making bibliographies and selecting text materials to use in courses of study.
- e. Experimental teaching and evaluating materials

actually prepared for courses of study. (p. 124)

A fifth general finding by Leonard was that "little research . . . seems to be done on modern state curriculum programs" (p. 124).

Based on his findings, Leonard (1935) arrived at three general conclusions about the state programs. First, Leonard concluded that "the present emphasis upon teacher study as an initial phase of curriculum programs is sound" (p. 125). He asserted that no other stage of a program better promoted teacher professional growth and acceptance of new curricula. A second conclusion Leonard drew was that "the practice of trying to have every teacher in the state participate in actual production is not sound" (p. 125). The aspects of organizing and managing a program which included all teachers in a state made including all teachers impractical. His final conclusion from the study was that curriculum construction was "a difficult task" (p. 125). He pointed out that "too much haste, too little experimentation, and the expenditure of too little time and thought" (p. 125) was devoted to the state programs studied. He suggested that these issues must be addressed in future state programs.

Like many states with small, widely dispersed populations, Oregon chose to approach curriculum development from a state-wide perspective. Johnson (1937), a faculty member at Eugene High School in Eugene, Oregon, briefly described the Oregon plan for curriculum development. The

plan was structured so as to "include a number of teachers and administrators organized in committees" (p. 20). The first committee created was an executive committee which was composed of five regional vice chairmen. The regional chairmen represented the five districts into which the state had been divided. The committee worked in conjunction with the state department of education.

Seven groups were created to handle various responsibilities. Johnson (1937) reported that the Oregon State Teachers' Association Curriculum Committee was responsible for directing the program. The curriculum committee's responsibilities included organizing teachers for a state-wide curriculum study, organizing state committees, requiring progress reports from committee chairs, providing assistance for developing organization to the five regions, and assembling and editing materials (p. 21). Teachers had taken a leadership role in the curriculum revision for Oregon.

Teachers served on the other committees. A second committee was the Principles and Procedures Committee. According to Johnson (1937), this committee was responsible for stating the principles which would guide the curriculum work, suggesting appropriate curriculum procedures, encouraging uniformity where appropriate, and defining terminology (p. 21). The third committee Johnson described was the Aims Committee. He reported that the Aims Committee was responsible for developing "the most desirable goals for

the public schools of Oregon" (p. 21). The Unifying Committee focused on the scope of the curriculum. It was primarily responsible for horizontal and vertical articulation between grades and subject areas. The Regional Vice Chairmen, who served on the state executive committee, were primarily responsible for organizing curriculum study groups and regional production committees. The Regional Production Committee followed the instructions of the Regional Vice Chairman and were to "assign to local production committees specific phases of curriculum work which, when unified, will provide the basis for a complete course of study" (p. 21). The Local Production Committee was responsible for the specific phase of work assigned by the regional production committee.

Arkansas was another state involved in curriculum revision during the 1930s. Jones (1937), an educator in the Fort Smith school system, reported on the progress of the first three years of the state's curriculum development program. The first year of the program was devoted to curriculum study by the teachers of the state. The curriculum study was successful for two reasons, according to Jones. First, Jones asserted that there was

indisputable evidence that a much greater number of teachers than ever before have been sensitized to the necessity of relating the life of the school more effectively to life outside the school. (p. 22)

A second reason was that, because of the initial curriculum study, "the study and a critical attitude toward the work of the school has carried over . . . and still prevails with

practically all of the teachers" (p. 22). Professional development, which was a goal of many curriculum development programs, was enhanced by the Arkansas program, according to Jones.

The second year was marked by teacher experimentation with unit organization of instructional materials. The unit, a method for organizing lesson objectives, was gaining a lot of attention during the 1930's. Jones (1937) noted that "all units taught were reported and filed for reference in the professional library. A number of the best ones were reproduced . . . and made available to all teachers" (p. 22). The success of the second year "led to a considerable extension of unit materials and procedures during the third year" (p. 22). Jones reported widespread participation and cooperation between and within grades and subject areas.

In another example of the unit of study being the focus for curriculum experimentation, Knudson (1937), a professor of education at Harvard, reported on an experiment he conducted in a South Carolina high school. A primary assumption for his experiment was that lack of confidence, not indifference or tradition, was the "main reason that several large-scale, state-wide attempts at curriculum revision have had so little effect on the secondary division of the public school system" (p. 7). Knudson suggested that one means of securing a "more active interest of secondary-school teachers in curriculum revision is to encourage them to organize a 'unit' for trial" (p. 7). To test this

theory, Knudson "utilized an opportunity which arose in the Columbia (South Carolina) High School" (p. 7). Knudson noted that the purpose of this report was to demonstrate "a method by which a small group of high school teachers may plan and initiate work which has a distinct bearing on the revision of the secondary school curriculum" (p. 12).

Knudson (1937) reported that the principal and teachers of Columbia High School had been studying the student failure rate for several years. Knudson noted that the curricular issues were associated with the problem of providing instruction in the traditional manner, i.e., "reading and listening to lectures" (p. 7). Teachers questioned whether the curriculum might be modified to make it more purposeful for students. Teachers proposed to investigate this possibility by developing an "experience unit" (p. 7) for some of the students in question.

Teachers began planning during the summer. Knudson (1937) reported that the teachers were guided by several considerations in the creation of the unit. The unit had to be one that could be developed cooperatively with students. The unit had to come from an "immediate life interest" (p. 8). The unit had to allow for maximum student growth "in the direction of an acquisition of learning held to be desirable" (p. 8). Finally, the materials required for the teaching of the unit had to be available.

Knudson (1937) reported that three teachers decided to plan and teach a unit on highway safety (p. 8). He

described each teacher's contribution to the unit. First, the three teachers developed the objectives for the unit on highway safety. Next, the teachers gathered materials for use by the students. Then, each teacher planned the activities related to their subject areas which would tie in to the topic of highway safety. Finally, the teachers assessed student performance during the unit and created an end-of-unit evaluation. The end-of-unit evaluation involved measuring "the manner in which the students behaved while driving automobiles" (p. 11).

Calls for uniform curricula continued during the 1930's. As state legislators granted more authority to state departments of education, the responsibility for the primary curricula again shifted from school systems to state departments of education. In turn, state departments of education increasingly became the focus of studies by researchers. A feature of the Curriculum Journal was a periodic survey of state departments of education to ascertain their plans for curriculum work. Heaton (1937), a staff member of the Michigan Department of Public Instruction, reported on current state curriculum programs for the period of 1936 and 1937. Heaton noted two general trends: the growth of state programs of curriculum revision and teacher involvement in the state programs. The increase in the number of states involved in "comprehensive programs . . . shows evidence of continuous growth in the [curriculum revision] movement" (p. 42). Many of the state programs

were similar in nature. One similarity, in particular, was the number of states which were involving teachers extensively in their programs.

Heaton (1937) reported on curriculum development programs in 26 states: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. Of these states, ten described various ways in which teachers were involved. For example, Heaton reported that Alabama was in "the second of a five-year study in which some five or six thousand teachers" were participating (p. 42). In Arizona, secondary teachers across the state were "involved in preliminary thinking" (p. 42) about instructional problems for revision of the secondary curriculum in the state. Teachers in South Dakota had "completed a seven-year intensive program in which the teachers of the state cooperated in the development of instructional materials" (p. 47). During the period from 1934 to 1937, approximately thirty thousand Texas teachers had participated in developing "the tentative course of study for all subjects in the elementary school, and home making in the high school" (p. 47).

Curriculum study was a common means of involving teachers in the initial program. Teachers in Arkansas had been "involved in a program of study and curriculum

planning" for the last four years (Heaton, 1937, p. 42). In California, teachers were involved in a program of curriculum study in which they were investigating curricular problems such as "the philosophy of education, socialization of learning materials, pupils' capabilities, guidance, and evaluation of results" (pp. 42-43). Heaton reported that "more than ten thousand teachers" (p. 43) in Georgia had participated in curriculum study groups since 1935. Part of the focus of the study groups was devoted to helping teachers develop an educational philosophy, statements of aims and principles, and "a scheme of problem areas and centers of interest for the guidance of teachers in selecting instructional materials" (pp. 43-44). In Louisiana, "all . . . teachers are organized into study groups, most groups consisting of from ten to twenty-five teachers" (p. 44). The study groups were represented at the district level which in turn had representatives in a state-level group. The function of the state group was "to prepare reports that will guide activities in succeeding years" (p. 44). Teachers in Oregon had been "engaged in study and curriculum revision during the past two years" (p. 46). The Oregon State Teachers' Association was supervising the study, by various committees around the state, "of objectives and materials to be submitted to the teachers of the state for study, criticism, and revision" (p. 46). In Tennessee, study groups of teachers were being organized in every school system. The Tennessee State Department of

Education had issued a bulletin which would be the basis of curriculum study for these groups (p. 47).

Tireman (1937), a professor of education at the University of New Mexico, reported on the New Mexico program of curriculum development. There were two phases of the program. The first phase was "the organization of teachers for the purpose of making them aware of the possibilities of this program" (p. 65). Preparation of the actual curriculum materials constituted the second phase of the program. Tireman emphasized that "the teacher was all-important" (p. 66) to the success of the program. Teacher involvement was a significant factor in each phase.

In the first phase, as with many state programs, teachers were to be invited to join study groups in their districts. Tireman (1937) emphasized that teachers would not be forced to join the study groups, but opportunities would be taken interest teachers in the curriculum work. A study bulletin prepared by the state department of education and the University of New Mexico would serve as the basis of study for these groups. The bulletin contained "excerpts from stimulating discussions of curriculum work, outlines, problems which face us in New Mexico, brief bibliographies, and questions" (p. 66). The purpose of the bulletin, according to Tireman, was to invite constructive criticism from teachers of present practice and to prepare teachers to "contribute materials and suggestions for the improvement of the whole teaching program" (p. 66).

In the second phase, production of curriculum materials was to take place. Preparations were in the process of organizing for the production of materials. Teachers were to be involved in developing materials. As Tireman (1937) noted a teacher who chose to do so could "devote her efforts chiefly to the production of materials" (p. 66). Laboratory schools had been selected in two systems to test curriculum materials which were developed in the program. Tireman noted that "all materials which are contributed to this program will be given an actual tryout in the laboratory schools" (p. 66). In this way, all submitted materials would be evaluated "so the needed modifications can be made and the materials re-tested before being distributed for general use" (p. 66).

Rogers (1937), the director of curriculum for the Louisiana state department of education, briefly outlined the state-wide curriculum program for the seventy-fifth meeting of National Education Association in Detroit. A fundamental consideration taken into account, according to Rogers, in the creation of the program was "the natural desire of teachers for freedom to direct the learning experiences of their own group" (p. 287). As with many state curriculum development programs, all teachers in every public school were organized into curriculum study groups. Professional growth was a primary goal of the curriculum study groups. Rogers reported that these study groups had representatives on district level committees which in turn

had representatives on a state-level committee. Rogers noted that the reports of the school-level study groups "became source materials for all state reports" (p. 288).

The state of Louisiana's program had been in operation since 1931, but the most "intensive part" (Rogers, 1937, p. 288) of the work, according to Rogers, had only begun in the last year. As with other states, a central or executive committee was formed to guide the curriculum work. In this work, "fifty selected teachers, supervisors, and superintendents" researched the procedures used by other states and developed "an organization and procedure for Louisiana" (p. 288). Rogers reported that "this group concluded its work with the preparation of a handbook that now serves as guide for the work of the whole organization" (p. 288). Once the curriculum study was completed, the next steps would involve teachers in the "collection and organization of new materials and . . . the preparation and installation of teachers guides" (p. 288).

Frederick and Patterson (1937), professor of education at the University of Mississippi and director of the Mississippi Curriculum Program, respectively, briefly reviewed the progress of the state of Mississippi's curriculum program since 1934. During the first year, Frederick and Patterson reported, all teachers and administrators were involved in curriculum study, attempting to determine the educational needs of the state. The focus during the second and third years was directed to

beginning instructional reorganization, improving programs of work, increasing available instructional materials, and collecting materials to aid in the further development of the program. (p. 239)

The authors noted that during the third year work on the scope of the curriculum began, production committees were organized, and plans for the revision of the secondary school curriculum, also, began.

Lamoreaux (1937), an administrator in the Santa Barbara, California, school system, described the curriculum development program in Santa Barbara. The primary objective of the Santa Barbara program, according to Lamoreaux, was the "process of teacher growth in service" (p. 266).

Lamoreaux noted that two principles guided the work of the Santa Barbara program. First, all teachers should be involved in the program. Lamoreaux asserted that "the concern must be in terms of all teachers rather than that of the few who could grasp ideas and do things well in a short time" (p. 266). A second guiding principle was that the curriculum development program and educational philosophy of the school system had to be in harmony.

Lamoreaux (1937) described the procedures used by the Santa Barbara school system to illustrate the two principles. The initial work began with a curriculum study which involved "the entire school system, both in terms of system activity and building" (p. 266). The curriculum study focused on "(1) conditions over the country, (2) new movements in education, and (3) the formulation of plans of work" (p. 266) for the school system. As a result of the

curriculum study, committees were created to formulate curriculum objectives and the scope and sequence of the curriculum. Lamoreaux noted that these committees were composed of "representative cross sections of the system" (p. 266). However, the work of these committees was not done on an entirely representative basis. Lamoreaux also noted that "great numbers of teachers" (p. 266) were frequently given release time from classroom responsibilities to work with these committees. Additionally, committee work was frequently submitted to teachers for their "reactions and participation" (p. 266). Once the work of these committees was completed, Lamoreaux reported that committees would be created to "consider the matter of specific learnings on year levels and learnings within a unit" (p. 266).

Spears (1937), the director of research and secondary education in the Evansville, Indiana, school system, detailed the curriculum work of the Evansville teachers. Spears asserted that an effective curriculum development program depended on "effective machinery" and the active participation of as many teachers as possible (p. 1). In order to encourage wide participation, Spears reported that department chairs and subject-area teachers not participating directly in the work of the curriculum committees were encouraged to "look in . . . as the program progresses" (p. 2). Spears noted that curriculum committees

from the elementary schools would be consulted periodically to correlate the work. He also noted that the curriculum revision program operated in two-year cycles: "Each department will work a year in constructing its new courses, these to be tried out in the second year, with final revision coming at the end of that year" (p. 2). Spears reported that "the school year 1934-35 was set aside for the social-studies construction work, the year 1935-36 for the English and commercial, 1936-37 for science and home economics, etc." (p. 2).

Spears (1937) outlined the duties and responsibilities of the various committees described in the organizational chart. Teachers served on the correlating committee, departmental key committees, production committees, and revision committees. The correlating committee was "to act as an advisory body and clearinghouse in correlating the entire curriculum building program" (p. 4). The departmental key committees were essentially responsible for researching and establishing the objectives of their particular departments. The production committees were basically responsible for developing the tentative course of study for a particular subject. All of the teachers in the department served on this committee. The revision committees were to be made up of teachers who had taught the tentative courses of study and were responsible for revision in the tentative courses based upon "the reactions of all teachers who have taught the courses in tryout form, and the

opinions of the original production committees" (p. 6). Teachers chaired all of these committees. The remainder of Spear's text described in detail the curriculum work of the various subject area departments, i.e., the English department, the commercial (vocational) department, the social studies department, the Home Economics department, and the science department.

In 1936, a joint committee of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study was created "to make available an up-to-date summary of thought and practice" (p. vi) in curriculum work. The joint committee was composed of eight members: Edith Bader, assistant superintendent for the Ann Arbor, Michigan, school system; Orville Brim, professor of education at Ohio State University; Prudence Cutright, assistant superintendent for the Minneapolis school system; Will French, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University; Harold Hand, professor of education at Stanford University; Charles Knudson, professor of education at George Peabody College; Ernest Melby, Dean of the School of Education at Northwestern University; Paul Rankin, director of curriculum and research for the Detroit school system; Laura Zirbes, professor of education at Ohio State University; and, Henry Harap, who served as chair of the committee and was a professor of education at George Peabody College. The Joint Committee on Curriculum (1937) reported on a study it conducted to determine the extent of

curriculum revision nation-wide and to identify the trends in these programs. The Joint Committee on Curriculum surveyed 303 superintendents who represented the following types of systems: 201 school systems serving populations of 25,000 or more, sixty school systems serving populations between 15,000 and 25,000, and forty-two school systems serving populations less than 5,000 (p. 1). The Joint Committee on Curriculum found that

well over half of the curriculum programs . . . were begun either in 1935 or 1936. Over seven tenths of these enterprises have been initiated since 1932. Only an approximate tenth . . . were begun before 1929. (p. 2)

The authors also reported thirty-two states had curriculum development programs underway. This was evidence to the Joint Committee on Curriculum of an increasing "interest and effort in curriculum development" (p. 2) throughout the country.

The Joint Committee on Curriculum (1937) categorized the trends they identified from the study into six groups:

the function of the curriculum, the nature of the learning experience, organization for curriculum development, selecting and arranging curriculum materials, installation, and evaluation. (p. 5)

The trends identified under organization for curriculum development were most pertinent to the discussion of teacher participation in curriculum work. The authors asserted that "the teacher occupies the key position in any effective program of curriculum development" (p. 10). They maintained that teachers could not intelligently utilize a curriculum they did not understand and would not utilize any curriculum

with which they did not agree. The key, then, to effective curriculum revision to change the "outlook of the teacher" (p. 10). The Joint Committee on Curriculum maintained that in order for this to happen "the classroom teacher must be brought into the center of the picture if efforts at revision are to issue in improved learning experiences for pupils" (p. 10). The Joint Committee on Curriculum reported that "this point of view represents the overwhelming consensus of opinion" (p. 10) among the participants in the study.

Another development identified by the authors was the trend to increased freedom for teachers in instructional matters. Curriculum development was moving away from highly prescriptive courses of study to "the practice of supplying teachers with the raw material of instruction (much of which they have designed) to employ within broadly defined limits" (Joint Committee on Curriculum, 1937, p. 10). The authors reported that this trend was identified by a "considerable majority" (p. 10) of the respondents.

Another development identified from the study was the trend toward cooperation between groups of teachers to integrate the curriculum. The Joint Committee on Curriculum maintained that this trend has

made it desirable or necessary for teacher-representatives of two or more broad fields to pool their respective resources and to engage in correlated or cooperative thinking. (p. 11)

Again, a majority of the respondents, according to the authors, indicated agreement with this trend.

The Joint Committee on Curriculum (1937) understood that the achievement of democratic practice in schools was difficult. Inadequate understanding and incomplete acceptance made practices difficult. Additionally, the authors contended that effective educational practice was

made more difficult by the fact that many of the practices in the organization and administration of our present schools are in direct violation of the philosophy of democracy and creative growth. (p. 125)

One particular challenge to teacher participation, according to the authors, were authoritative administrative practices. They asserted that "one of the most damaging principles in current educational administration practices is the idea of separating planning and performance" (p. 133). One way in which to address this challenge was to give

teachers and pupils the freedom to utilize their knowledge and skills. In other words the administrator or leader attempts to unshackle the teachers and children by removing centralized administrative controls. (p. 137)

One centralized administrative device was control of curriculum development.

Levin (1938), an administrator in the Baltimore, Maryland, school system, briefly described the curriculum revision program in Baltimore. The initial work began in 1935 with the creation of an executive committee made up of one hundred members. Levin reported that the members of the committee "were drawn from every rank of the system and included teachers, vice-principals, principals, supervisors, department heads, and directors" (p. 31). The executive committee selected several problems as a focus for study:

the function and scope of education in a democracy, the government in relation to social welfare, the effect of technological development upon society, the conservation of natural resources, international problems, and attitudes toward authority. (p. 31)

The executive committee was divided into sub-committees to study each of the problems. Levin noted that the sub-committees spent the next two years "engaged in the gathering of factual materials relating to their problems and in studying the educational implications" (p. 31).

The study of the executive committee served to guide the work committees within the schools. Teachers were also involved in this work:

In all the divisions of the school system, old courses of study are constantly being revised and new ones constructed by committees of teachers, vice-principals, principals, and supervisors. (Levin, 1938, p. 32)

As in other schools and school systems involved in curriculum work, some schools were designated as experimental centers where tentative courses of study could be examined. Teachers were involved in this evaluation and revision of the tentative courses. Levin (1938) reported that

In addition to the actual committee members the teachers in the so-called experimental centers where instructional materials are tried out, accepted, rejected, modified, or revised, make important contributions to this work, for all of the materials that are finally included in a course of study represent practical attainment in actual classrooms. (p. 32)

All faculty members were encouraged to offer suggestions and criticisms toward the improvement of the curriculum used in the Baltimore school system, according to Levin.

Elle (1938), the curriculum director for the Salem, Oregon, school system, reported on the curriculum improvement efforts there. A central, or executive, committee composed of administrators initiated the program in 1935 with a study of significant educational problems. After two years of study, Elle reported that the work was "expanded . . . to include teachers in the system" (p. 32). Nine curriculum study groups were created and included twenty-two teachers.

Each curriculum study group was expected to follow a similar plan. Each study group was to elect a chairperson who would be responsible for three meetings. After three meetings a new member would be elected to chair the next three meetings. Meetings were to be held weekly. Elle (1938) noted that each meeting was "to be spent in discussion of a question pertinent to curriculum improvement" (p. 32). Members of the study group were expected to prepare in advance of the meetings by studying materials (i.e., bulletins containing suggested procedures and study questions and a bibliography of pertinent materials) furnished by the curriculum director.

Once the discussion of a particular curricular problem was completed by each study group, their findings were to be presented to the entire faculty. Elle (1938) reported that three panels were to be formed from members of the study groups to discuss their findings before larger groups. Elle noted that each study group was expected "to prepare a

tentative statement of the principles which they consider to be basic to curriculum organization" (p. 33). These tentative principles would be submitted to the central committee "whose responsibility it will be to build from them a statement of principles for the entire system" (p. 33). These principles were to guide the further curriculum work of the system.

To insure that all teachers in the system had an opportunity to participate in the curriculum study groups, membership in the groups would change periodically. The composition of each group would be such so as to allow that there was always a representative mix of teachers from all school levels (i.e., elementary, junior and senior high schools). Through this organization of the curriculum study groups, it was hoped that "teachers will come to realize they have many common problems on which they can work cooperatively" (Elle, 1938, p. 32).

The theme of the January, 1938 issue of The North Central Association Quarterly was curriculum trends. One trend in the 1930's which has already been noted was the increase in the number of state programs for curriculum revision. The state of Kansas was one of the many states at this time which had begun a state program of curriculum development. Zeller (1938), the state department of education official directing the Kansas program, reported on the program's progress. As with Oregon and some other states, Kansas' curriculum program was a joint effort

between the state teachers' association and the state department of education. Zeller noted that they were also "able to secure the services of consultants from the Department of Field Surveys of George Peabody College" (p. 351).

The Kansas curriculum development program served one primary purpose, according to Zeller (1938). That purpose was to improve instruction on a state-wide basis through the professional development of the state's teachers. The production of courses of study, Zeller contended, was secondary to the improvement of instruction. The professional development of teachers was addressed, initially, by organizing teachers state-wide for curriculum study.

Zeller (1938) reported that "the first thing was to recognize and study on a state-wide basis our problems" (p. 351). In the summer of 1936, a committee was sent to the curriculum laboratory at George Peabody College to prepare materials for the study groups to use. Consultants at George Peabody College also planned a course on curriculum development and developed a plan for a research study, both of which all participants in the state program would take part.

Once the materials were prepared, the curriculum study groups were organized according to seventeen educational centers already in existence throughout Kansas. The larger city systems, such as Topeka, organized study groups

separately. Participation in some study groups was voluntary while in other centers it was required. Once the study groups were organized, each group selected its own leader and began their investigations guided by the study bulletins prepared at George Peabody College. The curriculum course planned at George Peabody College earlier was taught at each of the seventeen educational centers during this time, as well.

Zeller (1938) noted that each study group was expected to prepare a report that "will get at the results of the thinking" (p. 353) of the study groups. These reports were to be submitted to Zeller. Zeller reported that "on the basis of their opinion we will formulate the next year's program" (p. 353). One of the activities which was to take place in the second year of the Kansas program was "to set up exploratory situations for solving the problems we have agreed need to be solved" (p. 353).

Stretch (1938), the secondary curriculum consultant for the Waco, Texas, school system, described the curriculum work in Waco under the state of Texas' curriculum program. She noted that the twenty schools in the Waco system were served by three hundred and seventy-seven teachers. Stretch reported that all teachers in the system had been "actively engaged in a curriculum revision program since September, 1935, when the Texas program was begun" (p. 75). The Waco program, as a part of the Texas state program, had been in

operation for almost two and half years at the time of Stretch's report.

The work in Waco began in 1935 with the organization for the study groups. Arrangements were made for every study group in the system to be guided by a university professor. The initial focus of these groups was the principles and practices of curriculum development. Stretch (1938) asserted that "no pressure was brought to bear on any teacher to join a study group" (p. 75). The participating teachers "had the privilege of selecting the groups with whom they studied" (p. 75).

Once the curriculum study was completed, four committees were created to begin the actual curriculum work: Aims, Production, Installation and Revision committees. The Aims Committee, composed of administrators, was responsible for developing "aims, plans, and policies and to act as a central committee in general" (Stretch, 1938, p. 76). This committee basically guided the work of the school system. The production committees, composed entirely of teachers, were essentially responsible for creating the course of study. The installation committees were composed of teachers who had actually tested the tentative courses of study in their classrooms. The revisions committees, composed of thirty-six teachers, "received all suggestions and criticisms from all other classroom teachers and made revisions which seemed to be needed" (p. 76). Stretch (1938) noted that "the committees were selected so as to

provide for much participation in curriculum making on the part of every classroom teacher" (p. 76).

The curriculum work followed a general plan. Every teacher was asked to list the learning objectives for the subject areas they taught. These objectives were submitted to the production committee where the objectives were

arranged . . . under the head of general objectives for the various subject matter areas, semester objectives, and specific objectives for each separate division or unit of subject matter or experience. (Stretch, 1938, p. 77)

Once the objectives were resolved, the production committees began the selection and placement of content. Content was arranged in units and followed a similar arrangement in all subject areas (e.g., unit title, unit objectives, unit learning activities, unit teaching procedures, materials, unit evaluation). Once the units were arranged in the courses of study, the tentative courses were submitted to teachers for experimentation. Each teacher served on the installation committee in his or her particular subject area. Each teacher submitted his or her reactions to the tentative courses to the revisions committees for their consideration. Courses were then revised accordingly.

Frederick (1938), director of curriculum and research in the Saginaw, Michigan, school system, described curriculum work in the city school system of Saginaw during the last five years. Frederick asserted that the Saginaw school system was "one of the few cities in the nation in which all the faculty members, more than 500" (p. 120) were

actively involved in the revision of the curriculum. Another important feature of the Saginaw program, according to Frederick, was the involvement of a number of University of Michigan professors. Frederick went on to summarize the progress of the initial work.

The initial step in the Saginaw curriculum program was the creation of a central curriculum committee, known as the "Planning and Coordinating Council" (Frederick, 1938, p. 120) to guide the overall program. This committee was composed of fifty-four members: twenty-three school and central office administrators, and thirty-one elementary and high school teachers. Frederick noted that teachers serving on the Planning and Coordinating Council were selected primarily through nomination by other teachers. A sub-committee of the Planning and Coordinating Council created the tentative plan and procedures for the Saginaw Curriculum Program. Frederick reported that the tentative plan was revised twice: "first after suggestions were made by the entire Planning and Coordinating Council and again after the entire faculty studied the plans" (p. 121).

The final plan for the Saginaw Curriculum Program contained twenty-nine statements intended to guide the work of the school system. Several statements spoke directly to teacher participation. The third guideline stated that "all faculty members in the Saginaw school system will be encouraged to take active part in the Saginaw Curriculum Program" (Frederick, 1938, p. 121). Partial evidence of

this commitment could be seen in the number of teachers serving on the Planning and Coordinating Council. That teachers would serve on the Council was also put into policy as the fifth procedural statement noted:

All faculty members will be asked to suggest persons to be on a Planning and Coordinating Council. The members of the Council will be chosen largely on the basis of persons suggesting them. Care will be taken, however, to have all schools, all grades, all major phases of schoolwork, various institutions of higher learning, different amounts of experience, and different amounts of training represented by members of the Council. (p. 121)

The seventh policy statement addressed how the majority of the curriculum work was to be done:

A large part of the work on the program will be done by all the faculty organized into study groups working in the curriculum laboratory under the guidance of the curriculum director. (p. 121)

The general plan stated that there would be nine study groups which would address these issues: school responsibilities; conceptions of and aims of education, scope and content, grade placement, organization, extra-curricular activities, teaching procedures and evaluation, "securing and using occupational information," and curriculum problems (p. 121). The final policy related to teacher participation stated that "curriculum materials will be tried out by one or more teachers and revised before they are included in the tentative course of study" (p. 122).

Basler (1938), the director of curriculum improvement for the Tacoma, Washington, school system, summarized the curriculum work in the Tacoma school system. He asserted that "a properly organized and directed curriculum program

enlists large numbers of teachers in active participation" (p. 175). One result of an effective program of curriculum development, according to Basler, was the professional growth of the participants.

Basler (1938) outlined the plan of organization for the Tacoma curriculum program. A central committee known as the Curriculum Council was created to guide the work of the school system. The Curriculum Council was composed of twenty-five administrators and six teachers. Basler described three types of curriculum committees. Each broad field subject area (e.g., social studies, foreign language) was addressed by a separate course of study committee. Each course of study committee dealt with its particular subject area for kindergarten through twelfth grades to facilitate articulation and correlation, according to Basler. Sub-committees were formed from each course of study committee "to deal with one grade, one subject, or other definite aspect of the work" (p. 176). The third type of curriculum committee was what Basler described as special committees. These committees were created to address special aspects of curriculum, e.g., "guidance, report cards, and remedial reading" (p. 176).

Basler (1938) highlighted what he considered to be special characteristics of the Tacoma program. One particular feature he identified was the extent of teacher approval and participation in the program. Curriculum work by teachers was nothing new, however. He noted that

all good teachers, everywhere, are constantly devising and trying . . . what may prove to be more satisfactory activities, are constantly planning more vital learning experiences, are constantly seeking more effective instruction materials. (p. 176)

In other words, even before organized curriculum programs, effective teachers had always been involved in curriculum development in their classrooms. An organized program such as the Tacoma curriculum program, according to Basler, was

simply a means of providing opportunities, direction, and facilities in order that the improvement activities may be carried forward more deliberately, scientifically, and cooperatively. (p. 176)

An organized program of curriculum development provided the vehicle for what teachers had been doing individually all along.

Miel (1938), the principal of the Donovan School in Ann Arbor, Michigan, discussed teacher involvement in the cooperative development of curriculum and the practice at the Donovan School. It will be remembered that Miel, a student of Dewey's at the University of Chicago, was a teacher in the Laboratory School for five years during Dewey's experiment with cooperative administration. Miel proposed three principles of teacher involvement which she asserted had been gleaned "from actual observation and experience" (p. 343). The first principle was democratic cooperation. Miel defined democratic cooperation as "participation all along the line- in planning, in execution, and in appraisal of results" (p. 343). One technique, suggested by Miel, for building teachers

confidence and competence to participate was to "proceed from concrete to abstract" (p. 343). Miel proposed that

If you wish to demonstrate to teachers that the cooperative method of solving problems is the best method, don't just talk about the principles involved. Bring them face to face with one problem after another that can be solved satisfactorily only by cooperative attack. (p. 343)

A method of facilitating cooperation was to give teachers the opportunity to build capacity through intellectual initiative, discussion, and cooperative decision-making with the entire faculty.

A second principle which was directly related to democratic cooperation, according to Miel (1938), was patience (p. 343). Miel questioned whether administrators had considered "how abruptly sometimes you introduce teachers to new concepts which often involve fundamental changes in their point of view" (p. 343). While administrators have had time to reflect on the new concept being introduced, teachers are seldom allowed the time to reflect. She maintained that "teachers under your guidance also need to have an opportunity to grow slowly and naturally toward new beliefs" (p. 343). Administrators needed to be patient when introducing new concepts and practices. They need to allow teachers time to reflect and provide opportunities for them to reflect on the new ideas.

Miel's (1938) third principle was "faith in the potentialities of human beings" (p. 344). She asserted that if teachers were not capable of developing curriculum it was because they had "not had opportunities to work and do

thinking in this field" (pp. 344-345). She maintained that progress would never be made in cooperative curriculum development as long as administrators "as a group are afraid to entrust teachers with certain types of responsibility" (p. 344). Miel suggested that one way to initiate teacher participation was through a curriculum study program. She indicated appropriate activities would include providing stimulating speakers, provoking lively discussions, presenting innovative practices in other school systems, and presenting abstracts of significant educational texts (p. 345).

Once teachers were ready to begin cooperatively addressing curricular problems, Miel (1938) contended that they needed "a good technique for group thinking" (p. 345). A method she had effectively utilized was what she called "The Small Group Conference Plan" (p. 345). In a school, the entire faculty would first meet to "define problems and receive mutual stimulation" (p. 345). The large group was then broken up into smaller groups with each group given a specific responsibility. Most of the time was spent in small group discussion, because, according to Miel, "the real group thinking is done there" (p. 345). At the end of the allotted time, the small groups returned to the large group where each small group presented its recommendations. Miel noted that this technique was particularly useful when addressing a large, multi-faceted problem or when committee work was required.

Miel (1938) suggested four other techniques for effective group thinking. An critical technique, according to Miel, was "the keeping of careful written records of all kinds of group discussions" (p. 346). Written records served several important purposes: keeping all members of the larger group informed, making for more efficient use of group time and discussions, providing references for the discussion content, and, in regards to curriculum development, providing a "highly functional and flexible curriculum record" (p. 346). Another technique for effective group thinking suggested by Miel was following a set procedure for effective group discussion. She stated three rules for effective group discussion: suggestions exhausted before motions are made, questions asked to clarify suggestions, and no debate until all suggestions submitted (p. 346).

A third method of facilitating effective group thinking centered on building leadership within the faculty, particularly leadership in curriculum development. Miel (1938) asserted that "if classroom teachers are sharing leadership in curriculum making, a large staff of high-priced administrative assistants is hardly necessary" (p. 347). She reasoned that the money allotted for these positions could be diverted to hiring additional teachers: "Savings here could go to increasing the number of teachers and thus lighten teacher load appreciably" (p. 347). The

decreased load would also allow more time for developing leadership and group thinking in curriculum development.

The final technique for effective group thinking centered on "saving teachers' time and energy" (Miel, 1938, p. 346). Miel offered several suggestions. The first was the creation of "a functional organization through which [teachers] may work" (p. 346). She asserted that three basic committees would take "care of all the functions of a building faculty": community relations, teachers' affairs, and curriculum activities (p. 346). Another recommendation for saving teachers' time and energy was the careful scheduling of meetings. Miel proposed shortening the teaching day on days when meetings were scheduled, having a set schedule for meetings, and leaving at least one day a week free of meetings. A third proposition for saving teachers' time and energy was more psychological in nature. Miel asserted that if teachers felt that they were involved in a worthwhile cause, they would be more willing to commit their time and energy. Ultimately, this commitment might actually save time and energy.

Miel (1938) concluded by noting that the concepts and techniques she had outlined were used with her faculty at The Donovan School. She contended that these techniques were especially effective in facilitating curriculum development by the faculty. She noted that "this particular faculty group . . . attacked many curriculum problems" (p. 347) using these techniques. The curriculum problems

addressed by the faculty included "better integration of all junior high schools subjects, the program for the special experimental group, and dramatics in English classes" (pp. 347-348).

Cutright (1938), the assistant superintendent of schools for the Minneapolis school system, contended that while "an examination of the curriculum construction . . . in most cities shows that teachers play a prominent part" in curriculum development, "teachers must play a far more prominent role in determining the basic principles which will underlie a program of curriculum construction" (p. 342). She presented the work of the Minneapolis Teachers' Curriculum Committee as one example of how this further participation might be brought about. Cutright reported that every school in the system had representatives on the committee. She also noted that the "committee meets several times each year to discuss and plan changes in the curriculum" (p. 342).

One important activity that the Minneapolis Teachers' Curriculum Committee was involved in were the educational forums. Cutright (1938) pointed out that the educational forums were created for the purpose of bringing together teachers and administrators from all system schools "to discuss certain crucial topics bearing directly upon their classroom work" (p. 342). The response, according to Cutright, was greater than expected. At the inception of the idea of educational forums, Cutright stated that plans

had been made for about one hundred twenty-five participants since this was considered an ideal number for discussion. Cutright reported that "about eight hundred and fifty teachers and principals asked to attend one or more forums" (p. 342). The educational forums were such a success, Cutright noted, that plans were made to make the educational forums an ongoing feature of the school system.

While some might argue that the forums were more supervisory activities, Cutright (1938) suggested that the educational forums were curricular in nature since the supervisory and curricular functions were not easily, or wisely, separated. She asserted that "curriculum construction cannot be separated from classroom teaching. The true curriculum is to be found where the teacher meets the class" (p. 343). In this sense, curricular and supervisory activities were seeking to achieve the same or similar goals which was improvement of classroom instruction.

Matzen and Knapp (1938), professor of school administration and graduate assistant, respectively, at the University of Nebraska, contended that the significant amount of literature written on the subject of teacher participation in school administration "would indicate that much progress has been made in this area" (p. 27). The authors asserted that actual practice suggested otherwise. Teacher participation in school administration was defined by the authors as occurring when "teachers share, co-

operatively, with the administration the responsibility of formulating, adopting, and executing educational policies" (p. 27). Matzen and Knapp maintained that teacher participation in school administration was beneficial in that the professional growth of teachers was enhanced. Additionally, the educational organization was made more effective by "bringing into action the combined knowledge and intelligence of the various members of the instructional staff" (p. 27). Matzen and Knapp attributed the lack of teacher participation in practice to three factors: the inadequate understanding among some administrators as to the democratic mission of schools, the perceived loss of power among some administrators, and the relative inefficiency of cooperative effort (p. 27).

In order to examine this assertion, Matzen and Knapp (1938) analyzed the results of a survey conducted to assess the extent of teacher participation in school administration. In this study, a questionnaire identifying twenty-nine administrative functions was submitted to eighty-nine Mid-West superintendents to determine the extent of teacher participation. This extent was indicated by five degrees of teacher participation:

teachers are given complete responsibility,
participation restricted to committee membership,
teachers co-operate with administrator, teachers offer
suggestions, no participation. (p. 28)

Matzen and Knapp noted that in most schools "the majority of the administrative functions in which teachers participate fall between the two extremes" (p. 28). Participation was

most often achieved "either through 'teachers offering suggestions' or by 'participation through committee membership'" (p. 28).

In regards to teacher participation in curriculum development, the results of the questionnaire were similar to the general findings. Forty-five (53% of respondents) superintendents indicated that teachers' participation in curriculum development was achieved through "teachers offer[ing] suggestions" (Matzen & Knapp, 1938, p. 28). The next most selected method of teacher participation was "participation restricted to committee membership" (p. 28). Thirty-one superintendents (35% of respondents) indicated that was the preferred method of participation for curriculum development. Only one superintendent indicated that no participation of teachers was preferred for curriculum development.

The theme for the April, 1938, issue of Educational Method was cooperation. Misner (1938), the superintendent of schools of Glencoe, Illinois, discussed the place of cooperation in instruction. It will be remembered that Misner and the Glencoe school system had been previously cited as having an exemplary program of curriculum development in which teachers were actively involved (see Judd, et al., 1926; Glencoe Public Schools, 1938). Misner identified five issues that had emerged engendered by the pursuit of cooperative improvement of instruction:

What shall we mean by cooperation? Whom shall we

include in the cooperative enterprise? Shall we attempt to employ cooperative techniques in all areas of educational activity? Where does the specialist come in? and How can organization be planned to facilitate an cooperation? (p. 329)

These issues formed the outline of his discussion.

Misner (1938) created his definition of cooperation from Curtis' work (see Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, 1939). Curtis, according to Misner, considered the highest level of cooperation to be democratic. In order to achieve democratic participation,

There must be complete sharing of experience until all individuals become *equal in knowledge and desire* with respect to the situation being considered. Each personality must contribute distinctively until a rich unity of thought and purpose result. There must be a making-up-of-the-group-mind by a process very similar to that in which the individual makes up his mind. (p. 330)

Democratic participation, as Curtis conceived it, was the ideal for education, according to Misner. However, Misner contended that "the line and staff organization borrowed from industry and the army has resulted in undesirable status relationships" (p. 330) and inhibited democratic participation in education.

As to the question of who should be involved, Misner (1938) maintained that "if democratic cooperation is the ultimate goal it will not be enough to say that teachers and pupils are to be included" (p. 330). He contended that democratic cooperation implied that "all community persons will be included in the program of education" (p. 330). Democratic cooperation also suggested that a new kind of "organization within which all agents and agencies are

cooperating in the achievement of clearly defined social purposes" (pp. 330-331).

Concerning the educational activities for which cooperative effort was appropriate, Misner (1938) suggested that, ideally, cooperative effort could be applied to all educational activities. He also acknowledged that "the cooperation of all persons in every area of educational activity is difficult" (p. 331). However, he asserted that much more could be done than what was being attempted. One area he suggested was in curriculum development: "There is a growing emphasis upon the participation of pupils and teachers in curriculum making, revision, and recording" (p. 331). Misner predicted that "the era of domination by curriculum experts will pass and be replaced with the era of continuous and cooperative development of curricula by pupils, teachers, and experts" (p. 331).

A Guide for Curriculum Planning (Glencoe Public Schools, 1938) was printed by the Glencoe, Illinois, school system, where Misner was superintendent at the time, to guide the teachers and administrators of the school system in curriculum work. The guide was "a cooperative study of educational policies and procedures, designed to facilitate the growth and development of children within their environment" (p. 2). The guide noted that "the preparation of the curriculum outlines . . . was an enterprise in which pupils, classroom teachers, and parents participated" (p. 3). The curriculum outlines presented in the guide were

much more than written courses of study. The staff explained that

the present outlines should probably be interpreted as the record of an extended experiment in curriculum thinking. Real curriculum building will proceed on the basis of this preliminary thinking and must inevitably be interpreted as a continuous process made increasingly significant by the careful recording of the individual and group experiences. (p. 3)

The outlines served as a record of the group thinking on curriculum. The actual development of curriculum would be a result of this preliminary thinking and the implication was that the actual curriculum development would take place in the individual classrooms.

The organization of the curriculum program was relatively simple. The guide indicated that this organization facilitated group thinking (Glencoe Public Schools, 1938, p. 3). Participants chose the committees on which they wished to serve. Those who selected curriculum activities then selected the sub-committee on which they wished to serve. Each committee elected its own chairperson. The chairs of each committee also served on the Socialization Committee the function of which was to coordinate the activities of all committees.

Spinning (1938), the superintendent of the Rochester, New York, school system, described the practice of teacher participation in school administration in a number of school systems. While many writers were suggesting that teachers needed courses in school administration in order to participate effectively, Spinning asserted that

administrative coursework by teachers was not necessary for effective teacher participation in school administration. He made a distinction between policy making and administration of policy. He contended that teachers should be involved in policy-making and administrators should be responsible for administering policy. In Spinning's conception, then, teacher participation in policy-making consisted of:

(1) helping to form administrative policies; (2) special assignments in carrying out those policies that do not rest equally on all teachers in the same field or grade; and, (3) interpretation of those policies to other teachers or to the public. (p. 26)

Spinning noted that "the most common forms of teacher participation are committee service in curriculum revision and textbook selection" (p. 26).

Spinning (1938) outlined the practices of teacher participation in school administration in several school systems, i.e., Denver, Des Moines, Washington, Seattle, Salt Lake City, Atlanta, and San Francisco (p. 27). Denver and Atlanta were most notable for teacher involvement in curriculum work. Spinning reported that

the Denver policies council, an extension of the curriculum committee, has 175 members, including all principals and supervisors and a larger number of classroom teachers. (p. 28)

In Atlanta, Spinning reported that each semester a curriculum forum was organized in which groups of 30 to 40 teachers participated. At the conclusion of the forums, each groups made suggestions for curriculum development to the superintendent.

Morrow (1938), the director of curriculum research for the State Department of Education of Georgia, reported on the progress of the Georgia curriculum program. The state program was a joint effort, according to Morrow,

of the public schools, the State Department of Education, the University System of Georgia, the private and endowed colleges of the state, the Georgia Education Association, the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs. (p. 218)

While the program had been "eminently successful with teachers-in-service," Morrow concluded that the continued success of the program depended on this continued cooperation, particularly from teacher training institutions (p. 220). The Georgia curriculum program was in its fifth year of operation.

Morrow (1938) reported that planning for the Georgia program began in December of 1933. During the summer of 1934, approximately three hundred teachers and principals participated in courses on curriculum problems. The following school year, the teachers and principals who had participated in the courses on curriculum problems led a state-wide curriculum study. Morrow reported that eighty-five study groups were formed in fifty-five communities around the state (p. 218). The state department of education distributed a bulletin on curriculum fundamentals to guide the work of the study groups. Morrow attributed the success of the curriculum study program "to the requirements of a trained leader for each local study group,

a minimum of fifteen meetings of two hours each, and a minimum curriculum library" (p. 218).

The Georgia program provided two ongoing features for curriculum study. Morrow (1938) noted that, for the 1938-1939 school year, the curriculum study phase was "continued among teachers not reached by the program" (p. 218). In addition, the state universities and colleges which trained teachers provided curriculum courses during the summer especially for teachers. Morrow reported that

the work of the local community study groups has been supplemented by the curriculum courses of teacher training institutions in the summer schools of the state. (p. 218)

Morrow also related that, as of 1938, approximately eleven thousand teachers had participated in the curriculum study courses offered through these institutions. Future plans included having "groups of teachers from the same school system attend the same summer school and there work out educational programs for their own communities" (p. 219).

In 1938, curriculum demonstration sites for Georgia's curriculum program were created around the state. Morrow (1938) reported that "an official list of closely cooperating schools (elementary and secondary) have been named as demonstration centers for the program" (p. 219). These demonstration sites were open for visitation and study by teachers and administrators. Morrow noted that most of the demonstration sites were in the vicinity of a teacher training institution which provided some guidance to the individual sites. Morrow also noted that all demonstration

sites were under the guidance of supervisors from the state department of education.

As discussed previously, the eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction was devoted to cooperation. Part I of the yearbook was dedicated to the discussion of the concept of cooperation while Part II focused on the practice of cooperation in schools and systems. Williams (1938), an instructor in the School of Education at Northwestern University, described the experimentation of two schools in democratic school administration. Williams identified three organizational patterns that were characteristic of cooperative school administration: an advisory council to the superintendent, the open forum, and the traditional committee organization (p. 120). Williams noted, however, that democratic cooperation was not only about organizational patterns and would not be achieved solely through organization. A common theme of the eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction was that democratic cooperation was also an attitude. Williams asserted that both the organization and the attitude had to be present in order for democratic cooperation to be effective: "One cannot proceed far in a democratic administration with *either the pattern or the attitude* alone. It is not an *either-or* proposition. Both are needed" (p. 123).

Williams (1938) described the experimentation of two school systems, one system using the council form of

organization and the other system using the forum type of organization. The first school system Williams examined, the one using the council form of organization, served a suburban population of about 20,000. Williams reported that the socio-economic status of the community served by the system was "above that of the average American community" (pp. 124-125). The teachers in the system "had considerably more training" (p. 125) and teaching experience than teachers in comparable school systems. The system was composed of ten schools which employed one hundred and eighty teachers. The senior high school was one of thirty schools involved in the New Curriculum Experiment, also known as The Eight-Year Study, sponsored by the Progressive Education Association.

The advisory council to the superintendent had been in existence since the 1935-1936 school year. During this time, Williams (1938) suggested that the advisory council had evolved from a purely advisory group to policy-forming group. Williams noted that the advisory council was

now a body . . . that actually formulates and adopts policies, establishes practices, and in matter where the Board has discretion to act, recommends action to the Board through the superintendent. (p. 127)

The council was composed of forty members, thirty of which were teachers. Williams reported that there were no standing committees of the council. However, temporary committees were appointed as the need arose. Membership on these temporary committees was open to any qualified member of the school system. One of these temporary committees was

the Steering Committee on Educational Needs. This committee was appointed to "conduct a study to determine the needs of pupils and then to select for teaching those needs for which the schools are responsible" (p. 139). Williams reported that this committee was made up of five members- two teachers, two parents, and a pupil (p. 129).

From his examination, and a survey that he submitted to the faculty of the school system, Williams (1938) concluded that

contrary to the belief of some administrators, teachers desire to participate in formulating school policies and practices and are willing to accept the responsibility that is a part of group thinking and planning. (p. 138)

In his survey, he found that seventy-four percent of the teachers in the system indicated this desire to participate and willingness to accept responsibility (p. 138). He also reported that ninety-eight percent of the teachers in the system indicated a willingness "to accept the responsibility that is an integral part of group planning and thinking" (pp. 138-139). He noted that a majority of the administrators responding to the survey agreed with his general assessment.

The second system Williams (1938) examined utilized the forum type of organization. He noted that

the organization for participation in this system may be characterized by its three basic standing committees and also by its more formal pattern of considering policies and practices before they are acted upon by the entire staff. (p. 140)

Because of the size of this school system, Williams cautioned that some techniques utilized were inappropriate for larger systems. He explained that he classified this system as the forum type because of its practice of "discussion and consideration of proposed policies and practices by the entire faculty in an open forum type meeting" (p. 140).

The school system served a suburban community of approximately 6,000. Williams (1938) reported that the socio-economic status of this community was "somewhat above the average in economic and cultural status" (p. 140). The training and experience, while slightly less than the first school system Williams examined, was also "somewhat above the average for teachers throughout the United States" (pp. 140-141). The school system was made up of three elementary schools and employed fifty-five teachers. The superintendent was serving his first term in office.

Williams (1938) reported that one of the first challenges for the new superintendent "was the need of helping the faculty to realize the desirability of cooperative study of school problems" (p. 141). After careful consideration, the faculty "selected curriculum reorganization as the most urgent one and the problem that seemed most likely to lend itself to participative action by the staff" (pp. 141-142). The initial work began with "the creation of a large number of committees" but this number gradually decreased and "larger over-all committees evolved,

producing a unifying effect . . . not present in the initial stage" (p. 142).

The present organization, according to Williams (1938), consisted of three basic committees: the Curriculum Integration Committee, the Cooperative Professional Improvement Committee, and the Social Interpretation Committee (p. 142). In the organizational scheme, these were second level committees, according to Williams. The first level committee was the socialization committee. Third level committees were temporary and created to work with second level committees when needed. Williams reported that there were currently nine third level committees assisting the Curriculum Integration Committee: Guidance, Social Studies, Language Arts, Science, Mathematics, Arts and Crafts, Health and Physical Education, Upper School Reorganization, and Ungraded Primary (pp. 142-143). The organization of this unnamed school system was very similar to the organization of the Glencoe, Illinois, school system under Superintendent Misner (see Glencoe Public Schools, 1938).

The function of the Curriculum Integration Committee was the most relevant to the discussion of teacher participation in curriculum development. This committee had four basic functions: to prepare a curriculum guide which would be composed of "activities and experiences of pupils and teachers;" to organize the curriculum through correlation of these activities and experiences; to develop

goals for and evaluations of the curriculum; and, to emphasize guidance in the curriculum as a function of all staff members (Williams, 1938, p. 144). From the stated functions, it was clear that this committee was responsible for curriculum development in the school system.

As with the other school system that Williams (1938) examined, a survey of the teachers was conducted to ascertain their opinions and attitudes concerning democratic cooperation. Williams reported that eighty-six percent of the teachers in this system indicated a desire "to participate in formulating administrative policies or in determining administrative procedures" (p. 150). One hundred percent of the teachers in the system "indicated that they were willing to accept the responsibility which is an integral part of group planning and thinking" (p. 150). These findings, again, were contrary to the popular assumptions about teacher interest in participation and willingness to accept responsibility. While the schools Williams examined were selected from a number of schools "that apparently were making outstanding progress in cooperative school administration" (p. 150), he questioned whether this was any indication of a trend toward democratic cooperation in school administration. Alluding to a larger survey conducted by the Yearbook Committee, Williams asserted that there was a definite tendency "in the direction of more participation on the part of teachers, patrons, and pupils in administering schools" (p. 150).

The survey to which Williams (1938) alluded was conducted by McSwain (1938) and was included as a culmination to the discussion of the practice of democratic cooperation in the eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. McSwain, a professor of education at Northwestern University, was a member of the committee in charge of preparation of the eleventh yearbook. The survey sought information in four areas: administrator and teacher attitudes concerning democratic practices and principles in education; actual practices in cooperative administration; the extent of participation in cooperative administration; and, the advantages and disadvantages of cooperative administration (p. 154). McSwain reported that of 457 superintendents and 1,453 teachers participated in the study. The respondents represented twenty-two states and fifty-five school systems.

Several findings and observations were pertinent to the discussion of teacher participation in curriculum development. The first group of findings that McSwain (1938) presented concerned administrator attitudes and opinions. McSwain found that

ninety per cent of the superintendents as compared with eighty-seven per cent of the teachers placed the source of responsibility in administration within group action rather than in the planning and evaluating on the part of the administrative staff. (p. 159)

While a significant number of administrators indicated that democratic cooperation was desirable, barely half believed that teachers were prepared or interested in participating

in school administration. In regards to this, McSwain found that

little more than half of the administrative group believe that teachers are not adequately prepared to participate, do not desire to participate, and are unwilling to accept the essential responsibility for participation. (p. 161)

In response to the extent of participation in policy making, eighty percent of the administrators reported that a definite policy had been adopted for teacher participation in the preparation of courses of study. Administrators indicated that a large percentage of teachers, seventy-five percent, actually participated in the preparation of courses of study.

McSwain (1938) next presented his findings concerning teachers' attitudes and opinions on democratic cooperation in school administration. Teachers opinions toward qualification, desire, and time for cooperative participation generally indicated a desire and willingness for participation. Teachers indicated that instructional load was a hindrance to "intelligent participation in administrative affairs" (p. 168). McSwain reported that, in regards to cooperative participation in their system and school, fifty-eight and seventy-three percent, respectively, indicated that they were adequately prepared to participate in cooperative administration (p. 168). McSwain contended that "the desire [on the part of teachers] to participate is evident" (p. 176) with eighty-eight percent of the responding teachers suggesting that they had some desire to

participate in cooperative administration. McSwain added that the data also indicated "that teachers feel they should be given more opportunity than they actually had been given to participate" (p. 170). There were some administrative functions that teachers in which teachers indicated little desire to participate. The data indicated that "more teachers felt they should participate in affairs related directly to teaching than administrative affairs pertaining to the school or system as a whole" (p. 170). Specific to curriculum development, sixty-six percent of the responding teachers indicated a desire to participate in the "building and evaluating of courses of study," while seventy-six percent of the teachers indicated they had actually participated. Curriculum development was only one of two administrative functions in which actual participation exceeded desired participation. Other than evaluating pupil progress, curriculum work had the highest percent of teachers reporting actual participation.

In a brief report on the progress of the Alabama curriculum program, McCall (1939), an official with the Alabama State Department of Education, noted the involvement of teachers. The program was started in 1935. A primary objective of the Alabama curriculum program, according to McCall, was

to improve classroom instruction by encouraging teachers through study of their own curriculum problems to provide children with richer and more purposeful experiences. (p. 29)

There were to be five stages in the program: orientation of participants, initial production of materials, continuing production for all participating groups, installation, evaluation (p. 29). Six bulletins to guide the curriculum work had been developed through "the work of committees of teachers, principals, and supervisors, working in curriculum laboratories under the guidance of college departments of education" (p. 29).

McCall (1939) suggested that the progress of the program during the last four years was evidence of "distinct gain in the improvement of instruction" (p. 30). The number of systems participating in the state program had increased from fourteen systems, during the 1935-1936 school year, to seventy-three systems by the 1937-1938 school year (p. 30). McCall reported an increase in the number of curriculum libraries and holdings in these libraries. More proof could be seen, according to McCall, in the increase in curriculum experimentation being conducted in the schools.

Moser (1939), a principal of the evening high school in Pittsburgh, California, conducted a study to determine the extent to which teacher participation in school administration existed. Moser reported that "660 teachers and 90 administrators from 103 California elementary and secondary schools" (p. 50) participated in the survey. The survey identified ten areas related administrative policies and practices: work load, supervision, salary schedule, teacher rating scale, curriculum development, student

government, guidance and counseling programs, promotion and retention standards, grading system, and budget. Survey respondents were asked to select one of the four types of participative group effort which best described the method by which each policy or practice was developed.

The four types of participative group effort identified the level of participation in developing the particular administrative practice or policy. A type 1 effort was, according to Moser (1939), characterized by teachers and administrators who cooperate "both in the development and in the final decision, in making changes in administrative policies and practices" (p. 50). Type 2 effort was typified by an administration which was responsible for the final decision-making. Type 3 effort was "characterized by control centered in the administration with criticisms and suggestions by teachers" (p. 50). Finally, type 4 effort, in Moser's perspective, placed "the development and final decision in the hands of administration alone" (p. 50). Moser considered type 1 and 2 the most representative of "certain aspects of democratic procedure" (p. 51).

In regards to curriculum development, teachers (approximately 35% of those surveyed) reported that Type 2 effort, i.e., final decision-making resting with the administration, was the most prevalent. The responses of teachers concerning the use of type 4 and type 1 efforts were similar (28% and 25%, respectively). Type 3 effort was used the least in curriculum development, according to

teachers. If type 1 and 2 were considered the most representative of democratic procedures, sixty percent of the teachers responding indicated some participation in curriculum work. However, while teachers were participating to varying extent in curriculum work, this suggested that the final decision-making concerning the curriculum still rested with administrators.

As might be expected, administrators had a different perspective concerning the relationship of curriculum development and the effort used. Eighty percent of the participating administrators indicated that democratic procedures were used to varying extent in curriculum work. Type 1 effort, overwhelmingly, was the type used in curriculum development, according to administrators. Seventy-four percent of those participating reported that type 1 effort was most often utilized in curriculum development. The next most often reported effort used was type 2 with 17% of the participants reporting its use. Type 3 and 4 were reported as the least frequently used.

Moser (1939) concluded that "generally speaking, there is little teacher participation in developing policies and practices in the . . . representative administrative functions" (p. 51). He asserted that teacher participation was

largely limited to the offering of suggestions and making of criticisms on the part of minority groups of teachers rather than by cooperative effort of the whole teaching personnel or their recognized representatives. (p. 51)

He noted that, overall, "only 30 per cent of the teachers report changes made by [type 1 or 2] kinds of participation" (p. 51). Moser reported that the difference in administrative perceptions (i.e., fifty-seven percent of administrators reporting that either type 1 or 2 efforts were used) was probably explained by administrators using these types of efforts with individuals and small groups of teachers. Teachers participated at the highest levels, according to Moser, "in developing policies and practices in functions that are closely related to classroom procedures and subject matter content" (p. 51). Moser noted that "the greatest amount of teacher participation in all . . . functions is in regard to the construction or revision of the curriculum" (p. 51).

Misner (1939), the superintendent of the Glencoe, Illinois, school system, described how the elementary school faculty cooperatively addressed curricular problems. He reported that, at the beginning of the 1935 school year, the faculty of the school system created

a plan of internal organization designed to facilitate democratic participation of pupils, teachers, administrators, counsellors, and community adults in the continuous study and improvement of educational policies. (p. 55)

The plan provided for four basic committees. The Socialization Committee was created to coordinate the activities of the other three committees: curriculum activities, community relations, and teacher affairs (see also Glencoe Public Schools, 1938). The chairpersons from

each of the three secondary committees (i.e., curriculum activities, community relations, and teacher affairs) were selected by members of the respective committees and served on the Socialization Committee. Teachers selected the secondary committee on which they wished to serve. Misner noted that an auxiliary committee, known as the Service Council, was composed of administrators and supervisors, and served as an advisory group to the other committees. Misner reported that, once the organization was completed, "it became apparent that curriculum revision was the most important problem with which the staff should deal" (p. 55).

The work of revision by the faculty began with the development of a frame of reference, or philosophy. With a faculty of fifty-five teachers, every teacher was able to participate through one of the committees or sub-committees. These groups reported their progress to the Socialization Committee. In turn, the Socialization Committee made regular reports to the entire faculty. Misner (1939) asserted that it was in this manner that "a frame of reference was developed and accepted by the staff as a basis for the formulation of more specific curriculum policies" (p. 56). Misner noted that during the development of the frame of reference, the faculty "formulated a major integrative theme and facilitating themes" (p. 56). The themes would serve as a tool to integrate the various subject areas to be developed during curriculum work.

Misner (1939) reported that in 1936 the curriculum activities committee divided into seven subcommittees (i.e., Social Studies, Creative Arts, Language Arts, Science, Mathematics, Health and Physical Education, Guidance and Evaluation). Their primary function during this phase was to analyze their various subject areas as the contributions that the subject might make "to the progressive achievement of the major and facilitating themes" (p. 56). As in the development of the frame of reference, each committee made regular reports to the Socialization Committee which, in turn, reported to the entire faculty.

Misner (1939) noted that each committee placed emphasis on "the recording and reporting of what was being done in learning situations rather than the formulation of statements of what might be done" (p. 57). At the end of the second year, these reports were compiled and published as "Experimental Curriculum Outlines" (p. 57). Misner reported that the purpose of publishing the outlines was to "give some perspective to the total enterprise" (p. 57). The faculty decided that this would give them an opportunity to review the total work and identify "the inconsistencies and inadequacies of the project" (p. 57). Teachers were encouraged to use the tentative outlines and offer suggestions for improvement. Misner also reported that the outlines were submitted to fifty educational leaders for their criticism (p. 57).

The third year was dedicated to the revision and improvement of the tentative outlines. Revisions were based on the suggestions which came from experimentation with the curriculum outlines by the faculty. Suggestions from the educational leaders were also incorporated into the revisions. The results of the revision were published as "A Guide for Curriculum Planning" (see Glencoe Public Schools, 1938).

Neubauer (1939), the curriculum director for the Cicero, Illinois, elementary schools, briefly described how she use curriculum development as a supervisory tool in the Cicero elementary schools. Neubauer asserted that "supervision is significant only when it functions in such manner as to improve the quality of the curriculum" (p. 132). In her conception, supervision and the curriculum, particularly its improvement, were inseparable.

If curriculum development was accepted as an effective tool for supervision, then teachers had to be involved in curriculum development. Neubauer (1939) asserted that

the teacher who is in a position to make the most intelligent use of the curriculum is the one who has shared in the formulation of an educational philosophy and in the development of curriculum consistent with that philosophy. (p. 132)

Additionally, Neubauer asserted, the teachers' proximity to the students made their potential contributions invaluable.

The committee organization was the basic method of participation in curriculum development in Cicero, according to Neubauer (1939). Teachers' preferences for committee

assignments were considered, but administrators made the final decision. Neubauer noted that "the committees carry on their work as they see fit" (p. 133). The committee's finished product went through editing and revisions were made "by an individual who keeps in close contact with committee chairmen" (p. 133). Once initial revisions were completed, the material was submitted to teachers. Neubauer related that further revisions were made as teachers experimented with the materials in the classroom.

Neubauer (1939) asserted that "supervision, regarded as guidance and direction, is present every step of the way" (p. 133). Supervision, in Neubauer's conception, was considered a cooperative effort. Anyone capable of providing guidance or direction was encouraged to do so:

[Supervision] does not reside in one or two individuals bearing the title of supervisor; it is exercised by all who are capable of giving help. . . . from the experience of teachers, from the contributions of children, from principals . . . from every source that has help to give. (p. 133)

In regards to curriculum development, then, supervision was essentially the guidance that all participants provided in the development of curriculum which represented "the best possible contribution to education" (p. 133).

Hanna (1939), professor of education at Stanford University and curriculum consultant to the San Diego school system, described the San Diego school system's organization for curriculum development. Hanna noted that a new organizational structure had been created because the San Diego Curriculum Development Program was "being shaped by

the cooperative effort of the entire staff" (p. 104). Hanna described the operation of the San Diego Curriculum Development Program through an explanation of an organizational chart he provided.

In contrast to the typical organizational chart, Hanna (1939) explained that any rendering of the San Diego organizational chart should begin from the bottom of the chart. He noted that the box labeled "*Entire Staff* is represented as the 'original cause'" (p. 104) since this was the group from which the entire curriculum program developed. Branching off to the left of the *Entire Staff* was the *Central Curriculum Council*. Hanna reported that this council was appointed by the superintendent. All proposals for curriculum development came from this council. These proposals could originate from within the Council itself or be suggested by the entire staff through the Council.

The next level of committees up from *Entire Staff* in the organizational scheme (i.e., *Committees on Principles, Pupil Needs, and Societal Needs*) was responsible for carefully studying and developing principles and guidelines related to their areas of responsibility. These tentative statements were then submitted to the Central Curriculum Council for consideration. Revisions were made in conjunction with each of these committees. Once the Central Curriculum Council and a particular committee completed revisions, the tentative statements were then submitted to

the *Principals' Council* for consideration. If the tentative statements were not acceptable, they were returned to the committee with suggestions. If the tentative statements were acceptable, they were submitted to the entire faculty through the building principals. Suggestions for revisions from each building faculty were, in turn, submitted to the committee.

The next level up from the Committees on Principles, Pupil Needs, and Societal Needs was the *Committee on Curriculum Design*. The Committee on Curriculum Design was responsible for translating the refined principle statements into the scope and sequence of pupil experiences. Hanna (1939) called this task "one of the most important- if not the most important one- of the entire curriculum program" (p. 105). The scope and sequence, or curriculum design, went through the same process as the principle statements:

Statements [on scope and sequence] will go from the *Committee on Curriculum Design* to the *Central Curriculum Council*; back again to the *Committee on Curriculum Design*; eventually to the *Principals' Council*; then to *Building Groups*; and finally, back to the *Central Curriculum Council* and the *Committee on Curriculum Design*. (Hanna, 1939, p. 105)

Hanna explained that he expected the process of curriculum design to take approximately one year.

Once the curriculum design was completed, it was submitted to the *Council for Production of Instructional Materials*. This council was composed of the chairmen of the seventeen subcommittees representing each grade level, kindergarten through adult education. Each subcommittee was

composed of five teachers from that particular grade level. Each grade level subcommittee was responsible for "elaborating . . . [the curriculum design]. . . by specifying the appropriate learning experiences for pupils of the given age" (Hanna, 1939, p. 105). The tentative list of learning experiences for a given grade was then reviewed by the *Council for Production of Instructional Materials*. Once this council and the subcommittee agreed on the tentative list of learning experiences, the tentative list would go through the same review process as the curriculum design and principle statements.

Once the tentative instructional materials had completed the review process, they were to be submitted to the *Council for Reviewing the Completeness of the Sequence of Learning Experiences*. Hanna (1939) reported that this council was composed of the chairmen of subcommittees representing subject areas (i.e., social studies, Language Arts, foreign language, mathematics, science, Fine Arts, Vocational and Practical Arts, and physical education). These subcommittees were made up of teachers and supervisors from these subject areas. The subcommittees were to "review the vertical sequence of materials in their respective fields" (p. 107). In their review, the subcommittees possibly "would enrich, systematize, and . . . suggest rearrangement of pupil experiences" (p. 107). The work of this council would go through the same review process as the instructional materials, curriculum design, and principle

statements. Once this review process was completed, the tentative materials would be submitted to the *Editorial Committee* "for final editing and publishing" (p. 107).

Hanna (1939) asserted that a primary advantage of the organization for the San Diego Curriculum Development Program was the anticipation of widespread staff participation. One of the implications of this widespread participation was widespread professional growth. Hanna noted that

the apparatus is provided by which classroom teachers and administrators throughout the system can learn as they work on the larger curriculum project and at the same time shape the program in the light of their understanding and purposes. (p. 107)

In Hanna's conception, the individual, as well as the school system, benefited from this organizational plan.

Professional growth was beneficial to the individual as well as the school system. Additionally, the individual had a part in planning and developing the work that he or she was expected to carry out. Hanna called this "the democratic method in action" (p. 107).

Zeller (1939), now a professor of education at Kansas State Teachers College, reported on the progress of work on the Kansas Program for the Improvement of Instruction. Zeller noted that the Kansas program was a cooperative effort of the State Department of Public Instruction, the Kansas State Teachers Association, and curriculum consultants from George Peabody College. The Kansas program had been in operation since the summer of 1936 when a group

of educators went to study in the curriculum laboratory at George Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee.

Zeller (1939) reported that "the first two years of the program were for the most part promotional in nature" (p. 164). During the first year, "materials were prepared and . . . groups were organized to study important issues and problems of education in Kansas" (p. 164). The suggestions which came out the curriculum study of the first year were the basis for experimentation during the second year of the program. The modifications and revisions which came from experimentation during the second year formed the basis for planning the third year's work, according to Zeller. He reported that the work of the third year focused on the scope and sequence of the curriculum and the installation of the curriculum.

Zeller (1939) asserted that the Kansas program was intended to be a democratic one from its conception. He noted that the program "grew from the recognition that the democratic way of solving problems is through cooperative thinking of those affected by the problem" (p. 165). Provisions were made for flexible voluntary participation in the curriculum study during the first year. Zeller reported that "twenty large study centers were organized in differing patterns" (p. 165). Teachers came to these large centers "for occasional all-day meetings where they received materials, discussed problems, pooled opinions, and made plans" (p. 165). To facilitate further participation the

large study centers "were organized into small local study centers" (p. 165) where administrators and teachers from all levels could meet to discuss common problems. The local study groups reported their findings to the State Department for Public Instruction. Zeller reported that the basis of the accumulated opinions of the study groups plans were made at the state department addressing the problems. One problem, in particular, was the lack of focus on "problems in areas of living" (p. 166).

The second year, according to Zeller (1939), was devoted to "evolving and trying out ways and means for giving children desirable experiences in these neglected areas of living" (p. 166). Materials for experimentation by teachers had been developed at Peabody College. Zeller emphasized that participation by teachers was entirely voluntary. Volunteers were asked to investigate methods for addressing the problems addressed in curriculum study. Zeller noted that teachers came up with a variety of ways in which to address the curricular problems which had been identified.

During this period of experimentation, Zeller (1939) reported that a committee of teachers was working on a plan for the scope and sequence of the state curriculum. This committee was charged with the responsibility of developing a tentative "framework . . . that would give unity of purpose and continuity in direction in education and yet be flexible enough to aid teachers in planning programs" (p.

166). Based on the report of this committee and the results of the experimentation by teachers, a tentative scope and sequence was developed in the summer of 1938.

Franseth (1939), the Demonstration Supervisor at South Georgia Teachers College, described the curriculum work of secondary teachers in Bulloch County, Georgia. Franseth reported that a curriculum study began in the fall of 1936. Franseth provided the guidance for the teachers involved in the curriculum study. She noted that while the curriculum study involved all teachers, elementary and secondary, in the county, she chose to focus on the work of the secondary teachers.

The teachers identified several deficiencies in their study. The curriculum study almost resulted immediately in changes and improvements, according to Franseth (1939). She explained that the curriculum study suggested that

no serious attention had been given to the school as an institution to help improve life. As soon as the high school teachers began studying the curriculum in terms of life problems . . . the teaching immediately became more meaningful. (p. 214)

Teachers found that the content of the curriculum was not as meaningless as the methods in which it was being presented, according to Franseth. In particular, the teachers found that their focus primarily had been in helping students pass tests rather than applying what they had learned to life.

Other weaknesses the teachers discovered included poor performance in reading and too much departmentalization. Franseth (1939) reported that

the problem of curriculum change indicated by the reading results were twofold: 1. To help teachers see the futility of teaching content material without accepting responsibility for teaching reading; 2. to learn how to teach reading most effectively. (p. 215)

The curriculum study informed some changes which included adjusting reading materials for individual abilities and assigning fewer assignments which required reading outside of class. The other weakness noted by Franseth was departmentalization. She contended that departmentalization was making learning "more difficult than necessary" (p. 216). Teachers found that opportunities to integrate content were being ignored or missed because of the emphasis on departmentalization. As an example, she cited correlations between social science and literature which might have facilitated the learning of content in both areas, but teachers ignored them because of the demands of departmentalization. The strategies that the Bulloch County secondary teachers came up with to address the weaknesses of departmentalization focused on the subject areas of social science and literature. The strategies included teaching American history and American literature in the same grade; having the same teacher teach the social science and literature classes; and, providing opportunities for social science and literature teachers to plan cooperatively. Franseth noted that "in all schools there is a greater effort among high school teachers to plan their work cooperatively" (p. 217).

During the 1930's, the terminology related to curriculum development began to expand to include descriptors such as curriculum investigations, curriculum study, and curriculum research. The term *curriculum enrichment* was introduced in the July, 1939, issue of The National Elementary Principal. Curriculum enrichment was the theme of this issue and was generally described as

the addition of subjects, the modification of content and activities in subjects already taught, the addition of an activity period, individualized assignments, ability grouping, special classes, and, finally, the basic reorganization of the curriculum in terms of child interests and activities or social enterprises and problems. (p. 250)

Falk (1939), Supervisor of Curriculum for the Madison, Wisconsin, school system, reported on the curriculum enrichment efforts of the teachers in Madison. Teachers, according to Falk, had been involved in curriculum development prior to 1931. She reported that

for a number of years previous to 1931 a unique plan of supervision operated in this city. . . . Committees of teachers worked with [supervisors] in producing courses of study and bulletins which were used by all teachers. (p. 271)

Falk explained that this experience prepared teachers for the city-wide curriculum study program which would be started in during the 1931-1932 school year.

The curriculum study program began with the creation of a curriculum department and the appointment of a supervisor of curriculum. The stated purposes for the supervisor of curriculum included promoting

among teachers an experimental, analytical attitude toward teaching

1. By encouraging intensive study of the problems of instruction in their own classrooms and an interest in the results of such study by other teachers
2. By so directing this study that the teachers may discover principles for the selection of methods and materials
3. By providing speakers, professional books, and text materials that will be stimulating and valuable. (Falk, 1939, p. 272).

A primary responsibility, then, of the supervisor of curriculum was to engage teachers in curriculum research and experimentation.

The curriculum study started with teachers indicating their preferences for committee work. Teachers indicated their preference by selecting a topic of study from a list of curricular problems identified in the school system. Teachers were appointed to committees based on their stated preference, principal recommendation, and the need for balanced representation by grade and school. Falk (1939) reported that "one-third of the elementary teaching staff served on the original committees" (p. 273). Falk also reported that, by the end of that year, "all teachers participated . . . either as members of subcommittees or contributors of data or materials" (p. 273). Additionally, all faculty and staff members were kept abreast of the progress of the study through regular bulletins and general meetings. In the fall of 1932, the final product- "a compilation of all the work of the committees" (p. 273)- was made available to all teachers in the system.

Curriculum work by the teachers did not end with the publication of the results of the curriculum study in 1932.

During the next four years, the teachers used the results of the curriculum study to develop courses of study in social studies and science. Teachers, first, conducted a more focused study in these subject areas through "wide reading in [each] field and discussion of aims" (Falk, 1939, p. 273). This focused curriculum study also included an examination by the teachers of "the interests of 6000 children as revealed by their conversation and questions" (p. 273). Once a tentative curriculum design was agreed upon, teachers developed the tentative units of study, experimented with the tentative units, revised and evaluated the tentative units. Falk reported that kindergarten and first grade teachers cooperated in an investigation of reading readiness from 1935 through 1937. Their investigation followed a similar plan as the development of curriculum for social studies and science.

Several "fundamental beliefs" (Falk, 1939, p. 277) developed, according to Falk, as a result of the curriculum work in Madison. Many of these spoke directly to teacher participation in curriculum development. The greatest benefit of curriculum study, in Falk's view, was the professional growth of the teachers involved. Falk maintained that

such investigation acquaints the teacher with recent trends, published investigations, the thinking of other teachers in the same system and elsewhere, and facts from experimentation or research within their own classrooms. (p. 277)

Falk emphasized as a benefit the contact between teachers of different grades and schools. Falk explained that "the placing of teachers from several grades on each committee . . . does much to break down barriers of misunderstanding" (p. 277). Both the professional growth of teachers and improved communication between teachers ultimately provided benefits for students, also. A final principle related to teacher participation which emerged from the curriculum work in Madison, according to Falk, was the belief in voluntary participation on the part of teachers. Falk contended that "there are great differences in the willingness and capacity of individual teachers to contribute to curriculum study, and such differences should be provided for" (p. 277). Allowing teachers to participate on a voluntary basis served to address some of these differences, in Falk's view.

In the same issue of The National Elementary Principal, Broaddus and Norris (1939), a supervisor of elementary grades and assistant superintendent of the Richmond, Virginia, school system, respectively, described the curriculum enrichment efforts of elementary teachers in Richmond. The authors asserted that a primary task of supervisors and administrators was "to call forth creative work [in curriculum development] from their teachers" (p. 278). The authors contended that all teachers should participate in curriculum work:

The good teacher should be called upon because of the benefits derived from her superior skill and artistry, and because she deserves encouragement and recognition for good work. The mediocre teacher should be utilized

because of the personal growth she will undergo and the possibility of discovering potentialities which she has not hitherto revealed. (p. 278)

Teacher participation in curriculum work, and curriculum enrichment, was important. Broaddus and Norris reasoned that

if the fundamental interests of childhood form an important basis for curriculum building, then the person in intimate contact with the children is the one best prepared to make suggestions and help in planning. (pp. 278-279)

They added that "the person who looks upon the curriculum as a daily task, who sees it in action, is the one best fitted to suggest, plan, and devise the ways in which it shall go" (p. 279). Teacher participation in curriculum work, then, was important because teachers knew the children for whom the curriculum was being developed and because teachers were the ones who would have to use the curriculum.

The elementary teachers in Richmond were involved in two curriculum projects, the development of curriculum in elementary English and in elementary science. Broaddus and Norris (1939) reported that the work on the elementary English curriculum was conducted by four major committees: corrective teaching, creative expression, appreciation, and communication. These committees were composed of three principals, one of whom served as chairperson, and from one to three teachers from each elementary grade. The authors noted that "each teacher representative, in turn, was asked to form a committee of teachers from her grade to study and advise with her" (p. 279). All participation by teachers

was voluntary. In this method of organization, Broaddus and Norris reported that approximately 200 teachers were involved in the development of the elementary English curriculum.

The work of the committees began with a study of the problems particular to the English curriculum and the area of their particular committee. Each committee approached the study in varying ways. For example, the Committee on Creative Expression "listed a bibliography and set up a series of problems for study" (Broaddus & Norris, 1939, p. 280). The Committee on Corrective Teaching divided into three subcommittees each to address one of three areas of study: purposes and objectives to guide teachers, the type of course to set up, and the contents and methods of the spelling program (pp. 280-281). The curriculum study of the four committees continued during 1939. Broaddus and Norris reported that the committees continued to list problems for further study. One result of the study to date, according to the authors, was that "our whole teaching force is more 'English conscious' than it has ever been" (p. 282).

While the same philosophy of teacher participation guided the work on elementary science, Broaddus and Norris (1939) noted that the organization for the work on the elementary science curriculum differed from that for English. The work began with the supervisor, Broaddus, bringing successful elementary science teachers together for discussion of the science curriculum. A focal point of the

discussion was how successful science teachers might assist other teachers in developing science curriculum and instruction in their own classrooms. The group decided that, rather than develop a science course of study, they would create "a booklet of suggested activities, source material, and references in a form readily usable by the busiest teacher" (p. 282). One committee, composed of these successful science teachers, went about this work.

Broaddus and Norris (1939) reported that "the first step of the [science] committee was to formulate the aims of science teaching in the light of their own philosophy concerning child growth" (p. 282). Once the tentative aims and beliefs were developed, the committee divided into subcommittees to work on "specific phases of the science curriculum" (p. 283). The result of the first year's work, according to the authors, was the publication of a booklet containing "suggested activities, illustrations, 'finger-tip' facts, and page references for content materials and related poems and stories" (p. 283). These booklets were distributed to all science teachers "with the request that each teacher send to the committee suggestions for further improvement and enrichment" (p. 283).

Also in the issue of The National Elementary Principal which had curriculum enrichment as its theme was a piece by Wein (1939), a helping teacher in Cape May, New Jersey, in which she described the work of fifty elementary teachers on the science curriculum. Wein noted that "for several years

the teachers have been gathering evidence on children's interests in the field of science" (p. 285). The collection of children's questions were categorized according to recognized science concepts and "subject matter headings" (p. 285). As the science teachers recorded and discussed the questions students had posed, many began to acknowledge that "they were not familiar with science materials and did not know how to proceed to teach science" (p. 286). The children's questions, then, formed the basis for "organizing and directing the teacher's [curriculum] study" (p. 286). The activities involved in the curriculum study included individual and group study of subject matter, extension courses offered through a state teachers college, and cooperative study with high school science teachers (p. 286).

Wein (1939) reported that, after two years of study, "a committee representing each school grade gathered the materials that had been developed by the teachers of the county" (p. 287) for the purpose of developing tentative teaching units. She noted that the children's questions were used as focal points for the teaching units. The teachers decided on a general plan for organizing each teaching units. Teachers were in the process, at the time of this article, of developing these teaching units.

Frederick and Barnhart (1939), members of the initial planning committee for the Battle Creek, Michigan, Curriculum Study, described the initial work of the teachers

in the program. The senior high school had been selected to participate in the Michigan Study of the Secondary Curriculum in 1938. The authors noted that the decision was made to expand the study to include all schools in the Battle Creek school system. To initiate the study, a curriculum course through the University of Michigan was offered to participants in the curriculum study. Frederick and Barnhart reported that "approximately three hundred faculty members and twenty-five representatives of the Parent-Teacher Associations in Battle Creek" (p. 268) participated in the curriculum course.

The initial work began with the organization of committees to conduct the curriculum study. Committee work began with the creation of the Community and Instructional Council. The council had the overall responsibility for guiding and directing the curriculum study. The Council was composed of sixty faculty members, including all principals and supervisors in the system, fifteen student council members, and twenty-five members of various community organizations. Four study groups were assembled: community study, pupil study, responsibilities and purposes of educational agencies, and teaching procedures. Teachers expressed their committee preferences and Council members served as chairs. To handle the routine operation of the curriculum study, a Coordinating Committee was organized and was composed of the chairs and co-chairs of the four study groups. The final committee which was created was the

Initial Planning Committee. This committee was composed of the curriculum director and one representative each from the elementary schools, junior high schools, senior high schools, and central office (Frederick and Barnhart, 1939, pp. 268-269). This committee was charged with developing a tentative outline of the policies, procedures, scope, and responsibilities for the curriculum work.

At this time, curriculum reform was moving at a much more rapid pace at the elementary level than the secondary level. Rigid college admission standards which focused on traditional academic subjects were considered, in the minds of many educators, to be one obstacle to curricular reform in high schools. The Eight-Year Study of the Secondary School Program was begun in 1932 because of the concern of educators in the Progressive Education Association about the slow pace of curricular reform at the secondary level. A committee, referred to as the Commission on the Relation of School and College, was appointed by the Progressive Education Association to address this concern (see Aiken, 1942).

Tyler (1939), a professor of education at the University of Chicago, served as the research consultant to the thirty schools that participated in the Eight-Year Study. The work had begun with the identification of major deficiencies in the secondary curriculum. Some of these weaknesses included curriculum which lacked functional content, narrowly-conceived educational activities,

curriculum which lacked continuity, and, a lack of a democratic philosophy and approach. Tyler reported that "the thirty experimental schools are making an attack on these major deficiencies of the secondary curriculum" (p. 64). One way in which these deficiencies were being addressed was through the cooperative development of the curriculum. Tyler noted that

the most common method is to provide for cooperative planning of a core curriculum unit and then make an individual teacher responsible for teaching it after she has had an opportunity to plan cooperatively with several teachers. (p. 65)

Through this experimentation, individual teachers and small groups of teachers were able to contribute significantly to the overall development of the curriculum in the experimental schools (see also Giles, McCutchen, & Zechiel, 1942). Eight-Year Study would become a widely-recognized program for curriculum experimentation and improvement.

Aiken (1942) related that early on many of the thirty schools participating in the Eight-Year Study learned that teachers had to be involved in the work. Reform was not something that could be rushed into or conducted in a short amount of time. Effective reform required long-term commitment and thorough preparation. Aiken asserted that "thorough preparation demands co-operative deliberation" (p. 128). He maintained that

every teacher's work is significant in its relation to the school. Therefore, any important change in any part of the school's work should be made only as one move in a comprehensive plan. (p. 128).

Cooperative planning had to come before any effective change could be made in the school's work, in Aiken's perspective. This included work on the curriculum.

Giles, McCutchen, and Zechiel (1942), curriculum consultants in the Eight-Year Study, described the curriculum work of the participating schools. They noted that while teachers participated in curriculum work in all of the schools, the degree of participation varied. Giles, et al., reported that about one third of the schools involved all teachers in curriculum work. They asserted that "these were the schools whose graduates showed up the best on the College Follow-up" (p. 309). Of the other participating schools,

another third involved a significant number of teachers in the work of [curriculum] reconstruction. A final third could show only individual cases and segregated opportunities of the kind that have been described. (p. 309)

Denver's East High School was one of the third of participating schools which involved all teachers in curriculum work. Henry, et al., (1939) reported from the perspective of teachers in one of the thirty schools participating in the Eight-Year Study. Six teachers (representing the subjects of English, social studies, art, home economics, mathematics, and science) at East High School in Denver, Colorado, assumed the responsibility to cooperatively develop the curricular program for the sophomore class at East High School. They described the process they followed, in conjunction with the students and

parents, to determine the appropriate curriculum that these students would follow toward graduation.

Since no core courses were pre-determined, according to Henry, et al., (1939), the teachers decided to base the "core" curriculum on the needs of the students. The teachers dedicated the first weeks of preparation to conferencing with students and parents "to understand the individual students . . . and to determine the individual differences among them" (p. 435). Students and parents were questioned as to "the major interest of the child, difficulties encountered in the new school, vocational plans, reading taste, hobbies, and problems in personality and social adjustment" (p. 435). Henry, et al., also reported that they used "an extensive testing program . . . to help determine significant differences in the children" (p. 435).

The units of study were problem-focused and cooperatively determined by the teachers and students based on "the nature of the problem and the needs of the group" (Henry, et al., p. 436). Teachers led small counseling groups of students. Each counseling group, according to the authors, "worked out its own objectives" (p. 436) for tentative units of study. These ideas were presented to a central committee, composed of teachers and students, which reviewed the tentative objectives, pooled ideas, and made suggestions. The authors also reported that the central committee "set up laboratory periods to enable each student

or class to work with those teachers who could best assist in the development of the unit" (p. 436).

In conclusion, the trend of teacher participation in curriculum development was evident at least into the beginning of the 1940's. Spears (1940), director of research and secondary education in Evansville, Indiana, conducted a study of secondary curriculum development to ascertain its "implications for the high-school principal, and what pronounced features of the emerging secondary-school curriculum might be brought to his attention" (pp. 6-7).

The study was composed of three parts:

(1) the more general features of current instructional reorganization, the shortcomings of such reorganization, and the challenge these shortcomings present to the principal; (2) specific steps which the principal might take to improve the school as indicated by examples taken from such schools undergoing pronounced instructional reorganization; and (3) a curriculum charter for the principal, pointing out how he may function as a leader in the reconstruction of secondary education. (p. 7)

Spears noted that thousands of schools had become involved in the curriculum revision movement, but only a small percentage of the schools had conducted an adequate revision of the curriculum. He explained that

instructional inertia and curriculum consciousness can thrive side by side. Hundreds upon hundreds of revision programs have been unduly heralded; the old proverb that "all is not gold that glitters" again finds application in the curriculum movement. Many principals have mistaken committee formation and busywork as adequate 'revision of the curriculum.' On the other hand, from a more or less limited number of schools there is gradually emerging a promising pattern for instructional reorganization. (p. 9).

Some of these schools were the subjects of Spears' study. Sixteen curriculum revision programs were included in this study:

Pine Mountain Settlement School, Harlan County, Kentucky; Rappahannock District High School, Center Cross, Virginia; Washougal School, Clark County, Washington; North Bend High School, North Bend, Washington; Carpinteria Union High School, California; Yuba City Union High School, California; Tappan Junior High School, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Norris School, Norris, Tennessee; Secondary School, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley, Colorado; public secondary schools, Los Angeles, California; senior high schools, Denver, Colorado; public high schools, Evansville, Indiana; Northwestern-Evanston Unit, Evanston Township High School, Illinois; public schools, Birmingham, Alabama; and public schools, University City, Missouri. Treated less extensively are the Georgia State Program for the Improvement of Instruction and the programs of the California Co-operating Schools. (p. 10)

He noted that the programs in Birmingham, Alabama, University City, Missouri, and the state of Georgia were selected in particular because of their "faith in teacher participation" (p. 13). Spears indicated that this study presented curriculum trends in these exemplary schools.

Spears (1940) identified eight major weaknesses of curriculum revision in those schools that had conducted revision inadequately. The first weakness concerned the limited vision of the administrators initiating curriculum revision. Spears asserted that "curriculum revision has too often been conceived of as course-of-study construction" (p. 18). In this conception, "teachers were brought together to prepare a syllabus-type course of study. It was a task with a definite beginning and a definite ending" (p. 18). One way in which effective schools had addressed this short-

coming was "by taking the participating group through a general study period before any work was done on the actual course of study itself" (p. 18). The issues raised would serve to guide the work of the group rather than having the pre-determined purpose of a published course of study. Two programs which had conducted exemplary curriculum studies with teachers, according to Spears, were found in the Baltimore school system, which started in 1935, and at the Parker School in Greenville, South Carolina in 1938.

A second weakness in secondary programs was the tendency to conduct the curriculum revision by departments. Spears (1940) pointed out that such an approach assumed that "all instructional areas are of equal importance," promoted the subject matter over the student, "strengthened departmental lines, in spite of the great clamor for correlation," and tended to expand the field of study in a given department (pp. 22-23). One way in which to address this weakness to approach revision from a school-wide perspective and organize committees across departmental lines.

Spears (1940) contended that a third weakness was that "too often the classroom teacher has had no part in developing the new program which he is asked to handle" (p. 23). Spears maintained that widespread participation by teachers was critical. Even if a revision was conducted with the cooperation of a small group of teachers, there was still "a consequent lack of sympathy and understanding on

the part of those teachers who have had no part in its origin and development" (p. 23). The exclusion of large numbers of teachers was particularly a problem in large-city and state programs, according to Spear. Spear reasoned that "to select the more capable and promising for the work is to omit those most needful of the changed point of view" (p. 23). The development of curriculum study as a feature of a curriculum development program was an effective method for involving large numbers of teachers.

The remaining weaknesses of current curriculum programs were less pertinent to the topic of teacher participation in curriculum development. The "lack of worthy purposes of reorganization" (p. 23) was a weakness. Many schools or systems had begun programs simply because it was the "popular thing to do" (p. 23). The narrow conception of what constituted curriculum was another defect of many curriculum programs. Another flaw in many programs was the confusion caused by the concept of integration. The seventh deficiency identified by Spears was the lack of innovation in and the influence of the traditional subjects on curriculum development. The final weakness noted by Spears was the "apparent disregard for the administrative aspects of [curricular] reorganization" (p. 28). The building principal, in particular, had been separated from curriculum development in many programs, according to Spears. The principal's role was a primary concern of Spears' study.

The state of Alabama was another of the southern states involved in state-wide curriculum development. The Alabama Curriculum development Program had been recognized previously by various authors (e.g., McCall, 1939; Barr, et al., 1938; and, Heaton, 1937). Brock (1941), a principal in Beatrice, Alabama, described the Alabama curriculum program from the perspective of the Monroe County, Alabama, school system. Brock reported on the various stages of the curriculum program at the local level. The first step, Brock noted, was the evaluation of the existing educational program in Monroe County "in the light of the criteria set up by the Steering Committee of the Alabama Curriculum Development program" (p. 59).

The county organization was directed by the Curriculum Planning Committee, according to Brock (1941). This committee was composed of a chair who was appointed by the county superintendent and teacher representatives from each of the school divisions (i.e., primary, intermediate, junior and senior high schools). The Curriculum Planning Committee had several responsibilities. One responsibility was to solicit input from the teachers concerning the long-range planning for the curriculum program, the objectives for the current school year, and tentative objectives for the following school year (p. 60). The Curriculum Planning Committee compiled the teacher suggestions and made appropriate modifications. The revised plans and objectives

for the coming year were given to all teachers at the end of the preceding school term.

Another responsibility of the Curriculum Planning Committee, according to Brock (1941), was the planning of county-wide faculty meetings and preparing the study guides for these meetings. Brock reported that county-wide faculty meetings were held four times a year. Each meeting was planned around the objectives set the previous year. Plans for each meeting were made and study guides were prepared four to six weeks in advance of a meeting. Each faculty meeting lasted approximately four hours and followed this general agenda: a general session where "fundamental problems of the curriculum development program are discussed under the leadership of . . . an extension worker from the University of Alabama" (p. 60); meetings of small groups representing the four school groups (i.e., primary, intermediate, junior and senior high school) to discuss the theme of the general session; and, a study of reading problems within each of the small groups.

Brock (1941) noted several "definite changes in teaching practice" as a direct result of the Monroe County curriculum program (p. 62). These changes included the provision of opportunities for students to participate in planning and evaluation; a focus on the individual needs of students; an increase in the "volume and variety" of student reading; changes in reporting student progress;

and, changes in the selection and use of teaching materials (p. 62). A final change was implied in Brock's conclusion:

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that Monroe County teachers make only two claims for the program which is being developed: first, the present program more nearly meets the needs of Monroe County pupils than did the former program; second, the program is being developed by Monroe County teachers themselves. (p. 62)

A final change suggested by Brock was that teachers had the final responsibility for the curriculum program in Monroe County, Alabama.

In sum, evidence of the widespread and maturing practice of teacher participation in curriculum development was apparent in the educational literature of the 1930's. By the end of the 1930's, the Denver Curriculum Revision Program had been in operation nearly 15 years. The Denver program, though, was almost a footnote as other programs gained attention. Notable among these were the programs in Glencoe, Illinois (see Misner, 1939) and Evansville, Indiana (see Spear, 1937). Superintendent Misner, in particular, wrote frequently as an advocate for teacher participation in curriculum work. Misner offered the work of the Glencoe teachers as evidence that teacher participation was effective. Many other examples of city and county programs were evidence of widespread practice during the 1930's, e.g., Battle Creek, Michigan (Frederick & Barnhart, 1939), Cape May, New Jersey (Wein, 1939), Madison, Wisconsin (Falk, 1939), Richmond, Virginia (Broadus & Norris, 1939), San Diego (Hanna, 1939), Bulloch County, Georgia (Franseth,

1939), Rochester, New York (Spinning, 1938), Minneapolis (Cutright, 1938), Tacoma, Washington (Basler, 1938), Saginaw, Michigan (Frederick, 1938), Salem, Oregon (Elle, 1938), Santa Barbara, California (Lamoreaux, 1937), Cuyahoga County, Ohio (Reeder, 1936), Winnetka, Illinois (Washburne, 1935), Guilford County, North Carolina (Brogdon, 1935), and East St. Louis (Maxey, 1932). As state departments of education gained more authority, the responsibility for curriculum moved from city and county systems to state departments. This trend was evident during the 1930's as many state departments of education became in curriculum development. Numerous studies and reports (e.g., Brock, 1941; McCall, 1939; Morrow, 1938; Stretch, 1938; Frederick & Patterson, 1937; Heaton, 1937; Johnson, 1937; Jones, 1937; Rogers, 1937; Tireman, 1937; Leonard, 1935; and, Caswell, 1934) noted curriculum development programs in at least twenty-six states around the country during the 1930's. Finally, evidence of a widespread and maturing practice during the 1930's was found in the numerous studies examining teacher participation and its effects (e.g., Moser, 1939; McSwain, 1938; Matzen & Knapp, 1938; Joint Committee on Curriculum, 1937; Harap, 1935; Trillingham, 1934; Hamrin, 1932; Harap & Bayne, 1932; and, Lide, 1932b). All of the studies found significant evidence of teacher involvement in curriculum work. The growing number of research studies indicated the frequency of the practice and its growing importance during this period.

Summary

Advocacy for teacher participation in curriculum development continued to be a common theme in the educational literature of the 1930's. Many advocates were already familiar names in the discussion. For example, Newlon (1934), now a professor of education and director of the Lincoln School at Teachers College of Columbia University, asserted that progressive educational administration required the participation of teachers in the management of the schools. Curriculum development, in particular, was one aspect of school administration in which Newlon maintained teachers should participate. The business conception of school administration, according to Newlon, had interfered with the progress of teachers' professional status. In Newlon's perspective, then, a primary purpose for teacher participation in curriculum development was to further the progress of teachers' professional status.

Advocates offered other reasons for teacher participation. Promoting professional status and professional growth were common reasons given for involving teachers in curriculum work through the period under study. These continued to be popular reasons during the 1930's. For example, Kandel (1932), also a professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, suggested that one way to professionalize teaching was to involve teachers in curriculum development. Kyte's (1936) conception of curriculum development had "as its sole purpose the maximum

development of every teacher into the most professionally efficient person he is capable of becoming" (p. 23). Overn (1935), a professor of education at the University of North Dakota, maintained that curriculum development was "a fertile field for research and study by classroom teachers" (p. 199). By engaging in curriculum study, teachers would become more knowledgeable about curriculum development and would, therefore, be better prepared to participate in curriculum work. Developing and nurturing leadership in curriculum work was a reason related to professional status and growth. For example, Brown (1936), a central office administrator describing the Los Angeles curriculum development program, suggested that teacher participation in curriculum work served to develop curriculum leadership among teachers. By developing leadership in curriculum development, the intention was that teachers would "come forward and in the truest sense become guiding forces in curriculum development. A leadership diffused and widespread in the type most desired" (p. 17, see also Gumlick, 1937).

Paradoxically, inadequate teacher training and preparation continued to pose concerns for writers on the issue of teacher participation in curriculum development. In the past, though, inadequate training was suggested as a reason that teachers could not or should not participate in curriculum work. During the 1930's as advocacy reached its peak, the contention was that teachers should participate,

so they needed better preparation for this responsibility. For example, Otto (1934) endorsed teacher participation in curriculum development, but noted inadequate teacher training as a hindrance. Cutright (1936), the assistant superintendent for instruction in the Minneapolis school system, contended that one determinant of an effective curriculum development program was teacher training.

Changing conceptions of curriculum also justified the participation of teachers in the minds of some writers. A broader conception that perceived curriculum as more than just the printed material was beginning to acknowledge teachers as a factor. Cox and Langfitt (1934) noted a growing realization that "teachers are inseparable from the curriculum" (p. 553). They were critical of the idea that curriculum could be effectively developed away from and without consideration for the teachers who would use the curriculum. For example, Cox and Langfitt asserted that teachers "must create [the curriculum] in some degree or they cannot execute it" (p. 553). What happened in the classroom had to be considered in curriculum development. Teachers interpreted, adapted, and even created curriculum based on the needs of their students. For example, Goetting (1935), professor of education at Oklahoma Baptist University, asserted that "every teacher is a curriculum builder in her own right" (p. 16) and that this recognition was gaining increasing acceptance. This recognition was evidenced, according to Goetting, by the growing number of

curriculum revision programs in which teacher participation was a key provision. This conception of teachers required that they be prepared for and included in curriculum work (see also Harris, 1937).

For some, curriculum originated in the classroom. Kilpatrick's Project Method (see Kilpatrick, 1918) was, perhaps, the best known example of this conception of curriculum. He continued to develop the Project Method in Remaking the Curriculum (Kilpatrick, 1936). In Kilpatrick's conception, curriculum was developed in the classroom by teachers and students with the teachers acting as guides:

the successive activity-experiences which make up the curriculum are to be chosen by the class-teacher group; the teacher is the expert, but the class will learn better how to choose as they think and act responsibly. (p. 66)

Curriculum could not be conceived outside of the context of the classroom and, most importantly, the students. Teachers were the curriculum experts in Kilpatrick's conception.

Democratic practice continued to be a justification for teacher participation in curriculum development. For example, Brown (1936), a central office administrator in the Los Angeles school system, asserted that "an effective program of curriculum development demands extensive use of democratic procedures" (p. 16). The Los Angeles program was widely-acknowledged during the 1920's and 1930's for its involvement of teachers. Miel (1938), the principal of the Donovan School in Ann Arbor, Michigan, proposed three principles of teacher involvement which she noted had been

gleaned "from actual observation and experience" (p. 343). Two of these principles related directly to democratic practice. One principle was democratic participation which Miel defined as "participation all along the line- in planning, in execution, and in appraisal of results" (p. 343). A second principle, related to democratic participation, was the idea of patience. Miel noted that while administrators often took time to reflect on new concepts and practices, teachers were seldom given time to consider new ideas. This principle was crucial to facilitating change in any school, according to Miel.

The trend toward teacher participation which began prior to the 1920's continued through the 1930's. Numerous writers noted this trend (e.g., Knudson, 1937; Dewey, 1937; Reeder, 1936; Norton and Norton, 1936; Osburn, 1936; Douglas and Boardman, 1934; Norton, 1933; Graves, 1932; Windes, 1932). The increasing number of studies during the 1930's examining teacher participation in curriculum work supported this assertion.

As pointed out in previous chapters, the number of investigations devoted to the study of a particular phenomenon suggested the frequency of its occurrence and its importance. Studies devoted to examining teacher participation in curriculum development had steadily grown beginning with Updegraff in 1917. Numerous studies conducted during the 1930's identified teacher participation in curriculum development as a growing trend. For example,

Harap and Bayne (1932), in an examination of 317 course of study bulletins from 72 school systems, noted that "the most revealing conclusion from our analysis is the important that the teacher plays in curriculum construction" (p. 49). They found 178 examples in which teachers "either headed the project or shared in the leadership with administrative officers" (p. 49).

There were numerous other examples of studies during the 1930's examining teacher participation in curriculum development. Lide (1932a and 1932b) reported that seventy percent of the respondents in 129 city systems and 33 individual secondary schools indicated that teachers were involved in curriculum work. In a study of the administration and organization of 274 high schools, Hamrin (1932) noted that teachers were most often identified as the group being assigned the preparation of courses of study. Trillingham (1934) conducted a study examining the curriculum programs in 100 city school systems located in 38 states. While he noted numerous examples in which all teachers were involved in curriculum work, he noted an inverse relationship between teacher participation and the size of the school system: "As American cities grow larger in population, the tendency is away from the participation of the entire instructional staff in the curriculum activities" (p. 40). Harap (1935) studied over 300 courses of study from 125 school systems representing all states in the United States. He concluded that "the teacher continues

to play the most important role in curriculum revision" (p. 644). The Joint Committee on Curriculum of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study (1937) surveyed 303 superintendents around the country and identified trends which included the growing number of school system programs, the growth of state programs for curriculum revision, and the participation of teachers in these programs.

Matzen and Knapp (1938) concluded that the significant amount of literature which had been devoted to the subject of teacher participation in school administration "would indicate that much progress had been made in this area" (p. 27). Their analysis of a survey of eighty-nine mid-western superintendents to determine the extent of teacher participation in curriculum development indicated that teachers were involved in curriculum work in over half, fifty-three percent, of the school systems. McSwain (1938) conducted a survey of 457 superintendents and 1,453 teachers in fifty-five school systems from twenty-two states to analyze cooperative school administration. Over sixty percent of the teachers indicated a desire to participate in "the building and evaluating of courses of study" (p. 161). Over seventy percent of the teachers indicated that they had actually participated in curriculum work. Moser (1939) surveyed 660 teachers and 90 administrators in 103 California elementary and secondary school to determine the level of teacher participation in school administration.

Teachers participated at the highest levels, according to Moser, "in developing policies and practices in functions that related to classroom procedures and subject matter content" (p. 51). Moser noted that "the greatest amount of teacher participation in all . . . functions is in regard to the construction or revision of the curriculum" (p. 51).

One development of note was the trend toward state programs for curriculum development during the 1930's. Many researchers studying the trend toward state programs also noted the tendency of many of these programs to involve teachers in curriculum work. The findings of the Joint Committee on Curriculum of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study (1937) has already been noted. Heaton (1937) in a survey of twenty-six state curriculum programs noted two general trends: the continued growth of the number of states undertaking curriculum revision and teacher involvement in state programs. Of the twenty-six states he studied, ten states reported the involvement of teachers: Alabama, Arizona, South Dakota, Texas, Arkansas, California, Louisiana, Georgia, Oregon, and Tennessee. Significant numbers were reported, e.g., five thousand teachers in Alabama, thirty-thousand teachers in Texas, and ten thousand teachers in Georgia.

Another example of studies examining the trend toward state programs, Leonard (1935) reported on a study he conducted to examine the extent and character of teacher

participation in state curriculum programs. Eleven states participated in the study: Virginia, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, California, Pennsylvania, Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Iowa, and Texas. Leonard reported several findings related to teacher participation. The only phase that all teachers in each state were involved in was the initial phase of curriculum study. While teachers made up a large percentage of the state production committees, they were under-represented on the central curriculum committees.

The reports of the practice of teacher participation during the 1930's supported the assertions that this was a significant trend in curriculum development. Examples in local systems were numerous and widespread during the 1930's. For example, Maxey (1932), a faculty member at East St. Louis Senior High School, discussed teacher participation in school administration and described the practice in East St. Louis. Brogdon (1935) described the cooperative effort to develop an elementary health curriculum in Guilford County, North Carolina. Washburne (1935) reported on the involvement of teachers in curriculum work in the Winnetka, Illinois, school system. Additional examples included the teacher involvement in curriculum work in Cuyahoga County, Ohio (Reeder, 1936), in Evansville, Indiana (Spears, 1937), in Santa Barbara, California (Lamoreaux, 1937), in Baltimore (Levin, 1938), in Salem, Oregon (Elle, 1938), in Saginaw, Michigan (Frederick, 1938),

in Tacoma, Washington (Basler, 1938), in Minneapolis (Cutright, 1938), in Rochester, New York (Spinning, 1938), in Bulloch County, Georgia (Franseth, 1939), in San Diego (Hanna, 1939), in Richmond, Virginia (Broaddus and Norris, 1939), in Glencoe, Illinois (Misner, 1939), in Madison, Wisconsin (Falk, 1939), in Cape May, New Jersey (Wein, 1939), and in Battle Creek, Michigan (Frederick and Barnhart, 1939).

Wide variation in the way in which teachers were involved existed in city and county programs for curriculum development. A common procedure for curriculum work centered around a central coordinating committee. Teacher representation on these central committees ranged from no representation to almost totally composed of teachers. The central committee was usually responsible for creating the broad goals and guiding principles for the program. For those school systems that understood the curriculum development process as an on-going one, the central committee also served as the focal point for continual revision. Production committees, as a rule, formed the next organizational level. Typically, these were organized around subjects and grades. Production committees were almost always composed of only of teachers or the large majority of representatives were teachers. These committees were normally responsible for generating objectives specific to their subject and grade level, creating learning activities, and identifying appropriate resources. Once

production committees were finished, tentative curricula were, typically, submitted to teachers for critique. Once the period for critiquing the tentative curricula was over, the tentative materials were submitted to the revision committees. The revision committees were largely responsible for editing and publication. These committees were also composed of some combination of administrators and teachers.

Probably the most notable trend of the 1930's was the significant increase in the number of state programs for curriculum development. Caswell (1934) discussed state programs for curriculum development in Kentucky, Mississippi (see also Frederick and Patterson, 1937), Texas (see also Stretch, 1938), Georgia (see also Morrow, 1938), Tennessee, Virginia, Arkansas (see also Jones, 1937), North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana (see also Rogers, 1937), and Missouri. All of these state programs involved teachers to varying degrees. Coincidentally, Caswell was influential in several of these state programs, most notably in Virginia. There were numerous other examples of state programs in curriculum development which were involving teachers during the 1930's. Tireman (1937) reported on the New Mexico program and emphasized that "the teacher was all-important" (p. 66) to the success of the program. Johnson (1937) described the Oregon plan for curriculum development and the involvement of teachers. Zeller (1939) reported on the progress of the Kansas Program for the Improvement of Instruction which

provided for the participation of teachers. The Alabama program for curriculum development, which involved at least five thousand teachers, was described from the perspective of a local system by Brock (1941) and from the perspective of the Alabama Department of Education (see McCall, 1939).

For states which involved teachers, the methods for participation varied. Many states, such as Kansas, Oregon, and Virginia, had curriculum programs which were organized around a hierarchy of state, regional, and local committees. Teachers were represented at all levels, but saw greatest representation at the local levels. In the examples of Kansas and Oregon, the state teachers' associations worked in close collaboration with the state departments of education and served as the primary mechanism through which the work was accomplished. Much in the same way as city and county curriculum programs functioned, the local committees in the state organizations served as production committees. In other words, they usually generated the bulk of the activities and materials associated with specific objectives. The regional committees coordinated the work in their region and reviewed the work of the local committees. The primary objectives and guiding principles for the overall work came from the state coordinating committees. Many times, these state committees generated bulletins which served as guides for the work of local and regional committees. In many of these state programs, colleges and universities served as clearing houses for resources and

professional development. In some states where the populations were small and spread over large areas, the state university coordinated the work. For example, in New Mexico the work originated at and was carried out through the University of New Mexico. Finally, some states, e.g., Georgia and Alabama, involved large numbers of teachers through curriculum study. State departments of education, after determining the primary objectives and guiding principles, would generate a series of curriculum bulletins. Since a primary concern was the inadequate preparation of teachers for curriculum work, these bulletins not only served as guides for the actual work to be conducted in local systems, they also were intended as texts for professional development. Local teachers, in conjunction with university staff or state department representatives, would study these bulletins, generate learning activities, and identify appropriate resources.

The trend toward teacher involvement in curriculum development in local systems which began in the 1920's continued to be widespread through the 1930's. The most significant development during the 1930's concerning teacher participation, however, was the growth of state programs for curriculum development. The developments during the 1920's which saw the significant growth of local programs to involvement teachers in curriculum work continued during the 1930's and expanded to include state programs.

The 1930s saw a tremendous growth in the number of state curriculum programs (e.g., Stretch, 1938; Zeller, 1938; Frederick & Patterson, 1936; Heaton, 1937; Rogers, 1937; Tireman, 1937; Johnson, 1937; Jones, 1937; Leonard, 1935; Caswell, 1934; Bruner, 1932). At least thirty-two states had curriculum programs underway by the end of the of the 1930s. One trend noted in several studies of state curriculum programs conducted during the 1930s was the efforts that were taken to involve large numbers of teachers in the curriculum work (e.g., Heaton, 1937; Joint Committee on Curriculum, 1937; and, Leonard, 1935). While the number of state curriculum programs was increasing due to state departments of education taking responsibility for curriculum of public schools, there were still individual schools, city school systems, and county school systems engaged in curriculum development (e.g., Elle, 1938; Frederick, 1938; Levin, 1938; Knudson, 1937; Lamoreaux, 1937; Spears, 1937; Brogdon, 1935; Washburne, 1935; Bruner, 1932; and, Maxey, 1932). By the end of the 1930s, teachers were involved at all levels of curriculum development.

Curriculum committees became the primary means for involving teachers in curriculum work at the school and district levels during the 1930s. With this change from the teachers' councils of the first quarter of the twentieth century to participation through curriculum committees, teachers' influence on the curriculum became much more

direct and substantial. As in the 1920s, the most common organization for curriculum work included executive committees, which guided the work, and production committees, which conducted the actual creation or revision of curricula. During the 1930s, teacher participation was seen most often on production committees (e.g., Bruner, 1932; Harap & Bayne, 1932; Lide, 1932a & 1932b; and, Harap, 1935). In most cases, production committees were comprised primarily of teachers and chaired by teachers (e.g., Bruner, 1932; Harap & Bayne, 1932; Lide, 1932a & 1932b; and, Harap, 1935). Beyond chairing production committees, teachers played significant leadership roles on all committees. Harap & Bayne (1932), for example, found that 178 examples in which teachers either headed the project or shared in the leadership with administrative officers. While administrators typically initiated curriculum work, there were also examples where the curriculum work was initiated by teachers (e.g., Washburne, 1935; and, Bruner, 1932). Many of the curriculum programs cited during the 1930s touted the fact that attempts were made to involve all teachers in the curriculum work. Some programs required all teachers to participate, while others accomplished this voluntarily.

Much of what was true for the point in the process when teachers became involved in city and county curriculum programs held true for the state curriculum programs. Typical committee organization at the state level included

executive committees and production committees (e.g., Heaton, 1937; Leonard, 1935; and, Bruner, 1932). The greatest participation came through production committees. Many states, however, also involved large numbers of teachers through initial curriculum study (e.g., Heaton, 1937; Jones, 1937; and, Leonard, 1935). Several state curriculum programs were also initiated by teachers through state teachers' associations (e.g., Zeller, 1938; Johnson, 1937; and, Bruner, 1932). Participation in curriculum study and through committee work could be voluntary or involuntary depending on the state program.

The purposes for participation during the 1930s remained primarily the same as during the 1920s. Again, promotion of professional growth and democratic practice were the primary reasons offered (e.g., Meil, 1938; Zeller, 1938; Joint Committee on Curriculum, 1937; Lamoreaux, 1937; and, Rogers, 1937). Other aims included: to promote intelligent understanding for effective use of the curriculum (e.g., Joint Committee on the Curriculum, 1937) and to improve instruction (Zeller, 1938). The purposes for teacher participation in curriculum work had remained relatively similar through the period of study.

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

. . . I have a hunch that we may know less today than we once did about how to teach and particularly about why teaching is so important to the future of our society.
(Jackson, 1987, p. 74)

It has been generally recognized that teachers--through their classroom practice--have always been involved in informal curriculum study and decision-making (e.g., Paris, 1993 and Schubert, 1980). Adair (1922) asserted that

if you think back over your experience you will remember that teachers have always participated in school management to a greater or less degree. The fact that an activity was not the subject of general discussion does not presuppose its non-existence. (p. 546)

Teachers' formal involvement in curriculum work has been less clear. The idea of formal involvement of teachers in curriculum work was evident as early as 1880 (see for example, Douai, 1880a). Efforts to formally involve teachers in curriculum work began at the turn of the twentieth century. The work of Parker and Dewey were perhaps the most notable. Ideas such as democratic practice in educational administration and concepts of teaching as a profession had some influence on efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development during the period from 1890 through 1940. Certainly in Dewey's work at the Laboratory

School of the University of Chicago, his conceptions of democratic practice played a pivotal role.

Perhaps the most influential development, however, in teacher participation in curriculum development during the period from 1890 through 1940 was the curriculum revision movement which began around the turn of the century. The curriculum revision movement was a part of the progressive movement in education and the larger progressive movement in the United States to bring reform to many institutions which had begun in the late 1800's. With curriculum revision as the primary vehicle, the efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work would continue from some scattered attempts to widespread systematic efforts during the 1920's and 1930's culminating in programs such as the Denver Curriculum Revision Program and the Virginia Curriculum Revision Program.

The efforts of Dewey in Chicago, Newlon in Denver, and Caswell in Virginia have been given much attention in the current literature, while unfortunately many other efforts have been forgotten. This has resulted in, at best, a fragmented and inaccurate picture of teacher participation in curriculum development during the first forty years of the twentieth century. The purpose of this study was to examine, describe, document and explain the history of the idea and practice of teacher involvement in curriculum development during the period from 1890 through 1940. A further intent was to provide an historical perspective and

understanding to advise current attempts to involve teachers in curriculum development. The purpose was to answer five questions: What were the dominant ideas concerning teacher participation in curriculum development from 1890 to 1940? Are these ideas representative of the dominant practices during this time? What were the dominant practices during this time? What is the significance of the practices of teacher participation for which there are historical records? What can these ideas and practices contribute to our current understanding of teacher participation in curriculum development?

Dominant Ideas

The idea that teachers should participate in curriculum work was evident in the literature as early as 1880 when Douai (1880a) asserted that teachers should be responsible for laying out the plan of study (p. 228). This was suggested as a means for professionalizing the teaching profession. Numerous reasons were given to justify teacher participation in curriculum development. Most of the reasons found in this study could be grouped into four categories: to promote democratic practice, to promote professional growth, to promote implementation of the curriculum, and to improve instruction.

Promotion of democratic ideals and professional growth of teachers were the most widely-cited reasons for teacher participation in curriculum development. For Dewey (1903), democratic cooperation meant "freeing intelligence for

individual effectiveness- the emancipation of the mind as an individual organ to do its own work" (p. 193). The theme of democracy and intelligent action was common to other writers (e.g., Kinley, 1906; Participation of teachers in educational policy, 1909; MacDonald, 1921; Jacobson, 1924; Newlon, 1924; Kilpatrick, 1936; Misner, 1938). Promotion of democratic ideals took on a more patriotic tone with other writers (e.g., Walker, 1917a and 1917b; Boodin, 1918; Rice, 1920). This tone became more evident particularly during times of war (e.g., World War I), economic stress (e.g., the Great Depression of 1929), and the appearance of perceived threats to democracy (e.g., communism, labor unrest, unionism).

A common concern about teacher participation in curriculum development throughout the period of study was inadequate teacher preparation for the work. Conversely, teacher participation in curriculum work was seen as a means for promoting professional growth among teachers. Dewey (1903) addressed this concern:

The more it is asserted that the existing corps of teachers is unfit to have a voice in the settlement of important educational matters, and their unfitness to exercise intellectual initiative and to assume the responsibility for constructive work is emphasized, the more their unfitness to attempt the much more difficult and delicate task of guiding souls appears. If this body is so unfit, how can it be trusted to carry out the recommendations or dictations of the wisest body of experts? If teachers are incapable of the intellectual responsibility which goes to the determination of the methods they are to use in teaching, how can they employ methods when dictated by others, in other than a mechanical, capricious, and clumsy manner? (p. 197)

As Dewey noted, only by sharing in the responsibility of curriculum work could teachers become competent. Wilson (1924) and Newlon (1924) maintained that the challenge of keeping the curriculum current held greater potential for professional growth than any other medium in the school system. Numerous curriculum programs reported teacher professional growth as a primary purpose for teacher participation in curriculum development (e.g., Gilbert, 1913; Updegraff, 1919; Adair, 1922; Department of Superintendence, 1924; Bonser, 1924a; Longshore, 1925; Foster, 1925; Whitney, 1927; Webster, 1928; Holloway, 1928; English, 1929; Otto, 1934; Leonard, 1935; Rucker, 1937; Harris, 1937; Rogers, 1937; Linder, 1938; Hanna, 1938; Myers, et al., 1938; Basler, 1938; Matzen and Knapp, 1938).

Cremin (1961), Callahan (1962), and others have documented how education in the United States began to come under increasing criticism in the 1880's, leading to efforts to bring about reforms. The curriculum of the schools, in particular, came under heavy criticism. The nature of the curriculum began to be examined. As Kliebard (1995), Schubert (1980), and others have well documented, this period marked the beginning of the curriculum field as a separate and distinct area of study within the broader context of education. New conceptions of curriculum began to emerge at the turn of the twentieth century. Adherents to the traditional curriculum began to vie with numerous

other conceptions of the curriculum. Kliebard (1995), Schubert (1980), and others have also documented how these various conceptions of curriculum struggled for ascendancy during the period from 1890 through 1940. Teacher participation in curriculum development was affected, in part, by the dominant conceptions of curriculum during the period from 1890 through 1940. Saylor (1941) noted this tendency in his study of the factors associated with participation in cooperative programs of curriculum development: "Programs of curriculum . . . development have reflected changing concepts of curriculum development" (p. 2)

Numerous efforts have been made to classify and categorize these conceptions of curriculum which emerged during this period (e.g., Kliebard, 1995; Schubert, 1980). Many of the classifications overlap and would only serve to confuse this discussion. Generally, however, these attempts suggest that the conceptions of curriculum fall on a loose continuum from traditional conceptions to more progressive conceptions of curriculum. The traditional and established conceptions of curriculum tended to present curriculum as fixed. That is, the knowledge which was to be presented and learned was already established through tradition and prescription. Curriculum work, then, became simply the preparation of outlines of what was to be taught, or courses of study. Early in the period of study, especially when the traditional conceptions of curriculum were challenged less

frequently, curriculum was most likely to be prepared traditionally, i.e., usually by the superintendent "cutting-and-pasting" from a variety of recognized courses of study. While this observation generally holds up to close scrutiny, there were exceptions as teachers participated in producing courses of study. One type of cooperative curriculum program identified by Saylor (1941) were the "programs designed solely for the preparation of courses of study" (p. 2). One early example was the effort to involve grammar school teachers in Cambridge, Massachusetts, documented by Hart (1892a).

As conceptions of curriculum broadened, the purposes of the curriculum program were broadened in scope. Curriculum work also broadened. The appearance of other terminology such as curriculum study, curriculum investigation, and curriculum enrichment suggested this broadening conception. Indeed, the term curriculum development, describing the expanding curriculum work, came into wide use during the 1920's and 1930's. Curriculum work, i.e., curriculum development, tended to become a much more complex process involving, among, others, teachers. One excellent example of this idea can be seen in Kilpatrick's curriculum conception which he termed the Project Method (1918). In both theory and in practice, teachers were a critical component in curriculum development.

Dominant Practices

Formal teacher participation in curriculum development during the period from 1890 through 1940 was provided for through three primary means: teacher participation through advisory groups, teacher participation through committees, and through the participation of all or the majority of the teachers. While Dewey's work with the teachers in the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago was a notable exception, perhaps the earliest means of providing for formal teacher participation in curriculum work was through advisory groups. These teacher advisory groups appeared in a variety of forms, most commonly in the form of the teachers' council. A common function of many of these advisory councils was to make recommendations concerning the curriculum.

The use of teachers' councils in Chicago was one of the earliest examples appearing in the literature (Lane, 1902; Jackman, 1906; Sub-committee of the School Management Committee of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1907). The idea for the teachers' councils in Chicago originated with Superintendent Ella Flagg Young in 1899. Young was a student of Dewey's and worked as an instructional supervisor in the Laboratory School under Dewey. A primary purpose of the teachers' councils in Chicago was the "full expression of the judgment of principals and teachers on questions pertaining to courses of study" (North, 1915, p. 26). The Chicago teachers'

councils were widely cited and endorsed as an example of providing for teacher participation in educational administration, particularly in curriculum work.

Numerous other examples of teachers' councils appeared in the literature. Another example was the work of the teachers' council in Boston under Superintendent Stratton Brooks (Participation of teachers in educational policies, 1909). Downey (1910) noted that "the present course of study in the Boston schools is the result of the active cooperation of teachers with school officials" (p. 418). Other early examples of teachers' councils which were involved in curriculum work included those found in Dallas, Texas (Downey, 1910, and Lefevre, 1909), and Tacoma, Washington (Downey, 1910).

Successful examples of teachers' councils were noted well into the 1920's. Spaulding (1918), in a discussion of cooperative school administration, cited additional examples. In addition to those examples already cited in Chicago, Boston, and New York, Spaulding noted those teachers' councils operating in Los Angeles and Portland, Oregon (p. 569). Spaulding, as superintendent of schools, led in the efforts to establish teachers' councils in Minneapolis (see also Harris, 1919a and 1919b) and Cleveland. Spaulding pointed out that these councils were involved in "problems relating to the curriculum" (p. 569). Gardner (1919), a teacher in the Milwaukee schools and advocate of teacher participation through teachers'

councils, cited examples of successful councils in St. Paul and Toledo, in addition to those found in Minneapolis, Boston, New York, and Portland. Examples of teachers' councils found in smaller schools and systems included work done in New Britain, Connecticut (North, 1915), Brooklyn, New York (Fichandler, 1917) and Highland Park, Michigan (Knapp, 1919).

By the beginning of the 1920's, teacher participation was changing from an advisory role to more direct participation in curriculum work. Updegraff (1922), in a highly significant study of teacher participation in school administration, reported that there had been a steady increase in democratic participation in school administration. He noted that structures which provided for democratic participation in administration could now "be found in city school systems of all sizes throughout the United States" (p. 404). The primary form in which teacher participation had been manifested, according to Updegraff, was through "the making of the course of study" (p. 404). Curriculum revision became the vehicle through which democratic teacher participation was promoted. Teachers organized in committees for curriculum revision would become the most common form of providing for direct teacher participation in curriculum work during the 1920's and 1930's.

The most common method for providing for formal and direct teacher participation in curriculum work was through

committee organization. Updegraff (1922, 1921, and 1919) reported on a wide variety of committee types. While curriculum programs varied, the most common organizational structure for curriculum programs provided for a central committee which guided the work of several subject committees. The central committee was normally composed of both administrators and teachers. The superintendent, or the superintendent's designee, typically chaired the central committee. The central committee normally directed the work of the other curriculum committees within the organization. The central committee usually formulated the general goals and objectives of the program, and provided guidelines for the other committees. The subject-area committees, often referred to as the production committees, were almost always made up largely of teachers. In many examples, these committees were made up of solely teachers and were chaired by teachers. The subject-area committees primary responsibilities centered on the development of specific subject objectives, the creation of learning activities, and the selection of resources. Examples of this type of organization were numerous. Typical examples were found in Los Angeles (Wilson, 1924; Floyd, 1924; Jacobson, 1924; and, Rice, 1920), Evansville, Indiana (Spears, 1937 and 1940), and Glencoe, Illinois (Misner, 1939, 1938a and 1939b; Glencoe Public Schools, 1938).

Updegraff's (1922) study of cooperative structures indicated that by the start of the 1920's, committee

organization was the most common method of providing for teacher participation. The 176 school systems participating in the study reported a total of 351 curriculum committees on which teachers participated. Sixty-five of these systems reported curriculum committees composed entirely of teachers. Generally, the larger the school system, the less likely it was that all teachers participated in the curriculum program. However, Updegraff (1921) noted that the study "had proved conclusively" that teacher participation in curriculum work was an effective practice that "should be adopted by city school systems generally without regard to size" (p. 405). By the end of the 1930's, examples of teacher participation in curriculum development through committee organization could be found in virtually every state in the United States.

By the 1930's cooperative curriculum development had expanded from individual schools and school systems to include state curriculum programs. The Virginia Curriculum Revision Program (see Burlbaw, 1991; Caswell and Campbell, 1935) was probably the most notable of these. There were, however, other state curriculum programs which included teachers. Caswell (1934) identified and discussed state programs for curriculum development in Kentucky, Mississippi (see also Frederick and Patterson, 1937), Texas (see also Stretch, 1938), Georgia (see also Morrow, 1938), Tennessee, Virginia, Arkansas (see also Jones, 1937), North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana (see also Rogers, 1937), and Missouri.

All of these state programs involved teachers to varying degrees. Coincidentally, Caswell was influential in several of these state programs, most notably in Virginia. Leonard (1935) reported on a study he conducted to examine the extent and character of teacher participation in state curriculum programs. Eleven states participated in the study: Virginia, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, California, Pennsylvania, Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Iowa, and Texas (p. 118). He found several similarities between all of these state programs. First, Leonard (1935) noted that all of these states "endeavored to enlist every teacher in some phase of the program" (p. 119). Another important similarity that Leonard found was that "in all of these programs the bulk of the production was done by teachers" (p. 119). There were numerous other examples of state programs in curriculum development which involved teachers during the 1930's. Stretch (1938) also reported on the Texas curriculum program from the perspective of the Waco school system. Heaton (1937) reported that thirty-thousand teachers participated in the Texas program. Tireman (1937) reported on the New Mexico program and emphasized that "the teacher was all-important" (p. 66) to the success of the program. Johnson (1937) described the Oregon plan for curriculum development and the involvement of teachers (see also Heaton, 1937). Zeller (1939) reported on the progress of the Kansas Program for the Improvement of Instruction which provided for the participation of large

numbers of teachers. The Alabama program for curriculum development, which involved at least five thousand teachers, was described from the perspective of a local system by Brock (1941) and from the perspective of the Alabama Department of Education (see McCall, 1939). Frederick and Patterson (1937), in describing the Mississippi curriculum program, pointed out that all teachers and administrators were involved in curriculum study, attempting to determine the educational needs of the state. Few state curriculum programs instituted during the 1930's excluded teachers.

For many of the curriculum programs, whether at the school, system, or state level, the professional growth of teachers and the improvement of instruction were primary considerations for involving teachers in curriculum work. If professional growth and improvement of instruction were primary considerations, attempts were made to involve all teachers in some way in the work. The most common method, especially in state curriculum programs and the curriculum programs of large school systems, was through curriculum study. Typically, a curriculum program would be initiated with a period where teachers and school administrators throughout a state or system were involved in a study of curriculum theory, philosophical considerations of the particular curriculum program, tentative goals of the curriculum program, procedures for conducting curriculum work, etc. Many states issued a series of bulletins which served as study guides for groups of teachers (e.g., Brock,

1941, and Morrow, 1938). Some states sent state department or university officials to guide study (e.g., Zeller, 1939). Many states utilized state universities and colleges as centers for study and accessing resources (e.g., Morrow, 1938, and Tireman, 1937). Once the period of study and preparation was over, many states continued to utilize the organization which had been created for study as a means for involving these same study groups in curriculum development. The Virginia Curriculum Revision Program (see Burlbaw, 1991) was an excellent example of this.

The participation of all teachers in a state or large school system in curriculum work presented quite a few logistical problems. Even so, in spite of this, there were large school systems which made concerted efforts to provide for the participation of all teachers. For example, Floyd (1924) asserted that "probably the most outstanding work of the year in which the entire teaching force of Los Angeles had a part was making the present curriculums" (p. 483). Fenton (1926) reported that the Seattle program "has been participated in by practically the entire teaching force" (p. 91). Curtis (1926) suggested that the Detroit curriculum program was unique because "it makes possible the participation of the entire system in actual curriculum-construction" (p. 199). Norton and Norton (1936), citing a study conducted by Trillingham (1934), reported that

more than a third of the cities over 30,000 in population attempt to use all teachers, and a majority of cities of this size provide for the participation of a substantial percentage of teachers. (p. 562)

While more difficult for large systems, there were curriculum programs in large systems which successfully involved all teachers.

Individual schools and small school systems, however, were better able to involve all teachers in curriculum work. There were numerous examples of these, as well, in the literature. The work of teachers in Evansville, Indiana (Spear, 1937) and Glencoe, Illinois (Glencoe Public Schools, 1938) has already been mentioned. The work of two hundred teachers in the Decatur, Illinois, school system (see Engleman, 1917, and Newlon, 1917) may have influenced Newlon in his work in Denver. In its description of curriculum work conducted in public schools around the country, the Department of Superintendence (1926) noted the work of the school systems in Shorewood, Wisconsin, and Darby, Pennsylvania, among others. Spangler (1928) described the work of the teachers in Logansport, Indiana.

The participation of all teachers in a particular curriculum program is not necessarily of importance. The forced participation of teachers would have been contrary to the democratic principles behind many of these programs. In many of these examples, it was made clear that participation of teachers was voluntary. What is significant was the willingness and extent of teacher participation. Not only did large numbers of teachers participate, but many chose to participate and, by the 1920's and 1930's, their participation was widespread.

Significance of Past Efforts

Just as it was at the beginning of the twentieth century, the role and status of teachers continues to be a nagging question at the start of the twenty-first century. In particular, current discussions focus on teacher or professional autonomy in curricular and instructional matters. It is not surprising that discussions in the 1990s began to focus on teacher empowerment and autonomy. Educational legislation in many states during 1970's, 1980's, and 1990's focused on teacher accountability as a means for correcting continually poor student performance. Teachers have been increasingly perceived as technicians rather than as professionals. Darling-Hammond and Sclan (1992) described this perception of teachers as the "bureaucratic" conception (p. 7). The bureaucratic conception of teachers assumes that

specialized knowledge for teaching is unnecessary because techniques, tools, and methods can be prescribed from above; they need not be crafted by teachers themselves. (p. 7)

As one consequence of this technical, or bureaucratic, perception of teachers, curricular decisions have been increasingly made by legislators and educational policy-makers. As attempts at educational reform through teacher accountability have proven to have little or no effect, professional autonomy and teacher empowerment became common themes in the educational literature of the 1990's. Just as many educators during the period from 1890 through 1940 realized that teachers were inseparable from the curriculum,

many educators today are again recognizing the relationship between teachers and the curriculum. Questions concerning issues such as the role of teachers in curriculum development, the purposes for involving teachers in curriculum development, and the methods for involving teachers are again being discussed as possibilities for reform.

Being unaware or uninformed of past practices and ideas has been a concern for many writers on educational and curricular issues. Specific to curriculum history, Davis (1991) contended that "the curriculum field, from its beginnings earlier in this century, has honored its history by neglect" (p. 77). Ignorance of curriculum history allows misrepresentations or misinterpretations of past practices to be perpetuated and unchallenged. Wraga (1998) contended that certain interpretations of the early history of the curriculum field were "problematic, at best, and inaccurate, at worst" (p. 13). Garrett (1994) likened this ahistoricism to a teacher with no memory of what s/he has done in the classroom. With no memory, efforts to improve practice or curriculum are futile. Curriculum history serves as the "collective memory" of educators (p. 392). Because of this lack of a collective, professional memory, Tanner and Tanner (1995) contended that "reinventing the wheel is a serious problem in education" (p. 3). With teacher participation in curriculum development an area of renewed interest, ideas

and practices from the past have significant contributions to make to present knowledge.

Contributions to Present Understanding

One important contribution to present knowledge gleaned from past practice should be that teacher participation in curriculum development cannot be legislated or mandated. While there were many ideas on the relationship between democracy and education, Dewey's writings were some of the earliest, most pertinent, and most influential. For Dewey (1903), democratic cooperation was fundamental to teacher effectiveness, whether in teaching children or in curriculum development: "Democracy means freeing intelligence for independent effectiveness- the emancipation of the mind as an individual organ to do its work" (p. 193). Dewey's (1903) role for the teacher in curriculum development was clear. To be effective, teachers must have some

regular and representative way in which he or she can register judgment upon matters of educational importance, with the assurance that this judgment will somehow affect the school system. (p. 195).

Matters of educational importance included "methods of discipline and teaching, and the questions of curriculum, text-books, etc." (pp. 194-195). Dewey's influence was evident throughout the period of study in the curriculum ideas and work of educators such as Young, Newlon, and Caswell.

A fundamental principle of many of the early curriculum programs was democratic cooperative effort. While there certainly were curriculum programs during the period of

study which required teacher participation, such bureaucratic approaches rarely achieved the goals of the programs. Adair (1922) asserted that

general practice has shown that the best place for a teachers' council to originate is with the teachers themselves. Rarely does a council otherwise instituted serve its mission. (p. 547)

In his review of current curriculum practices, Caswell (1937) noted that:

teachers can improve the curriculum only as they broaden their insights, deepen their interests, and improve their technics. Consequently, emphasis is placed on voluntary participation, democratic procedures, provision of varied experiences which contribute to the growth of teachers, and curriculum changes which emerge from the classroom. (p. 123)

Hanna (1938), in summarizing the process of many current curriculum programs, noted that

teachers entirely on a voluntary basis, organize themselves into reading and discussion groups. . . . they read in the fields of science, philosophy, psychology, the arts, human relations, and a broad study of the culture of which we are a part. (p. 143)

Zeller (1939) asserted that Kansas program was intended to be a democratic one from its inception. He noted that the program "grew from the recognition that the democratic way of solving problems is through cooperative thinking of those affected by the problem" (p. 165). Provisions were made for flexible voluntary participation in the curriculum study during the first year. Falk (1939), in generalizing principles which could be gleaned from his participation in the Madison, Wisconsin, program, cited the belief in voluntary participation on the part of teachers as a significant principle. Falk contended that "there are great differences

in the willingness and capacity of individual teachers to contribute to curriculum study, and such differences should be provided for" (p. 277). The participation of Richmond, Virginia, elementary teachers on curriculum projects in English and science was on a voluntary basis, according to Broaddus and Norris (1939). Curtis' (1938) theory on democratic cooperation was based, in part, on his years of curriculum work with teachers in systems such as the Detroit school system (see Curtis, 1926).

Another lesson to be learned from past practice was that curriculum development (i.e., curriculum revision) in the most successful programs was understood to be a continuous process. The rapid social, technological, scientific, and economic changes taking place during the period from 1890 through 1940 made this clear to many educators. That curriculum plans were tentative was recognized by teachers as early as 1892 in Dewey's work in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago. Other examples were found in the literature. For example, Wilson (1924), the superintendent of the Berkeley, California, schools, contended that an effective curriculum program had to plan for the continual revision of the curriculum. The curriculum program instituted under his leadership was widely recognized during its time. Cox (1925) maintained that the curriculum would "be in a constant state of reevaluation and adaptation" (p. 254). On the other hand, many curriculum programs during the period of study did not

carry out this part of the curriculum development process. Foster (1925), for example, was critical of curriculum programs which omitted this part of the process:

Everyone knows that it is the usual custom for a committee to work intensively for a short period of time, prepare a report, print it, and then forget it until further demand for reconstruction of the course comes, when another committee is appointed and goes through the same procedure. (p. 143)

In Foster's perspective, the continual review of teachers' suggestions and criticisms of the curriculum constituted "real teacher participation in the making of curriculum" (p. 143).

The historical record suggested a variety of ways in which to provide opportunities for teacher participation. All teachers in a school or system were involved in some examples. The ultimate example could be found in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago (see Mayhew & Edwards, 1936). Dewey met weekly with the entire faculty of the school to reflect on curricular and instructional issues. Support for the teachers' work came from a variety of resources: Dewey, himself, university faculty and graduate students. An example at the system level could be found in Minneapolis (see Cutright, 1938). Educational forums of teachers were organized by the Minneapolis Teachers' Curriculum Committee to discuss instructional issues which bore directly on the teachers' classroom work. Cutright reported that eight hundred and fifty teachers and administrators were involved in one or more of these educational forums.

Where involvement of all teachers posed logistical obstacles, teacher participation was provided through representation in curriculum work. The teachers' council was one of the most common methods. Examples of teachers' councils can be found throughout the literature in schools and school systems (e.g., Updegraff, 1922; Gardner, 1920; Harris, 1919a; and, Spaulding, 1918). This method for teacher involvement in curriculum work was practiced in individual schools and school systems as large as that found in Chicago (see North, 1915). Seven thousand teachers and administrators were represented on seventy-four group councils. General curriculum revision as well as specific questions concerning curriculum were addressed by these teachers' councils.

Most opportunities for teacher participation came through committee organization at the local or state level. Committee work could involve all teachers in a particular group (i.e., subject, grade, school, or system) or representatives of a group. As early as 1919, Updegraff (1919) reported on the wide variety of committee organizations created to meet particular curricular needs, i.e., to revise courses in certain subjects, to revise courses in certain grades, to revise courses in certain schools, and to direct revision of courses in all subjects and all grades. He noted additional committees for reviewing and editing the work of other committees (pp. 682-683). Examples of these committee organizations were found

throughout the literature, particularly that of the 1920's and 1930's. All elementary teachers worked on the science curriculum in Cape May, New Jersey (see Wein, 1939). In Guilford County, North Carolina, teacher representatives worked on the health curriculum (see Brogdon, 1935). The work of Denver teachers under Newlon was an example of all teachers in a school system being involved in curriculum development through committee work (see Newlon & Threlkeld, 1926).

Past curriculum programs could serve to broaden the narrow conceptions of curriculum development which exist today. Curriculum development was generally viewed in broader terms than just the generating of objectives to be taught. A major weakness of those schools and systems which had conducted curriculum revision inadequately, according to Spears (1939), was the limited vision of the administrators initiating curriculum revision. Spears asserted that "curriculum revision has too often been conceived of as course-of-study construction" (p. 18). Courses of study were typically lists of objectives which were assigned to be taught at specific grade levels. In this conception, "teachers were brought together to prepare a syllabus-type course of study. It was a task with a definite beginning and a definite ending" (p. 18). Many of the more successful curriculum programs took a comprehensive approach. Curriculum development in these programs entailed not only identifying specific objectives. Teachers in these programs

were involved in selecting and creating appropriate learning activities, identifying and selecting resources, and experimenting with tentative curriculum.

Even though the focus of this study has been teacher participation in curriculum development, this should not be interpreted to mean that only teachers have had something of value to contribute to curriculum development. The understanding in the more successful programs was that curriculum development was a truly cooperative endeavor requiring contributions from many different participants. Clandinin and Connelly (1992) asserted that

proper historical studies of [the progressive era] would be illuminating; not only would they help us to understand the history of the teacher as curriculum maker but also they would provide a more balanced picture of the ways in which schools, colleges of education, faculties, consortia, and laboratories might work together. (p. 379)

Cooperation with universities was a common factor in many of the successful programs. For example, Proctor (1927), professor of education at Stanford University and consultant to the San Francisco school system, described his work in curriculum revision with San Francisco's secondary schools. Zeller (1938, 1939) reported on the extensive cooperation between the state of Kansas and Peabody Teachers College in Nashville, Tennessee. Zeller (1938) noted the use of "consultants from the Department of Field Surveys of George Peabody College" (p. 351). Committees were sent to the curriculum laboratory at George Peabody College to prepare materials for the study groups to use. Hanna (1939),

professor of education at Stanford University and curriculum consultant to the San Diego school system, described the San Diego school system's organization for curriculum development.

Cooperative curriculum work has not been restricted to universities. Teachers organizations have played an important role in several curriculum programs. For example, Johnson (1937) reported that the Oregon State Teachers' Association Curriculum Committee was responsible for directing that state's curriculum program. Zeller (1938) also noted that the Kansas curriculum program was a cooperative effort of the state department of education and the Kansas state teachers' association. The Cooperative Plan for Curriculum Revision (Department of Superintendence, 1926) was a curriculum consortium of approximately 300 systems across the country organized "to foster research and professional cooperation" (p. 23) among those participating systems.

Current efforts to involve teachers in curriculum development could be advised by the support provided for teachers involved in early curriculum programs. Most significant was the use of consultants, release time, professional resources, and secretarial help. The Denver Curriculum Revision Program was perhaps the most notable of these early curriculum programs (see Newlon and Threlkeld, 1926). The use of consultants was widely reported in other curriculum programs (e.g., Charters and Miller, 1915; Kyte,

1923; Foster, 1825; Courtis, 1926; Proctor, 1927; Wilson, 1927; Webster, 1928; English, 1929; Stretch, 1938; Zeller, 1938; Caswell, 1939; Hanna, 1939; Tyler, 1939). The provision for professional libraries and other curriculum resources was also widely reported (e.g., Minor, 1922; Davis, 1924; Threlkeld, 1925; Department of Superintendence, 1926; Cocking, 1926; English, 1929; Jones, 1937; Morrow, 1938). More unusual was the provision for release time and substitute teachers for those teachers involved in curriculum work (e.g., Threlkeld, 1925; Wilson, 1927; Webster, 1928; Strayer, 1937; Lamoreaux, 1937; Lide, 1938a and 1938b). Secretarial help was provided in several curriculum programs to take care of the extensive clerical chores required in these programs (e.g., Wilson, 1924; Threlkeld, 1925; Englehardt, 1938; Lide 1938a and 1938b). These support mechanisms for teacher participation certainly contributed to the success of many of these early programs.

A common concern about teacher participation throughout the period from 1890 through 1940 was that teachers lacked the preparation necessary for effective curriculum work. A primary purpose for teacher participation in many of these early curriculum programs was as a means furthering the professional growth of teachers. Since teacher training and preparation continue to be concerns, this is another lesson to be learned from early curriculum programs. Dewey (1903) addressed this concern:

The more it is asserted that the existing corps of teachers is unfit to have a voice in the settlement of important educational matters, and their unfitness to exercise intellectual initiative and to assume the responsibility for constructive work is emphasized, the more their unfitness to attempt the much more difficult and delicate task of guiding souls appears. If this body is so unfit, how can it be trusted to carry out the recommendations or dictations of the wisest body of experts? If teachers are incapable of the intellectual responsibility which goes to the determination of the methods they are to use in teaching, how can they employ methods when dictated by others, in other than a mechanical, capricious, and clumsy manner? (p. 197)

As Dewey noted, only by sharing in the responsibility of curriculum work could teachers become competent in fulfilling the responsibility. Wilson (1924) and Newlon (1924) maintained that the challenge of keeping the curriculum current held greater potential for professional growth than any other medium in the school system. Numerous curriculum programs reported teacher professional growth as a primary purpose for teacher participation in curriculum development (e.g., Gilbert, 1913; Updegraff, 1919; Adair, 1922; Department of Superintendence, 1924; Bonser, 1924a; Longshore, 1925; Foster, 1925; Whitney, 1927; Webster, 1928; Holloway, 1928; English, 1929; Otto, 1934; Leonard, 1935; Rucker, 1937; Harris, 1937; Rogers, 1937; Linder, 1938; Hanna, 1938; Myers, et al., 1938; Basler, 1938; Matzen and Knapp, 1938).

A final lesson to be learned from these past efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work and centers on the issue of teacher autonomy. Tanner (1997) asserted that "professional autonomy is an insufficient peg on which to hang our hopes for school improvement" (p. 68). Instead,

current efforts to bring about reform in education should focus on Dewey's conception of teacher intellectual freedom. Dewey's (1903) conception of democracy as "freeing intelligence for independent effectiveness" has been discussed previously. This intellectual freedom that Dewey not only proposed for teachers, but provided to teachers in the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, was an important concept to understand, according to Tanner (1997). Teachers in the Laboratory School, and perhaps in other curriculum programs influenced by Dewey's work, "had much freedom in developing curriculum" (p. 64).

By contrast, teachers today have less intellectual freedom. Tanner (1997) attributed this to several causes: the scarcity of true advocates of teacher freedom, and hidden prejudices about teachers' intelligence and abilities. These certainly were causes during Dewey's time. A third reason suggested by Tanner was very relevant to studies of past efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work. Tanner (1997) contended that teachers are without intellectual freedom because "we are without professional memory about where this freedom has existed and in what circumstances it is most effective" (p. 64).

The primary difference between professional autonomy and intellectual freedom can be compared to the relationship between freedom of intelligence and freedom of action identified by Dewey. Dewey (1903) asserted that while "we naturally associate democracy . . . with freedom in action .

. . . but freedom of action without freed capacity of thought behind it is only chaos" (p. 193). In much the same way that democracy and freedom of action were commonly associated in Dewey's time, professional autonomy is frequently associated with freedom of action. As Dewey predicted, though, freedom of action without intellectual freedom is ineffective. Tanner (1997) suggested situations in which professional autonomy becomes inadequate:

A teacher with professional autonomy may follow ways of teaching that have become habits and through her emotions have been become untouchable. Or a teacher's autonomy may be limited to finding ways of helping students to do well on standardized tests. (p. 68)

Tanner further contended that professional autonomy is worthless when teachers are given opportunities to participate in curriculum work but are not given the necessary support or resources to successfully complete the tasks. Tanner (1997) characterized "the era of professional autonomy" as an "age lost opportunities" (p. 68).

Examples of how past practice might inform current practice

The study of past practices simply to understand the past has some merit. However, in order for it to be considered significant, it should contribute in some way to current understandings and practices. Because past practices can inform current practice, it is important that some practical examples be examined. The practices of The League of Professional Schools (Allen, Glickman, & Hensley,

1998) and the state of Georgia's 1998 curriculum revision offer two examples in examine contributions.

The League of Professional Schools.

The League of Professional Schools was started in 1984 as a means to achieve school improvement by drawing upon the knowledge and experiences of school professionals.

Collaborative decision-making would capitalize on this contextual information and provide further professional growth opportunities for participants. Additionally, the results of decisions made collaboratively would serve to inform future decisions. The decision-making process became cyclical, much in the same way that Dewey (1929) perceived the relationship between classroom practice and educational theory, as the consequences inform the next decisions.

Three facets form the framework for lasting school improvement, according to The League of Professional Schools: shared governance, a covenant of teaching and learning, and action research (Allen, Glickman, & Hensley, 1998).

A central facet of the framework for the Professional League of Schools is shared governance. Shared governance, a very Deweyan idea, seeks to involve everyone in decisions concerning the teaching and learning process. A key point, for the League, is that only decisions concerning the teaching and learning process go through the shared governance process. While this sounds simple, this was a problem that was identified early in the literature on site-

based management (see for example Calhoun & Allen, 1996, and Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990). The League of professional schools found that most schools had effectively implemented shared governance within the first three years of joining the League (Allen, Glickman, & Hensley, 1998).

Additionally, these collaborative decisions are to be guided by action research and filtered through the covenant of teaching and learning.

The covenant of teaching and learning is the collaboratively developed guiding document for improvement in the school. The covenant is an articulation of the school-wide vision (Allen, Glickman & Hensley, 1998). The covenant embodies the guiding principles which are based upon the participants' beliefs about teaching and learning. In an example from a case study, Allen, Glickman & Hensley (1998) described the covenant as a statement of what the participants must know and what they want for children (p. 29). The covenant is intended to be the filter through which all decisions, including those related to curriculum, are considered.

Action research is the final part of the framework for the League's model for school improvement. Action research is the process of collecting data about the school and using the data to make informed decisions. It provides the feedback that informs the shared governance process. Action research proved to be the most difficult facet of the framework for member schools of the League to effectively

implement. Particularly difficult, according to Allen, Glickman & Hensley (1998), was conducting action research which focused on improving the teaching and learning process.

Dewey's influence on Glickman (see for example Glickman, 1998, and Glickman, 1993), who is acknowledged as conceiving the idea of the League of Professional Schools and its framework, suggests that past practice has already had some influence current practice. Beyond the influence of Dewey's beliefs on democratic ideals and practices, Dewey's practices in the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago stressed at least two components of the League's framework: shared governance and action research. While the terminology had not been coined, the practice was clear. The teachers' meetings in the Laboratory school were focused on making collaborative decisions concerning the improvement of teaching and learning. Additionally, Dewey's beliefs about the recursive nature of theory and practice required that teachers collect data about classroom practices. The collected data was used in the teachers' meetings to inform and guide the decision of the teachers.

A paradox in democratic practice in schools is the issue of participation. Requiring the participation of all teachers, whether it be in shared governance or curriculum development, seems to go against the ideals of democracy in which it is assumed that individuals should decide. The League suggests that all teachers are involved in the

decisions concerning the teaching and learning process. Shared governance councils are to be composed of at least a majority of the teachers. Everyone is expected to participate in the discussions, the reading, and the reflecting that are a part of the decision-making process embodied in League principles. Glickman (1993) indicated that the concept of collective autonomy must replace the idea of personal autonomy if schools are to be effective. This would suggest that individual teachers have little or no choice to opt out of participation. Yet, this has been one of the contemporary criticisms of past practices to involve all teachers in curriculum work, particularly if it was on a non-voluntary basis.

An issue both in past practice as well as in League practice is the concern of when teachers would participate in shared governance, as well as curriculum work, given the demands placed on most teachers. While it is suggested that the League schools budget for substitutes, a practical consideration is that large numbers of schools have little or no direct control over their budgets. In past practice this was the responsibility of the school system. In Denver, Newlon convinced the school board to fund not only release time for teachers involved in curriculum work, but for additional resources such as a professional library and clerical assistance. In Detroit, Curtis noted an even more innovative way for providing release time for teachers involved in curriculum work. As reported earlier, the

Detroit school system supported a school for the training of teachers, both in pre-service and in-service. Pre-service teachers were provided as substitutes for Detroit teachers involved in curriculum work. This obviously served dual purposes. It provided trained individuals to release in-service teachers for curriculum development. It provided practical experiences for pre-service teachers.

This past practice suggests a larger collaboration for current practices, such as the League, beyond the practice of using university and college personnel for consultation. For example, in Georgia, the university system has a network of universities across the state. All have colleges or schools of education which are responsible for educating and training pre-service teachers. Many of these regional sites provide teachers for surrounding school systems. Providing pre-service teachers to release in-service teachers for curriculum work could be one way to address the concern of over-worked in-service teachers. Additionally, it could address the challenge of providing pre-service teachers with sufficient practical experiences.

Everyone should be a part of the discussions, reading, reflecting and sharing that go into the decision-making process.

The state of Georgia's 1998 curriculum revision. The Georgia Department of Education is mandated by Quality Basic Education Act of 1986 to periodically revise the state curriculum known as the Quality Core Curriculum. In 1995, a

work group known as the Georgia School Improvement Panel was appointed by the state superintendent to begin, among other improvement initiatives, the revision of the state curriculum. The panel decided that the revision of the state curriculum should be done by teachers. The panel asked that at least half of the writers involved in the revision be current classroom teachers.

The revision of Georgia's curriculum followed a four-step process (see Georgia Department of Education, 1998). First, the School Improvement Panel surveyed 8,000 teachers across the state to determine the needed revisions. The School Improvement Panel determined from the surveys that the Quality Core Curriculum would not be replaced, but would be revised.

Next, writing teams were created based on subject areas needing revision. Nine curriculum areas were revised: science, mathematics, language arts, social studies, fine arts, technology/career, agriculture, physical education/health, and foreign languages. One hundred and fifty educators, parents, and business leaders were selected to serve on these teams. Membership on each writing team was selected according to gender, ethnicity, position, and geography. Approximately 75 of the participants on these writing teams were teachers.

The work of each writing team was guided by state department of education officials. Subject area objectives were evaluated by the writing teams according to three

criteria: clarity, relevance, and measurability. Resources such as textbooks, other states' curricula and standards, national standards, and professional literature. Each writing team met for a two week period to evaluate and revise objectives.

The third step involved soliciting comments on the tentative curriculum. Once the writing teams were done, a tentative curriculum was submitted for review to all interested parties. Copies were made available to school systems, posted on the Internet, and placed in public libraries. Comments and suggestions were incorporated into the final revision.

The final step focused on implementation of the revised curriculum. Training was conducted through the School Improvement Panel, the Department of Education, regional service agencies, and local school systems. The training centered around reviewing the nine revised curriculum areas, introducing new features and formats of the revised curriculum, and providing information on staff development opportunities. Training was accomplished through one-day sessions of approximately eight hours. Additional staff development opportunities included one-day drive-in sessions which attempted to focus on teaching strategies and four-day sessions which focused on curriculum alignment activities.

Contrast Georgia's 1998 revision of its state curriculum with how Georgia and other states conducted curriculum revision during the 1930s. First, it is

important to note that definitions of curriculum during the first half of the twentieth century tended to be broader in scope than current conceptions. Curriculum revision during the first half of the century involved teachers not only in identifying objectives, but also in also identifying appropriate instructional strategies and resources. Current conceptions, such as that implied in Georgia's 1998 curriculum revision, separate curriculum and instruction and tend to focus much more on subject-specific objectives.

Past efforts at the state-level tended to involve larger numbers of teachers in various phases of curriculum revision (e.g., Kyte, 1936, and Caswell, 1934). Georgia's 1998 revision involved approximately 75 teachers in writing subject-specific objectives which during the 1930s would have been a part of the production phase of curriculum revision in many states. During the 1930s, many states, Kansas, Oregon, and Virginia, for example, had much more complex organizations for curriculum revision which allowed more teachers opportunities to participate in various phases of revision including the production phase. These organizations were similar, in that, they provided for state, regional, and district production committees. Large numbers of teachers were usually represented at all levels of production. Teachers submitted ideas and suggestion, even lessons and units of study, which were evaluated at each level.

Curriculum study was another way in which large numbers of teachers were involved. Georgia's curriculum revision during the 1930s (see Morrow, 1938) reportedly involved over 10,000 teachers. Curriculum study in most states, during the 1930s, was an initial phase to involve teachers up-front and involved examination of the professional literature related to methods of curriculum development, philosophical considerations, and the like. The curriculum study was usually intended to prepare teachers for further participation. In many states, curriculum study lasted at least a year, before moving to the next planned phase. While Georgia's 1998 curriculum revision program involved teachers in what might be construed as curriculum study, it had a very narrow focus on introduction of the revised objectives. The study was relatively short-term and was focused on fidelity in implementation.

State initiatives during the 1930s tended to be much more collaborative in nature. State programs in Kansas, Oregon, and New Mexico, for example, were conducted as a collaboration of the state teachers' associations and the state departments of education. In the case of Oregon, the state teachers' organization actually oversaw the revision program. Many state curriculum revision programs were also conducted in collaboration with colleges and universities. These institutions provided personnel and resources to facilitate the state curriculum revision programs. During the 1930s, in Georgia, for example, university professors

helped conduct the local curriculum studies. In Kansas and Oregon, colleges and universities provided regional centers for study, experimentation, and consultation to facilitate the state-wide efforts.

Areas of further study

Further study of individual efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work needs to be conducted, particularly of the period from 1915 through 1940. The work of the teachers in the University of Chicago Laboratory School under Dewey, in the Denver Curriculum Revision Program, in the Eight-Year Study, and the Virginia Curriculum Revision Program have been well-documented and studied rather extensively. Tendencies in the current literature have been to make broad and sweeping generalizations about teacher participation based on these efforts. These examples give only a limited perspective of the widespread attempts to involve teachers in curriculum development.

Unfortunately, records and reports of many of the numerous efforts to involve teachers have been forgotten, ignored, or lost. Reporting and record-keeping of efforts to involve teachers were often tentative and incomplete. Updegraff (1920), among others, noted this problem when reporting on teachers' councils: ". . . it is true that [teachers' councils] are being established from week to week without news of the fact reaching central sources" (p. 285). Further study of primary sources, such as board of education records, would serve to provide valuable insights and

possibly reveal efforts which have been little discussed. Another problem of reporting and record-keeping which has been exacerbated by the passing of time was recognized by the Department of Superintendence (1925) in its third yearbook. The purpose of this yearbook was to compile research studies on curriculum revision efforts which had been "inaccessible because of their technical form, or because of their publication in isolated monographs or magazines, or because of their fragmentary distribution" (p. 7). Because past efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work were numerous and widespread, records of these efforts are stored widely in university libraries, repositories, and various archives. The broad focus of this study limited this type of examination. Case studies of these and other efforts are needed to bring these efforts back to our "professional memory" before they are lost.

Many of these efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work, while successful, were short-lived. Some were short-lived because of participants' conception of curriculum. If curriculum was perceived simply as the course of study, then curriculum work consisted only of the production of a course of study. Curriculum work was not viewed as a process. The need for continual revision and review was not necessary since the work ended until the next superintendent or board of education demanded a new course of study. Some schools and systems involved teachers in curriculum work because cooperative curriculum work was receiving so much attention

in the literature during this period that this seemed the thing to do. Cooperative curriculum work did not fit well in authoritarian organizations. A final reason may have been that some efforts were not really short-lived they only appeared that way because of fragmented or poor record-keeping. Many systems reported their initial efforts or provided synopses of their efforts in professional journals. Further reports might have been kept internally or not done at all. The need for accurate and comprehensive record-keeping was recognized as early as the turn of the century. Additional investigations into these individual efforts could reveal the reasons why some efforts appeared short-lived.

A more likely reason was the political uncertainty of school administration. This was recognized as a problem by early educators. For example, Brooks (Participation of teachers in educational policies, 1909), a superintendent in the Boston school system recognized for his early efforts to provide for teacher participation in curriculum work, noted that it had been recognized all along that stability of reforms became a problem since educational policies changed as administrators changed. This problem continues to be recognized today. Kliebard (1995) contended that reforms in education have been directly influenced by frequent political changes, particularly in the superintendency or board of education. Traditional investigations have focused on the reasons why various reforms have translated well into

sustained practice. Kliebard (1995) contended that investigations into why certain reform efforts failed might be needed and just as important. This would certainly be true of teacher participation in curriculum development during the period under study, particularly the period from 1915 through 1940.

Related to political uncertainties was the issue of time. The longer an effort, such as teacher participation in curriculum development, was sustained successfully in a school or system the more likely it would be to become entrenched in practice. Many of the efforts to involve teachers in curriculum work were organized around three- or four-year cycles. Interestingly, this may have coincided with superintendents' terms even though this was never explicitly or implicitly given as a reason. A period of three to four years was generally recognized as the minimum amount of time needed to conduct a successful curriculum program. While the popular thinking continues to indicate a three to four year cycle, Grismer, an analyst with the Rand Foundation, has contended that educational "reforms take 10 to 15 years to play out" (see Mollison, 2000). Few of the past efforts to involve teachers enjoyed such longevity.

The Denver Curriculum Revision Program was probably the best example of the influence of political stability and time. Newlon initiated the program along with the help of his deputy superintendent Threlkeld. Threlkeld succeeded Newlon as superintendent of the Denver schools. One reason

for the longevity of the Denver program may then have been the political stability, among other factors, found in the Denver school system.

Also related to political influences was the fact that few programs were given formal and/or legal standing in the school system. Continued teacher participation was therefore dependent on the goodwill of the current superintendent and/or school board. Lack of legal status made many of the early efforts to involve teachers too fragmented and undependable. This continued to be a problem throughout the period under study. Updegraff (1920) alluded to this problem when he reported that "it may safely be said that there are not at present time over fifty duly constituted [educational] organs in the United States" (p. 285).

Finally, the years following the period of study, particularly the 1940's and 1950's, need to be examined carefully. Since teacher participation in curriculum development proved to be a widespread phenomenon during the 1920's and 1930's, one would assume that the practice continued in the years following. We know the practice (as manifested during the 1920's and 1930's) was rarely evident after the 1960's. An explanation of why and when the widespread practice of teacher involvement in curriculum work ended would be revealing.

Contemporary writers exploring teacher participation in curriculum development have tended to ignore a rich source

of information, the literature and practice of the past. While examples of rhetoric were more numerous than actual practice, practice during the period of study, particularly the 1920's and 1930's, was prevalent. These past discussions and practices could serve to advise contemporary thinking and practice. Rather than "reinventing the wheel," educators have a valuable knowledge base from which to investigate the idea and practice of involving teachers in curriculum work.

REFERENCES

Adair, C. (1920). The teacher in administration. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (p. 99). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Adair, C. (1922). Report of committee on participation of teachers in school management. Addresses and proceedings of the sixtieth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Boston, Massachusetts (pp. 546-547). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Adair, C. (1925). Teacher participation in the determination of school policies from the viewpoint of the classroom teacher. Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-third annual meeting of the National Education Association, June 28-July 3, 1925 (pp. 98-102). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Aiken, W. (1942). The story of the eight-year study. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Allen, L. & Glickman, C. (1992). School improvement: The elusive faces of shared governance. NASSP Bulletin, 76(542), 80-87.

Allen, L., Glickman, C., & Hensley, F. (1998, April). A Search for Accountability: The League of Professional Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Almack, J. (1933). Curriculum construction. California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 8(2), 143-147.

Altenbaugh, R. (1992). Introduction. In Richard J. Altenbaugh (Ed.), The teacher's voice: A social history of teaching in the twentieth-century America (pp. 122-125). London: The Falmer Press.

American Association of School Administrators. (1936). The social studies curriculum: The fourteenth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence. Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Bagley, W. (1918). The status of the classroom teacher. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-sixth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (pp. 383-387). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Bagley, W. (1933). The task of education in a period of rapid social change. Educational Administration and Supervision, 19, 568-569.

Baldwin, J. (1888). The art of school management. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Barr, A. (1924). Making the course of study. The Journal of Educational Method, 3(9), 371-378.

Barr, A., & Burton, W. (1926). The supervision of instruction. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Barr, A., Burton, W., & Brueckner, L. (1938). Supervision: Principles and practices in the improvement of instruction. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Basler, (1938). Tacoma curriculum program. Curriculum Journal, 9(4), 174-177.

Bellack, A. (1969). History of curriculum thought and practice. Review of Educational Research, 39(3), 283-292.

Bersch, C. (1927). Making a course of study in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. The Journal of Educational Method, 6(9), 381-386.

Bicknell, T. (1885). The presidents' address: The annual address before the National Educational Association of the United States, at Madison, Wis., July 18, 1884. Education, 5(3), 273-316.

Blanton, A. (1920). Democracy in school administration. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 515-518). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Bloch, M. (1953). The historian's craft. New York: Vintage Books.

Bobbitt, F. (1918a). Summary of the literature in scientific method in the field of curriculum-making. The Elementary School Journal, 18(3), 219-229.

Bobbitt, F. (1918b). The curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Bobbitt, F. (1925). Difficulties to be met in local curriculum-making. The Elementary School Journal, 25(9), 653-663.

Bogan, W. (1919). The value of the teachers' councils. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 387-390). Washington, DC: National Education association.

Bolin, F. & Panaritis, P. (1992). Searching for a common purpose: A perspective on the history of supervision. In Carl D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition: 1992 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 30-43). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bonser, F. (1920). Implications for elementary education from experiments in democratizing industry. Teachers College Record, 21(1), 108-116.

Bonser, F. (1924). The elementary school curriculum. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Bonser, F. (1924). The reorganization of the curriculum of the elementary school. Addresses and Proceedings of the Sixty-Second Annual Meeting of the National Education Association, June 29-July 4, 1924 (pp. 890-897). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Boodin, J. (1918). Education for democracy. School and Society, 7(182), 724-731.

Briggs, T. (1926). Curriculum problems. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Brochhausen, A. (1908). The teachers' view of the methods used to inspire professional interest. The Elementary School Teacher, 8(5), 249-264.

Broadus, L., & Norris, F. (1939). Stimulating and guiding teachers in enriching the curriculum. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 18(6), 278-284.

Brogdon, N. (1935). A cooperative venture in curriculum building. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 14(6), 558-564.

Brown, W. (1936). Leadership and democratic procedures in an effective program of effective curriculum development. Curriculum Journal, 7(6), 16-21.

Bruner, H. (1932). The present status of curriculum construction for elementary school in the United States. The North Central Association Quarterly, 6(4), 399-407.

Bullough, R. (1979). Curriculum history: Flight to the sidelines. Paper presented at the 2nd annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 995)

Burlbaw, L. (1991). More than 10,000 teachers: Hollis L. Caswell and the Virginia Curriculum Revision Program. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 6(3), 233-254.

Calhoun, E. F., & Allen, L. (1996). The action network: Action research on action research. In B. Joyce & E. Calhoun (Eds.). Learning Experiences in School Renewal: An exploration of Five Successful Programs (pp. 137-171). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Calkins, N. (1882). School supervision. Education, 2(5), 497-506.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Carpenter, W. (1932). Participation of teachers in the determination of school policies. Peabody Journal of Education, 2(4), 234-238.

Caswell, H. (1934). Current studies in curriculum making. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, 7(2), 41-50.

Caswell, H. & Campbell, D. (1935). Curriculum development. New York: American Book Company.

Caswell, H. (1937). Plans for curriculum building and research. Review of Educational Research, 7(2), 120-123.

Caswell, H. (1939). Administrative considerations in curriculum development. In Harold Rugg (Ed.). Democracy and the Curriculum: The Life and Program of the American School (pp. 453-474). New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. _

Caswell, H. (1979, April). The revisionist historians and educational practice. Paper presented at a joint session of the American Educational Research Association and the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 966)

Charters, W. and Miller, E. (1915). A course of study in grammar based upon the grammatical errors of school children of Kansas City, Missouri. The University of Missouri Bulletin, 16(2), 3-45.

Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In Philip W. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 363-401). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Clark, H. (1914). A plea for greater democracy in school administration. Sierra Educational News and Book Review, 10, 20-24.

Clark, M. (1920). The part the teacher should play in the school administration. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 93-95). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Cocking, W. (1926). The St. Louis program of curriculum-revision. In Guy Montrose Whipple (Ed.), The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction, Part I, Curriculum-making: Past and present (pp. 241-248). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.

Coffman, L. (1919a). Need for substitution of a cooperative type of organization for the present system. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 376-377). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Coffman, L. (1919b). The need for the substitution of a cooperative type of school organization for the present system. The American School Board Journal, 59(3), 29-30.

Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. (1918). Cardinal principles of secondary education. (Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1918, No. 35). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Committee on the Role of Education in American History. (1965). Education and American History. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Cooke, D., & Schmitz, B. (1932). The participation of teachers in the administration of small high schools. The School Review, 40(1), 44-50.

Cooke, D., Hamon, R., & Proctor, A. (1938). Principles of School Administration. Minneapolis, MN: Educational Publishers, Inc.

Cooke, F., & Osborne, R. (1926). Fundamental considerations underlying the curriculum of the Francis J. Parker School. In Guy Montrose Whipple (Ed.), The twentieth-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction (pp. 305-313). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.

Co-operation of parents in improving schools. (1840). Connecticut Common School Journal, 2(6), 86.

Counts, G. (1927). Who shall make the curriculum? Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin Number 15, Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals (pp. 7-14). Cicero, IL: National Association of Secondary-School Principals.

Courtis, S. (1926). Curriculum-construction at Detroit. In Guy Montrose Whipple (Ed.), The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction, Part I, Curriculum-making: Past and present (pp. 189-206). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.

Courtis, S. (1938). Techniques of cooperation. Educational Method, 17(7), 349-350.

Courtis, S. (1938). Human progress in working together: Levels and types of cooperation. In Stuart A. Courtis, Eldridge T. McSwain, and Nellie C. Morrison (Eds.), Cooperation: Principles and practices, eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (pp. 18-32). Washington, DC: The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association.

Cox, P. (1925). Curriculum-adjustment in the secondary school. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott Company.

Cox, P., & Langfitt, R. (1934). High school administration and supervision. New York: American Book Company.

Cremin, L. (1961). The transformation of the school, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Cutright, P. (1936). Factors which enter into the development of the curriculum of a city school system. Curriculum Journal, 7(6), 6-8.

Cutright, P. (1938). Cooperative curriculum making. Childhood Education, 14(8), 341-343.

Cutright, P. (1945). Practice in curriculum development. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The forty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I curriculum reconstruction (pp. 267-288). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Sclan, E. (1992). Policy and supervision. In Carl D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition: 1992 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 7-29) Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Davis, C. (1924). The principal and the building of the courses of study. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 3(4), 489-492).

Davis, O. (1977). The nature and boundaries of curriculum history: A contribution to dialogue over a yearbook and its review. Curriculum Inquiry, 6(4), 159.

Davis, O. (1989). Opening the door to surprise: The next decade of curriculum history studies. In Craig Kridel (Ed.), Curriculum history (pp. 2-13). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Davis, O. (1991). Historical inquiry: Telling real stories. In Edmund C. Short (Ed.). Forms of curriculum inquiry (pp. 77-87). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Department of Superintendence. (1924). The elementary school curriculum, second yearbook of the Department of Superintendence. Washington, DC: Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States.

Department of Superintendence. (1925). Research in constructing the elementary school curriculum, third yearbook of the Department of Superintendence. Washington, DC: Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States.

Department of Superintendence. (1926). The nation at work on the public school curriculum, fourth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence. Washington, DC: Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States.

Department of Superintendence. (1934). Critical problems in school administration, twelfth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence. Washington, DC: Department

of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States.

Department of Superintendence. (1936). The social studies curriculum, fourteenth yearbook. Washington, DC: Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association of the United States.

Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. (1938). Cooperation: Principles and practices, eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. The School Journal, 54(3), 77-80.

Dewey, J. (1903). Democracy in education. The Elementary School Teacher, 4(4), 193-204.

Dewey, J. (1904). The Educational Situation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1915). The school and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1929). The sources of a science of education. New York: Horace Liveright.

Dewey, J. (1937). Democracy and educational administration. School and Society, 45(1162), 457-462.

Dillard, J. (1915). New text books and new course of study. The Virginia Journal of Education, 9(1), 19-20.

Douai, A. (1880a). Teaching a profession- (I). New-England Journal of Education, 12(13), 227-228.

Douai, A. (1880b). Teaching, a profession- (II). New-England Journal of Education, 12(14), 244.

Douglas, H., & Boardman, C. (1934). Supervision in secondary schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Downey, J. (1910). Educational progress in 1909. The School Review, 18(6), 400-423.

Draper, E. (1936). Principles and techniques of curriculum making. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Dunton, L. (1893). Experts in education. Education, 13(6), 327-335.

Edmonson, J., Roemer, J., & Bacon, F. (1932). Secondary school administration. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Eldridge, (1939). The teacher in school administration. The Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals, 23(82), 29-32.

Eliot, C. (1894). The unity of educational reform. Educational Review, 8, 209-226.

Eliot, S. (1875). Organization of school faculties. New-England Journal of Education, 2(4), 49-51.

Elle, (1938). Curriculum improvement in Salem, Oregon. Curriculum Journal, 9(1), 32-33.

Engelhardt, N. (1938). Teacher participation in school administration. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, College of Education, University of Kentucky, 11(2), 12-18.

Estabrook-Chancellor, W. (1908). Our city schools, their direction and management. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.

Etzioni, A. (1969). Preface. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization (pp. v-xviii). New York: The Free Press.

Falk, E. (1939). Cooperative curriculum study in a city school system. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 18(6), 271-277.

Fichandler, A. (1917). An attempt an Americanization. School and Society, 5(114), 251-254.

Floyd, M. (1924). Curriculum making in Los Angeles. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 3(4), 483-489.

Foght, H. (1920). The rural teacher and his work. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Ford, M. (1992). Motivating humans: Goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Franseth, J. (1939). Rural high schools improve their curriculum. Curriculum Journal, 10(5), 214-217.

Frederick, O. (1938). Launching the Saginaw curriculum program. Curriculum Journal, 9(3), 120-123.

Frederick, O., & Barnhart, R. (1939). Beginning the Battle Creek curriculum study. Curriculum Journal, 10(6), 268-270.

Frederick, O., & Patterson, D. (1937). The Mississippi curriculum program. Curriculum Journal, 8(6), 239-244.

Freeman, F. (1924). Review of Superintendent Wilson's paper. Department of Superintendence Second Yearbook: The Elementary School Curriculum (pp. 45-47). Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Gardner, E. (1919). Constructive participation in organization and administration by teachers. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 378-380). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Gardner, E. (1919). Constructive participation in organization and administration by teachers. N.E.A. Bulletin, 8(4), 10-11.

Gardner, E. (1920). Teacher cooperation in administration. The American Teacher, 9(6), 127-128.

Garrett, A. (1994). Curriculum history's connection to the present: Necessary lessons for informed practice and theory. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9(4), 390-395.

Gates, C. (1923). The management of smaller schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Georgia Department of Education. (1998). Georgia's Quality Core Curriculum: Questions and Answers Relating to the 1998 Revision of Georgia's Statewide K through 12 Public School Curriculum. Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education.

Gilbert, C. (1906). The school and its life: A brief discussion of the principles of school management and organization. New York: Silver, Burdett and Co.

Gilbert, C. (1913). What children study and why: A discussion of educational values in the elementary course of study. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Co.

Gildemeister, T. (1919). Revision of the elementary-school curriculum. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 182-186). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Giles, H., McCutchen, S., & Zechiel, A. (1942). Exploring the curriculum. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Giroux, H. (1994). Teachers, public life, and curriculum reform. Peabody Journal of Education, 69(3), 35-47.

Glencoe Public Schools. (1938). A guide for curriculum planning. Chicago: W. M. Walsh Manufacturing Company.

Glickman, C. (1992). Introduction: Postmodernism and supervision. In Carl D. Glickman (Ed.). Supervision in transition: 1992 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 1-3). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. (1993). Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Glickman, C. (1998). Revolutionizing America's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goetting, M. (1935). Orientation of the teachers for curriculum building. Educational Administration and Supervision, 21(1), 13-26.

Goodier, F., & Miller, W. (1938). Administration of town and village schools. St. Louis, MO: Webster Publishing Company.

Goodlad, J. (1966). The changing school curriculum. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Gosling, T. (1919). Cooperative intelligence in city school administration. The American School Board Journal, 59(2), 29-30.

Gould, L. (1919). Necessity for sharp differentiation between the teacher's point of view and the administrator's point of view. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 380-381). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Grabo, R. (1926). The Oak Ridge plan of teacher participation. The Journal of Educational Method, 5(7), 300-303.

Graves, F. (1932). The administration of American education. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Gumlick, H. (1937). Curriculum improvement in the individual school. Curriculum Journal, 8(6), 267-269.

Hailmann, W. (1882). Emancipation of teachers. Education, 2(4), 339-345.

- Hamrin, S. (1932). Organization and administrative control in high schools. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.
- Hanna, P. (1938). Teacher participation in curriculum making. The National Elementary Principal, 17(5), 142-146.
- Hanna, P. (1939). Organization for curriculum development. Curriculum Journal, 10(3), 104-107.
- Harap, H. (1927). A critique of the present status of curriculum-making. School and Society, 25(634), 207-216.
- Harap, H. (1932). The technique of curriculum making. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Harap, H. (1935). A survey of courses of study published in the last two years. Journal of Educational Research, 28(9), 641-656.
- Harap, H., & Bayne, A. (1932a). A critical survey of public school courses of study published 1929 to 1931. Journal of Educational Research, 26(1), 46-55.
- Harap, H., & Bayne, A. (1932b). A critical survey of public school courses of study published 1929 to 1931. Journal of Educational Research, 26(2), 81-109.
- Harden, F. (1919). A plea for greater democracy in our public schools. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 390-392). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Harris, M. (1919a). Teacher participation in school administration. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 189-191). Washington, DC: National Education association.
- Harris, M. (1919b). Teacher participation in school administration. The American School Board Journal, 59(3), 30-31, 109.
- Harris, P. (1937). The curriculum and cultural change. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.
- Hart, A. (1892a). Reform in the grammar schools: An experiment at Cambridge, Mass. Educational Review, 4, 253-269.
- Hart, A. (1892b). The teacher as a professional expert. Journal of Education, 36(22), 365.

Hart, A. (1893). The teacher as a professional expert. The School Review, 1(1), 4-14.

Haskell, T. (1984). Introduction. In Thomas L. Haskell (Ed.). The authority of experts: Studies in history and theory (pp. ix-xxxix). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hatch, N. (1988). Introduction: The professions in a democratic culture. In Nathan O. Hatch (Ed.), The professions in American history (pp. 1-13). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Heaton, K. (1937). State curriculum programs for 1936-37. Curriculum Journal, 8(2), 42-48.

Henry, E., Reid, C., Sparhawk, B., & Wagner, G. (1939). Cooperative planning of a Denver core course. California Journal of Secondary Education, 14(7), 434-437.

Herron, S. (1920). The part the teacher should play in the administration of the school system. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 96-97). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Heslep, R. (1997). Philosophical thinking in educational practice. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Hopkins, L. T. (1931). Curriculum principles and practices. Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company.

Hopkins, L. T. (1932). Curriculum making in a child-centered school. Educational Method, 11(7), 410-414.

Hopkins, L. T. (1941). Interaction: The democratic process. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.

Hoose, J. (1882). The system versus the teacher. Education, 3(1), 28-32.

Horn, E. (1923). Who shall make the course of study and how? Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-first annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Oakland-San Francisco, California (pp. 971-974). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Hughes, P. (1913). The place of the elementary teacher in the administration of the school. Proceedings of the New York State Teachers' Association, sixty-seventh annual

meeting (pp. 155-158). New York: State Teachers' Association.

Hunter, F. (1918a). Discussion: Leadership as found today in instruction in interpreting the curriculum. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-sixth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (pp. 620-623). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Hunter, F. (1918b). The superintendent as a leader in interpreting the curriculum. Educational Administration and Supervision, 4(5), 271-280.

Hunter, F. (1925). Teacher participation in the determination of administrative policies. School and Society, 22(570), 665-671.

Jackman, W. (1906). Editorial notes. The Elementary School Teacher, 6(5), 265-274.

Jacobson, J. (1924). Machinery and organization for devising, revising, and supervising the curriculum- The classroom teacher's viewpoint. The Elementary School Curriculum, Second Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (pp. 62-67). Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Johnson, F. (1925). The administration and supervision of the high school. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Johnson, H. (1937). The Oregon plan of curriculum development. Curriculum Journal, 8(1), 20-22.

Joint Committee on Curriculum. (1937). The changing curriculum. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Jones, R. (1937). An evaluation of the Arkansas curriculum program to date. Curriculum Journal, 8(1), 22-23.

Judd, C., Ballou, F., McAndrew, W., Spaulding, F., & Withers, J. (1926). Fundamental considerations in curriculum building. The Nation at Work on the Public School Curriculum, Third Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (pp. 6-18). Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Kandel, I. (1932). Teaching- A trade or a profession? Educational Method, 11(7), 385-390.

Kilpatrick, W. (1918). The project method. Teachers College Record, 19(4), 319-335.

Kilpatrick, W. (1936). Remaking the curriculum. New York: Newson & Company.

Kimball, B. (1992). The "true professional ideal" in America: A history. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Kinley, D. (1906). Democracy in education. The Elementary School Teacher, 6(8), 377-397.

Kliebard, H. (1968). The curriculum field in retrospect. In P. W. F. Witt (Ed.). Technology and the Curriculum (pp. 69-84). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kliebard, H. & Franklin, B. (1983). The course of the course of study: History of curriculum. In John H. Best (Ed.). Historical inquiry in education: A research agenda (pp. 138-157). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Kliebard, H. (1988). Fads, fashions, and rituals: The instability of curriculum change. In Laurel Tanner (Ed.). Critical issues in curriculum. Eighty-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (pp. 16-34). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Kliebard, H. (1995). The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893 - 1958 (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Knapp, T. (1919). Practicing democracy in school administration. Educational Administration and Supervision, 5(10), 463-474.

Knudson, C. (1937). Enlisting the high-school teacher's interest in curriculum revision. Curriculum Journal, 8(1), 7-12.

Koons, C. (1920). Supervision of teachers: Viewpoint of the teacher. The Pennsylvania School Journal, 68(10), 438-440.

Kyte, G. (1923). The cooperative development of a course of study. Educational Administration and Supervision, 9(9), 517-536.

Kyte, G. (1936). Watch teachers grow. The Nation's Schools, 18(4), 22-24.

Lamoreaux, L. (1937). Concepts of curriculum construction. Curriculum Journal, 8(6), 266-267.

Lane, A. (1902). Teachers should have a voice in school matters. Journal of Education, 60(14), 216.

Leithwood, K., Menzies, T., & Jantzi, D. (1994). Earning teachers' commitment to curriculum reform. Peabody Journal of Education, 69(4), 38-61.

Leonard, J. (1935). Teacher participation in recent state curriculum programs. Journal of Educational Research, 29(2), 117-125.

Levin, N. (1938). Curriculum revision as in-service training in Baltimore. Curriculum Journal, 9(1), 31-32.

Lide, E. (1932a). Plans for curriculum-making in secondary schools. The School Review, 40(10), 751-759.

Lide, E. (1932b). Procedures in curriculum making (National Survey of Secondary Education Monograph 19). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization: Its management and value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Linder, I. (1938). Twelve basic questions on curriculum construction. The American School Board Journal, 96(3), 27-29.

Logan, A. (1924). The Cincinnati Program of Curriculum Revision. Department of Superintendence Second Yearbook: The Elementary School Curriculum (pp. 121-125). Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Longshore, W. (1925). Teacher participation in the determination of policies from the viewpoint of the principal. Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-third annual meeting of the National Education Association, June 28-July 3, 1925 (pp. 107-110). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Lortie, D. (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization (pp. 1-52). New York: The Free Press.

Lull, H. (1923). Teacher-training in curriculum making. Educational Administration and Supervision, 9(5), 290-303.

Lull, H. (1925). Teacher-training in curriculum building. Educational Administration and Supervision, 11(7), 452-464.

MacDonald, D. (1921). Democracy in school administration-- Some fundamental principles. The American School Board Journal, 63(3), 31-33, 119.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R., & Kranz, J. (1990). Site-based management: Unfulfilled promises. The School Administrator, 47(2), 30, 32, 53-56, 59.

Marius, R. (1995). A short guide to writing about history. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Matzen, J., & Knapp, R. (1938). Teacher participation in school administration. The American School Board Journal, 97(4), 27-28, 87.

Maxey, E. (1932). Teacher participation in secondary school administration. The Clearing House, 6(2), 400-404.

Mayhew, K., & Edwards, A. (1936). The Dewey school. New York: Appleton-Century.

McCall, W. (1939). Progress of curriculum development in Alabama. Curriculum Journal, 10(1), 29-31.

McMurry, C. (1906). Courses of Study in the Eight Grades. New York: Macmillan Company.

McMurry, C. (1915). Principles underlying the making of school curricula. Teachers College Record, 16(4), 307-316.

McMurry, F. (1913). The uniform minimum curriculum with uniform examinations. Journal of proceedings and addresses of the fifty-first annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Salt Lake City, Utah, July 5-11, 1913 (pp. 131-148). Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association.

McMurry, F. Changes in curriculum making. Pennsylvania School Journal, 70(7), 251.

McSkimmon, M. (1926). Teacher participation from the viewpoint of the principal. Bulletin of the department of elementary school principals, 5(2), 71-75.

McSwain, E. (1938). The school and democratic living. In Stuart A. Curtis, Eldridge T. McSwain, and Nellie C. Morrison (Eds.). Cooperation: Principles and practices, eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (pp. 69-80). Washington, DC: Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association.

Miel, A. (1938). Teachers in the cooperative development of instructional programs. Educational Method, 17(7), 342-348.

Minor, R. (1922). Making the course of study. The Elementary School Journal, 22(9), 655-664.

Misner, J. (1938). The place of cooperation in the development of instruction. Educational Method, 27(5), 329-334.

Misner, J. (1939). Curriculum building as group thinking. Curriculum Journal, 10(2), 55-59.

Moore, E. (1925). Introduction. In Ernest C. Moore (Ed.). Minimum course of study. Reports of committees on minimum essentials in elementary education (pp. v-vii). New York: The Macmillan Company.

Morrow, P. (1938). Progress of Georgia curriculum program. Curriculum Journal, 9(5), 218-221.

Moser, W. (1939). Do teachers help run the school? The nation's Schools, 23(1), 50-52.

Myers, A., Kifer, L., Merry, R., & Foley, F. (1938). Cooperative supervision in the public schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

National Governors' Association. (1986). A time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

National Society for the Study of Education. (1926). The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction, Part I: Curriculum-making past and present. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.

Neubauer, D. (1939). The curriculum approach to supervision. Curriculum Journal, 10(3), 132-133.

Newlon, J. (1917). The need of a scientific curriculum policy for junior and senior high schools. Educational Administration and Supervision, 3(5), 253-268.

Newlon, J. (1924). Review of Superintendent Wilson's paper. Department of Superintendence Second Yearbook: The Elementary School Curriculum (pp. 47-49). Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Newlon, J. & Threlkeld, A. (1926). The Denver curriculum-revision program. In Guy Montrose Whipple (Ed.), The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction. Part I curriculum-making: Past and present (pp. 229-240). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.

Newlon, J. (1929). John Dewey's influence in the schools. School and Society, 30(778), 691-700.

Newlon, J. (1934). Educational administration as social policy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Nolan, J. & Francis, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In Carl D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition: 1992 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 44-60). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

North, L. (1915). Teachers as participators in school planning and school administration. Boston: School-Voters' League.

Norton, J. (1933). Curriculum construction and revision. In John C. Almack (Ed.), Modern school administration: Its problems and progress (pp. 157-185). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Norton, J., & Norton, M. (1936). Foundations of curriculum building. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Ortman, E. (1921). Teacher councils. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-ninth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Des Moines, Iowa (pp. 293-301). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Osburn, B. (1936). Criteria of curriculum construction. Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, 25(8), 229-231.

Otto, H. (1934). Elementary school organization and administration. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Overn, A. (1935). The teacher in modern education: A guide to professional and administrative responsibilities. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Pajak, E. (1993). Change and continuity in supervision and leadership. In Gordon Cawelti (Ed.), Challenges and achievements of American education: 1993 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 158-186). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Palmer, J. (1919). The importance of the teacher in the school organization. The Elementary School Journal, 19(7), 541-544.

Paris, C. (1993). Teacher agency and curriculum making in classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.

Parker, F. (1894). Improvement of the teachers. Journal of Education, 39(10), 147-148.

Parker, J. (1936). Organization of a city school system for effective curriculum development. Curriculum Journal, 7(6), 8-15.

Participation of teachers in educational policies. (1909). School Board Journal, 39(6), 4, 30.

Patridge, L. (1883). Notes of talks on teaching. New York: E. L. Kellogg and Company.

Payne, W. (1882). The aspects of the teaching profession. Education, 2(4), 327-338.

Perry, A. (1912). Outlines of school administration. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Peltier, G. (1965). Jesse H. Newlon as Superintendent of the Denver Public Schools, 1920-1927. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, Colorado.

Peterson, A. (1925). Teacher participation in the determination of policies from the viewpoint of the classroom teacher. Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-third annual meeting of the National Education Association, June 28-July 3, 1925 (pp. 93-98). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Pickard, J. (1890). School supervision. New York: D. Appleton and Co.

Pinar, W. (1995). Understanding curriculum. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Pinar, W. (1978). Notes on the curriculum field. Educational Researcher, 7(8), 5-12.

Philadelphia: The new course of study. (1878). New-England Journal of Education, 7(12), 85.

Proctor, W. (1927, June). Curriculum revision in San Francisco secondary schools. California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 2, 297-301.

Rankin, P. (1937). Planning for curriculum development. Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-third annual meeting of the National Education Association, June 27-July 1, 1937 (pp. 569-571). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Reeder, W. (1936). The fundamentals of public school administration. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Reinoehl, C. (1938). Teacher participation in school administration. The National Elementary Principal, 18(2), 69-74.

Reynolds, E. (1920). Democracy in education. The American Teacher, 9(8), 178-181.

Rice, G. (1920). More democracy for teachers. School and Society, 10(269), 230-231.

Richmond, K. (1919). The curriculum. London: Constable & Company LTD.

Riley: Don't send out teachers unprepared. (2000, January 9). The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. A6.

Roberts, A., & Draper, E. (1927). The high-school principal as administrator, supervisor, and director of extra-curricular activities. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.

Rockwell, I. (1920). The limitations of teaching as a profession. School and Society, 12(305), 408-409.

Rogers, M. (1937). The Louisiana program of curriculum development. Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-third annual meeting of the National Education Association, June 27-July 1, 1937 (pp. 287-288). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Rosow, J. & Zager, R. (1989). Allies in education. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Rucker, (1937). Guiding principles in curriculum-making. Curriculum Journal, 8(5), 215-216.

Rugg, H. (1926). The school curriculum, 1825-1890. In Guy Montrose Whipple (Ed.), The twentieth-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction (pp. 17-33). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.

Rugg, E. (1937). Experience in curriculum making. Curriculum Journal, 8(5), 205-208.

Rugh, C. (1927, April). Curriculum construction and reconstruction in the University High School, Oakland. California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 2, 225-232.

Salisbury, E. (1920). The construction of a course of study. Educational Administration and Supervision, 6(7), 381-387.

School Board Journal. (1918). School administration and teachers. School and Society, 8(208), 740-741.

Schubert, W. (1980). Curriculum books: The first eighty years. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Sears, J. (1921). Teacher participation in public school administration. The American School Board Journal, 43(4), 29-32, 113-114.

Sears, J. (1933). The function of research in curriculum making. California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 8(2), 147-153.

Seguel, M. L. (1966). The curriculum field: Its formative years. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sipple, E. (1926). A unit-activities curriculum in the public schools of Burlington, Iowa. In Guy Montrose Whipple (Ed.), The twenty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction, Part I, Curriculum-making: Past and present (pp. 207-217). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.

Sizer, T. (1992). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co.

Skinner, J. (1920). The place of the classroom teacher in the administration of school affairs. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 95-96). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Slattery, P. (1995). Curriculum development in the postmodern era. New York: Garland Publishing.

Smith, S., & Speer, R. (1938). Supervision in the elementary school. New York: The Cordon Company.

Snedden, D. (1910). Centralized vs. localized administration of public education. Education, 30(9), 537-549.

Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In Philip W. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 402-435). New York: Macmillan.

Spaulding, F. (1918). Co-operation in school administration. The School Review, 26(8), 561-575.

Spears, H. (1937). Experiences in building a curriculum. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Spears, H. (1940). The emerging high-school curriculum and its direction. New York: American Book Company.

Spinning, J. (1938). Administration without portfolio. The Nation's Schools, 22(5), 26-28.

Stillman, C. (1920). Democracy in the management of the schools. The American Teacher, 9(3), 63-65.

Stillman, C. (1920). Democracy in the management of the schools. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 178-179). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Strayer, G. (1937). Why teacher participation in school administration? Teachers College Record, 38(6), 457-464.

Stretch, L. (1938). Curriculum making at Waco, Texas. Curriculum Journal, 9(2), 75-77.

Subcommittee of the School Management Committee of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. (1907). Plan for official advisory organization of the teaching force of Chicago. The Elementary School Teacher, 7(6), 305-310.

Sub-committee of the School Management Committee of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. (1907). Plan for official advisory organization of the teaching force of Chicago. Chicago Teachers' Federation Bulletin, 6(6), 1-3.

Sullivan, L. (1975). Urban school decentralization and curriculum development: Views and implications. In I. Staples (Ed.), Impact of decentralization on curriculum: Selected viewpoints (pp. 14-17). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Suzzallo, H. (1913). The reorganization of the teaching profession. Journal of proceedings and addresses of the fifty-first annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Salt Lake City, Utah, July 5-11, 1913 (pp. 362-379). Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association.

Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1995). Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tanner, L. (1997). Dewey's Laboratory School: Lessons for Today. New York: Teachers College Press.

Tanner, L. (1991). The meaning of curriculum in Dewey's Laboratory School. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 23(2), 101-117.

Taylor, J. (1836a). Teaching made a profession. No. 1. Common School Assistant, 1(6).

Taylor, J. (1836b). Teaching made a profession. No. 2. Common School Assistant, 1(7).

Thornburg, Z. (1918). Leadership as found today in instruction in interpreting the curriculum: In the superintendent. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-sixth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (pp. 618-620). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Threlkeld, A. (1925). Curriculum revision: How a particular city may attack the problem. The Elementary School Journal, 25(8), 573-582.

Tippett, J., Coffin, R., Barnes, E., Barry, M., Bliss, E., Bridge, E., Francis, T., Groggel, M., Hughes, A., Keelor, K., Kelly, M., Matthews, F., Porter, M., Sperry, H., & Wright, L. (1927). Curriculum making in an elementary school. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Tippett, J. (1936). Schools for a growing democracy. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Tireman, L. (1937). The New Mexico program of curriculum development. Curriculum Journal, 8(2), 65-66.

Trillingham, C. (1934). The organization and administration of curriculum programs. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.

Tyler, R. (1939). Secondary curriculum improvements. Curriculum Journal, 10(2), 64-65.

Updegraff, H. (1917). Scientific management in educational administration. School Board Journal, 60 (5), 19-21, 83.

Updegraff, H. (1919). Administrative cooperation in the making of courses of study in elementary schools. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-seventh annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin (pp. 617-716). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Updegraff, H. (1921). Participation of teachers in school management. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-ninth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Des Moines, Iowa (pp. 284-293). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Updegraff, H. (1922). Report of the committee on participation of teachers in school management. Addresses and proceedings of the sixtieth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Boston, Massachusetts (pp. 404-408). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Walker, N. (1917a). Democracy in education after the war. The North Carolina High School Bulletin, 8(3), 109-111.

Walker, N. (1917b). Paternalism or democracy in education? The North Carolina High School Bulletin, 8(3), 111-112.

Walker, W. (1978). Education's new movement-privatism. Educational Leadership, 35(6), 472.

Washburne, C. (1935). What is progressive school administration? Progressive Education, 12(4), 219-223.

Webster's tenth new collegiate dictionary. (1998). Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Company.

Webster, E. (1928). The curriculum in the making. The Journal of Educational Method, 7(4), 159-165.

Wein, D. (1939). Countywide teacher participation in developing a science program. Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 18(6), 285-288.

Whitney, F. (1927). The growth of teachers in service: A manual for the inexperienced superintendent of schools. New York: The Century Co.

Willard, E. (1923). A project in curriculum-making. The Journal of Educational Method, 2(4), 207-217.

Willard, F. (1925). Teacher participation in the determination of policies from the viewpoint of the superintendent. Addresses and proceedings of the sixty-third annual meeting of the National Education Association, June 28-July 3, 1925 (pp. 110-114). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Williams, O. (1938). Experimentation in democratic cooperation in school administration. In Stuart A. Courtis, Eldridge T. McSwain, and Nellie C. Morrison (Eds.).

Cooperation: Principles and practices, eleventh yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (pp. 120-152). Washington, DC: Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association.

Willis, G., Schubert, W., Bullough, R., Kridel, C., and Holton, J. (Eds.). (1994). The American curriculum: A documentary history. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Wilson, H. (1920). The participation of the teaching staff in school administration. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 176-178). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Wilson, H. (1923). Machinery and organization for devising, revising, and supervising the curriculum- The administrator's viewpoint. Department of Superintendence Second Yearbook: The Elementary School Curriculum (pp. 37-45). Washington, DC: The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Wilson, M. (1927). The curriculum revision program in the Long Beach City schools. California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 3(1), 55-93.

Windes, E. (1932). Trends in high school curriculum construction. Virginia Journal of Education, 25(9), 345-347.

Winn, A. (1920). The part the teacher should play in the administration of the school system. Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-eighth Meeting of the National Education Association, July 4-10, 1920 (pp. 97-98). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Winship, A. (1900). The finding of Colonel Parker. Journal of Education, 51(17), 259.

Wraga, W. (1998). 'Interesting, if true': Historical perspectives on the 'reconceptualization' of curriculum studies. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14(1), 5-28.

Yocum, D. (1917). Report on common characteristics of efficient courses of study. Addresses and proceedings of the fifty-fifth annual meeting of the National Education Association held at Portland, Oregon, July 7-14, 1917 (pp. 213-219). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Young, E. (1901). Isolation in the school. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zeller, D. (1938). A state program of curriculum making. The North Central Association Quarterly, 12(3), 351-355.

Zeller, D. (1939). The Kansas program for the improvement of instruction. Curriculum Journal, 10(4), 164-167.

Zumwalt, K. (1988). Are we improving or undermining teaching? In Laurel N. Tanner (Ed.). Critical Issues in Curriculum: Eighty-seven Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (pp. 148-174). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.