COMMUNITY ASPECTS

OF

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

by

David C. Tickner

B.A., University of Saskatchewan, 1969

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

in the Faculty

of

Education

David C. Tickner 1984

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

June 1984

APPROVAL

Name: David C. Tickner

Degree: Master of Arts (Education)

Title of Thesis: Community Aspects of Curriculum Development

Examining Committee

  Chairperson: R. W. Marx

J. Wyatt
Senior Supervisor

D. Common
Associate Professor

K. Toohey
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University
External Examiner

Date approved *06/06/84*

ii

Traditional approaches to curriculum development often result in the failure or substantial modification of curriculum innovations. The literature indicates that, in many cases, developers have not adequately considered an innovation's relationship to factors beyond the classroom (e.g., faculty development, political priorities, capital costs, and student employability). This thesis examines the problems which occur when developers do not adequately consider these factors in their thinking about curriculum. These problems are methodological. Their roots lie in the ways by which curriculum workers frequently approach the creation of the settings in which curriculum development is conducted.

This study examines the literature of community development in order to explore ways by which this field, directly concerned with the creation of settings, can inform and enable curriculum development. Two questions are asked: What general trends are revealed in these two fields? And, what does a comparison of these trends reveal? The major finding is that the intentional creation of the setting for curriculum development is a method by which current problematic aspects of development may be resolved. Drawing from the literature of community development, a setting is defined in terms of its environmental, human, and contextual aspects.

The literature of community development methodology indicates that the issues involved in setting-creation must be considered simultaneously and in relationship to one another (i.e. dialectically). The name given this dialectic approach is 'human development'. Five emergent themes recur and are proposed as foundational to the creation of any setting: i) all people affected must be involved or represented; ii) all issues and aspects of the situation must be considered; iii) problem-solving and decision-making processes are comprehensive, integrated, and systematic; iv) the process is marked by collaboration and deliberation; and v) motivating factors of symbol and vision are key. This methodology reflects a shift from more sequential research, development, and diffusion approaches.

The implications of these community aspects of curriculum development are discussed in terms of the curriculum development setting. Curriculum developers, when creating settings, will be primarily concerned with the building of a development community and of a development context. Aspects of community-building are discussed in terms of guilds and networks. Aspects of context-building are first defined and identified, then discussed in terms of how context is negotiated and sustained. The steps of one method of creating settings are outlined.

The thesis concludes by discussing setting-creation as a method for enabling new ways of thinking about curriculum and for sustaining development processes. In particular, the conclusion focuses upon the applications of this method in the community college system.

For

Raymonde, Mark and Kiran

"Culture is the driving force behind development."

UNESCO, 1983

"With its diffuse and all-embracing reality, of which we are sometimes as little aware of as the air we breathe, society wraps us round, penetrates and directs our entire lives".

Braudel, 1982

"The only way to understand the excitement, joy, and willingness to commit one's life totally to intentional community . . . is to recognize that one is tapping the dimension of transcendence in modern life. Where others despair, one sees visions of an awakened society--and feels as a co-participant in the awakening."

Boulding, 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank the following for their encouragement and support.

- The Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) for eight years of community and human development experience.

- Vancouver Community College for six years of curriculum and faculty development experience.

- Dr. Dianne Common for introducing me to the theory and practice of curriculum implementation, and for setting me upon the personal and professional odyssey which writing this thesis has been.

- Dr. June Wyatt for her guidance, enthusiasm and time.

- Dr. Kelleen Toohey for her forthright constructive criticism and suggestions.

CHAPTER ONE

THE NEED FOR INTENTIONAL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT SETTINGS

Introduction: definitions and purposes

The term curriculum means different things to different people. The curriculum literature reveals many definitions and uses of the term as it is applied in specific situations for particular purposes and needs. For example, in some cases curriculum is a document (Beauchamp, 1975), and in other cases, curriculum is a field of study (Zais, 1976). More generally, curriculum has been described as a concern for both what is to be learned and how such learning will be enabled (Egan, 1978). While such diverse meanings illustrate the wide range of current curricular theorizing and activity, the term curriculum will refer in this thesis to outlines of what is to be learned and encompasses elements such as learning goals, objectives, and tasks, resource materials, and evaluation instruments. Unruh (1975) defines curriculum as "a plan for achieving intended learning outcomes" (p. 76). The term curriculum can also encompass descriptions of teaching activities. The general perspective from which these conceptions of curriculum will be discussed in this thesis is that of post-secondary adult education in the community college system.

The literature reveals many different approaches to the development of curriculum. Developing a curriculum can mean improving existing elements or activities of teaching and learning, adding new elements to an existing curriculum, or constructing something new. For

1

example, developers of curriculum for vocational-technical programs offered in community colleges often use adaptations of the Tyler model. In this model, four major tasks serve as the focus for curriculum construction (Tyler, 1949):

i)   Select and define learning objectives
ii)   Select and create learning experiences
iii) Organize learning experiences
iv)   Evaluate curriculum as a basis for revision and
      improvement

More generally, Unruh (1975) discusses these curriculum development tasks in terms of the "contextual factors" (p. 83) which also must be considered. She defines curriculum development as the process of assessing needs, identifying learning outcomes, planning instructional alternatives, and "using the cultural, social and personal interests that the curriculum is to serve" (p. 76).

The term curriculum innovation is used to identify the product of such a process. Once such an innovation has been developed, it is then adopted and implemented; that is, it begins to be used in a particular educational setting. One model of curriculum development describes these stages as curriculum development, curriculum adoption, and curriculum implementation[1] (Common, 1978). This model reflects the current and widely practiced view that adoption and implementation issues are resolved during the transition between a curriculum innovation's development and its 'accepted' use. While such a model names the different processes which occur between the initiation and the completion of a curriculum project, there are indications that curriculum development can not simply be considered in this linear and mechanistic

way. Even though the processes can be identified in discrete components for the purposes of a timeline or flow chart, the specific issues and complex tasks which are addressed within each of the processes are not as easily discerned or categorized.

Increasingly, problems related to the development, adoption, and implementation of curriculum innovations are reported in the literature (Anderson, 1979; Aoki, 1977; Bowman et al, 1980; Boyd, 1979; Bussis et al 1976; Common, 1978; Connelly et al, 1980 Churchman, 1979; Doyle and Ponder, 1977; Fowler, 1980; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Fullan, 1979; Jackson, 1974; Kritek, 1976; Leithwood and Russell, 1973; Leithwood et al, 1979; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1980; McNeil, 1977; OECD, 1975; Tornatzky et al, 1980; Werner, 1979). These studies indicate that innovations generally fail and are abandoned by instructors and schools, or that innovations are adopted, but so substantially modified as to nullify the developers' original intentions.

Attempts to implement an innovation often fail because developers have not adequately considered an innovation's relationship to factors beyond the classroom (e.g., faculty development, political priorities, capital costs, and student employability). For example, when developers and administrators do not share a common understanding of the costs, not only of classroom applications of the innovation, but of adopting and implementing the innovation in the school, then conflicts about the use of resources occur.

Also, innovations fail when they are substantially modified or ignored by instructors. Instructors generally tailor an innovation to suit their various teaching styles and their students' learning styles.

The modification of innovations by instructors has two outcomes. A poorly constructed innovation can sometimes be improved or a well-constructed innovation will have less of an influence in the classroom. In either case, the degree to which an innovation can be considered a success is contingent upon the degree to which the learners can be said to have learned what was intended to be learned. The literature suggests that such curriculum failure and modification increases instructor frustration and resistance to change.

Developers respond to these problems in a number of ways. The literature reflects tendencies to emphasize either the development task (e.g., increase the quality and quantity of curriculum objectives)[2] or the development process (e.g., de-centralize or centralize curriculum decision-making)[3]. Developers tend to over-emphasize the rational, the mechanistic, or the systematic[4], using descriptors such as trouble-shooting, skill inventory, skill profile, problem-solving[5], and so on. Common describes this over-emphasis in terms of the mistaken assumption that rationality in curriculum-making can be contained only within limited "scientific-technological metaphors" (1982).

I would suggest that the major unresolved issue underlying these problems is that developers and other stakeholders (i.e, instructors, administrators, bureaucrats, etc.) do not usually have the opportunity to adequately consider and articulate their common understanding of the curricular goals and tasks, and of curriculum development processes (Aoki, 1977; Botkin et al, 1979; Huebner, 1975c; Pinar, 1975; Schwab, 1983). This issue is methodological. It is not in

the first instance a concern for the curriculum product or innovation. Rather, it is a concern for how stakeholders arrange their environment and their relationships with each other. The fundamental assumption of this concern is that curriculum development is a collaborative and deliberative activity which must involve all stakeholders in order that the problems of curriculum adoption and implementation can be anticipated and solved as they occur. This methodological concern represents a dialectic approach to development which is a shift away from more sequential research, development, and diffusion (R,D, & D) approaches.[6]

One indication of this shift is the involvement of teachers in the development of their own curriculum; that is, school-based curriculum development. Skilbeck (1975) describes the involvement and responsibilities of such teachers.

> "The phenomenon of school-based curriculum development is that of greater teacher freedom and autonomy, of dissatisfaction with imposed curricula . . . of support systems which presuppose and facilitate teacher-curriculum development, and of courses . . . which encourage teachers to think critically and creatively about the curriculum . . . In simplest terms, school-based curriculum development claims that . . . the school-teacher should have the primary responsibility for determining curriculum content" (Skilbeck, 1975, p. 91).

Schwab (1983), writing from a similar perspective, stipulates the following conception of the term curriculum:

> "Curriculum is what is successfully conveyed to differing degrees to different students, by committed teachers using appropriate materials and actions, of legitimated bodies of knowledge, skill, taste, and propensity to act and react, which were chosen for instruction after serious reflection and communal decision by representatives of those involved in the teaching of a specified group of students who are known to the decisionmakers" (p. 240)

However, while the literature points to this dialectic approach as a way of addressing development problems, it does not adequately indicate how this approach will be given structure and form in schools.

The intent of this thesis is to explore this dialectic approach to curriculum development in greater detail and to provide curriculum workers with some insights as to how structure and form can be given to such an approach. Deliberation and collaboration do not exist in a vacuum--they exist in specific settings. Such settings are located in time and space--they contain people engaged in thought and action. The intentional conceptualization and creation of settings is required if curriculum workers are to work toward new understandings of the relationships between task and process issues in the development, adoption, and implementation of curriculum. The task for curriculum workers is two-fold: it involves creating a setting, and at the same time, it involves building and sustaining a common mind or consensus among the stakeholders.

A setting is defined as "any situation in which two or more people come together in new relationships over a sustained period of time in order to achieve certain goals" (Sarason, 1974, p.1). For Sarason, a setting is any relationship from a marriage to a revolution. In this thesis, the setting for curriculum development will be described in terms of environment, human relationships, and context.

Intentionally creating settings means that all stakeholders consciously create and manage their working environment, their time, and their relationships. These activities imply the simultaneous

building of consensus and a common mind. Consensus, in this case, refers particularly to a decision-making process. The term common mind refers to the more general shared aspects of the setting, such as common operating procedures and habits, common memory (i.e. stories told about incidents or events which all know despite the fact that some people may not have experienced the incident or event), common goals, and so on. The term context, or common context, will be used to describe the integration and weaving together of these environmental, relational, and consensual aspects of the setting. A common context is created when developers intentionally reflect upon the activity of setting-creation; i.e., the activity of creating environments, relationship, and a common mind. Setting-creation and context-building will be considered in terms of how together they represent a new paradigm for development. The meaning and significance of a setting is not only that it enables curriculum development efforts, but that it represents an effective model by which people can act and reflect together to accomplish any task.

The task of creating settings encompasses many concerns for curriculum workers: balancing product and process issues (e.g., Connelly, 1972), considering consciousness, intuition, and rationality within a framework of action and reflection (e.g. Common, 1982; Freire, 1970; Green, 1975; Kolb, 1981), emphasizing innovative or maintenance learning (Botkin et al, 1979), constructing a responsive context for curriculum development encompassing the political and economic aspects of curriculum issues (Unruh, 1975), and others. These concerns have begun to be conceptualized in relation to traditional curriculum concerns (Pinar, 1975). Terms such as praxis and transformation (Freire,

1970) or <u>currere</u> and pilgrimage (Pinar, 1975) are used to name such new conceptualizations of curriculum theory and practice. Perhaps most importantly, these conceptualizations point to curriculum development not simply as a technical activity, but as a "hope-filled" activity (Freire, 1970).

Curriculum workers must also concern themselves with the trends and directions of the society of which they are a part. This interdependence does not necessarily mean becoming subservient to the dominant institutions of society, nor does it necessarily mean acting in confrontation with dominant societal institutions. Rather, a balance and a collaboration is implied between institutions of schooling and other institutions of society (Benne, 1976a; Schindler-Rainman, 1975). Just as individuals shape the world and the world shapes individuals, so too do societies shape schools and schools shape societies. In a recent study of organization development in schools (Fullan <u>et al</u>, 1981), the authors conclude that strategies must be found for managing change imposed on schools by "turbulent urban school districts" (p. 31). For curriculum workers, this means finding strategies for managing the curricular changes generated by social change (e.g. computer-assisted education) as well as for managing changes which are called for by the education community (e.g. competency-based education).

The problem of creating settings

The problem of creating settings includes i) ensuring that the new setting is not simply an old setting in disguise, ii) ensuring activities to promote reflection upon setting-creation, and iii)

addressing concerns for objectivity and subjectivity in curriculum development and setting-creation.

First, a setting for curriculum development can be compared to a classroom setting. A classroom is a setting for learning and teaching. A traditional classroom can be described in environmental terms; for example, the lighting, the decor, and the orderly arrangement of desks in rows. The same classroom can also be described in relational terms; for example, the daily routines (opening rituals, how attendance is recorded, etc.), the ways of acquiring supplies, and the instructor's "practical knowledge" (Elbaz, 1981). The setting will predispose the unreflective instructor to think and act in the classroom in certain ways; for example, when it is possible to do otherwise, many instructors will still use a classroom 'as is' rather than re-arrange the decor and furniture to suit different instructional or learning tasks.

The curriculum development setting can be described in similar ways. The nature of the setting and the way by which the setting is created will inform the way by which the curriculum workers involved will think about and act upon curriculum development problems and solutions. Not just any setting will do. A new 'old setting' may reinforce and contain the seeds of the problem that the curriculum project is meant to resolve (Sarason, 1971, 1974). In order to approach creating a new setting, a unique environment, intentional relationships, and a new, or renewed, context which motivates change are required. Sarason has described this problem: "the ways in which we have been accustomed to thinking about what it was that needed change [have] prevented us from recognizing that which we did not know but needed to

know" (1971, p. 229). Later, in another work, Sarason states:

"Those who create settings always want to do something new, usually are unaware that they are armed with, and will subsequently be disarmed by, categories of thought which help produce the conditions the new setting hopes to remedy" (1974, p. xiii).

This problem has also been noted by Kritek (1976) who states

"Although the program initially set out to avoid the mistakes of traditional community action programs, it eventually began to resemble what it tried to avoid" (p. 93).

Second, Sarason et al (1971) examining the problem of creating settings, suggest that people generally do not reflect upon how they think and act as they begin developing a setting. Sarason et al describe the lack of preparation with which most people approach the complexities of development. These authors recognize that "an appreciation of the problem of the creation of a setting . . . could be gained only by engaging in the world of action", yet emphasize that the real problem lies in "the haphazard, unreflective way in which people generally engage in the creation of their settings" (1971, p.2).

For curriculum workers, the problems of thinking about and creating complex settings cannot be solved by 'head on' or by 'sequential' approaches. The problems cannot be solved simply by thinking nor simply by 'muddling through'--that is, jumping into action in the hope that solutions will somehow emerge from the chaos. The curriculum worker can neither engage in the problems of creating a setting for development without self-conscious critical reflection upon this engagement, nor can the curriculum worker simply and naively attempt to think through all aspects of the project before actually engaging in

development. Engagement and reflection are integrally related to one another (Freire, 1970). Similarily, Sarason suggests that "evolving <u>a way of thinking about</u> creating a setting" can only occur in the midst of "creating the setting" (1971, p. 5).

Third, curriculum theorists have begun to question the notion of individual objectivity and to explore means by which concerns for objectivity and subjectivity may be addressed. For example, Macdonald (1975b), citing Myrdal[7], suggests that the "student of curriculum" must find ways to "liberate himself from three pervasive influences" (1975b, p. 283): i) the powerful heritage of earlier writing in his field of inquiry, ii) the influences of the entire cultural, social, economic, and political milieu of the society where he lives, and iii) the influence stemming from his own personality. Macdonald concludes:

> "We approach the world or mediate reality through fundamental perceptual structures. Thus, the implication that it is possible to deal with curriculum as a purely objective descriptive phenomenon is apparently a naive wish" (1975b, p. 284).

What is required, however, is not simply the recognition that objectivity is a naive wish nor that the justification of curriculum decisions based on the factors of tradition, environment, and personality reflects the value commitments of the curriculum worker. Rather, the situation of individual subjective perception of the world and of individual subjective values regarding curriculum decisions becomes problematic when curriculum workers operating together in a setting become aware of the "fundamental realization that we are all not working out of the same

basic structures (or metaphors if you wish) and that it is not sufficient simply to reason together for everything to become clarified and agreeable" (Macdonald, 1975b, p.285)[8]. For example, even though Sarason (1974) has suggested that the "first basic problem" (p. 6) facing developers creating settings is the need for a discussion of values, "consensus about values does not instruct one in how to create settings consistent with these values" (p. 20). The stakeholders in a curriculum development project will bring a wealth of varied experience and insight to the setting. This variety and diversity will likely predominate during the initial stages of creating the setting and will be on-going within the life of the setting. How then, in the midst of such diversity, do developers determine and form their common mind regarding their environment and relationships encompassing that which is both agreed and not agreed?

The problem here is neither the diverse nor the subjective nature of each individual's participation. Rather, the problem is to find ways by which the issues of environment and relationships can be described indicatively. One way of responding to this problem is the building of a common <u>context</u>. This contextual framework is the key factor in the effective creation of settings, yet it is often the most neglected factor. The contextual framework is not simply the result of developers linking their subjective perceptions and intentions together like a chain. Nor does the contextual framework claim to reflect what the group perceives as an objective statement of their combined perceptions. Rather, the context is indicative of the development group's values, intentions, and actions.[9] Context literally means

"that which is braided together ... things only make sense in relation toother things" (Ferguson, 1980, p. 303). The common sense or the "shared meaning" (Yankelovich, 1981, p. 12; citing Geertz[10]) which comprises a contextual framework is articulated by and for the development stake- holders in their processes of reflection upon the environmental, relational, and consensual aspects of their setting. In turn, such a context can provide a motivating and sustaining framework for subsequent development activity.

This conception of development as <u>praxis</u>--action and reflection--suggests that curriculum workers must create and sustain a setting which reflects their common interpretation and understanding of reality; i.e., of the world and of the human condition. Developers must also create and sustain a setting which enables them to make decisions in the midst of societal complexity, in the midst of conflicting points of view, and in the midst of increasing amounts of information to be processed.

Methodology and thesis overview

Earlier in this chapter, I suggested that the curriculum literature, while identifying deliberative and collaborative school-based curriculum development as a means of overcoming problems of curriculum failure, does not adequately indicate how this dialectic approach will be given structure and form in schools. I subsequently proposed that the intentional creation of settings for curriculum development is one method for creating such structure and form, and described some problems to be addressed when creating such settings.

My rationale for such a proposal is grounded in my experience in community development activity. Creating local community settings is the primary task of community developers. In addition to creating settings, community developers have also needed to address the issue of creating the common context (shared meaning) among the participants of the setting. The methodologies which exist in community development to create a common context are related to the development of a community mind, a community spirit, and a sense of commitment to the community. Perhaps the juxtaposition of such context-building methodologies from community development activities can enable future curriculum development activity. Therefore, the subsequent chapters of this thesis involve a review and a comparison of the literature of curriculum and community development; in particular, the ways of thinking about and doing curriculum development in groups, and the ways by which community development practice informs the creation of settings and the building of context.

Chapter Two outlines the ways in which curriculum workers have approached curriculum theorizing and development over the last fifty years. This discussion will trace the shifts in emphasis from curriculum product and process concerns to the concerns for method outlined in Chapter One. The literature describes these shifts in terms of the development of traditionalist, conceptual-empiricist and reconceptualist approaches to curriculum theorizing, and in terms of systems, management, and open-access models of curriculum development. The creation of settings is proposed as one way to begin to synthesize current reconceptualist concerns for language, consciousness, temporality and

politics with the concerns for development described in terms of the practical and the eclectic.

Chapter Three defines and describes community development as the creation of settings. If it can be said that the development of settings has been an area of only marginal concern for curriculum developers, it can certainly be said that the development of settings has been the primary concern and task of community developers. Most recently, and perhaps of most importance to the curriculum developer, has been the use of collaborative and deliberative processes to create the community setting. Such processes are based upon creating structures which enable commitment and service.

In particular, Chapter Three traces the growth of community development from its roots in India and in Western social work and adult education to the current conceptions of community development as regional development, human development, and contextual development. The chapter explores the similarities and differences between current curriculum and community development problems and concerns. The focus of this exploration is the search for those ways by which aspects of community development can inform and enable current curriculum development efforts.

Chapter Four outlines three common elements of curriculum development settings: forming the curriculum development community or team, delineating the environmental, human, and contextual aspects of the setting, and building a common context among development workers. These elements are rooted in the insights which the field of community development brings to the curriculum development. In particular, the

chapter focuses upon creating a common context (i.e. creating a collaborative setting through the development of a common mind; in particular the negotiation of reality, the interpretation of meaning, and the replicability of methods).

Chapter Five describes the task of creating settings in terms of the images, values, and actions which curriculum workers bring to their development activities. Intentionally created settings are characterized by 'eventful' activity and by a style of leadership which serves and sustains the development team. Such eventfulness is described in terms of the team's growth through stages of awakenment, conscientization, and commitment. Such settings provide the forum by which curriculum adoption and implementation issues can be considered simultaneously with curriculum development product and process issues. One model for creating settings, drawn from community development experience, is outlined.

Chapter Six focuses upon curriculum development work in post-secondary education, particularly the community college system. First, curriculum developers who work in behalf of adult learners must consider their work both in terms of adult development and in terms of their interdependence with other institutions and individuals in the community. Second, curriculum developers must conceptualize their curriculum development activity in relation to organization development, but not necessarily as organization development which is an end in itself. In conclusion, new paradigms for curricular research and action are required as curriculum developers direct their attention to the creation of the curriculum development setting. In particular,

curriculum developers must find ways to sustain the commitment of the curriculum development community through the structures of the setting.

NOTES

[1] Curriculum development involves <u>writing</u> the plan of the intended educational program, curriculum adoption involves <u>deciding</u> to go ahead with the curriculum, and curriculum implementation involves <u>using</u> a curriculum within a school (Common, 1978, p. 18).

[2] For example, Bailey (1983) states: "Spelling out the basic academic competencies provides a way to tell students and teachers what is expected of them" (p. 22).

[3] For example, Connelly (1972) states that the oscillation between centralized and localized development are "symptomatic of the failure of curriculum development" (p. 162).

[4] For example, Zemke (1983) describes the need for objectives-based curriculum drawn from projected job descriptions.

[5] 'Problem-solving', used in this instance, is akin to 'tinkering' or 'band-aiding' such as illustrated in the rearranging of the proverbial deck chairs on the Titanic. Apple states that "We may have to face the fact squarely that 'realistic tinkering' may not suffice to make [some schools] effective educational settings" (1974, p. 99)

[6] "The most systematic conceptual categorization of processes related to educational innovation is that evolved first by Brickell (1961) and later by Clark and Guba (1965), under the headings "Research, Development, and Diffusion". This orientation is guided by at least five asumptions. First, it assumes that there should be a rational sequence in the evolution and application of an innovation. This sequence should include research, development, and packaging before mass dissemination takes place. Second, it assumes that there has to be planning, usually on a massive scale over a long time span. Third, it assumes that there has to be a division and coordination of labor to accord with the rational sequence and the planning. Fourth, it makes the assumption of a more-or-less passive but rational consumer who will accept and adopt the innovation if it is offered to him in the right place at the right time and in the right form. Fifth and finally, the proponents of this viewpoint are willing to accept the fact of high initial development cost prior to any dissemination activity because of the anticipated long-term benefits in efficiency and quality of the innovation and its suitability for mass audience dissemination" (Havelock, 1975, p. 161).

NOTES (continued)

7   Gunnar Myrdal, <u>Objectivity in Social Research</u> (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 3 - 4.

8   T.T. Aoki (1977) discusses the "possibility of the curriculum builder becoming conscious of the perspective which he himself takes for granted as he acts, and also of how his perspective gives shape to the program he designs" (p. 51)

9   While I make the distinction between indicative and objective, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to begin to address the philosophic arguments related to the notion of objectivity. The term indicative is used to distinguish between the articulated perceptions of the individual and of the group; that is, an individual may claim that certain assertions are objective or subjective statements whereas a group may more likely claim that its assertions represent what is indicative without attempting to justify them as objective or subjective. For example, the statement "Village 'x' residents wish their community .to be self-sufficient in rice production" would be indicative of how developers will approach these villagers and how together a plan for realizing this wish will be developed. In the first instance, it is not important whether the statement is one describing the objective situation or whether it is one describing the subjective wish of residents. What is important is that the statement is indicative of other similar statements comprising the common context (comprising other similar statements) or common mind out of which all plan and act.

10   C. Geertz, <u>The Interpretation of Cultures</u> (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 5.

This chapter outlines some major themes found in the curriculum literature. These themes illustrate the diversity which exists in such writing and provide a basis for beginning to explore curriculum in relation to its community aspects. The chapter concludes by suggesting that the creation of settings may be a way by which current problematic aspects of both curriculum theorizing and curriculum development may be synthesized and resolved.

Problematic aspects of curriculum theorizing

Pinar (1978) describes the evolution of curriculum theorizing in this century in terms of three "groups of curricularists" (p. 207) traditionalist, conceptual-empiricist, and reconceptualist[1].

The traditionalists emerged in the 1920's and are primarily concerned with the desire of school administrators to assist the school teacher with curriculum plans and materials. Curriculum, as described by Tyler (1978), reflects this theme.

> Curriculum is the term "used to include the plans for an educational program. The term 'curriculum development' theory will refer to developing the plans for an educational program, including the identification and selection of educational objectives, the selection of learning experiences, the organization of the learning experiences, and the evaluation of the educational program" (p. 239).

20

Wilson (1981) suggests that the outcome of this orientation to curriculum development is that the teacher's primary concern "becomes 'how to make what is taught interesting' rather than 'what is worthy of teaching?'" (p. 58). Other writers of the last thirty years considered part of this traditionalist stream include Taba, Saylor and Alexander, Tanner and Tanner, Neil, Zais, Fantini, Jordan, Simon, and Weinstein (Pinar, 1978, p. 207).

The conceptual-empiricists emerged in the late 1950's and early 1960's in the post-Sputnik concern for the quality of education in the United States.   This group is "steeped in the theory and practice of present-day social science" (Pinar, 1975, p. xii) more than the more school-oriented traditionalists.   Their approach reflects an emphasis upon materials and educational technology where curriculum means "materials rather than experiences that can be undergone as a consequence of interacting with those materials" (Gowin, 1981, p. 84).   In its extreme, this approach generated the production of so-called 'teacher-proof' materials.   Pinar identifies writers such as Posner, Walker, Westbury and McKinney, Beauchamp, Duncan and Frymier, Johnson, Lowe, and Short (Pinar, 1975 (p. xii), 1978) as conceptual empiricists.

The reconceptualist form began to develop in the late 1960's and was named as such in the mid-1970's.   Reconceptualization encompasses critical social theory, particularly in reaction to the scientific-technological emphasis of the traditionalist and conceptual-empiricist groups.   Reconceptualization also encompasses a post-critical dimension (Pinar, 1975, p. xiii) which describes the synthesis of diverse curriculum development groups and "fundamental

structural change in the culture" (Pinar, 1978, p. 210) which is given

curricular form on the other side of individual educators' reflections

upon their experiences of themselves and their world. In both cases, the

reconceptualist group represents a move from the objective "disinterested

service of building a body of knowledge" to more subjective and

"inescapably political as well as intellectual acts" (Pinar, 1978, p.

210). Reconceptualist writing could be said to represent a new concern

for the methods of curriculum inquiry and development rather than for

curriculum development tasks and processes. Pinar (1978) names Apple,

Burton, Mann, Molnar, Huebner, Macdonald, and Kliebard as reconceptualist

writers.

>"Reconceptualists tend to concern themselves with the internal and existential experience of the public world. They tend to study not 'change in behavior" or 'decision-making in the classroom', but matters of temporality, transcendence, consciousness, and politics. In brief, the reconceptualist attempts to understand the nature of educational experience" (Pinar, 1975, p. xiii).

Reconceptualist writers are less concerned for what should

be taught or how 'x' should be taught, and are more concerned with

bringing self-consciousness to how curriculum development decisions are

made and the frames of reference which developers choose in order to

guide their deliberation and decision-making[2]. Such views contrast

with those traditionalist and conceptual-empiricist theorizers of

curriculum and community development whose work is to guide practitioners

or "to investigate phenomena with the methods and aims of behavioral and

social science" (Pinar, 1975, p. xii). Pinar (1975) suggests

"dissatisfaction with established research methods and, by implication,

with that area that is traditionally researched in the field of

curriculum" (p. 415). Pinar's response to this expressed dissatisfaction is to turn his attention to the search for appropriate methods of curriculum enquiry.

Before further examining this concern for method, various approaches to curriculum development will be outlined in order to subsequently discuss the relationship between theoretical curriculum enquiring and curriculum development activity. The purpose of such a discussion is to suggest that the curriculum development setting is the forum where concerns for both curriculum theorizing and development can be resolved.

Problematic aspects of curriculum development

Curriculum development has been described in terms of three "models"--the management model, the systems model, and the open access model (O'Hanlon, 1973). The management model "involves the application of the same decision-making procedures to curriculum development as are generally used in administrative functioning within the school. This model is by far the most widely used in schools today" (p. 64). The systems model has its origins in industry and in the military, and encompasses performance-based or competency-based approaches which have been applied most effectively in the development of vocational/technical programs. O'Hanlon cites Taba (1962) and Goodlad and Richter (1966) as theorists and advocates of such a model (p. 66)[3].

The open access model, founded in philosophy and psychology, is based upon curriculum development decisions made in accord with values which will be "most successfully identified ... when the

decision-making process is based on open inquiry" (O'Hanlon, p. 68). For O'Hanlon, the open access model has four aspects: all stakeholders are free to participate in development in ways "that are meaningful to them" (p. 68), all the information is available to all the people involved, all decisions are open for consideration at any time, and "no decision is to be reached for which a humanistic rationale cannot be constructed" (p. 68). The 'open access' model appeals to many who are reacting against management or systems models of development and raises concerns similar to those found in reconceptualist writing.

O'Hanlon observes that the systems and open access models seem to be used on a more limited 'project-by-project' basis than the more widely used management models because of the greater demands that the former two models place on educational institutions. While O'Hanlon talks of the adequacy of each of these three models in achieving different curriculum tasks, he speculates that these models "represent different levels of sophistication in the curriculum development process" (p. 70)[4] and that competency by curriculum developers in management and systems models may be necessary for the effective implementation of open access models. In addition, O'Hanlon suggests that when curriculum developers shift <u>from</u> simply improving or adding to existing curriculum <u>to</u> preparing for and anticipating future curricular needs, delivery modes, and structures of schooling, it is apparent that what is required are "strategies for moving away from the management model [in order to be] more receptive to creative action than is currently the situation" (p. 70).

However, many strategies for curriculum development and

implementation, including the 'open-access' type, appear to have failed in the mid and late 1970's in spite of the growing awareness of the need for curriculum change and of the problems related to implementation. The literature indicates that developers who tended to focus upon the task of developing a curriculum or upon the processes of developing a curriculum without at the same time re-considering the frames of reference in the midst of which such curriculum development occurred tended to repeat the mistakes of earlier developers or to recreate a situation which the developmental activity originally was set up to avoid (Common, 1978; Fullan, 1979; Kritek, 1976; Werner, 1979). Such strategies have failed in spite of increasingly lucid articulations of the need for a re-consideration of frames of reference, values, and so on, as expressed in the reconceptualist stream of curriculum theorizing (e.g. Pinar, 1975).

What reason can be suggested for these problems of innovation and implementation in the face of the increasing recognition of both problems and solutions? Curriculum theorists and curriculum developers both seem to have come to a dead-end. Schwab (1978) has stated that the present condition of the curriculum field is "moribund" (p. 486)[5].

A proposal for resolving curricular problems

Schwab suggests that a renaissance of curriculum lies in diverting energy away from concern for theoretical models to a concern for the practical and the eclectic (pp. 486 - 487). He discusses two weaknesses of a purely theoretical approach to curriculum problem-solving. First, theorists ignore the specifics of the "local"

curriculum situation "in order to make theories theoretical" (p. 242); i.e. to confer upon theories a required universality, theorists only take account of elements which fit their theory. The second weakness of such theories is that they are almost always psychological theories of one kind of psychology or another, or political-economic theories, or sociological, or epistemological (pp. 242-243). That is, theorists do not consider the possibilities of encompassing many "subsubjects" in an "eclectic" way (1978, p. 495).

> "There is no foreseeable hope of a unified theory to order these subsubjects in a fixed hierarchy of importance to the problems of curriculum. What remains as a viable alternative is the unsystematic, uneasy, pragmatic, and uncertain unions and connections which are affected in an eclectic" (Schwab, 1978, p. 495).

For Schwab, the "alternative to such theoreticism [is] the localism of curriculum and the adaptation of theories to one another and to the educational problems on which they are brought to bear" (1983, p. 243)[6].

Yet, in spite of a concern for re-emphasizing the practical, the theoretical cannot be ignored--a balance between the practical and the theoretical must be established. Pinar's contribution (1975) to the literature of curriculum and curriculum development is his belief in the need to understand the theoretical nature of educational experience; e.g. in terms of temporality, transcendence, consciousness, and politics (p. xiii). Schwab's contribution (1983) to the literature of curriculum and curriculum development is his belief that such thinking about and describing curriculum occurs only in the midst of the practical; that is, in the eclectic deliberations of particular people in a particular locality at a particular time. Schwab suggests a number of

reasons for the failure of this contribution to transform curricular

theorists into practitioners:

> "Curricularists are unfamiliar with the arts of deliberation and eclectic and unprepared to master them; ... the practical is not particularly respectable academically and professors of education desperately pursue academic respectability; ... the bureaucratic structure of American education provides no pathway for exercise of the arts of practice by professors of education" (Schwab, 1983, p. 243).

Aoki (1977) anticipates a possible synthesis of these

theoretical and practical themes of curriculum development activity.

> "An authentic radical departure calls for not only a lateral shift to the practical but also a vertical shift that leads us to a deeper understanding of the program developers' theoretic stance. This stance may be implicit or even unconscious, based as it is on assumptions that are frequently taken for granted in dealing with the practical problems of program development" (Aoki, 1977, p. 51).

Curriculum development is simultaneously theoretical and practical. It

is theoretical in the sense that "curriculum theory is neither a basis

for prescription nor an empirically testable set of principles but is a

critical conceptual schema for discovering new ways of thinking and

talking about curriculum" (Macdonald, 1975, p. 6)[7]. It is practical in

the sense that particular people engage in curriculum development

activity at particular places and times.

The concern for the synthesis of theoretical and practical

aspects of curriculum and curriculum development reflects the

reconceptualist concern for method raised earlier in this chapter (i.e.,

Pinar, 1975). Understanding educational experience or experience of any

kind is first and finally an affair of the heart and mind of the

individual[8]. Such a subjective understanding, however, can only be

mediated through forums of deliberation upon experience. Such forums, or

settings, for deliberation must encompass all stakeholders and other representatives of the wider community[9] (particularily if implementation of curriculum innovations is considered important) . In this sense, Pinar's concern for methods of theorizing can be described as a concern for methods of deliberation. Schwab (1983) suggests that a starting point for examining the ways by which the practical and the eclectic can be brought to bear upon curriculum development is the establishment of a "new role or office to be installed in individual schools or small school systems", i.e. "a group", whose task would be the "continuing watch over curriculum"; i.e. "what is to be taught, how teaching should be run" and so on (pp. 243 - 244).

To conclude, a major reason for the failure of curriculum development innovation lies in the failure to intentionally consider or create settings in which developers can discuss how curriculum theory can inform their curriculum development activity. A curriculum development setting containing a curriculum development group is proposed as a method by which theoretical and practical developmental curriculum concerns can be balanced and resolved. The curriculum development setting is shaped and informed by both the needs and nature of the world (in particular the community) as experienced, studied, and intuited by curriculum developers and other stakeholders. In thinking through such a curriculum development setting, these individuals not only anticipate the shaping of the curriculum, but the consequent shaping of the school and community in which the schooling is a part.

<u>NOTES</u>

1 Wilson uses these categories as a framework for a critical examination of teacher education. One of the implications of Wilson's work is the "need to conduct more inquiry into the significance teachers give to instructional planning. This calls for a case study approach for studying the actions of teachers in classroom rather than model-building for prescribing how teaching should be done" (1981, p. 63).

   This concern for school-based instructional planning in relation to the practical "locality" (Schwab, 1983) and to the "practical knowledge" of the teacher (Elbaz, 1981) are continuing themes of this thesis.

2 For example: deliberative curriculum development (Whitehead <u>et al</u>, 1980); naturalistic curriculum development (Walker, 1971); and praxis, dialogics, and the development of generative themes (Freire, 1970).

   Guba and Lincoln (1981) describe the naturalistic paradigm as the attempt to arrive at truth viewed as "ineluctable, i.e., as ultimately inescapable" (p. 55). Characteristics of this mode of inquiry include layers of reality perceived as interrelated "patterns of truth" (p. 57); the determination of the perceptions of the data collector (p. 58), and the depth description of particular cases rather than generalization (p. 59).

   Jackson (1974) describes three characteristics of naturalistic investigation: 1) methodological eclecticism, ii) hypothesis - free orientation, and iii) implicit acceptance of the natural scheme of things (p. 85).

3 Other advocates of this model who have influenced vocational/ technical curriculum development (an area of work and interest encompassing many people in the community college system, including myself) include Gagne, 1970; Mager, 1975; and Gronlund, 1978.

4 "Thus it might be hypothesized that the management model is at the low end of the scale in sophistication, requiring less complicated processes of its implementors and making the least demand for validation of the decisions that are reached" (O'Hanlon, 1973, p. 70).

5 Schwab, in a paper first published in 1969, stated "the field of curriculum is moribund, unable by its present methods and principles to continue its work, and desparately in search of new and more effective principles and methods". He suggests that a prime reason for such a moribund state is the unexamined reliance upon theory.

NOTES (continued)

6   Such a statement is, of course, a theoretical statement about
     theories. However, as Schwab (1983) has recognized in his
     introduction to the paper in which this statement is found, a
     paper on the practical "must necessarily exemplify arts of the
     practical insofar as this is possible in expository prose" (p.
     239). Schwab recognizes the irony of using prose to describe
     what he says can or should only be described in "the natural
     language of the practical which is deliberative exchange and
     consideration among several persons or differing selves about
     concrete alternatives in relation to particular times and
     places" (p. 239).

7   According to Macdonald (1975), curriculum theorizers are in
     three "camps": i) curriculum theory functions as a philosophy
     or a framework for curriculum development and prescription of
     practical activity, ii) curriculum theory functions as a
     conceptual basis for the "empirical validation of curriculum
     variables and relationships, rather than as a test of . . .
     curriculum prescription", and iii) curriculum theory is a
     critical conceptual scheme for discovering new ways of thinking
     and talking about curriculum" (p. 6).

     "A further interesting and sometimes complicating factor is
     that individuals who theorize may well operate in all three
     realms upon different occasions as specific professional
     pressures and tasks appear" (p. 6).

8   Aoki (1977) views the curriculum developer "not only as a being
     engaged in program engineering and solving curriculum
     development problems, but also as a being engaged consciously
     or otherwise in the construction of his own meaningful human
     and social reality. He is simultaneously engaged in
     self-reflection as he turns over in his mind what he is taking
     for granted in the way of cognitive interests, his assumptions
     about man and world, and approaches to that world. In such a
     reflective activity, we can see the possibility of the
     curriculum builder becoming conscious of the perspective which
     he himself takes for granted as he acts, and also of how his
     perspective gives shape to the program he designs for his
     students" (p. 51).

9   Werner (1979) describes a central reason underlying the failure
     of curriculum innovation: "everyone involved with programs does
     not hold and share the same beliefs and assumptions" (p. 1). A
     first major implication for implementation on the other side of
     identifying this reason for failure is "the development of
     intersubjectivity concerning the beliefs of a program ...
     implementation is an ongoing construction of a shared reality
     among group members through their interaction" (p. 9 - 10).

COMMUNITY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The setting in which development of any kind occurs encompasses environmental, human, and contextual aspects. Any group of developers intending to be effective must ensure that the settings which they create include these aspects. As has been suggested, curriculum developers who consider only the product or process dimensions of their work often neglect these aspects of the setting within which their activities occur. On the other hand, community developers are primarily concerned with the development of settings. How can community development experience inform and enable the creation of settings for curriculum development?

Historical roots and growth of the community development field

Community development has its roots in India, primarily in the village renewal work begun by Gandhi and Tagore in the early 20th century and in the work of agricultural missionaries in the 1920's, especially in the Punjab.

> "India had more well-documented experience with rural reconstruction and community development than any other country in the world . . . influencing how the United States and United Nations approached community development" (Holdcroft, 1978, p. 6).

In the United States and the United Kingdom, community development grew out of the work in adult education, community services, and social welfare initiated in the 1930's (Holdcroft, 1978).

Brokensha and Hodge (1969) describe adult education (particularly extension programs conducted by university agriculture departments) and social work as the two main roots of the community development process. Knowles (1977) describes the origins of the adult education movement:

"One of the most original developments of this era [1921 - 1961] was the conversion of the entire community into a classroom through community development programs sponsored by several universities, in which the process of problem-solving was utilized for broad-scale continuing education of the adults involved in the process" (p. 89).

However, Biddle and Biddle (1966) state that community development is not simply institution-based social service, pressure group or issue-oriented social action, or social welfare. They contrast social welfare with community development: the former being agency-centered and focused on the alleviation of immediate miseries whereas community development is community-centered and focused on the long-term and comprehensive "growth in competence" of the people (p. 21).

In 1948, the term 'community development' was used officially for the first time[1]. In 1960, the United Nations abandoned the term 'fundamental education', which to that point had referred to 'technical assistance', in favour of the more comprehensive term 'community development' (Mezirow, 1963, p. 9).

As part of the United States 1950's Cold War foreign policy, community development programs were introduced in developing nations with the intent of being 'anti-revolutionary'; that is, they were aimed at curbing the encroachment of communism in these nations. They failed. These programs did not work because of basic political conflicts

which were too deep to be resolved at the local level and because of the failure of economic programs to improve the income and living conditions of the rural poor. The failure of these economic programs heralded a shift in approaches to community development in the 1960's.

> "The evolution of the Indian program from social welfare and public works to co-operative, local government, and technical agriculture was the general pattern in community development programs around the world" (Holdcroft, 1978, p. 25).

Holdcroft (1978) describes this shift from a focus upon economic growth and the improvement of the material conditions of life to participative or political approaches in which local people were involved in programs of problem-solving and the development of self-reliance.

Community development until the early 1970's was marked by four main approaches: the trickle down, the bureaucratic, the disestablishment, and the bootstrap (Knutsen, 1981)[2]. With the failure of these approaches, community development workers in the 1970's began to look for new models or approaches to the development of communities. "The failure of community development and the shortcomings of the 'green revolution' have once again shifted the focus to a more comprehensive or integrated rural development" (Holdcroft, 1978, p. 26). Practitioners seem to be clearer about what IRD (integrated rural development) is not than what IRD is. IRD is not a specific program, it is not the co-ordination or monitoring of a program or series of programs, nor is it the planning or synchronizing of resources. Rather, IRD and similar terms point to the two primary emphases of current community development activity and thinking--regional development and human development.

While community development has its roots in adult education and social work, the literature suggests that it is becoming a field in its own right: "like any emerging profession, community development has begun to develop its applied theory" (Sanders, 1970, p. 29) Sanders (1958) described four ways by which those involved in community development viewed their efforts: i) a process, ii) a method, iii) a program, or iv) a movement. As a process, community development moves from one condition or state to the next. As a method, practitioners see community development as a means of working toward some goal. As a program, community development is seen as a set of procedures or a list of activities, such as in a nation's Five Year Plan; the outcomes of which can be quantified and reported. As a movement, community development becomes a cause to which participants become deeply committed in terms of idealism and philosophy as well as pragmatism and process.

The most widely used of these four descriptors is 'process'. The understanding of community development as a process is described both in terms of the community's growth in relation to the region and in terms of the individual's growth in relation to the community (Biddle and Biddle, 1966; Brokensha and Hodge, 1969; Cary, 1970; Edwards and Jones, 1976; Knutsen, 1981; Matulich, 1981; Mezirow, 1960).

"Problems, programs, and methods vary, but the process is fundamentally one of activating citizenship responsibility, initiative, and action" (Mezirow, 1960, p. 139).

"[Community development is] a process by which human beings can become more competent to live with and gain some control over local aspects of a frustrating and changing world" (Biddle and Biddle, 1966, p. 78).

"Community development is viewed not only as a means of accomplishing certain specific program objectives, but it is also considered intrinsically valuable as a process. It is not merely a question of what is accomplished, but of how it is accomplished" (Warren, 1970, p. 43).

Consideration of community development as a process tends to focus the interaction among participants in the process. This interaction also includes the relationships of the community with the region and with the larger society of which it is a part. The problem of identifying and analyzing these relationships (rather than goals), and their influence upon development is a primary concern of the process (Edwards and Jones, 1976, p. 140). Knutsen (1981) talks of community development as "an on-going creation. It is not a state or goal which can be achieved . . . in the sense that there is no such thing as a developed or an undeveloped community. There are only communities engaged in the process" (p. 35).

"The rationale for considering it a process is that it begins before there are any specific substantive activities that represent programs; it can occur in the absence of consciously applied procedures that would represent method; and even though its participants may have emotional commitment similar to that found in a social movement, its operation at the community level does not have the scope usually associated with social movements" (Edwards and Jones, 1976, p. 140).

Warren (1970) describes the community development as both a "radical" and a "conservative" process. It is a radical process in that it promotes greater citizen participation, encourages new groupings in society, and new patterns of decision-making, accelerates change and deliberation, and it involves more people more directly and more rapidly. It is a conservative process in that it is decision-making at

the local level, it makes government responsive to the citizenry, and it is immediacy-based (p. 5).

Current activity and thinking in community development

Roberts (1979) summarizes two common traditional uses of the term community which are found in the literature of community development[3]. First, a community is "a fairly easily identifiable geographical locality" (p. 25). This usage, which defines community as a setting in time and space, reflects the traditional approach to community development. However, there are two problems with this definition. First, the literature reveals an increasing vagueness as to what defines the geographical boundaries of a community, particularly in an urban setting, and second, communications technology now puts people more easily in touch with others from whom they were previously geographically separated. The second traditional use of the term community refers to the perception of a group of people of common needs and problems, the acquisition of a sense of identity, and the creation of a common set of objectives regardless of the community's geographic location (p. 27). A professional association is an example of such a community.

Edwards and Jones (1976) integrate these two understandings of community, using the term to describe people who have common ties and objectives and who live and interact in a particular geographically delimited place. However, in contrast to Roberts, Edwards and Jones do not describe professional or other groups as community.

A third and more recent use of the term community also integrates elements of the first two usages, but encompasses and points

to a sense of 'regional' identity. Community development is becoming considered as synonymous with terms such as 'regional development' or 'integrated rural development' (IRD). Developers recognize that the effectiveness of the community development process is determined in terms of finding the balance between the relationships within the local community and the global factors which influence and impinge upon the community. Questions of the relationships of the community to the wider society must be asked. The fulcrum of such a balance is being articulated as the 'region' (Boskoff, 1970; Cary, 1970; ICA, 1981; King, 1981; Lynch, 1976; Phillips, 1978; Schumacher, 1973, 1976; Vance, 1981; Warren, 1970; Weissman, 1976; Yankelovich, 1982).

"As communities become . . . more closely intertwined with the major institutions of the larger society, fewer of the problems . . . can be adequately confronted at the community level ... Every community is affected by the economic, technical, and political conditions that exist in the surrounding region and nation. At the same time, conditions in individual communities affect the well-being of the surrounding region" (Warren, 1970, p. 44 - 46).

"The region now appears to be a two-way intermediary link between its component groups on the one hand and the environing society and the world on the other hand . . . the region, therefore, becomes the crucial focus for understanding the complexities, the problems, the achievements, and the limitations of modern society" (Boskoff, 1970, p. 4).

Whether this sense of 'regionalness' happens and is articulated because of local community development efforts, or whether it is the framework in which new community development efforts are begun, the elements of a regional approach include "inclusiveness, unity-in-diversity, participation, interdependence, and cooperation [which implies] cross-sectoral linkages and participatory methods" (ICA, 1981a, p. 32).

In addition, community development is becoming considered not only as regional development, but also as human development. The development of the regional environment is perceived as the development of a setting in which people take new relationships of responsibility for the life of their community. Community development, as human development, involves creating new relationships among people and institutions as well as creating new environmental structures. In traditional forms of community development, where emphasis is primarily upon the development of the environment (eg. the development of agricultural techniques or the construction of a hospital or school), the development of relationships among people (eg. through education and training or participatory planning) by the bureaucrat or the outside expert is often perceived by the local residents as being instrumental to these environmental projects.

More recent efforts to emphasize the development of people (eg. the development of problem-solving and participatory decision-making techniques) have tended to reverse, or to re-balance, this relationship between environmental and human concerns. This approach to development is marked by new forms of collaboration within the region among corporations, agencies, and organizations whose experience and resources are vital to local development.

> "This growing trend toward coalitions, consortiums, and partnerships reflects a new conviction on the part of all sectors that by joining forces, it is possible to deal more effectively with common challenges" (ICA, 1981b, p. 16).

The concern for integrating environmental and human development issues is only recently reported in the literature. The focal point for such an integration is the notion of developing a contextual framework for development. Community development is not just the creation of something new; it is also the revelation and highlighting of those elements which are desired and which perhaps are latent within the existing situation. Such situations can be described in both geographic (e.g., the region) and organizational (e.g. a professional association or a school) terms. A key element in developing a contextual framework by which the 'usual' can be perceived in 'new' ways is the negotiation of the community's common vision (grounded in the realities of present experience rather than in an ideal, but abstracted, future) and the negotiation of a common plan for common action.

The turn to this concern for context has occurred for a number of reasons. For example, community development efforts traditionally have focused in a small geographic area where a common vision has often been assumed. Such efforts have often been considered 'marginal'; that is, their impact on the general society has not been considered significant (Jackson, 1973)[4]. Regional approaches to community development, in which a common vision cannot be assumed and in fact must be negotiated, begin to transform strictly marginal, reactive, or confrontative efforts (Roberts, 1979)[5] to efforts which reflect a sense of 'on-behalf-of-ness'; that is, "each system...is not merely passive but can have an effect on its environment and the larger system of which it is a part" (Roberts, 1979, p. 169). A regional setting for development comprises both geography (i.e. environment) and human

relationships. The geography is delimited not so much by political boundaries as it is by what those responsible for development sense is the consensus about what constitutes the region. Within such a setting, participants can perceive themselves in new collaborative relationships which may be different from previous non-collaborative or even competitive modes of operation. The negotiation of a common vision can anticipate and encompass the latent vision of the region. The development of a sense of regionality cuts over against the sense of marginality and moves towards the integration or re-integration of aspects of 'local' community development efforts within the 'region'. In some cases, this can lead to the "intentional geographic extension of [successful aspects] of a particular project" to other local communities of the region (ICA, 1981b, p.13).

Another example of a concern for context is perceived in the instances where groups of people who share common objectives rather than common geography (for example, an organization or national professional association) are described as communities. These groups are generally communities of relatively like-minded people. In the intentional development of regional settings, several quite diverse communities of this sort may find themselves working toward similar purposes, whereas before such intentionality was brought to bear by community developers, they may not have considered the possibilities of such linkages and coordination of effort. This new collaboration raises the question of context as: Where do we commonly stand as a development group in order to work effectively together?

The next sections of this chapter will discuss the region as the setting for human development, and will suggest that, in a time when developers are increasingly turning from economics and politics to culture as the driving force behind development (UNESCO, 1983), community development is finally and fundamentally human development[6]. Current community development efforts which reflect this emphasis can be described in terms of five characteristics[7] drawn from the literature of community development:

1. All the people affected must be involved or legitimately represented in some way.

2. All issues and problems of the local situation must be encompassed.

3. The process of community development is marked by deliberation and collaboration.

4. The problem-solving, decision-making, and planning aspects of the local community development process are comprehensive, integrated, and systematic.

5. The motivating and empowering aspects of symbolic and 'envisioning' factors must be incorporated within the process.

In spite of such attempts to synthesize and document insights from diverse projects, the literature emphasizes that every setting is unique. "Circumstances leading to the formation of a particular project are rarely even closely repeated in another setting . . . The variety of factors always present (place, time, people, resources, etc.) makes the usefulness of any single project's learnings questionable when considering new initiatives" (ICA, 1984, p. 237). What is important to remember is that such documentation is intended to enable the development of a contextual framework, not to provide a set of

procedures or a recipe for development. A second, more particular, set of such human development characteristics is drawn from eighty-four community development projects in Canada. Nine "groups of learnings" are identified and elaborated in order "to encourage broader examination and interpretation" of development experience (ICA, 1984, p. 237)[8]. The titles of these nine groups follow.

1. Careful planning and long-range attitude to success.

2. Strong community support and participation.

3. Project activities related to locally expressed needs.

4. A sense of pride and self-reliance among local residents.

5. Fun and fulfilment for people associated with the project.

6. Effective use of all available resources.

7. Profitability and quality in economic ventures.

8. Strong leadership and committed team.

9. Flexibility of approach combined with hard work.

Traditionally, community development practice stressed growth in the economic and political aspects of the community. Outside experts would come to a community in order to do something for the residents rather than <u>with</u> them. The reaction in the 1960's to such a materialistic approach and the prevailing counter-reaction in the 1970's is coalescing in a balance of material and human factors.

> "Today, one hears about scientific-technological forces in conjunction with human forces. There is more discourse--if not action--about cultural diversity, social issues, etc.; and there is evidence of conscientious private sector response . . . to social and cultural issues rather than earlier response on the basis of economic and political motivation" (Leskiw and Moir, 1982, p. 10).

In spite of this traditional emphasis in development practice, the literature of community development has always reflected a concern for the development of the individuals who live in an environment as much as a concern for the development of the environment itself.

> "Community development is not better roads, better beehives, pure water nor sanitary privies. It is something of the spirit not something material. It must reach into the deep cultural patterns of people" (Biddle and Biddle, 1966, p. 243).

However, it is only recently that practical ways have been developed to occasion and sustain in those community residents a sense of responsibility and commitment which will allow them to participate in those decision-making processes which affect the life of their community. These efforts toward development, often called cultural or social development, has been described as the key element[9] of the community development process (Alchin and Decharin, 1979; Biddle and Biddle, 1966; Blakely, 1979; Boskoff, 1970; Edwards and Jones; 1976; Eyford, 1979; Freire, 1970, 1972; Grabow and Heskin, 1973; ICA, 1971, 1982; Knutsen, 1981; Masse, 1982; Oliver, 1976; Warren, 1970). Human development has many aspects: it is cultural development in balance with economic and political development; it is the growth of individual confidence and commitment; it is the growth of a community in terms of the growth of the individuals who live there; and more particularly it is development occasioned by the education and training of the community members. Community development is becoming a concern for human development--a concern for choices and values--a concern for the moral dimensions of development. From this perspective, economic and political problems are becoming perceived as symptomatic of more fundamental

cultural concerns.

However, while economic and political issues cannot be ignored or even relegated to a lesser priority[10], a balance between economic and political issues and cultural issues must be maintained. "Economic growth cannot be maintained without simultaneous social development . . . There is no sustained forward movement over a period of time if one or the other is overlooked or de-emphasized" (FAO, 1977, p.5). Economic growth and human development are not mutually exclusive but mutually reinforcing.

This approach of mutual reinforcement is not to suggest that a concern for human development is oriented to making people more receptive or more acquiescent toward economic or political structures which already may be dominant in their community. Rather, it is to suggest that human development, in transforming how individuals perceive themselves and their community in terms of responsibility for their community, also has the possibility of transforming the nature and role of the economic and political structures.

> "The human development approach presumes that the local community is the origin rather than the target of activity. A community's economic life is foundational to its vitality and sustenance of its residents. When local economic self-sufficiency becomes eroded, human confidence and courage are undermined . . . images of dependence block individuals and communities from effectively employing human, technical, and natural resources . . . Effective development is accomplished by anticipating the economic needs of all project programmes and developing a local economic structure which functions as an integral part of the community's total organization" (ICA, 1981, XI(3), 8).

Community development, perceived as intentional social or 'human' development, provides a new perspective in which economic and

political development can be seen. The initiation and implementation of community development processes are more than just economic or political development, more than fine tuning the structures of a community to make them more workable, or more than simply improving the status quo.

"Human development consists of social and economic development and should be contrasted to the present emphasis on economic growth: (Grabow and Heskin, 1973, p. 418).

To describe community development as human development is to recognize that the emphasis is upon "what happens to people" rather than the "accomplishment of certain task objectives" (Warren, 1970, p. 45). FAO (1977) describes similar shifts in development emphasis from the "changes in social organization" to the "socio-psychological changes of people in a gradual manner" (p. 3). This emphasis upon the 'human factor' marks the shift currently taking place in development efforts toward local or individual responsibility for community program planning and implementation based upon people's discovery of their ability to make informed choices about their situation.

Such concepts of development give form to the insights in the mid-1960's of community development writers such as Mezirow (1963) and Biddle and Biddle (1966) who, for example, wrote "Community development is essentially, human development" (p. 259).

More recently Masse (1982) stated:

"This new cultural model of development incorporates much of what some people--missionaries, sociologists, and Third World thinkers such as Gandhi--long ago tried to tell economists and planners: that the essence of development is people" (p. 3).

A Third World thinker and statesman, Abdulatif Al-Hamad, Minister of Finance and Planning for Kuwait, stated:

"The basis of all economic development is the
development of man . . . A development activity's success is
measured by the level of consciousness and responsibility to
which it raises the people to whom it is addressed" (cited by
Servan-Schreiber, 1981, p. 259).

To summarize, community development is more than
implementing a rational plan in a community--regardless of whether such a
plan has been created by local people or by outside experts.
Implementation of change in a community involves the fostering and
enabling of people's commitment to take responsibility for the decisions
affecting their lives and their community. Commitment involves
decisions based on values and is in relation to the process over time of
learning and action (Freire, 1970[11]; Roberts, 1979). Human development
is more than simply the isolated self-actualization of each individual.

Human development is a way of giving form to a "new ethic
of commitment" which transcends self-actualization Yankelovich (1981).
In spite of such lofty intents, community development is inherently
unspectacular.

It deals with developmental processes in human beings
and their achievement of a sense of responsibility for
community welfare. This growth is slow and unspectacular"
(Biddle and Biddle, 1966, p. 295).

The need for a common contextual framework

Collaboration and deliberation among individuals and groups
requires articulating a common point of view, frame of reference, or
contextual framework which will provide a basis for subsequent community
development activity.

"Society is like the proverbial elephant being described by six blind men. None could ever see the whole elephant and no person has ever seen all of society.

Yet society is one integrated whole and understanding social changes today requires some means of comprehending the whole" (ICA, 1981, XI (1), 8).

In a complex and interdependent world, no local community can escape the impact of economic, political, and cultural forces which swirl around it. Anyone engaged in development processes must come to grips with them. Forces for change originate both from discontent within the community as well as from the impact of global factors. "External and impersonal--even global--dynamics impinge upon the community" (Franklin, 1969, p. 352). In addition:

"In search for innovative measures which may solve or alleviate these problems [of coordinating vocational and technical education in developing nations], strategies must be designed so that action, even to solve a problem of a fairly limited scope, will have the widest possible repercussions on other problem areas: the problems discussed here are interlinked, and so are the solutions. Such strategies should be based upon an identification of all factors involved in a problem and analysis of the probable consequences of any action" (UNESCO, 1978, p. 108).

The creation of a common context, as a method for creating settings, has been described or alluded to in a number of ways in the literature of community development. Developers, attempting to manage social change and to create social change, require common ways of thinking about the world and the community in order to build effective plans of action.

Developers routinely use various research reports, demographic information, and other statistical data, as well as personal experience and knowledge, when putting together such an understanding or

'image' of the community. From such a picture, generalizations are extrapolated and shared--primarily by the experts whose background allows them to 'understand' this data.

However, this approach is proving inadequate for two reasons. The first is that the picture which is created is a static or a 'snapshot' picture. What seems to be required is a dynamic or a 'motion' picture of the social processes at work in the community which allows for the connections and relationships to be perceived as well as the objective data. Second, an understanding or picture of the community created by experts does not allow for the community residents (in the case of community development) or the lay stakeholders (in the case of curriculum development) to intentionally or self-consciously participate, in collaboration with the experts, in the creation of their picture or self-image of their situation. What local or lay people think of themselves and their situation is as important as what the experts think.

In a study (1977) of integrated rural development (IRD), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations concluded that people living and working at the local level no longer wish to leave consideration of the big or macro picture only to outside experts or government authorities. Collaborative models must include collaboration on all the issues. Village residents, government policy makers, and community development workers each "must consider their component contribution within the total programme" (p. 4).

The macro picture must not just be an accumulation of details and statistics. "It is more important for a community development worker to be equipped with a framework into which he can fit

his observations, and which will help him analyze the community, than to be in possession merely of hundreds of unrelated facts" (Brokensha and Hodge, 1969, p. 12).

Such a framework, i.e. 'common context', is a tool for determining the development focus of action as well as being an "advance organizer" (Novak, 1981) of the developers' conceptions of the world. This framework addresses the problem described by Sarason (1974) as the "lack of an organized set of conceptions which would help select and order data according to the basic problems confronting the creation of any setting" (p. 12). A number of sources in the literature of community development describe such frameworks, organized sets of conceptions, or common contexts; for example: Alchin and Decharin, 1979; Boskoff, 1970; Edwards and Jones, 1976; ICA, 1971; Oliver, 1976.

Bennis et al (1976) have described this as "the construction of conditions which support people out of differing and conflicting traditions in creating new shared values as an integral part of planning, implementing, and assessing social interventions" (p. 469). Similarily, Knutsen (1981) anticipates the development of conditions which are "not designed to do community development (although they do), but which trigger. . . the resurgence of local communities which is based on and requires the decision of local people to be engaged in that process. Once that decision is made, a local plan can be developed" (p. 30). Such a resurgence is rooted in shared values, a common vision, and a plan for common actions. This is not to suggest a commonness which is the lowest common denominator to which all can agree, or so that controversy, ambiguity, or complexity are minimized. Rather, the concern

for the development of commonness (i.e. community and commitment) is the concern for human development and the generation of dialogue, understanding, and compassion. Development is more than simply doing activities more effectively or organizing activities more appropriately; it is the development of a contextual framework within which such activities occur.

Writing of her experiences in community development, Cramer (1981) elaborates upon the relationships between contextual and practical methods. In her discussion of collaboration and participatory modes of development, she describes the need for methods which are both contextual and practical:

> "The contextual methods have the power to release people to see themselves in the new paradigm, in the new world, to be able to declare 'All things as new'. There is no old.
>
> If people have a chance to declare that, then they have a way to begin to operate. One of the biggest dangers of teaching practical social methods without the contextual is that if you teach someone how to plan, but his or her world view is from the past, the plan simply will not work. It will be irrelevant. On the other hand, contextual methods without practical methods are also dangerous. Having a context for knowing the new with no practical way to Do and Be the new creates a kind of paralysis" (pp. 6 - 7).

The chance of declaration that Cramer describes revolves around the creation of 'events' or 'settings' in which the individual is 'awakened' to that which he or she did not know self-consciously before the event.

The setting for community development is defined by the environment, by the relationships among individuals, and by the context, the way of thinking, or community spirit which has been created. The creation of community in this latter sense of shared contexts or shared meanings reflects Turner's view (1977) of a "communitas [which] emerges

where social structure is not" (p. 126)[12]. All three factors - environment, relationships, and context - inform one another[13].

Community development, adult education, and curriculum development

The literature of community development is rooted in conceptions of adult development, of the relationships between learning and action, and of program planning. These conceptions can inform and enable contemporary curriculum development activity. The community development literature describes learning in terms of 'formal', 'non-formal', and 'informal' forms. Formal learning refers to schooling; non-formal learning occurs in groups organized outside the formal schooling systems in order to meet particular learning needs (e.g. 'on-the-job training'); informal learning refers to the reflection which occurs in the everyday experience of encountering one's environment in the business of living (Compton and McClusky, 1980; Radcliffe, 1977; Roberts, 1979; FAO, 1977).

These forms of learning are described in what appears at first to be two quite different views regarding the place and role of adult learning within the community development process. These views are in response to the fundamental issue of whether processes of education are the means or the ends of community development processes. On the one hand, stemming from community development's roots in 'top down' social welfare and social service, non-formal and informal adult learning is described in terms of the learning required in preparation for or as a part of community development efforts (Gleazer, 1981). Individual learning is oriented to community ends, or to what Eisner (1979) has

identified as the "social reconstruction" orientation of curriculum (pp. 62 - 67).

On the other hand, stemming from community development's roots in adult education (e.g. the early agricultural extension work of the universities in the U.S.), learning is perceived as a result of the community development process. Community development, in this view, is a method of education (Mezirow, 1960; Knowles, 1977; Verner, 1962).

> "It is in fulfilling his responsibility for creating educational experiences in which people learn by doing that the community development professional concerns himself with the organization of institutional contexts of learning" (Mezirow, 1960, p. 138).

Verner (1962) describes the differences between the educational method[14] of community development and "community action, improvement, or organization which are entirely different from the method, but which may result from the method's use in a community" (p. 16). However, in the twenty years since Verner wrote, many of the "imperfect delineations in definition and concept" (p. 16) to which he referred have been addressed to some degree. When talking in terms of adult learning, rather than community development, Verner's distinction between community action and community development has remained central--the former being more community-oriented and the latter more learner-oriented. That is, the former has to do with action programs which address needs within the community--the latter has to do with the design of programs which train and educate learners, or citizens, who subsequently may build appropriate models for the creating and managing of community development action programs.

Unfortunately, while this distinction between learning and action, with its focus upon community development as a learning method, continues within the literature of adult education, the term community development has become widely used over the last twenty years to describe development actions in the community which include both learning and action as integral and inter-related elements of one another (Brokensha and Hodge, 1969; Cary, 1970; Compton and McClusky, 1980; Edwards and Jones, 1976; FAO, 1977; Freire, 1970; 1973; ICA, 1981; Jackson, 1973; Rivera, 1972; Roberts, 1979).

As community development has evolved toward being a field of study in itself, the distinctions between learning and action perceived by early social welfare workers or educators are becoming re-conceived in terms of their inter-relationships. Such a view is held by Compton and McClusky (1980):

> "Considerable debate has ensued about whether community education for development (CED) programming should emphasize program or process, or should be school-based or community-based, should be oriented toward education or social problems; a related issue is whether CED should take place within a hierarchial organization or as part of a community-wide social system" (p. 248).

According to Compton and McClusky, "much of the debate revolves around a false set of dichotomies" in that "CED represents complementary . . . efforts at improving both citizens and community" (p. 248). Two issues emerge from this discussion which bear upon the discussion of community aspects of curriculum development.

The first is based upon the "false set of dichotomies" described by Compton and McClusky (1980). Regardless of whether learning

is seen as <u>preparation for</u> or <u>as a result of</u> community development, both views involve learners who have decided for one reason or another to participate in the processes of community development and learning. Both views assume an 'awakened' and self-conscious, if not self-confident participant.

The second issue, which is more directly the concern of this thesis, concerns the involvement of the 'unawakened', unself-consciousness, wary or timid participant. How do development processes 'awaken' and 'care' for such people? This is an important issue if developers take seriously the claim that <u>all</u> participants must be involved or legitimately represented in development processes. Such a concern also involves the creation of settings and processes involving the 'unawakened' or the 'unconvinced'--a concern which is directly related to implementation of community or curriculum development innovations. Brokensha and Hodge (1969) have stated:

> "The content of training is nor merely facts to be remembered, but rather the process of self-examination within him, his own appraisal of his convictions and motivations in relation to the aims of his work in community development" (p. 84).

Lessons and task for curriculum workers

Curriculum workers, like their counterparts in community development, must consider the interrelationships which exist among the environmental, human, and contextual aspects of their work.

> "Contextual factors affecting curriculum development are many, varied, complicated, interconnected, and constantly changing. A given model for curriculum development may be suitable in one setting and inappropriate in another. Thus, a

theory of curriculum development that can be responsive to individual and social needs in a complex, changing society cannot be built around linear or single principle concepts. In addition to the many environmental factors involved, the participants must be considered. Also, wisdom does not stand still; it is constantly being revised, extended, replaced, and interpreted differently from varying points of view (Unruh, 1975, p. 75).

Pena (1983) (an education consultant in Bogota, Columbia) describing "the technologists' lack of awareness of the [disruptive and creative] impact that technology has on any culture" suggests that this issue is "not, as it has often been presented ... the conflict between man and machine, but the clash of two ways of thinking." (p. 18). From this premise, Pena discusses problems of curriculum development and innovation in developing nations and suggests that "the success or failure of educational programs in the Third World may depend much more on structural or contextual factors than on planning and design factors" (p. 18). That is, curriculum workers need to consider the influence of local aspects of the setting in which the program is to be implemented, and balance this consideration with the rational and systematic planning of the curriculum technologist working at a distant university or Ministry of Education.

Such complexity in development efforts is not in the first instance new--life has always been complex. What is new is the awareness that such complexity is not simply problematic or pre-ordained fate. Rather, complexity is the stuff of life--it is the situation (not the problem) in which people experience limitations and possibilities out of which, in freedom, they make responsible decisions about the future. In this sense, the 'new-ness' is the awareness of complexity as destiny--not fate. The concern for creating settings is the concern to provide a

forum for the action and reflection which may occasion such a transformation in consciousness. This concern for methods of awakening, sustaining, and giving form and structure to consciousness through settings reflects new perceptions of curriculum and community development as moral as well as scientific activity. That is, development must be increasingly concerned with and informed by values and choices, with people and relationships, as much as it is already concerned with systems, logic, and empiricism[15]. Today, this concern for giving form to such new consciousness or new awareness reflects Bell's observation (1973):

> "Ideas and cultural styles do not change history--at least, not overnight. But they are the necessary preludes to change, since a change in consciouness--in values and moral reasoning--is what moves people to change their social arrangements and institutions" (p. 479).

This need for considering aspects of culture and consciousness such as values, the nature of schooling, the nature of curriculum-making in terms of its interrelationships and influences with community and schooling (as well as in terms of content and process), dramatizes the inadequacy of scientific-technological metaphors in relation to curriculum making (Common, 1982; Pinar and Grumet, 1980). What complicates the problem of finding new ways of thinking and valuing in relation to curriculum is that the community and world in which such a problem is set is perceived as changing and radically influencing value systems. Curriculum workers cannot simply apply value frameworks to a static world, but must ask how a dynamic world is influencing and shaping such value frameworks. Approaches to curriculum development must incorporate these interdependent and complex aspects of community. In

particular, curriculum workers must be responsible for ensuring that the discussion of values is an integral part of curriculum deliberation. In the field of community development some projects in the 1970's have demonstrated approaches to program planning and implementation which incorporate the integration of all such economic, political, and cultural values in the community's understanding of itself'[16].

However, the curriculum developer is not simply concerned with making such an integrated curriculum in order to make the current school system more workable. Underlying the rebalancing of these moral and scientific aspects is the concern to place curriculum-making in relation to the changes in society and to changes in school systems within that society (for example, the discussion of environment, situation, and culture in Pinar, 1980). Oliver (1977) states the curriculum maker's problem in these terms:

> "The central problem of education . . . is one of creating balance between primal and modern aspects of human community, systems of thought, and personality. This means creating balanced participation among primal social forms (family and community) and the modern social form of the corporate organization; creating a balance between an ultimate sense of religio-philosophical meaning and the skeptical sense of choices we associate with 'scientific thinking" (p. ix).

What, then, are the primary tasks for curriculum workers implied by such a discussion? First, curriculum workers responsible for a particular curriculum development effort must form themselves self-consciously as a group, a team, a task force, or according to some other similar organizing image[17]. Second, such a group must create a curriculum development setting which encompasses environmental, human,

and contextual factors. These factors will be both <u>given</u> as part of the project parameters and <u>created</u> as stakeholders respond to the project proposal. Third, the group, once established in a setting, will begin to address the curriculum development task and process issues. The degree to which such issues are resolved and curriculum innovations subsequently implemented will be contingent upon how adequately the group and the setting have been formed.

The next chapters of the thesis will address the first two tasks from the point of view of how community development efforts in these areas can inform and enable curriculum developers. Addressing the third task is beyond the intention and scope of this thesis.

NOTES

1   The term was introduced by the British Colonial Office at the
    Cambridge Conference on African Administration which was called
    to help British African territories prepare for independence by
    improving local government and developing economic strength
    (Holdcroft, 1978, p. 2). The previously used term 'mass
    education' did not convey the developmental intentions of the
    conference.

2   See Appendix I: Four Approaches to Community Development.

3   Hillery (1955) reviews 94 definitions of the term 'community'
    and reaches the conclusion that "beyond the concept that people
    are involved in community, there is no complete agreement as to
    the nature of community" (p. 119).

4   "Community development is marginal . . . to basic political and
    economic institutions. It operates chiefly in certain kinds of
    distributive, rather than, productive institutions, for example
    education and welfare. It usually operates on the margins of
    these institutions also. Indeed, its strength lies in its
    constant attempt to exert power from the margins into the
    center" (Jackson, 1973, p. 23).

5   Roberts (1979) describes three ways by which community
    development efforts can be legitimately criticized as marginal:
    if its practitioners have "woolly, if well-meaning, intentions,
    which characterizes some of the work in this field (1979, p.
    1970); if the community development process is not part of the
    formal political process; and if community development efforts
    "can be seen by people in formal government institutions as
    being subversive of the control mechanisms which they manage
    . . . in many cases, community development is made to be
    marginal (p. 170).

6   Knutsen (1981) describes this understanding of community
    development and human development in terms of the development of
    "primal community".

7   For a detailed elaboration of these presuppositions, refer to
    Appendix II: Five Characteristics of Contemporary Community
    Development Efforts.

NOTES (continued)

8   For almost 30 years, the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) has been pioneering educational methods, curriculum designs and participatory problem-solving techniques. The ICA is a private, non-profit, non-partisan, non-sectarian, voluntary organization committed to service and improving the quality of human life. The goals of the ICA are simply stated: Development is a community affair, a partnership between the public, private, voluntary and local sectors that is all-encompassing and involves everyone in planning and implementation.

The ICA is a catalyst for grass roots participation. Local groups are cooperating to achieve significant social and economic changes. They are revitalizing their aging urban neighbourhoods and small towns, modernizing their underdeveloped villages, improving the working environment in their corporations and other organizations.

The ICA encourages community spirit. People learn practical problem-solving methods that help make their communities self-sufficient, self-reliant and self-confident. The people to be served determine their own goals, draw up the plans for reaching those goals and implement the plans through their own efforts. With the combination of research, training and demonstration, the ICA is helping people help themselves, getting them involved in shaping their own futures.

Like the people and villages they help, the Institute itself strives for self-sufficiency. Most of the 1,200 full time staff members in forty nations work without salary and all the part-time volunteers cover their own expenses.

The ICA has coordinating centres in Bombay, Brussels, Chicago, Hong Kong, and Kuala Lumpur. Financial support comes from individuals, corporations, foundations, religious organizations, government agencies, and program fees. The coordinating center for Canada is in Montreal.

9   The others generally being considered as the 'economic' and 'political' elements. Economic aspects of the community have to do with resources, production, and distribution; political aspects have to do with order, polity, and social 'well-being' or 'welfare'; and the cultural aspects comprise those which have to do with wisdom (useful skills, accumulated knowledge, and final meanings), life-styles (social roles, social covenants, and social structures), and symbols (language, art, icon, rites, and myths): (ICA, 1971).

10   For example, Holdcroft (1978) states that current IRD efforts
      require income producing "center pieces" in relation to
      community self-sufficiency.

11   Action and reflection in a particular situation must be
      apprehended as a challenge "interrelated to other problems
      within a total context [and that responses to this challenge]
      evokes new challenges, followed by new understandings; and
      gradually [people] come to regard themselves as committed"
      (Freire, 1970, p. 68).

12   Turner (1977) describes 'communitas': "Communitas, with its
      unstructured character, representing the 'quick' of human
      inter-relatedness, what Martin Buber has called das
      Zwischenmenschliche, might well be represented by the
      'emptiness at the centre' [of Lao-tse's chariot wheel], which
      is nevertheless indispensable to the functioning of the
      structure of the wheel". Turner cites Buber's description of
      community as "community is where community happens" and
      Bergson's "elan vital, or evolutionary life force" to describe
      the aspect of potentiality held in the term 'communitas'.
      Communitas, says Turner, "breaks in through the interstices of
      structure" (1977, p. 126 - 128).

13   For one example of how a contextual framework was initiated and
      developed by a group of community developers, refer to Appendix
      III.

14   Verner (1962) defines method as "the relationship established
      by the institution with a potential body of participants for
      the purpose of systematically diffusing knowledge" (p. 9).

      Verner's primary methods are i) individual methods; for
      example, correspondance study, ii) group methods--large and
      small; for example, conventions and discussion groups, and iii)
      community methods. At the time, Verner wrote, his sole example
      of a community methods was 'community development', although he
      suggested television might well become a community method.

15   For example, Pinar (1975) points to an overemphasis in
      curriculum development upon design, development, instruction,
      and evaluation (p. 527). Common (1982) describes the inaptness
      of metaphors of rationality underlying curriculum theory.
      Schwab has pronounced that current approaches to curriculum
      development are "moribund" (1978). In community development,
      the overemphasis upon "non-representative models" (Cary, 1970),
      "economic growth" (Holdcroft, 1978), "co-ordination" rather
      than "integration" (FAO, 1977) are noted.

NO<u>TES</u> (continued)

16   ICA. Demonstrating Human Development. <u>Image</u>, <u>XI</u> (3); ICA. International Exposition of Rural Development: Sharing Approaches That Work. <u>Image</u>, <u>XII</u> (1).

17   Schwab (1983) states that a group is required for five reasons: i) in order to include the four "common places" of education - teacher, student, what is taught, and the milieu of teaching/learning, ii) no one person completely understands all these commonplaces, iii) many people enable a diversity of alternatives, iv) a group is required for deliberation upon alternatives, and v) the occasional participation of various specialists.

Schwab goes on to elaborate who should comprise the group (pp. 245 - 252), and to discuss the leadership of the group (pp. 252 - 260).

COMMON ELEMENTS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT SETTINGS

This chapter will discuss the method of setting-creation in terms of i) forming the curriculum development community, ii) delineating the environmental, human, and contextual factors of the curriculum development setting, and iii) building a common contextual framework. Characteristics of curriculum development approaches which reflect this methodological concern will be described.

Forming the curriculum development community

The curriculum development community can be formed on the basis of either or both of two primary configurations drawn from community development experience: i) the community which exists within a region, and ii) the community which exists within an organization.

The major identifying image of the <u>first</u> configuration is the network. This image emerges from the current work in community development which is occuring regionally and cross-sectorally. Naisbett (1982) suggests that networks emerge when people are trying to change society. They emerge as individuals, frustrated by the failure of "hierachies" to solve problems, seek "horizontal links" with each other. According to Naisbett, the importance of <u>networking</u> lies in the processes of communication and deliberation and the "linkages" among individuals and groups (pp. 189 - 205). Networking should not be misconstrued as

simply a current or popular fad. Networking, as the local response to the breakdown of traditional structures or usual ways of thinking about problems, has been observed in other periods of significant historical change[1]. A network may be formed around a particular task and dispersed upon the task's completion, or a network be formed around a particular ongoing interest or concern.

What do collaborative networks look like? In the field of urban community development, Holland (1982) describes five aspects of effective "public-private partnerships":

> i) a realistic and broadly accepted vision of the community's future
> ii) individuals who understand themselves as 'stewards' of an organization's resources
> iii) an "incubator" organization for potential leaders
> iv) a spirit of trust
> v) cross-sectoral networking of those involved in the development process

Curriculum development partnerships could be formed in a number of ways: for example, a partnership could comprise a group of different stakeholders from one or more organizations (i.e instructors, administrators, employers, etc.) or could comprise a group of curriculum development professionals drawn from various institutions and schools. Such a partnership or community would discern its operating vision, recognize its stewardship of the primary resource (i.e. information), perhaps involve graduate students or other novices, and work in a spirit of trust and cooperation. Schwab (1983) describes the roles and responsibilities of a curriculum development group comprising teachers, a principal, people who employ school graduates, school board members,

concerned citizens, students, content and process specialists, and social scientists.

One example which appears to represent some aspects of this approach to curriculum development has been outlined by Scharf (1984). Scharf identifies the problem which most community colleges have in "monitoring the environment [i.e., the community] in a systematic manner" (p. 10) in order to be responsive to changing curricular needs, particularly in fast-changing high technology programs. Scharf suggests the creation of program development "task forces" (p. 11) characterized by the involvement of college, business, and government stakeholders, an orientation to the future, and a responsiveness to changing community needs and policies.

The major identifying image of the _second_ configuration is the guild. This image emerges from current facilitative work in community development done by project organizers and "project auxiliaries"[2] (Hanson, 1982). Hanson describes the guild in terms of "paravocation" (p. 2).

> "Every person has the possibility of enacting at least two aspects of their occupation or their primary activity. First, there is the primary art they practice, whether that be doctoring, teaching, welding, or accounting; second, there is the 'para' aspect--that part along side of the primary one--which is within but also beyond the first" (Hanson, 1982, p. 2).

For example, a person with the vocation of doctor may also have the paravocation as a Boy Scout leader or as an underwater photographer.

However, while Hanson (1982) recognizes this aspect of paravocation, he is primarily concerned with those aspects of paravocation enacted _within_ the organization for which the particular

person works. That is, Hanson suggests that within every healthy organization there is a paravocated core group of people.

> "This group is concerned with the organization's mission and the direction of its mission. They are also concerned with its internal sensitivity to the people who are part of that organization" (Hanson, 1982, p. 3).

For example, a core group in a school may consist of people who work in different areas (administration, teaching, consulting, and so on), but who share a common concern for caring for and taking responsibility for the whole organization. Such groups most often are not formally organized nor do they act formally. Their influence is more 'behind the scenes'. However, this is not to suggest that such influence is manipulative (which of course it can become). Rather, the emphasis is upon the "servant" nature of their leadership role (Greenleaf, 1977)[3].

Hanson (1982) drawing from the facilitative or servant styles of leadership emergent in the field of community development, suggests three distinguishing features of such groups or guilds - their method, their style, and their stance. Hanson describes their planning methods as visible and indicative[4], their style as positive and inclusive[5], and their stance as loyal and representational[6]. Hanson concludes his description of guilds by suggesting that guilds also have a "role for an outside facilitator, in providing the kind of objectivity that allows a group to see through a strategy, to see beyond the mire of their everyday problems" (p. 8). Similarily, Sarason (1974) suggests that as a setting becomes more focused on its mission "it increasingly loses sight of what it can or must do for its own members" (p. 86). It is important to remember that settings are about the development of the

individuals who comprise them as well as the development of those whom the setting serves (Sarason, 1974).

A curriculum development community formed as a guild within an organization or as a network within a region will display certain characteristics which will distinguish it from a group operating simply in its own self-interest. Such characteristics include the enablement of the natural[7] leadership of the organization or community, the catalysis of new ways by which various and diverse groups may work together, the demonstration of a servant leadership style, and reflection upon the activities of the change process[8]. In addition, while the forms of the curriculum development community or network or guild may vary from place to place and from situation to situation, the recurring theme which motivates and sustains is the spirit of voluntary cooperation[9].

"Its members are free to choose whether or not to participate in it. The ties that bind it are looser and more fragile. It is more likely to go to pieces in the absence of conscious dedication, effort, and care" (Royal Bank, 1983, p. 1).

In British Columbia, three groups currently exist within the post-secondary education system which, in different ways, illustrate how such characteristics are given form. While these groups do not represent ideal or comprehensive applications of all characteristics of guilds or networks, they indicate the potential which exists for bringing intentionality to forming groups for curriculum development. These three groups which will be described meet to discuss and do curriculum development, faculty development, and international training and education. The groups are proposed as models of guilds or networks for curriculum development which is conducted in settings where environment,

relationships, and context are intentionally considered and given form.

First, most persons involved in post-secondary curriculum and program development in British Columbia, Alberta, and the Yukon meet every four to six months to exchange ideas in small workshops, tour a particular college or institute facility, and discuss a particular topic of current concern. A formal organization or association has not been formed. At the conclusion of each meeting representatives from a college volunteer to host the next meeting and a task force is struck to follow through with making the necessary arrangements. A recent concern has been the need for colleges to begin working collaboratively on the development of common programs. In the past, developers have worked in program development independently of each other.

Second, a number of persons from different community colleges in B.C are actively involved in the Instructional Skills Program (ISP) originally developed at Vancouver Community College in conjunction with the Ministry of Education. This program is designed for people who are hired by the colleges as instructors because of their expertise in a particular trade or profession, but who most often do not have any teaching experience. In addition, experienced instructors can participate in various on-campus in-service formats of the program as part of their professional development.

> "The Instructional Skills Program is an interlocking system of three levels of training that has as an overall goal, improving the instructional skills of both new and experienced instructors" (Mason and Kerr, 1980, p. 3).

The three levels of training include training the instructors, training the facilitators who will train the instructors, and training the

trainers who will train the facilitators.

Two important features of the ISP are its emphasis upon "peer" training and the voluntary participation of those involved in the program (Kerr, 1980). To date, approximately 750 British Columbia instructors have participated in the basic level of training. Approximately forty people from across the province are involved as a 'core group' and in the 'train the trainer' level. The program has no formal organizational structure. It is coordinated by a person seconded annually from a college by the Ministry of Education for this purpose. Members of the core group communicate regularly with each other and with the coordinator through telephone conference calls, exchanging audiotapes and written articles, and through occasional chance encounters at other gatherings of instructors. The program seems to succeed because the participants have seen and participated in its successes, because new people are continually invited to become involved, and because people are willing to work at it in addition to their regular teaching duties. The ISP has been introduced and used in the colleges of Newfoundland, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Yukon, the North West Territories, and has been used as part of the practicum experience of the joint University of British Columbia/Vancouver Community College instructor training program for tradespeople from Zimbabwe.

The third and least developed (or perhaps least coordinated) group involves the activities in international education which are occurring on various post-secondary college and university campuses. Such international education involves developing programs for people from other nations who come to B.C. as well as the involvement of

B.C. instructors in the development of training programs in other nations and for other nations. At a provincial conference on international education in January 1983, co-sponsored by the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) and Vancouver Community College, Bentley (1983) discussed the revitalizing possibilities for faculty and for curriculum development which can be provided by international education opportunities:

> "Here is where the allure of international work acts its magic. Faculty members, like people, do what they do because they find it interesting or personally rewarding, and the opportunity to exchange positions, students, programs, or to develop and teach programs for foreign students not only attracts but also stimulates and revitalizes.
>
> Such tasks appear to give occasion for faculty (and students) to do what they seldom do: meet together to think and plan seriously a significant project. A project of any size can cross departments, bringing sorts of 'invisible college' into play, with self-designated participation in temporary work groups for a common purpose. The project opens up the structuring of the job in human terms, with the administrators providing decision-making energy and information and the rest of the group working on team-building relationships" (Bentley, 1983, pp. 3 - 4).

Delineating the enviromental, human, and contextual factors of the curriculum development setting

The curriculum development community, modelled either as a guild or a network, will need to create the setting in which it will work. Curriculum developers must consider the physical aspects of their environment and the relationships and common understandings (i.e. common mind) which they establish with one another. This section of the chapter will identify and describe these environmental and human factors. Examples of such factors have been identified by Sarason (1971, 1974) in relation to his work in creating community settings. They have been

described by Unruh (1975) in relation to her work in creating the settings and theoretical frameworks for "responsive curriculum development"[10].

As developers create a setting, they build a frame of reference or contextual framework as they reflect upon their activity. Such a context resolves problems associated with maintaining objectivity in a diverse group and at the same time motivates and sustains the group. A phrase which can be used to indicate the notion of contextual framework is Sarason's "categories of thought" (1974, p. xii). The phrase does not necessarily mean 'better' or 'new' categories of thought; rather, it is similar to the use of the term 'reconceptualization' by Pinar (1975, 1978) to describe ways of thinking about curriculum.

Sarason (1971, 1974) has written extensively about the creation of settings. In an attempt to begin to address the problems associated with new settings being created without adequate guidance or reflection enabled by theory or ways of thinking, Sarason et al (1971) listed "several major points" to consider when initiating the creation of a new setting (pp. 89 - 92, passim). The examples are mine, not Sarason et al.

A setting is created in the context of another previously created setting. The history and traditions of this established setting "will determine the degree to which the new setting will be capable of innovating".

A setting is of the community rather than for the community. The limitations of the setting--resources, people, funding and so on--must be recognized.

All participants have a valid stake in the process. Such a stance reduces the "tendency of those in the setting to view it as 'mine' or 'ours', and reduces the barriers which can

emerge between 'professional' and 'lay' stakeholders.

The responsibility for developing and rendering service [for example, developing a curriculum] must be shared with the community rather than possessed only by the setting.

The setting can serve the personal and professional human 'needs' of the 'helpers' as well as the 'helped' [for example, the stakeholders not directly involved in the eventual learning and instruction delivered by a curriculum 'product' can still benefit from participation in the curriculum 'process'].

The establishment of external as well as internal "means of self-criticism" is required in the setting.

The fact that a "universe of alternatives of thought and action relevant to any decision" exists must be acknowledged.

Later, Sarason (1974) uses the American Constitutional Convention of 1787 as an illustration of "categories of thought" about structuring environments and relationships. While recognizing the limitations of such an illustration, it is still very illuminating and helpful for understanding the factors involved in an effective setting (pp. 16 - 19). The setting described by Sarason is characterized by:

1. "Some implicit or explicit rules are necessary by which the individuals will be governed . . . the considerations which led to the rules. . . are reflected in the document that finally emerges [i.e. the American Constitution]. These rules not only reflected real problems, but also conceptions about what man is and how he acts."

2. "The strong presence . . . of a conception of man, and man in certain public roles" cuts against any ideal conception of man in an unachievable utopian setting.

3. "The necessity for anticipating problems and consequences, an activity or process notably absent or found only in diminished degree in the creation of most settings."

4. "For any problem there was a wide variety of alternative solutions . . . one of the differences between presight and hindsight is contained in the concept of the universe of alternatives."

Other factors by which settings may be considered emerge from reflection upon Sarason's work: they are the notions of 'the human condition', 'on behalf of', and 'covenant'. First, Sarason (1974) alludes to the need for examining and symbolizing a common understanding of the human condition and the ways by which people operate by referring to a statement made by Benjamin Franklin at the American Constitutional Convention[11]:

> "Mr. President: . . . For when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men, all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected?"

A second factor is the self-conscious awareness of the developers that they are acting 'on behalf of'--that as they recognize a need and a solution and as they embody the change within their own forms of organization, they demonstrate to the larger organization or society of which they are a part the fact that change is a possibility. An example of such would be the Society of Friends abolishing slavery within itself and then leading the abolitionist movements in 19th century England and America.

Third, Sarason uses marriage as an illustration that even love is not enough to sustain the creation of a new setting (1974). If love is not enough, what is missing? Part of loving a person or a situation or an organization requires the acknowledgement of the human condition as previously described in the Franklin citation. Love is 'for better or for worse'. However, the foundational ingredient, not only for a marriage, but for the creation of any setting, is the sense of

commitment, covenant or mission which provides the focus around which disagreements can be worked out. Such a sense of covenant is required if developers are to avoid the problems reflected in such a statement as: "I quit. I can't work with that person another day." Such covenants are not always clearly articulated or seen; nevertheless they can spell the difference between success and failure.

The task of creating a setting includes consideration of environmental, human, and contextual factors. Such considerations include not only values, but substantive knowledge, history, time perpectives, vehicles of criticism, leadership, rules by which individuals will be governed, a conception of people in certain public roles, anticipation of the future, a wide variety of alternatives (Sarason, 1974); the community in which the setting is set, the limitations of the setting, ownership of the setting, mission of the setting, the personal and professional growth needs of those creating the setting, (Sarason et al, 1971); and of the notions of on behalf of and of covenant. These considerations are critical elements of any categories of thought; that is, of any context for initiating a development setting. They lend themselves to infinite interpretations and forms of expression.

> "The creation of settings is not an engineering or technological task. It is also not one that can be accomplished by simply having appropriate or strong motivation. In short, to the extent that our imagined society is ready to restructure itself, it is faced with problems no less staggering or overwhelming or difficult than those with which it was faced before the magical transformation of values" (Sarason, 1974, p. 6).

In her description of "responsive curriculum development",

Unruh (1975) identifies similar factors which must be considered by developers. These factors include the developers themselves, type of students, student perceptions, type of school (elementary or community college), school buildings, number of instructors involved, geographic scope of the project (school, school district, state or province), curricular needs, diagnoses, objectives, learning styles, evaluation instruments, futures thinking, technological support, cultural pluralism, and community resources.

> "This is by no means an exhaustive list, but it illustrates the possibility for responsiveness in curriculum development, particularily in light of the great variety of educational and cultural settings" (Unruh, 1975, p. 84).

What must not be lost sight of is that such considerations (i.e., Sarason, 1971, 1974; Unruh, 1975) are addressed, negotiated, and resolved in relation to creating the setting for development--not only in relation to the debates over development tasks and processes. If these considerations are not adequately addressed, problems will likely emerge in subsequent development and implementation phases as has been discussed. These considerations (i.e., "contextual factors"; Unruh, 1975, p. 83) become part of the contextual framework by which those involved in change perceive their world and make meaningful decisions about their actions.

The task of creating settings for development through building a common context is the primary response to these issues from the initial stages of any development process, and must continue to play an important but more subtle role in all subsequent stages. The contextual framework is the key factor in relation to creating settings.

Articulating such ways of thinking enables this struggle of development to be perceived as a human struggle and as one which is worthwhile. For whether the task is the re-structuring of a community or the re-structuring of an educational program, the creation of settings is a human activity. The creation of settings is something done by, for, with, and on behalf of people.

Building a common contextual framework

In order to address the issues and concerns involved in bringing form and structure to the setting, developers must build the contextual framework in which such issues will be given focus and resolution. The form and structure of the setting will reflect the contextual framework created by the developers in the initial stages of developing the setting. This notion of creating a contextual framework is in contrast to traditional approaches in which the point of view is either given or 'found' (i.e. it is determined by polls, surveys, demographic data, etc.). Such views of reality most often reflect those of the social scientist, the bureaucrat, the community activist, and so on. However, in situations where all such stakeholders insist that their particular point of view be heard and be incorporated in the planning process, the problem of determining a common or 'project' point of view becomes more complex[12]. Such a point of view must be negotiated if the project is to be effectively managed and completed.

The creation of a contextual framework involves i) the negotiation of reality ii) the negotiation of values, and iii) the negotiation of the means of negotiation. The methods of such deliberation

are contentless; that is, while deliberations may be conducted by a particular facilitator, the content of the deliberations is determined not by the facilitator, but by the participants.

The notion of negotiating reality has been elaborated in both the literature of community and curriculum development. The negotiation of reality by social scientists, policy makers and community development field workers has been discussed by Moles (1979) in terms of public criteria, values, learning, and social change. Moles' argument that knowledge (i.e. culture[13]) is reality implies that the processes of eliciting the knowledge of a particular reality (i.e. a local community or setting) from the people who live and work in the midst of the reality is in fact the creation (or negotiation[14]) of a new reality by those people.

> "We create reality each time we select among alternatives . . . Part of our reality is created privately, and we do not attempt to share it with others. Other aspects of reality are negotiated with others and determined through consensus or at least an agreement not to disagree anymore" (Moles, 1979, pp. 183 - 184).

The negotiation of reality is a process which involves both individuals and groups in the reflection upon experience. First of all, approaches to the individual's negotiation of reality have been termed "neo-phenomenological . . . characterized, first of all, by the assumption that no one can experience a reality that is interpretation-free[15]" (Bussis et al, 1976, p. 12). Bussis et al (1976) describe "personal constructs" (i.e. points of view or images of reality) as "a representation of some aspect of reality that is the result of the individual's interpretation of the world" (p.16). Every

reality must be interpreted and each interpretation of changing reality forms the individual's personal construct[16].

Second, the negotiation of reality by groups occurs in the midst of the dialogue and deliberation of individuals "making explicit their real consciousness of their world" (Greene, 1975, p. 303); i.e. their experience of their experience. A precondition for such dialogue is freedom (Arendt, 1963[17]; Freire, 1970; Macdonald, 1975). Creating a common contextual framework raises personal constructs to self-consciousness and draws from them those "aspects of reality which are negotiated with others and determined through consensus or at least an agreement not to disagree any more" (Moles, 1979, p. 184). The negotiation of reality then is both an individual and a corporate activity. Individuals create personal constructs. Groups create common contexts.

In brief, the negotiation of reality encompasses two related notions: i) the views of reality, or "personal constructs" (Bussis et al, 1976), which individuals have built for themselves, and ii) the deliberative and collaborative melding of these constructs in order to create intentionally and self-consciously the group's context. The negotiation of reality involves a general examination of the social milieu and a conception of man (Sarason, 1974) and, in particular, the examination of the reality of educational activity (Huebner, 1975c). Such negotiation involves the raising to self-consciousness of the "images" (Boulding, 1956) and personal constructs out of which people live. When such activity is conducted in community--that is, in terms of the collaboration and deliberation by the various stakeholders--the

articulated product, resolve, decision, or conclusion will be represented in some symbolic form. Such a symbolization of the deliberative process can be said to be the objective representation of the mind of the group, rather than the mind of an individual or even the 'linked' (anthologic) minds of several individuals.

However, it is not adequate to discuss the negotiation of reality as though people were simply describing the situation. Bussis et al (1976) describe the struggle of interpreting the meaning of reality which emerges in relation to the negotiation of reality; that is, 'we agree that these are the facts, but we don't agree what they mean'.

> "Depending on the extent to which parties to a decision agree that the available evidence has been impartially gathered and represents 'important' information, people may or may not agree on the meaning of the evidence. Even when there is virtual consensus on the 'facts of the matter', such facts do not automatically lead to decisions regarding future action. People render decisions; information does not" (Bussis et al, 1976, p. 19).

Such decisions are always mediated by values which are "articulated and justified by public criteria rather than by personal and unexamined preference" (p. 19).

The negotiation of values can be described in terms of several value frameworks (Huebner, 1975). Such negotiation involves the raising to self-consciousness of the values which underlie decision - making and ways of living. However, agreement upon values (even fundamental values, like love) is not enough (Sarason, 1974)--values must be mediated by interpretations and images of the world and humanness.

Sarason (1974) suggests that renewed values are not enough to make the creation of a new setting workable[18]. An overemphasis on

values obscures the point that "agreement on values and goals, possessing the strongest motivation [such as] achieving power [or] love" are not enough to create a setting (pp. 10 - 12). Sarason's recurring theme is that "consensus about values does not instruct one in how to create settings consistent with these values" (p. 20). Bell (1978) describes the relationships between the "communal" or community aspects of society and the collaborative and deliberative aspects of decision-making. He also notes the struggle between description and interpretation; that is, between the description of participation and collaboration as dominant characteristics of the post-industrial society and the realization that such inclusive participation can lead either to consensus or "stymie" (p. 148)[19]. Before individuals can affirm such changes which the world is imposing upon their values, they must find ways to take a new relationship to these changes in order that they can participate meaningfully in them, and in so doing, take responsibility for them.

The processes of mediation between descriptions of reality (the world and the individual) and the interpretations of the values underlying these descriptions are the key to the creation of context or categories of thought (Sarason, 1974) required for the initiation of an effective setting. These mediation processes are key in that they forge common or team constructs built upon personal constructs. Effective processes are characterized by collaboration, teamwork, and deliberation (Bennis et al, 1976; Blakely, 1979; Cary, 1970; Compton and McClusky, 1980; Edwards and Jones, 1976; ICA, 1982; Knutsen, 1981; Roberts, 1979; Sanders, 1970; Schindler-Rainman, 1975; Weissman, 1976; World Bank, 1980). Other characteristics of such processes include a balance of

contextual and practical methodologies (Cramer, 1981), a self-consciousness in relation to the use of language (Botkin et al, 1979; Habermas, 1979; Huebner, 1975; Macdonald, 1975), praxis (Freire, 1970); and eventfulness (ICA, 1979, 1981).

Characteristics of curriculum development context-building methods

First of all, curriculum making is a political, or decision-making, activity. Curriculum making is value-laden--it reflects the values of those who have been able to use their power to make the curriculum hold the particular values to which they subscribe. Curriculum making is political activity "in which some people influence others" (Huebner, 1975, p. 272). Huebner (1975) suggests that "the struggle to remake the school is a struggle to make a more just public world" (p. 273). Debates over school purposes and curriculum making "indicate shifts in society's evolution". Such debates must be consistent with the "historical rhythm of society"--for example, curriculum makers cannot operate out of images freighted by statements such as 'school is dead' or 'deschool society' if they hope to influence or change all society rather than simply one part of society (Huebner, 1975, p. 247). Greene (1982) calls for educators to be concerned about the public realm and states her concern that "there is silence about

renewing the common world and about what the common world should be" (p. 4).

Second, the concern for curriculum making as integrally related to social change reflects the shifting focus of curriculum making from an emphasis upon instructing to an emphasis upon learning. The function of curriculum making is described in terms of allowing the learner to experience meaning in terms of their freedom to participate in the continual creation of the world. By raising questions of free and creative participation in negotiating and interpreting the reality of the world, "man is probing the very nature of what it means to be a human being . . . and hence delving into metaphysics and theology" (Huebner, 1975, p. 241). Greene (1975) suggests that someone "will only be in a position to learn when he is committed to act upon his world" (p. 313). Similarily, curriculum developers will be only in a position to 'develop' when committed to acting in the world; that is, acting in a setting which is grounded in a common contextual framework for thinking and acting.

Third, creating a curriculum development setting is like creating a community--it is like doing community development; that is, given the presupposition that to 'do' community development is to 'do' human development. While curriculum developers may not eventually implement the same innovations in each school or community, presumably the method by which they approach the tasks and processes of developing these innovations needs to be consistent--i.e. common and replicable. Analogously, to do effective village (community) development in a nation like India requires that developers find ways to do development in more than one village[20]. What works in one village must be translated in

some way to other villages[21]. Approaches which generate such replicability are being called for and described (Franklin, 1975; Vittachi, 1982[22]). In an example from curriculum development, King (1981) describes his experiences of working with Indian bands of British Columbia in order to implement local control of education in the band communities. As a result of his experience, King concludes that local control is necessary, but does not seem workable on a band-by-band local community control basis.

> "Some forms of regional grouping or affiliation with provincial school districts or other means of achieving consistent status-role relationships must be found for the policy ideal [of Indian control of Indian education] to be realized" (p. 74).

A replicable contextual framework within a development setting should have two main features. One, it should provide agreed upon terms of reference which do not predetermine content outcomes. Two, it should serve the individuals who participate in it. While certain individuals may have inititated the setting, other individuals should be able to 'arrive' and participate in the deliberations of the setting without having to have been involved in the setting from its beginning. In short, the setting should be like a community. It should have structures which serve the people who live there, and people should be able to participate and come and go as necessary.

These characteristics have been drawn from observations of individuals operating effectively and self-consciously <u>as a team or group</u> in community development settings. Community development, described in this thesis in terms of 'human development' and the 'journey of

commitment', is the activity of enabling commitment to the community which grows from commitment to oneself. Such commitment can only be sustained through a common context incorporating common ways of thinking and acting.

<u>NOTES</u>

1   For example: Braudel (1982), describing the growth and development of 'merchant capitalism' in Europe between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, suggests that "A merchant had to be very quick on the ball . . . the prime requirement was to send and receive large numbers of letters, to be included in as many as possible of the information networks which advised one where there was a promising opportunity, or on the contrary which should be avoided like the plague" (p. 410).

2   Local residents who, in formal and informal leadership roles, take responsibility for enabling community development efforts and following-through in these roles when the project orgainzers' initiating work is complete.

3   The concept of 'servant leadership' in detail is Greenleaf (1977).

4   "The visible, indicative <u>method</u> focuses in the 'here and now' reality the organization <u>as it is</u>. It raises the questions, where are we, what are we facing, and how do we move from here into the future?" (Hanson, 1982, p. 6).

5   "By positive, I refer to problem-solving activity and not problem-identification activity . . . by inclusive, I refer to the foundational premise that the more people involved . . . the better". .(Hanson, 1982, p. 7).

6   "By loyal I refer to one who is not an infiltrator of an organization, with another agenda . . . but rather those who are intensely loyal to the structure in which they operate. If not, they'd better figure out another life quest because they are spending their time in the wrong place . . . . They are representational--they are sensitive to the fact that the renewal of any one organization in these times is but a drop in the bucket and that it is not worth a life-time to be engaged in that activity save you do it from the context that this organization revitalized can become a sign and a demonstration to others" (Hanson, 1982, p. 7).

7   That is, the leadership which normally exists (which may or may not include the leadership of the development group).

8   The following represents an example of such a set of characteristics drawn from community development (ICA/Lonavela, 1982):

<u>NOTES</u> (continued)

<u>First</u>, community developers "enable local leadership to stand on its own through methods which enable the global/local linkage". The danger to be avoided is presuming "what a community needs and imposing ideas and programmes upon it".

<u>Second</u>, community developers serve as a catalyst in allowing single-focussed agencies and organizations to perceive new ways of interweaving with others. The danger here is "abstract or utopian theory...ungrounded in emerging social forms".

<u>Third</u>, community developers serve as "a catalyst...manifesting their own understanding based upon a foundational concern of engaging the profound resurgence of the human spirit". The danger here is twofold: i) dissipating intent by working with 'anyone' who talks of participation and local concern, and ii) failing to recognize the gifts of other people and other organizations who have worked effectively in similar development efforts.

<u>Fourth</u>, community developers "facilitate reflection by demonstrating that anyone can expend themselves in service at the point of real need". The danger here for the developer is the "inadvertent alienation of development organizations . . . through a presumptuous or accusatory stance which fails to honour all past contributions."

<u>Fifth</u>, community developers "utilize methods which engage diverse groups". The danger to avoid here is the "propensity of groups and individuals to collapse into defensive philosophical debates about their ideas on development".

9   "Bergquist (1979) describes the advantages and disadvantages inherent in voluntary-participation groups formed to develop and implement community college faculty training and renewal programs (1979).

10   "Responsive curriculum development implies the ability to meet diverse human needs, to receive new ideas, and to adapt to new situations, new knowledge, and new uses of knowledge. It is a process of continual renewal of the curriculum, through which new forms are created to fit new conditions of the environment" (Unruh, 1975 p. 90).

11   Sarason (1974) : citing C. Rossiter, <u>1787:   The Grand Convention</u> (New York: New American Library, 1966), p. 235.

<u>NOTES</u> (continued)

12   For example, groups of developers whose points of view are
      dominated by anticipated economic returns or by collaborative
      rather than confrontative political mechanisms or by a
      particular cultural orientation will create different
      developmental structures and relationships (i.e. settings), in
      spite of the fact that all three groups many face a similar
      task, e.g. developing a computer-assisted instructional modules
      for training supervisors.

13   Citing W.H. Goodenough, <u>Culture, Language, and Society</u> (New
      York: Addison-Wesley, 1971), Moles (1979) states "culture
      consists of the information we use to decide what is, what can
      be, how we feel about things, what to do about things, and how
      to go about doing something about things. . . This is similar
      to the idea proposed by Boulding (1956) in which he
      conceptualized culture as images of ourselves and our
      surroundings" (p. 177).

14   Benne (1976b), describing the field experience of students as
      an adjunct or equal component of academic instruction, outlines
      the "historical shift . . . in the focus of epistemological
      studies" (p. 168) in order to approach the problem of
      negotiating different cognitive worlds as basis for "effective
      collaboration between academic persons and practitioners and
      action leaders" (p. 169).

15   "At the roots of this is the assertion that man's most
      distinguishing characteristic is his striving to make sense of
      experience: to understand it, in whatever terms, in order to
      make it meaningful, manageable, predictable" (Bussis <u>et al</u>,
      1976, p. 12).

16   K. Boulding (1956) has described this process in some detail in
      terms of "images" and "behavior". E. Boulding (1976) describes
      the processes of "imaging the future" in which interpretations
      of reality are projected into the future.

17   Yankelovich (1982) outlines Arendt's discussion of freedom as
      one of the principles defining revolution. Citing Arendt (<u>On
      Revolution</u>. New York: Viking Press, 1963, p. 28), Yankelovich
      states that "revolution will always advance the cause of human
      freedom"--a distinction being made by Arendt between
      'liberation' and 'freedom' in which liberation is "a necessary
      precondition of freedom" (pp. 217 - 218). In this sense
      liberation could be considered as 'liberation from oppression'
      whereas freedom could be considered as the 'freedom to decide'.

NOTES (continued)

18   "The discrepancy between the unfortunate fate of so many real-life attempts to build a utopia and the success described in the literary utopias is that in the real world agreement on basis values is far from adequate to the development of a viable, new social setting" (Sarason, 1974, p. 8).

19   "A post-industrial society, because it centers on services--human services, professional and technical services--is a game between persons. The organization of a research team, or the relation between doctor and patient, teacher and pupil, government official and petitioner--a world, in short, where the modalities are scientific knowledge, higher education, community organization, and the like--involves cooperation and reciprocity rather than coordination and hierarchy. The post-industrial society is thus a communal society in which the social unit is the community organization rather than the individual, and decisions have to be reached through some polity--in collective negotiations between private organizations, as well as government--rather than the market. But cooperation between men is more difficult than the management of things. Participation is a condition of community; and when many different groups want too many different things and are not prepared to bargain, then increased conflict or deadlock results. There is either a politics of consensus or a politics of stymie. (Bell, 1978, p. 148).

20   In India, 342 million people live in rural villages.

21   "There needs to be a comprehensive integrated global approach that is created out of what has been learned in the past by a coalition of people made up of all sectors involved in the development process . . . The ICA International is organizing an INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT to respond to this need for a new approach to the worldwide task of rural development. The Exposition, in India in Februray 1984, is the culmination of a three year series of related events in fifty nations". (ICA, 1983, XII, (1), p. 2).

22   V.T. Vittachi (1982), Deputy Director of External Affairs, UNICEF, in a talk presented to the Institute of Cultural Affairs, Chicago, insisted "that wherever I work in the United Nations ... The assistance must be more than marginally effective. It must be used as a spur to development . . . a multiplying effect" (1982, p. 2)

CHAPTER FIVE

CREATING CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT SETTINGS

Intentionally created curriculum development settings will
have many forms. However, there are three methodological aspects which
could be considered common to creating settings: i) generating images
and ideas for thinking, planning and acting; ii) building an effective
team or action force, and iii) sustaining the team as resolutions and
actions are given form and implemented. Each of these aspects will be
discussed in terms of how community development experience can inform
curriculum development efforts. Three assumptions guide this discussion:
i) people act according to their images[1] of the world, ii) events can
bring such images to self-consciousness and can change images, and iii)
the stories, rituals, and other symbolic forms which are created to
significate these events sustain the development team's commitment. A
model for creating curriculum development settings will be outlined.

Images, values and actions

In contemporary society, many settings appear to be
changing and many new settings appear to be created. Sarason (1974)
suggests, however, "the high rate of setting creation does not in itself
mean that the creation of settings is a crucial problem" (p. 4). The
quantity of settings created is not at issue, but rather the quality of
such settings[2]. Yet, while each setting needs to be judged
individually, and while any attempts to generalize about such varied
settings are not valid, it is necessary to go beyond "superficial
appearances [in order] to seek communalities that are most productive of

89

new ideas and different view of the world" (p. 4). The problem is <u>not</u> simply to seek communalities in order to find new ideas or a different view of the world. Such ideas and views exist in abundance.

Rather the problem is to discern the particular new ideas and particular world views (i.e. categories of thought) within the communalities which reflect the basic or fundamental changes of society. These ideas and world views are at the root of the issues underlying a particular situation for which a new setting is being planned. Developers creating settings must intentionally discern this contextual framework from which they will approach the problem of creating a setting in order to ensure that the setting will not simply reproduce the problem they are trying to solve. E. Boulding (1976) calls this activity "imaging the future" (p. 431). These images reflect not only a different view of the world but a different view of the particular situation for which setting creation is anticipated. Such an image affects how individuals think and act (K. Boulding, 1956). These images of the world have a significant impact on the awareness of values. Such an impact pushes some to a blind and frightened affirmation of what they consider the basic values, while others may be pushed to a critical appraisal of traditional values and to a "developing consciousness of new values" (Sarason, 1974, p. 5)[3].

In development efforts, an initial strategy is often to raise to self-consciousness each participant's images of self, community, and the world in order that new images and ideas can be generated. Participants are enabled to "assume responsibility for their own images, for society, and for the future" (ICA, 1981, <u>XI</u>(2), p. 2)[4].

"The first task is to discern people's unconscious operating images in order to work with them effectively. . . No one can control the images of another person; yet it is possible to bring consciousness to existing images and the awareness of alternative images. It is essential that the alternative images be demonstrated" (ICA, 1981, XI(2), 14).

The negotiation and interpretation of the images, values, and actions

is made self-conscious in the midst of 'eventful' experiences (i.e. pleasing, or shocking, or awesome, or otherwise memorable experiences which developers create in the midst of a setting). When an event occasions 'revolutionary change" in a person's images (Boulding, 1956, p. 8), when such an event "deeply disturbs the status quo"[5] (Arendt, 1963), or when the event occasions "conversion" [6] (Polanyi, 1975, pp. 179-1980), the person experiences a transformation in meaning which allows the situation to be perceived from a whole new perspective. For example, community developers, in response to particular community needs, may initiate the construction of an irrigation ditch. However, the significance of such activity is not simply in the fact that the new irrigation ditch exists, but rather is that the villagers, who, in helping dig a new irrigation ditch, realize for the first time that in taking responsibility for changing their village, they have changed not only the village, but have changed themselves. The situation may only be slightly different, but their self-image has been significantly transformed.

Alchin and Decharin (1979) state "the decision-making process is based on the idea that individuals have images, or a perception, understanding, and interpretation of the world around them . . . . Images result in plans" (1979, p. 92)[7]. Each step in the process of converting these images to plans to actions involves not only the

identification and interpretation of image and action by each individual participant, but by the development group. Each step involves not only perception and interpretation, but evaluation[8]. These processes of evaluation--converting images to action--occur in the midst of deliberative events.

Eventfulness: awakenment, conscientization, and commitment

A deliberative event provides the basis for initiating and sustaining the setting-creation process. Each deliberative event encompasses three aspects of this process by which images and ideas are converted to plans and actions: awakenment, conscientization, and commitment[9]. During the initial phases of a development process, concerns for 'awakenment' will be predominant. During the latter phases of a process, concerns for 'commitment' will be predominant.

i)   Awakenment

Images and ideas can come to self-consciousness in two ways. They can grow slowly and subconsciously--bubbling up through an individual's intuitions and rational reflections--for example, people talk of the 'dawning' of an insight. Or, they can be occasioned in a 'moment'. In this latter sense, there is a more delimited sense of a 'before' and 'after' quality to ways of thinking--"Yesterday I didn't realize 'x'--today I do". An awakenment event[10] is a structure for enabling such 'moments'.

"This new consciousness indicatively emerges out of
the process of history itself which is, in essence, experience

and response (event and story) . . . life is known as
significant only through the process of internal reflection on
the external event out of a self-conscious relationship. When
this happens, it is called awakenment, whether you are
referring to an individual, a group within a community, or a
world.

It is this life process that raises the
methodological question of how to occasion awakenment to a
self-conscious, creative relationship to every external
situation" (ICA, 1979, p. 4).

An awakenment event will have two functions: i) the
presentation of aspects of ways of thinking about humanness and the
world, and ii) the deliberation upon such presentations as the basis for
the negotiation of reality, value, and the means of negotiation.
Deliberation at this level often involves participants' responses to
questions of the type suggested by Crowfoot and Chesler (1976):

> "1.   What are their general images of society?
> 2.   What are their general images of the individual?
> 3.   What are their diagnoses of contemporary society?
> 4.   What are their priorities with regard to change?"
>   (p. 190).

Such processes can each contain four related stages: i)
participants' generation and collection of data--descriptions of reality,
value statements, etc., ii) subjective reflection upon this information--
discerning a pattern of response contained in all individual's
presentations, iii) the interpretation of this pattern of response; that
is, "the articulation of the significance of the pattern which reveals
[iv] the indicative decision" to act on this basis of this significance
(ICA, 1979, p. 4).

An awakenment event, incorporating such reflective
processes, is a way by which some community developers have experimented
with creating a common context for people engaged in a community

development process[11]. The effect of such events is that participants see how diverse options and issues can be focused into consensed group action through a carefully designed method. People see that their concerns have been considered, experience the power of common planning, and perceive the question of individual responsibility in the community.

The story which participants create about the meaning of such events can become a motivating factor in subsequent growth toward commitment. Such stories, or mythologies, are created out of the reflection upon experiences by individuals which, in dialogue with each other, they significate[12]. Mythology cannot be created and given to people--it must be created by people. Spencer (1981), describing stories documented by people who have worked with him in several international community development projects, sets out four recurring elements of such a 'mythology'--the human condition is characterized by mystery, freedom, care, and fulfilment in the midst of service.

A group of people can come to share a common mind about common experiences. The ways by which the events and stories comprising this common mind are recounted often assume the characteristics of myth and legend. In this sense, the story which highlights, dramatizes, and significates the event often becomes as important and as real than the event itself. Other bases of commonness, similar to story and myth, include interpretations of reality given form and structure through symbols[13], art[14] (for example, Fifth City Project Report, 1981), and ritual[15].

ii) <u>Conscientization</u>

"Liberating action necessarily involves a <u>moment</u> of perception and volition. This action both precedes and follows that moment, to which it first acts as a prologue and which it subsequently serves to effect and continue within history" (Freire, 1970, p. 36; citing Jose Luiz Fiori).

The event within which the awakenment moment occurs is one step in the conscientization of the participants in the development setting[16]. Within an awakenment moment, participants experience the transformation of their understanding of the problem. The aspect of the concrete situation which is now problematic is the newly revealed underlying root problem which is preventing the more obvious, and perhaps symptomatic problems, from being resolved[17]. After such an event (or moment) participants experience themselves as both obedient and free. That is, they must address the indicative contradictions revealed within the situation[18], and at the same time, the moment which reveals and transforms their conscious relationship to the contradiction also occasions the consciousness of their freedom to address the problem rather than be blocked by it.

The issue is not simply freedom in abstraction nor submission to the situation, but the occasioning of responsibility - the responsibility which exists in the creative tension of freedom and obedience (Bonhoeffer, 1965). Freire (1970) describes this in terms of emergence and intervention - "men <u>emerge</u> from their submission and acquire the ability to <u>intervene</u> in reality as it is unveiled" (p. 100), and in terms of the "increased commitment to the position one has chosen, and thus ever greater engagement in the effort to transform concrete, objective reality" (p. 21). This shift from the moment of awakenment to

the activity of conscientization can be described in Turner's terms as the natural shift from "spontaneous" to "normative" and "ideological" communitas.

>"Both normative and ideological communitas are already within the domain of structure, and it is the fate of all spontaneous communitas in history, to undergo what most people see as the 'decline and fall' into structure and law" (Turner, 1977, p. 132).

Creating a setting involves not simply the ideas and vision which developers share as they create a setting, but the environment and in the relationships (i.e. the structure and law) of the setting itself. Conscientization involves the building of a common mind among the participants and the gradual growth of a sense of commitment to the development team and the development vision.

iii) Commitment

Commitment, in terms of a development setting, can be described in two ways: the growth of commitment of the community (i.e., all those involved in the setting--Conner and Patterson, 1982; ICA, 1981) and the growth of each individual within the community in terms of the individual's relationships with others and with her or himself (Fowler, 1976; Perry, 1970).

A community journey has four phases (ICA, 1981, XI (3))[19]. First, a community development effort is initiated in the midst of enthusiasm and good intentions. Second, as the project gains momentum and substantial changes are brought into being "the euphoria of new activities gradually dulls as more complex and long-term responsibilities come clear" (p. 11). Third, the community experiences a

major crisis of some sort which calls the whole project into question. Such a crisis is precipitated when certain initial expectations are not fulfilled or when change is not fast enough or when change is too fast. Cliques may emerge, conflict surfaces, resentment grows, and enthusiasm fails.

Such crises have been described in terms of "role shock" (King, 1981) and in terms of the disillusionment that "the more things change, the more they stay the same" (Sarason, 1974). At this point, the project either collapses or moves into the fourth phase. What seems to make the difference between success and failure are the ways by which the developers and the participants from the initiation phase have thought through and articulated new and common understandings of the community's journey, particularily in terms of anticipating such human problems (contrasted with technical or logistical problems) and in terms of anticipating issues relating to the implementation and completion of the project.

If the community is to move into the fourth phase, two such factors will need to have been anticipated and in place: i) if on-going and accepted programs have been put in place during the first three phases, their momentum and often their 'routine-ness' will in many cases carry the community through the conflict and perhaps even provide vehicles through which the conflicts may be discussed and resolved, and ii) if a substantial victory or "keystone miracle" (ICA, 1981) can be achieved as this time, it will often re-focus the community's deliberations and provide a way to see conflict in a new perspective (such a victory might be the completion of a well and subsequent fresh

water for a village, or the arrival of a grant, or the public recognition of the community's contributions to the region).

The fourth phase is the new resolve and new perseverance of the community. It is like a newly married couple's awareness that the honeymoon is over and the reality of the marriage lies before them. This phase is marked by a new depth of commitment, an expansion of the leadership core, and "an expanded role of social responsibility [to other parts of the region]" (ICA, 1981, XI (3), p. 11).

> "This journey is not a living through good times and bad times; it is not a linear progression towards the achievement of an ideal state of mind. It is a journey of consciousness of a community through time. It goes on and on, is ever changing, is never the same. It is only when a community refuses any particular part of the journey that it loses its vitality, its creativity, its determination to win" (Knutsen, 1981, p. 35).

The growth of commitment in individuals (particularly adults) has been described by Fowler (1976). A similar pattern of growth has been observed and described in Perry's study of college students (1970)[20]. However, even though Perry's categories are more closely related to schooling and learning than Fowler's, Fowler's categories will be used as they more comprehensively describe the adult's growth of commitment in community.

The first stage of commitment for Fowler (1976) is marked by the adult's awareness of the desirability of taking seriously the responsibility for his or her own commitments, life-style, beliefs and attitudes. The next stage, according to Fowler, is marked by a recognition by the person of the integrity and truth of commitments other than its own. The final stage, says Fowler, is "rare":

"The sense of oneness of all persons is not a glib ideological belief but has become a permeative basis for decision and action. The paradox has gone out of being-for-others . . . one is being more truly oneself . . . Such persons are ready for fellowship with persons at any of the other stages" (p. 197).

Fowler discusses each of these stages in the journey of adult commitment in terms of forms of logic (built upon Piagetian theories of cognitive development), forms of world coherence, role-taking, bounds of social awareness, forms of moral judgement (in relation to Kohlberg's stages of moral development), and the role of symbols. He concludes his discussion by stating that the stages are not to be taken in a simplistic 'higher is better' manner.

"Each stage may be the most appropriate stage for a particular person or group. Each stage describes a pattern of valuing, thinking, feeling, and committing which is potentially worthy, serene, and graceful" (Fowler, 1976, p. 201).

Leadership

From the early part of this century, community developers have identified the commitment and confidence of the local people as the one element which could make the difference between a project's success and its failure. Commitment grows from an awakened self-confidence in each individual.

"Tagore believed that if villagers could be given confidence in their own ability, they could determine their own needs for professional assistance" (Mezirow, 1963, p. 16)

"It was the building of personal self-confidence in the villagers which Gandhi recognized as a liberating pre-condition for their assuming the responsibilities of citizenship" (Mezirow, 1963, p. 202).

However, early community development efforts often dealt with only the most basic levels of need--the provision of adequate food, water, shelter, and so on. Such approaches reflect theories of human development [for example, Havighurst (1979), Levinson (1979), and most notably Maslow (1968, 1970)] which have described human development in terms of a progression from the meeting of basic level needs (such as food, clothing, and shelter) to the higher level needs (e.g. self-actualization).

Community development, understood more recently in terms of human development, is a more complex task than simply providing for the material well-being of people in a community. At the same time as such material well-being is being provided, opportunities must also be provided for the development of local self-confidence. Such self-confidence is not only founded on the meeting of individual needs, but on the meeting of community needs. There is more to human development than self-actualization--human development involves the development of people's sense of responsibility and commitment to the community as well as to themselves as individuals.

"Human priorities do not function according to a hierarchy. [The idea that] self-actualization presupposes our ascension through various stages of economic well-being is a particularly self-congratulatory philosophy for a materialistic age" (Yankelovich, 1982, p. 234).

Yankelovich (1982) describes the trends away from self-actualization[21] as described in the popular literature of self-psychology and toward an ethic of commitment which "discards the Maslowian checklist of inner needs and potentials of the self, and seeks instead the elusive freedom Arendt describes as the treasure people sometimes discover when they are

free to join with others in shaping the tasks and shared meanings of their times" (p. 247).

One way of sustaining such commitment is through what Bennis (1982) calls the "artform of leadership". Bennis discusses leadership by asking "How do organizations translate intention into reality and sustain it?" (p. 44). He suggests that the way to achieve and sustain this "translation" is through leadership, which, according to a study (1982) conducted by Bennis, includes the following competencies:

"The capacity to create and communicate a compelling vision[22] (or paradigm, context, frame) that induces commitment;

"The capacity to communicate a vision in order to gain the support of multiple constitutencies;

"The capacity to maintain the organization, direction, especially when the going gets rough;

"The capacity to create environments--the appropriate social architecture--that can tap and harness the energies and abilities necessary to bring about desired results" (pp. 44 - 45).

A leader or leadership team sustains commitment through the intentional creation of a setting. Settings will vary in appearance and form, of course, from situation to situation according to the tasks to be accomplished, the processes chosen to achieve them, and the nature of the individuals involved. The key factor is the intentionality which the leaders bring to the creation of an environment and through the creation and enabling of the relationships within that environment.

Each setting will be located in a certain environment--the physical space and facilities will be arranged and used in particular ways. Each setting will encompass certain relationships--people will define certain rules, policies, procedures,

roles, incentives, rewards, and so on. In those settings in which developers have brought an intentionality to the contextual framework, an observer would notice a concern for the rites of initiation and closure of the project; for symbol; for the story which significates each individual's engagement; for task accountability, absolution[23], and assignment; for corporate celebration; for reflection in the midst of action; and a concern for time--times of structure and rationality, times for exuberance and for intuition. Through such intentionality a leader can communicate a sense of "a deep, intimate involvement near or at the heart of things which motivates and empowers" (Bennis, 1982, p. 46). In this sense, the structure of the environment and the relationships within the environment sustain the individual's commitment. Paradoxically, the leader leads not necessarily by being charismatic or authoritarian, but by serving the structures which sustain people. The leader proclaims the vision, guards the symbols, and ensures that the structures are comprehensive and inclusive. The leader's authority is perceived in terms of 'presence' rather than simply in terms of 'power'.

A model

Traditional forms of planning settings often reflect either hierarchical or confrontational "power-coercive" approaches (Chin and Benne, 1976). The following model, drawn from community development experience[24], outlines a "normative-re-educative" (Chin and Benne, 1976) approach to planning and creating settings for curriculum development which encompasses environmental, relational, and contextual concerns. The model addresses both the planning process and the

community-building process. Another purpose of this model is to provide
an alternative to hierachical or confrontational approaches which is a
response to two recurring problems with the latter two approaches.

First, both tend to be situation-specific where
decision-making is grounded in the immediacies of a situation. Such
approaches do not easily allow for consideration of impinging long-term
factors or consequences nor for consideration of all factors in a
situation. A second problem is that both tend to be goal-oriented. The
hopes, and or desired changes, of the participants are stated in terms of
goals. These goals are arranged according to values and priorities, and
a series of strategies and tactics are mapped out to accomplish the goals
over a specified period of time. Working to unblock problems which arise
(which they do unfailingly!) is experienced as time consuming and
frustrating, delaying the 'real' work which is needed to accomplish the
goals. Sarason (1974) alludes to this problem by suggesting that a
goal-orientation, with its "preoccupation with the future", fragments the
perspective of developers--i.e., "this orientation isolates or
de-emphasizes the past" (p. 61). Problems of the present upset the
goal-oriented timetable:

> "As events begin to invalidate the time perspective,
> the handling or response to the present can become invaded by
> all kinds of factors which disrupt relationships and sometimes
> even result in aborting the whole affair" (Sarason, 1974, p.
> 62).

The model to be outlined is based upon an approach
involving "contradictional analysis" (ICA, 1981, XI (2)) which has been
developed in the attempt to overcome these problems. Rather than being

goal-oriented, this approach is vision-oriented. Planning and setting-creation, involving contradiction analysis, has six steps. Each of these steps involves participants in the activities of brainstorming information, reflecting on the information and organizing it into helpful categories, discussing these categories and interpreting what they mean, and finally, deciding what form and structure are revealed and called for in this information and its relationships.

The six steps are:

1. <u>The Operating Vision</u>: sharing specific hopes and dreams for the future

2. <u>The Underlying Contradictions</u>: discerning the sociological reality which prevents the vision from being realized

3. <u>The Practical Proposals</u>: determining the arenas of action which will deal with the contradictions

4. <u>The Tactical Systems</u>: itemizing the particular actions necessary to move in the proposed directions

5. <u>The Actuating Programs</u>: grouping the tactics into a system of action programs

6. <u>The Timelined Implementaries</u>: organizing the tasks and assignments on a calendar to carry out the programs

The first two steps are the most important and most unique. In the first step, the values and images of all participants are elicited. Also included in this step is the consideration of research material such as demographic data, geo-social analyses, and so on. People often have difficulty with this step--it is assumed that everyone understands a given situation in terms of its needs and problems. It is assumed that everyone has similar operating images. Creating the operating vision allows for such difficulty to be addressed. The vision

reveals for the group involved the perceived community trends and the intentions of the group's anticipated programs.

In the second step, the contradictions, i.e. these aspects of 'reality' blocking the vision, are identified. These contradictions will have to be addressed in order for the vision to be realized. This allows for subsequent planning to be grounded in what individuals perceive as 'real life'[25] rather than in what is often perceived as the more abstract goals of traditional planning processes.

For those individuals working on the day-to-day work of doing the implementation tasks, the process of rehearsing and refining the product of each of the six steps is on-going. Every week and every month of the project, new understandings and images of the contradictions, proposals, and tactics will be generated and the action plans subsequently modified.

> "As images and plans are evaluated and converted into action, new images and new plans emerge. The process is cyclic, ongoing, and never-ending" (Alchin and Decharin 1979, p. 94).

An outline of a model for curriculum developers based upon these community development activities follows. The general intention of this model is to involve as many people as possible who will be affected by the curriculum product; i.e. instructors, administrators, employers, content experts, students, and so on. In addition, the intention of the model is to address and resolve issues of curriculum implementation of all steps of the curriculum development process.

i) PHASE ONE: General Strategies and Initial Approaches

Intention: To determine curriculum project parameters: anticipated outcomes, limitations, and possibilities.

Stage of the Model	Basic Questions
ASSEMBLE PROJECT TEAM	Who are we? Who else needs to be involved?
DEFINE CURRICULUM PROBLEM	What needs to be done? Why is this important?
DETERMINE OPERATING GUIDELINES	How will we work together?
BUILD PRACTICAL VISION	What would the curriculum product be? What would have occurred in the school to accommodate the new curriculum?
IDENTIFY THE PROBLEMS	What would block the realization of this curriculum effort?
NAME THE DEPTH ISSUES	What is preventing these blocks from being overcome?
MAKE INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS	How can the depth issues be addressed?
EXPAND INFORMATION BASE	What information is needed to support or modify the recommendations?
CONSOLIDATE BASIC PROPOSALS	What are the best proposals for curriculum content and implementation underlying the recommendations?
MAKE DESIGN DECISIONS	What are the best ways to achieve these proposals?
BUILD IMPLEMENTATION TACTICS	Who? What? Where? Why? When? How? How much?
SPECIFY EVALUATION INTENTIONS	How will we know the degree to which we have been successful?

This model could consist of a series of workshops conducted over a three to five day period. The product of these workshops could include curriculum goals, purposes, and anticipated outcomes; the implementation

tactics relating to the development and preparation of specific curriculum objectives, materials, aids, lesson plans and so on; recommendations for in-service workshops for training faculty; budgets; and other administrative and instructional details.

ii) PHASE TWO: Specific Stategies for Completion of Curriculum Project

Intention: To give substance and structure to the curriculum product, given the parameters and guidelines previously determined.

A number of strategies exist which could be used to integrate data generated in Phase One with the data which would be generated during the subsequent detailed development of the curriculum materials and resources. One curriculum development model, developed by Kemp (1977), illustrates how community and organizational considerations could be integrated with specific curricular concerns; for example, vocational/technical training programs. Kemp's model involves eight elements of a flexible process (pp. 8 - 9):

a) Consider goals, and then list topics, stating the general purposes for teaching each topic.

b) Enumerate the important characteristics of the learners for whom the instruction is to be designed.

c) Specify the learning objectives to be achieved in terms of measurable student outcomes.

d) List the subject content that supports each objective.

e) Develop pre-assessments to determine the student's background and present level of knowledge about the topic.

f) Select teaching/learning activities and instructional resources that will treat the subject content so students will accomplish the objectives.

g)   Coordinate such support services as budgets, personnel, facilities, equipment, and schedules to carry out the instructional plan.

h)   Evaluate students' learning in terms of their accomplishment of objectives, with a view to revising and re-evaluating any phases of the plan that need improvement.

Kemp's octogonal arrangement of these eight elements represents their interdependence--decisions relating to one will affect others. There is not necessarily a 'right' element with which to begin the process. The product of this process would include all curriculum objectives, plans, aids, evaluation instruments, and so on.

The second phase of this model is drawn from the literature of curriculum development whereas the first phase is drawn from the literature of community development and the creation of settings. The model provides a way for generating images and ideas for thinking, planning and acting, and for building and sustaining an effective development team. Such a model reflects development events in which participants experience awakenment, conscientization, and growth in commitment.

NOTES

1   K. Boulding (1956) describes images as "subjective knowledge . . . this image [of the world] that largely governs my behaviour" (p. 5). E. Boulding (1976) discusses "the capacity of a society to generate creative images of the future, that will act back on the present, and draw it toward the envisioned tomorrow" (p. 431). Elbaz (1981) describing the teacher's "practical knowledge" suggests that "image", in concert with "rules of practice" and "practical principles", "guides action in an intuitive way" (p. 50).

2   "The rate of setting creation reflects some kind of basic change in our society, but again this is quite different from arguing that swift change is the hallmark of our times" (Sarason, 1974, p. 3). Underlying this observation is the aphorism (which seems to be Sarason's hallmark) that the more things change the more they stay the same.

Similarly, Abbey (1983) writes "We live in a time [i.e. the 20th century], as we are told and like to think, of 'revolutionary changes', with even more astonishing revolutionary changes about to come roaring around the corner. (No end of revolutions, the skeptic murmurs; but where is the change?)".

3   The relationship of values to images has been described by K. Boulding (1956) who states that "the value scales of any individual or organization are perhaps the most important single element determining the effect of the messages it receives on its image of the world" (p. 12).

4   For example: "In the Bayad village project in Egypt, alternative images projected to the people included images of themselves as significant and capable, of the task as learnable and 'do-able', and of the village as a human place in need of the creative participation of its citizens" (ICA, 1981, XI (2), 14).

5   Yankelovich (1982) citing Arendt (On Revolution. New York: Viking, 1963), describes one of two principles which define all revolutions:

"One is that a true revolution always starts a 'new story' in human affairs . . . a new beginning". Such a revolution is more than mere change: it is founded upon an event or events which "so deeply disturb the status quo that all old beliefs, values, meanings, traditions, and structures are disturbed and profoundly modified" (pp. 217 - 218).

NOTES (continued)

.

6   "At that moment we <u>are</u> converted . . . for we are addressed by nature to the attainment of meaning, and what genuinely seems to us to open the doors to greater meaning is what we can only verbally refuse to believe" (Polanyi, 1975, p. 180).

7   Alchin and Decharin (1979) state: "Images are culturally determined and are composed of beliefs, values, traditions, and more--the collective knowledge and wisdom of the individual--which can be shared or not shared" (p. 92).

8   "Evaluation is the process of determining objectives and alternatives, discussion, negotiation, compromise, decision, and transactions to achieve individual or group goals" (Alchin and Decharin, 1979, p. 92).

9   The terms reflect the growth of individuals in what Turner (1977) calls "communitas: a relationship between concrete, historical, idiosyncratic individuals" (p. 131). Turner, describing <u>communitas</u> identifies:

   i)   "spontaneous communitas; that is, 'a happening', and what Williams Blake might have called 'the winged moment as it flies';

   ii)   "normative communitas; that is, the organization or social form given to enduring spontaneous communitas; and

   iii)   "ideological communitas; that is, "the external and visible effects . . . of an inward experience of spontaneous communitas" (p. 132).

10   A number of "indicators of awakenment" have been determined; for example: individuals trust their intuitions about their experience; they tend to consider the 'whole' picture and move toward more comprehensiveness in their thinking; they discover their ability and power to build futuric models; alternative possibilities held by the future are realized; they realize that some forms of deliberation and consensus-building can work; in thinking through issues with others, insights are generated which they would not have considered as individuals; they discover relationships between the past and present and the present and the future; and they discover the power and motivating aspects of teamwork (ICA, 1979, pp. 11 - 17).

11   For example, the Human Development Project Consultation developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA). This five-day construct enables deliberation between local community

NOTES (continued)

residents and professional 'experts' and is facilitated by ICA staff. Each of the five days focuses on a particular deliberative task: Vision, Contradictions, Proposals, Tactics, and on the final day, Implementation Timelines. This information is documented and provides the basis for initiating two to four year community development projects.

12 Joseph Campbell (1972) suggests that myths are to groups what dreams are to individuals--they provide four important functions in the life of groups, or of communities: i) the awakening of a sense of awe, ii) the offering of a comprehensive image of the world, iii) support for the social order, and iv) the guiding of individuals through inevitable life crises.

MacKinnon (1979), citing Frye (1967), states "Myth ... is the essential building block of culture" (p. 245).

Some current work in community development suggests that:

"In philosophical methods, the issue is not in the analytical or the existential, but in the meta-language or myth factor. Historically, the analytical method says that even though we stand in different places, we can consense on our individual descriptions of a common experience. In existential methodologies (phenomenological) we have learned that if you stand where I am standing and see what I am seeing you will experience what I am experiencing. The edge today is building the meta-language to describe the intensification of these two method systems or the 'myth factor' methodology" (ICA, 1979, p. 6).

Writing in The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, J.T. Leonard (1983) describes myth in relation to apologetic tales, satire, parables, and history. All five types of 'stories' emerge as people attempt to describe their experiences of 'consciousness" as it transcends itself--"The universal human response to mystery has been to tell stories--stories that create order and meaning within the question that is mystery. The first kind of story is a myth . . ." (p. 19).

13 Douglas, 1982; Duncan, 1968; Jung, 1979.

14 Langer, 1957.

·15 "To talk of ritual as the desperate need of our age is not something unique or new with us. Huxley talks of ritualization as the vehicle of progress. Turner (1977) says ritual is the

source of life and adaptation. Ritual is described as the enlivener of law (Sally Moore of Havard), as the way to healing transformation is psychology (Czikszentmihaly of the University of Chicago), as a basic intent of drama (Grotowski of Warsaw), as the way of religious knowledge (jennings of Penn State), and of neurological health (D'Aquili of the University of Pennsylvania)" (Grow, 1983).

Jennings (1982) discussed "ritual knowledge" in terms of "ritual action"; i.e. i) ritual activity as a way of gaining knowledge--"a mode of inquiry and discovery" (p. 112); ii) ritual activity as a way to transmit knowledge" (p. 120) and for "ritual as the object of knowledge" (p. 122).

16 Freire (1970) describes 'conscientization' (i.e. conscientizacao) or 'critical consciousness' as the process of learning to perceive the contradictions in a situation and to take action against them - the process which makes it possible for people "to enter the historical process as responsible" (p. 20).

17 The "situation ceases to present itself as a . . . tormenting blind alley" (Freire, 1970, p. 100).

18 "Hence the radical requirement - that the concrete situation which begets oppression must be transformed" (Freire, 1970, p. 35).

19 Conner and Patterson (1982) describe eight stages of commitment in relation to the implementation of organizational change. These eight stages, encompassing a Preparation Phase, an Acceptance Phase, and a Commitment Phase, are described in terms of the positive and negative outcomes which can be anticipated.

20 Perry describes the college student's journey toward commitment in terms of nine "positions" ranging from the freshman's "Basic Duality" where issues are most often perceived in black and white tones to the college graduate who has begun to make "Initial Commitments" and is anticipating the implications of developing commitments.

21 Similarily, Pilder and Murphy (1975) caution curriculum developers that a concern for self-actualization may actually be "another more subtle form of teacher (social) control. Marcuse's analysis is apt: Self-actualization isolates the individual from the one dimension where he could find himself: from his political existence" (p. 346).

NOTES (continued)

22   "A compelling vision is a set of symbolic forms expressing a
     tapestry of intentions . . . the intention and its
     expressions--crowns and coronations, limousines and
     conferences--give what goes on in organizations an aura of
     being not merely important, but, in some odd fashion, connected
     with the way the world is built. The gravity of organizational
     leadership and solemnity of high worship spring from more
     similar sources than might first appear' (Bennis, 1982, p. 45).

23   That is, raising to self-consciousness the freedom which exists
     in taking responsibility for accomplishing a given task or for
     caring for a particular situation (Bonhoeffer, 1965).

     Other shorter versions of this model have been developed for
     community development work; for example, Community Forum
     Canada, Town Meeting (USA), Community Meeting Australia, Gram
     Sabha (India), and others.

24   For example, the Human Development Consultation developed by
     the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA, 1981, XI (2))
     previously cited (p. 110).

25   A contradiction is not a 'negative' quality. It is not a lack
     of 'x'. For example, lack of funding is not a contradiction.
     The contradiction is that reality which is stopping the group
     from getting the funding which is perceived as necessary.

     Freire states that "since it is in a concrete situation that
     the ... contradiction is established, the resolution of this
     contradiction must be objectively verifiable" (1970, p. 35).
     Once the contradiction is clear, the proposals are often
     obvious.

Curriculum development and adult education in post-secondary education

Adult education and adult development have only relatively recently been studied in depth. Before 1920, the term 'adult education' did not appear in the professional educational vocabulary. However, "by 1960 this term was widely used as a symbol of a significant aspect of the national institutional system" (Knowles, 1977, p. 154). A hallmark of the adult education movement was Kidd's How Adults Learn (1959) which was reprinted several times and in 1973 was updated and rewritten. Adult education and training is characterized by a collaborative and collegial relationship between the instructor and the learner (Knowles, 1972; Knox, 1977; Verner, 1962). Knox, in his comprehensive description of adult development (1977) reviewed forty-three (43) studies of adult learning. An examination of the dates of publication of these forty-three studies reveals a fifty year range from 1927 to 1977; eight were published before 1953, eight during the 1950's, fifteen during the 1960's and fourteen between 1970 and 1977. This concern for adult education and adult development parallels the growth of the community college system in the 1960's and 1970's.

The collaboration perceived in adult education is reflected in the curriculum development process where deliberation occurs among

adults in the development of programs for adults. The stakeholders who are involved in or related to curriculum development efforts in post-secondary education, particularly the community college system, include curriculum workers, instructors, consultants, employers of students, administrators, government officials, students, counsellors, and supervisory personnel from business and industry. Representatives of these different groups also participate on Advisory Committees set up for each program offered by the colleges.

Community colleges are a recent form given to adult learning in Canada. "In 1960, there was only one institution [in Canada . . . at Lethbridge, Alberta] which could be described as a public community college" (Dennison et al, 1975, p. 1). Today in British Columbia alone there are sixteen community colleges. In the larger community colleges, curriculum workers assist instructors primarily with the development of vocational/technical programs. Curriculum in this instance has a "technological" (for example, competency-based) orientation (Eisner, 1979, p. 67 - 70). In most colleges, community aspects of curriculum development are often assumed, taken for granted, or ignored. Curriculum development is often perceived by administrators and practitioners as a reactive task--the response to industry and employer requirements, given a college's limitations and resources. The development of programs, particularly on the vocational/technical college campuses, is perceived as being characterized by an over-emphasis upon economic concerns and assembly-line training techniques and methods.

Curriculum projects are undertaken and completed which are, in themselves, effective pieces of work. That is, the curriculum enables

students to be adequately trained in order to meet the employment requirements of a particular trade. For example, the current British Columbia Ministry of Education efforts[1] at developing a provincial post-secondary 'core' curriculum for each 'designated trade' have produced some well-written curriculum documents (as well as some poorly written and unusable documents). These documents are intended to reflect the skills necessary to be learned in order to obtain employment in various trades. However, good intentions are not enough.

The problems which are arising from such curriculum efforts are not just with the curriculum documents[2]. The whole method by which the curriculum making is conducted is perceived by many as inadequate. Criticism revolves around such economic, political and cultural issues as the values implied or imposed in the curriculum, the participation or non-participation of various stakeholders in decision-making, the working relationships or collapse of relationships between the Ministry and the various community colleges, the unanticipated costs and problems to the colleges of implementing the core curriculum, the feeling that too many people are being trained for too few jobs or that not enough people are being trained for certain jobs, and that no one is anticipating training needs for jobs which may not even exist at this time.

Curriculum developers concerned with the immediacies of product and process issues are not able to give significant attention to these so-called community aspects of development in spite of being aware of the impact that such aspects will have upon their work. Curriculum developers are frustrated by the foreknowledge that no matter how technically appropriate their curriculum documents, they know that their

efforts likely will be ignored or radically altered by bureaucrats, administrators, or instructors in order for the curriculum product to 'fit' the status quo or other such exigencies of a particular situation.

In spite of the awareness that these economic, political, and cultural aspects overlap and interrelate, there are few approaches to curriculum development which intentionally set out to integrate them in order that the curriculum product reflects the intentions and vision of all stakeholders. A number of suggestions for curriculum workers follow which are derived from the current understanding and experience of community developers. Such learnings from community development can inform and enable curriculum developers who begin the task of creating the setting for curriculum development.

A first suggestion is to become aware of and to generate awareness in others of a critical self-consciousness and understanding of the changing relationships within the educational community and the wider society.

A second suggestion is to discern ways by which curriculum workers can begin to think about and give form to the setting in which to discuss and create the necessary curriculum in response to and in anticipation of such changing societal relationships.

A third suggestion--given the new self-awareness of individuals as they respond to shifts in the society--is to find ways of giving common expression and form in the development setting to the new awareness of the relationships between such individual consciousness and social structures.

A *fourth* suggestion is to explore "the relationships of knowledge to power" (Bell, 1973, p. 44) in a world where knowledge is perceived *as* power.

In brief, the curriculum worker must describe the relationships in the given situation, reflect upon them, with fellow curriculum workers build a common mind regarding their analysis and understanding, develop the required curiculum, and finally, act strategically so that the curriculum is implemented.

New perspectives for curriculum research and action

"By the very fact that there are now many more differentiated ways in which people gain information and have experiences, there is a need for the self-conscious understanding of the processes of conceptualization as the means of organizing information in order to gain coherent perspectives on one's experience" (Bell, 1973, p. 423).

Current community development experience can inform and·enable curriculum development efforts. Traditional community development *theory* has been strongly influenced by practitioners from the social sciences--anthropologists, psychologists, educators, economists and so on. However, community development *practice* has often of necessity been the domain of practitioners from the physical sciences and from vocational/technical trades--nutritionists, agriculturalists, hydrologists, mechanics, electricians, and so on.

In early community development work (pre- and immediately post-World War II), community development experts applied scientific social science methods *to* communities in traditional empirical and

action research modes where variables were isolated and controlled, modifications to behavior introduced, and other such research techniques used.

> "Psychologists, social workers, administrators . . . a host of field workers representing public, private, and religious interests have employed these methods of democratic group participation . . . [based upon advances in social sciences illuminating behavioral change which have been made by researchers in clinical and social psychology]" (Mezirow, 1960, pp. 139 - 140).

Today there seems to be a greater awareness and recognition of the uncontrollable and the unpredictable 'human factors'. Almost reluctantly, theoreticians and field workers are beginning to realize that each can learn from the other. The theoretician is recognizing that the lay or non-professional field worker has a contribution--the latter is recognizing that the 'ivory tower' types do have some useful models. With an increased awareness of the human aspects of development (as opposed to the technical aspects), there appears to be a shift away from a reliance upon quantitative methodologies in order to explore more qualitative methodologies[3].

> "The relevance for community development is not so much the theoretical orientation or the research technique, but the peculiar relationship between research and action within an ongoing community that is relevant . . . In this environment the psychological and social-psychological orientation and the client-consultant relationship are not so prominent" (Voth, 1979, p. 71).

Voth (1979) describes such new relationships. Current approaches to community development are characterized today not so much by the particular research methodology as by the relationship established between the developers and the community residents. The shift is from the university to the community; that is, the community in collaboration

with the university. In Third World settings, the shift is away from a reliance on Western expertise to local community efforts in collaboration with Western expertise. The shift described by Voth is the shift from research efforts conducted by professionals to "a process of education, self-education, or enlightenment, which the community development process requires of its participants" (1979, p. 73). Another way to describe this shift in emphasis is that action research, based upon scientific methods, is becoming as much concerned with those human factors relating to the setting of the planning process and to the motivation of the participants as with the actual creation of the plan itself (i.e. with needs analysis, goal setting, etc.).

This is not to suggest that the planning process and the plan itself are unimportant. Rather, the primary concerns of the developer are shifting to the methods by which the transformation of the individuals within the community occurs and away from (or with equal concern for) the more straightforward focus upon whether particular project goals have been achieved. Development activities in this sense are concerned not so much with a rational analysis of the community as with a "do-able plan which becomes an ongoing part of the community's life and which is revised over and over as the community changes and its relationships shift" (Knutsen, 1981, p. 31).

The concern is with building the context and the setting which will enable development goals to be achieved. Community developers, in wrestling with methods which enable local residents to take responsibility for the creation and sustaining of the settings in which they live and work, have proposed that building common contexts is

the way by which people can most effectively be enabled to participate in the deliberative processes by which such settings are created.

Curriculum developers can draw a number of conclusions from such community development experience. One set of conclusions can be stated in relation to the creation of settings in schools. A second set of conclusions can be stated in terms of the setting as a method for generating new ideas and for sustaining the commitment and vision of curriculum group. These conclusions summarize the community aspects of curriculum development described in this thesis.

Setting-creation post-secondary schools

The creation of settings is not necessarily the same as organization development even though the two concepts are closely related. The primary concerns for curriculum developers are the intentionalizing of the environmental, relational, and contextual aspects of the setting, forming the curriculum group or team, and addressing the tasks and processes of the curriculum project. Organizational intents and constraints will be reflected by the curriculum setting, the curriculum group, and the curriculum task; however, 'organization development' in schools will encompass many other factors in addition to curriculum development.

Kepner and Tregoe (1982) describe four paradigmatic shifts within the field of organization development. Over the last twenty-five years, the emphasis has shifted from:

i) a concern with slices of an organization
<u>to</u> concern for the entire organization

    ii) a concern for the development of the
individual manager to concern for the development of an
effective organization
    iii) change from the outside to change from
inside
    iv) a concern for the current situation to
being "clear on where the organization is going--its future
strategy" (p. 133).

Such shifts indicate a greater awareness of the importance of dealing

comprehensively with the organization as a community and as a part of the

larger societal community. Not suprisingly, these four shifts are quite

similar to current descriptions of community development efforts.

        Yet, a recent study (Fullan et al, 1981) undertaken to

explore and describe the "state of the art" of organization development

(OD) in schools, explains the nature of change within the school, but

does not provide an adequate explanation of how the external conditions

in a changing community can affect change in the school.

        "Classical OD approaches seem to depend on fairly
    stable environmental conditions, and a certain level of
    favourable attitude and initial propensity for collective
    problem solving. Thus, this form of OD probably does not
    represent the most appropriate strategy for change in
    turbulent urban school districts" (Fullan et al, 1981, p. 31).

School-based curriculum development, a major factor affecting the school

organization, must be considered in terms of the community aspects of the

development group as well as the community aspects of the wider community

(or society) which impinge upon the curriculum development effort. This

thesis implies that curriculum development, adoption, and implementation

processes are processes by which an organization (i.e. a school) is

developed. To say that a curriculum has been implemented is to say that

the organization has been changed.

However, current curriculum development efforts may or may not have a significant impact on the form and operation of a school.

> "No matter how noble the intent or how well financed an instructional plan may be, a plan cannot bring about effective change if it attempts to impose new methods or new materials on the traditional school structure, the same routine, and the same personnel capabilities and attitudes" (Kemp, 1977, p. 6).

Implementation is not simply the injection of a curriculum as if it were a drug or stimulant into the veins of a passive institution of schooling. Sarason (1971), examining the concepts of culture and change, raises three questions for those who have responsibility for change in schools. The ways by which curriculum workers respond to such questions will determine the degree to which curriculum implementation efforts will be effective.

> "The first question concerns the extent of their knowledge or experience about the actual functioning of schools and school systems. The second question was the extent to which the school was viewed as an organization possessing a unique culture . . . The third question, and one derived from the first two, was in two parts: What were the critic's or change agent's implicit or explicit conceptions about how one effectively introduces and maintains a change in the school culture? What knowledge did the critic have of the modal process by which a change is initiated and accomodated in the school culture?" (Sarason, 1971, p. 229).

Considering curriculum development efforts as part of a greater organizational development process or as a community development process requires ways of thinking which involve new or different theoretical frameworks from which to examine curriculum problems. This concern for theory is a concern for the interpretation of information about curriculum tasks and processes rather than simply a concern for the gathering of information (Common, 1978). Curriculum workers are clear

that certain development problems exist, particularly in relation to the implementation of curriculum innovations; however, there does not seem to be the same clarity with regard to why such problems recur, and with regard to the contextual frameworks which are necessary in order to begin to approach those problematic areas in curriculum development. Successful implementation of a curriculum innovation is contingent upon the methods chosen for thinking through curricular tasks and processes. This thesis has suggested that the creation of a contextual framework encompassing community and cultural aspects is a key method for enabling new ways of thinking.

A concern for context and method, therefore, is a concern for such interrelationships and new paradigms--not just a concern for more information. The method of creating settings is not simply a concern for the relationships between curriculum development, organization development, faculty development, community development, and so on. The concern for creating settings is a concern for exploring those paradigms which contain all of these related elements. The concern for the method of creating common contexts is a concern for giving form and structure to the ways of thinking which emerge from such exploration.

A setting is a method by which curriculum workers as a team, can participate, examine, and reflect upon all aspects of their curriculum development work. Such a setting can be a part of an organization and yet at the same time can be apart from that organization. Networks, and guilds, as previously described, are a way of giving form to these notions of 'apart from' yet 'a part of'. By creating and engaging in a curriculum development setting, curriculum

workers begin to model in themselves the organizational 'newness' they intend to offer to the larger school as well as simply developing a new curriculum.

Enabling new paradigms and sustaining a common mind

[Many people] "subscribe to narrow perceptions of reality which are inadequate for dealing with the major problems of our time. These problems . . . are systematic problems, which means they are closely interconnected and interdependent. They cannot be understood within the fragmented methodology characteristic of our academic disciplines and government agencies. Such an approach will never resolve any of our difficulties but will merely shift them around in the complex web of social and ecological relations. A resolution can be found only if the structure of the web itself is changed, and this will involve profound transformations of our social institutions, values, and ideas. As we examine the sources of our cultural crisis it will become apparent that [they are in relation to the use of] outdated conceptual models and irrelevant variables" (Capra, 1983, pp. 25-26).

The limitations and inadequacies of current approaches to thinking about and resolving curriculum development problems have been described in the first chapters of this thesis. While these limitations and inadequacies in traditional approaches are becoming increasingly apparent, there is often a resistance to the consideration and application of new paradigms for development which might address and overcome some of these problems. The positive and negative aspects of such resistance to change has been described (for example, by Klein, 1966). Boulding (1956) has suggested that resistance to change is rooted in the "images" which individuals bring to situations (e.g settings for curriculum development) and that such resistance is overcome only when some "revolutionary change" transforms these images. Such transformation

can occur in the midst of reflection upon 'eventful' activity (Freire, 1970).

When such change occurs, innovative approaches to development often seem utopian[4] or, at the very least, controversial--considered first of all by a relatively small percentage of "innovators" and "early adopters" (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971). Even when innovative approaches to development are initiated, there are often problems which surface if the developers have not adequately considered how they will sustain the new images, ideas, and actions of the individuals involved in the development process. One example of the conflicts which can occur as a result of inadequate consideration of the development a setting has been described by King (1981) as "role shock"[5]. Role shock occurs in individuals who have "previously been confident in their abilities to manifest appropriate behaviors" (p. 74). Such confidence is founded in traditional or usual settings which have not previously called into question the individual's images or ways of thinking about and resolving problems.

The intention of this discussion is not to suggest that the distinctions between traditional and innovative approaches to curriculum development are synonymous somehow with bad vs. good approaches or with conservative vs. liberal approaches. Rather, drawing from Warren's discussion (1970) of the community development process, the intention is to suggest that development of any kind is <u>both</u> a "radical" and a "conservative" process (p.5)[6]. Development is conservative in that it must address the real problems and contradictions of a given situation. It is radical in that developers must find ways to intentionally create

development settings which do not unintentionally contain the seeds of those very problems which they are trying to solve (Sarason, 1974).

Developers must clearly and self-consciously articulate the operating context from which they will operate as they cannot afford to rely upon preconceptions and assumptions about how they perceive the problems and the processes of development. The intent of such an articulation is not a 'right' frame of mind, but a common (and motivating) frame of mind. Creating such a common frame of mind involves the transformation of the developers' values and ideas (Capra, 1983).

The task of creating a common context is central to developers involved in the creation of a setting. Such a common context reflects the new paradigm which is required if a development setting is to be successfully initiated and implemented. The problems and methods of creating such a common context have been most clearly articulated in the literature of curriculum development. For example, Macdonald (1975) describes the problems of communication between curriculum development theorists:

> "We are often . . . talking at different value levels and thus miss the whole point of each other's thinking. But it has not clearly been realized that the most fundamental level, structural perspective, is also grounded in a value matrix of some sort. Thus, people have either assumed that we all shared the same basic perspective, or that you simply could not communicate with certain other persons" (p. 285).

Paradoxically, while the theory relevant to the development of a common context is more self-consciously articulated in the literature of curriculum than of community development, community developers have struggled intently with experiences of creating new settings. This would suggest that perhaps community developers, trapped

in traditional ways of thinking about their <u>activity</u>, have not adequately reflected or theorized on their experience[7]. On the other hand, curriculum developers working from a <u>theoretical</u> perspective have articulated the conceptual frameworks by which curriculum development might be undertaken, but they have not directly addressed the issues of what the setting for development might look like or how it might be created[8].

To suggest that the problems associated with creating a common context are complex is an obvious understatement. Creating a common context does not necessarily mean that all the participants agree with one another. It does not necessarily mean that the experienced, confident, self-conscious participants (who may be the "innovators" or "early adopters"--Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971) ensure that the newcomers, the wary, the "early majority" (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971), the uninitiated or the un-selfconscious participants begin to think like they do. Rather, the creation of a common context involves discerning those aspects which all participants see as the common or consensed points of agreement and the common points of departure towards issues needing further clarification and deliberation. Building a common context also requires individuals to make a commitment to these collaborative processes. Paradoxically, the commitment required in building a common context is a commitment to the community rather than to the personal. It is the commitment to risk one's commitment--to be prepared to give and take in relation to the processes of consensus in order that a truly representative common context emerges.

To summarize, the creation of a setting is a method by which developers can commonly reconceptualize the ways by which they think about the tasks and processes which they are about. Thinking about tasks and processes in such new ways can enable the successful implementation of innovative projects.

NOTES

1   "Training Access, or TRAC as it is called, is a new and innovative approach to technological and vocational training" (From the British Columbia Ministry of Education TRAC brochure, 1982).

2   For example: Someone may develop a series of well-written learning objectives for a particular program which reflect what needs to be learned for a particular trade. The problems which arise are often not with the curriculum document. For example the new curriculum (developed somewhere else) often calls for equipment and materials which a particular college cannot afford to purchase under the present economic contraints or the college is required to substantially change its student intake and admissions procedures in order to accommodate the new curriculum.

3   Rist (1977), in his description of educational research paradigms, assesses the similarities and differences between qualitative and quantitative research. While Rist recognizes that "quantitative research is the dominant methodology in educational research" (p. 42), he asserts that "a situation of detente is rapidly evolving" (p. 42) between these two broad categories as practitioners of each recognize that one can contribute something to the other.

Rist's assessment of qualitative methodologies is based upon "the polarities of reliability vs. validity, objectivity vs. subjectivity, and holistic vs. component analysis" (p. 44).

4   For example: "Modern man is so committed to the view that rational men must live in a highly structured society . . . in socially productive corporate organizations set up to operate efficient technical apparatus that alternative world views seem as unrealistic or as romantic utopias" (Oliver, 1976, p. 35).

5   King (1981) describes the problems which arose during a community project related to local control of schooling by a B.C. Indian Band. King suggests that role shock was a major factor underlying these problems; using the term "'shock' rather than 'strain' because of the high levels of commitment and idealism with which each of the participants associated with the school (teachers, administrators, school board members) entered into the undertaking. Prior to the opening of the school, everyone concerned felt assured that these (usual) attitudes would produce the kind of school they all thought they wanted" (p. 72).

Furthermore, the outside innovators (i.e. educators) who were

brought in to assist with this project also experienced role shock. While these innovators were experienced and knowledgeable in relation to their usual settings, they experienced their ways of thinking called into question in the bringing into being of a new setting.

King describes role shock in terms of the intensification of both the "schismatic tendencies within the community" and of "ambiguities for outsiders" (p. 74).

6 As outlined in Chapter Two.

7 Sarason et al (1971) suggest that "although settings are being created at a fantastic rate, there is very little in the way of theory and description to guide those who are faced with the task" (p. 89).

8 Aoki's reference (1977) to "implementation-oriented mini-conferences" (1977, p. 53) and Schwab's description (1983) of the need for a school-based curriculum "group" or "office" are examples of exceptions to such a statement.

FOUR APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Four approaches to community development have been identified (Knutsen, 1981); the trickle-down, bureaucratic, disestablishment, and bootstrap approaches. The <u>trickle-down</u> approach developed out of a recognition that 'outside' resources are needed for local development. In this approach, money and other resources are injected at the top of the national social structure (that is, the political and economic decision-makers). These decision-makers, having an overview of the whole nation, inject resources at the local levels where they are most needed. The problem with this approach is that often, for a variety of reasons, very little resources actually trickle down to the local level.

> "During the era of the 1950's and 1960's when the 'trickle down' theory of economic growth was in vogue, community development programs were not intended to, nor did they affect the basic structural barriers to equity and growth in rural communities. Rather, they accepted the local power structure as given . . . thus strengthening the economic and social position of the elites. There was little attention given to assuring that benefits from community development programs accrued to the rural poor" (Holdcroft, 1978, p. 20).

The <u>bureaucratic</u> approach provides inclusive expertise to communities served by a bureaucratic structure through the creation and delivery of replicable schemes--that is, one model of development could serve all villages. The problem with this approach is that there is no place in the process for engaging the creativity and consent of the local people in determining what local village requires. The typical orientation of the bureaucracy is toward sectoral and department operations,

toward a multiplicity of departments and agencies (whose work often overlaps or is at cross-purposes) and toward top-down or trickle - down approaches (Puri, 1977). The top-down bureaucratic approach "was not accepted by people, did not reach the poor, and . . . ignored agricultural production" (Holdcroft, 1978, p. 24).

The disestablishment approach grows out of the awareness that people living in local communities know what their developmental needs are. Citizens' groups and activists make the community aware of its relationships to the larger society and force the government to respond to community needs through public pressure and confrontation tactics. The problem with this approach is that a mindset of dependency is fostered within the community--'the government owes us a living' (Knutsen, 1981), or that "In extreme cases, citizen activists have become a new generation of 'colonialists', accumulating much of the power and the prerogratives that they opposed in those who previously enjoyed this status" (Gilbert and Eaton, 1976, p. 249).

The bootstrap approach also grows from the recognition that local initiative is required for development. However, the primary motivation of this approach is simply the exhortation to do better. The problem with this approach is that neither words of encouragement nor threats of dire consequences are effective in moving people toward development in settings where despair and a lack of hope in the future are the primary roadblocks to renewal (Knutsen, 1981).

FIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTEMPORARY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

Community development writers have described characteristics of effective community development efforts (Bennis et al, 1976; Blakely, 1979; Brokensha and Hodge, 1969; Cary, 1970; ICA, 1982; Knutsen, 1981; Schindler-Rainman, 1975). From these works and others, five characteristics of contemporary community development recur.

1. All the people involved or affected must be involved or legitimately represented in some way.

   (Bell, 1978; Benne, 1976; Brokensha and Hodge, 1969; Cary, 1970; Edwards and Jones, 1976; FAO, 1977; ICA, 1981; Mezirow, 1960; Roberts, 1979; Sanders, 1970; Schindler-Rainman, 1975; Schindler - Rainman and Lippitt, 1980; Voth, 1979).

   Characteristics of such participation include the involvement of marginal groups, the development of models of participation and "collective identity", and the indigenous recognition of community developers as representative of the community (Cary, 1970, p. 141). In addition,

   "People are capable of both perceiving and judging the condition of their lives; they have the will and capacity to plan together in accordance with these judgements to change that condition for the better; they can act together in accordance with these plans; and such a process can be seen in terms of certain values" (Roberts, 1979, p. xv).

   Participation is increasingly of a voluntary and non-professional nature. Benne describes the voluntary aspect, particularily emergent in the 1960's, as the reaction to the 'professionalization' of service, such as health and welfare, which originally were the domain of (voluntary) religious groups and private societies (e.g. the John Howard Society's work with prisoners) (Benne, 1976, p. 80).

Cary describes organizational models of the community
development process": i) the <u>inclusive</u> model which involves
direct participation of all <u>involved</u> and is of necessity
limited to use in neighbourhoods or villages; ii) the
<u>representative</u> model which involves 'indirect' participation by
residents who are represented by local interest groups,
advocacy groups, and other activists[1]; and, iii) the
<u>non-representative</u> model which involves 'top-down' or 'expert'
or 'client-consultant' relationships (Voth, 1979).

While Cary refers to the non-representative model as
the one which is "most currently used" (1970, p. 141), he
describes three areas of emphasis for future work relating to
citizen participation in participative processes:

i) the legitimacy of 'representative' community
development groups can be anticipated if there is indigenous
recognition by the community that these organizations or groups
are acting on behalf of the wider community.
ii) the legitimacy of 'representative' community
development groups can be anticipated if 'marginal' groups
sense that they are authentically involved in or with such
groups, and
iii) the legitimacy of 'representative' community
development groups can be anticipated if "new models of
participation that take the collective identity concept of
community . . . into account" are created (Cary, 1970, p. 141).

In summary, "the dormant productivity of the people,
who have been bypassed in the development process, needs to be
optimally released" (FAO, 1977, p. 7).

2. <u>All issues and problems of the local situation must be
encompassed.</u>

(Blakely, 1979; Compton and McClusky, 1980; FAO, 1977,
Holdcroft, 1978; Knutsen, 1981; Schindler-Rainman, 1975).

"Village problems cannot be successfully attacked in
isolation because a village is a highly integrated unit. A
sound approach involves all of the community's various aspects;
that is, the physical, social, and economic aspects of
development must be taken into consideration simultaneously"
(Holdcroft, 1978, p. 38).

3. <u>The process is marked by deliberation and collaboration.</u>

(Benne, 1976; Blakely, 1979; Cary, 1970; Compton and McClusky, 1980; Edwards and Jones, 1976; ICA, 1982; Knutsen, 1981; Roberts, 1979; Sanders, 1970; Weissman, 1976; World Bank, 1980).

"To help make programs fully effective, administrators may need to use a variety of institutions--national bureaucracies, public enterprises, private businesses, voluntary agencies, local government and organizations of intended beneficiaries, and strike the right balance among them" (World Bank, 1980, p. 77).

4. <u>The problem-solving, decision-making, and planning aspects of the local community development process are comprehensive, integrated, and systematic.</u>

(Bennis <u>et al</u>, 1976; Blakely, 1979; Brokensha and Hodge, 1960; Cary, 1970; Compton and McClusky, 1980; FAO, 1977; ICA, 1982; Jamieson and Tannenbaum, 1982; Puri, 1977; Sanders, 1970; Schindler-Rainman, 1975; Schler, 1970; Weissman, 1976).

Integrated rural development (IRD) "adopts a total 'systems approach' to development, which is viewed as a single and unified process of which economic growth is a part. Its various aspects, viz., political, social, economic, and technical must be inter-related and mutually reinforcing" (FAO, 1977, p. 5).

"It should be possible to take a hard-headed look at the resource situation in an IRD project area . . . and choose activities which are explicitly mutually reinforcing and which have substantial bearing on the . . . main objectives of IRD" (Puri, 1977, p. 12).

"These problems are all closely interlinked and no one can be solved in isolation from another. Thus the most effective strategies for solving problems in one area would be developed with the possible repercussions in other areas in mind" (UNESCO, 1978, p. 112).

5. <u>The motivating and empowering aspects of symbolic and 'envisioning' factors must be incorporated within the process.</u>

(Bell, 1978; Bennis, 1982; Brokensha and Hodge, 1969; Greenleaf, 1977; ICA, 1981; Knutsen, 1981).

"The distinctive quality of Tagore's work was his emphasis upon traditional media and methods of communication, and the use of Indian dance, drama, music, and epic stories to enrich village life" (Brokensha and Hodge, 1969, p. 41).

Rabindranath Tagore (1861 - 1941), a poet, was a pioneer and collaborator with M.K. Gandhi of village development work in early 20th century India. Ironically, while music and other art-forms have played central roles in the cultural life of communities since prehistoric times, the 20th century emphasis in the West upon scientific rationality has tended to downplay the impact of art and symbol in community life. Only in the last few years have such factors been intentionally re-introduced into community and organization development process (Lippitt, 1982; ICA, 1981).

Freire also discusses the role of arts in Third World development (1972, p. 39) citing "The Role of Poetry in the Mozambican Revolution" as an excellent study.[2]

NOTES

[1] The problems involved in understanding and identifying who represents who and what have been described by Gilbert and Eaton (1976).

[2] The Role of Poetry in the Mozambican Revolution. Africa Today, April - May, 1969, 16 (2).

DEVELOPING A COMMON CONTEXT: ONE EXAMPLE FROM COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE

The work of the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA)[1] provides an example of how such a common context can be developed. In July 1971, approximately 1,000 people associated with the work of the ICA met in Chicago in order to create a model of the social process. This model was drawn from participants' experiences of renewal efforts happening at that time in local church religious education programming, primarily in North America (but also including representatives from different places in the world), and in the work of groups which had been working full-time in two community development projects--one on the west side of Chicago (Fifth City Human Development Project) begun in the early 1960's and one at an aboriginal community in northwestern Australia (Oombulgurri Human Development Project) begun in 1970.

The rationale for creating such a model was to provide groups of people working on curriculum and community development projects in widely differing social situations with a common 'structure' for talking through their experiences and for working and talking together to create those new curriculum and community projects which were perceived to be necessary.

"Such an articulation is the first step in recreating the social images that will allow people to operate in the situation they have. And if such a model is authentically inclusive and faithful to social experience, it becomes possible once again for people to view the total societal context and to make responsible decisions in the midst of the social process" (ICA, 1971, p. 9).

A model of the social process was created: "a comprehensive model of the dynamics of society . . . showing the inter-relatedness of the economic, political, and cultural processes and the complex dynamics within each. This model will serve as a foundation for all further community development work" (ICA, 1971, p. 13).

Such a model would enable the examination of i) the components, relationships, and imbalances or limitations which could be said to occur within forms of community, e.g. schools, and ii) the components, relationships, and imbalances of these forms and structures in relation to the components, relationships, and imbalances of the wider society. Such an examination would not be simply for intellectual or rational clarity, but to provide a screen or rationale or context for decision-making and problem-solving.

"Such an articulation or model is the first step in recreating the social images that will allow people to operate in the situation they have. And if such a model is authentically inclusive and faithful to social experience, it becomes possible once again for people to view the total societal context and to make responsible decisions in the midst of the social process".

"This work on the dynamic relationships of the social process revealed at one level society's interdependence upon its inclusive categories, and at another level the foundation of humanness . . . The grounding of the model and its dynamics was an exercise in recognizing that the very dynamic that occurs in any single individual's interior occurs in society as a whole . . . The corporate effort of writing this document was a way for the Institute to begin the job of articulating the givenness of the social process and its dynamics in order to discern the contradictions that now exist in society [which block community development efforts]" (ICA, 1971, pp. 9 - 13).

As a result of this work, a subsequent meeting was held in 1972 to discern which aspects of the social process would become the

focus of the ICA's development activities. The 1972 meeting resulted in the initiation of twenty-four two to four-year community development projects during the mid-1970's. One of these projects, the village of Maliwada in the state of Maharashtra, India, was the focus of world attention as the site of the ten-day International Exposition of Rural Development (IERD) held there and in New Delhi in February 1984. (ICA, 1983).

In July 1980, a follow-up and review of this model and its use was made at a global symposium in Chicago. Six hundred participants from forty nations participated:

> "Working in task forces, participants looked for indications of future trends in films, articles and excerpts from contemporary writings, speeches and interviews. Each of the indicators was recorded, numbered, and listed on the social process triangles [i.e. the schematic representation of the social process model]. The participants then listed and plotted their own concerns about the future . . . clusters of data were identified [on the triangles] . . . These clusters indicated the points of the social process which are in greatest transition" (ICA, 1981, XI(1) 8).

The five clusters with the most data were (in order of greatest to least): Meaningful Involvement, Formal Methods, Community Groupings, Human Wisdom, and Social Morality. Three of these (the second, fourth, and fifth) fall within the Common Wisdom section of the model. "The clusters as a whole reflect a major upheaval taking place in the cultural pole of the social process: of the over 2,500 pieces of data, almost half fell here" (ICA, 1981, XI (1), 8).

The ICA approach appears to be the most comprehensive model for beginning to create common contexts. Compared to other sources (Alchin and Decharin, 1979; Boskoff, 1970; Edwards and Jones, 1976;

Oliver, 1976), the ICA approach appears to have been the most helpful in terms of providinga focus for subsequent development action. It encompasses many of the categories identified by the other approaches and in fact shows the interrelationships of categories in a more helpful way.

> [This process of examining the social processes]
> "allows participants to organize a massive amount of
> information about social change. It enables people to view
> their everyday activities objectively and to see where the
> critical changes in society are occurring. Just as a timeline
> gives a historical perspective, the social process analysis
> gives a social orientation" (ICA, 1981, XI (1), 8).

Finally, the writer must confess his bias. The writer was a participant in both the 1971 and 1972 research assemblies in Chicago, and subsequently spent the next three years in India working with other international and Indian volunteers associated with the ICA laying the foundation for the initiation of the Maliwada Human Development Project in 1975.

NOTES

1   The ICA is a world-wide research, training, and demonstration
group concerned with the human factor in world development.
It grew out of the Ecumenical Institute, an
interdenominational organization originating in Illinois
following the World Council of Churches General Assembly at
Evanston in 1954. The objective of the ICA is to find and
implement effective methods of comprehensive development at
the community level, by motivating a local spirit of
responsibility and cooperation.

See also Note # 8, Chapter Three, p. 60.

REFERENCE BOOKS

Apple, M.W., Subkoviak. M.J., and Lufler Jr., H.S. Educational
    Evaluation: Analysis and Responsibility. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan
    Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Arendt, H. On Revolution. New York: Viking Press, 1963.

Arunachalam, K. and Natarajan, K.M. (Eds.) Integrated Rural Develop-
    ment. Madurai, India: Koodal Publishers, 1977.

Bannister, D. and Fransella, F. Inquiring Man: The Theory of Personal
    Constructs. Melbourne, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., Inc.,
    1971.

Beauchamp, G.A. Curriculum Theory (Third Edition). Wilmette, Illinois:
    The Kagg Press, 1975.

Bell, D. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books
    Books, 1973.

_____. The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. New York: Basic
    Basic Books, 1978.

Bell, G. Strategies For Human Settlements: Habitat And Environment.
    Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1976.

Bennis, W.G., Benne, K.D., Chin, R. and Corey, K.E. (Eds.). The
    Planning of Change (Third Edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and
    Winston, 1976.

Bergquist, W.H. and Phillips, S.R. A Handbook for Faculty Develop-
    ment: Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of
    Small Colleges, 1977.

Bhattacharya, S.N. Community Development: An Analysis of Programs
    in India. Calcutta: Academic Publishers, 1979.

Biddle, W.W. and Biddle, L.J. The Community Development Process:
    The Rediscovery of Local Initiative. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and
    Winston, 1966.

Blakely, E.J. (Ed.) Community Development Research: Concepts,
    Issues, and Strategies. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Bonhoeffer, D. Ethics. Edited by E. Bethge. New York: The
    MacMillan Company, 1965.

142

Boskoff., A. The Sociology of Urban Regions. Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1970.

Botkin, J.W., Elmandjra, M., and Malitza, M. No Limits to Learning: Bridging The Human Gap. A Report to the Club of Rome. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979.

Boulding, K.E. The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1956.

_____ . The Meaning of the 20th Century: The Great Transition. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Braudel, F. Civilization and Capitalism: 15th - 18th Centuries (Volume II). Trans. by Sian Reynolds. London: William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd., 1982.

Brokensha, D. and Hodge, P. Community Development: An Interpretation. San Francisco: Chandler, 1969.

Brundage, D.H. and Mackeracher, D. Adult Learning Principles And Their Application To Program Planning. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.

Bussis, A.M., Chittenden, E.A., and Amarel, M. Beyond Surface Curriculum. Boulder: CO: Westview Press, 1976.

Campbell, J. Myths to Live By. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

Capra, F. The Turning Point. New York: Bantam Books, 1983.

Carlstein, T., Parkes, D., and Thrift, N. (Eds.). Human Activity and Time Geography. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Cary, L.J. (Ed.) Community Development as a Process. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1970.

Chesswas, J. Methodologies of Educational Planning for Developing Countries. Paris: UNESCO, 1968.

Cohen, P. The Community Development Process: An Introductory Bibliography. Monticello, IL: Vance Bibliographies, 1981.

Common, D.L. A Theoretical Model for Curriculum Implementation. Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, University of Ottawa, 1978.

Connelly, F.M., Dukacz, A.S., and Quinlan, F. (Eds.). Curriculum Planning for the Classroom, Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.

Dennison, J.D., Tunner, A., Jones, G., and Forrestor, G.C. The
          Impact of Community Colleges: A Study of the College
          Concept in British Columbia. Vancouver, B.C.: British
          Columbia Research, 1975.

Dimock, H.G. A Study of Process-Oriented Qualitative Research Using
          Community Collaboration as a Social Action and Assessment
          Method of Community Development. Montreal: Sir George
          Williams Centre for Human Relations and Community Studies,
          Concordia University, 1976.

Douglas, M. Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology. New York:
          Pantheon Books, 1982.

Duncan, H.D. Symbols in Society. New York: Oxford University
          Press, 1968.

Dunne, J.S. The Way of All the Earth. New York: MacMillan Publish-
          ing Co., Inc., 1978.

Edwards, A.D. and Jones, D.G. Community and Community Development.
          The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton and Company, 1976.

Eisner, E. The Educational Imagination. New York: MacMillan
          Publishing Co., Inc., 1979.

Ferguson, M. The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Trans-
          formation in the 1980's. Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, Inc.,
          1980.

Fersh, S. (Ed.) Wingspread Report: International Developments in
          Post-Secondary Short-Cycle Education. Washington, D.C.:
          American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Joint
          Report on the Expert Consultations on Policies and
          Institutions for Integrated Rural Development: Columbo,
          Sri Lanka, 20-30 October 1975, and Jakarta, Indonesia, 2-12
          December 1975. Vols. I & II. Rome: FAO, 1977.

Freire, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Trans. by M.B. Ramos. New
          York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

_____. Cultural Action for Freedom. Monograph Series No. 1.
          Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 1972.

_____. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: The
        Seabury Press, 1973.

Frissell, S.E. Organizational Change: A Literature Review. A
        Special Project Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement
        for Education 881 and Partial Fulfilment of the
        Requirements of the Degree of Master of Arts (Education) in
        the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, 1980.

Frye, N. The Educated Imagination. The Massey Lectures: Second
        Series. Toronto: CBC Publications, 1967.

Fullan, M., Miles, M., and Taylor, G. Organization Development in
        Schools: The State of the Art. Washington, D.C.: American
        Educational Research Association, 1981.

Gagne, R.M. The Conditions of Learning (Second Edition). New York:
        Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Goodlad, J.I. Changing American Schools. Chicago: The University
        of Chicago Press, 1966.

Gowin, D.B. Education. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Greenleaf, R.K. Servant Leadership. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

Greifer, J.L. Community Action for Social Change: A Casebook of
        Current Projects. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Gress, J.R. and Purpel, D.E. (Eds.) Curriculum: An Introduction to
        the Field. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation,
        1978.

Gronlund, N.E. Stating Objectives for Classroom Instruction (Second
        Edition). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1978.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. Effective Evaluation: Improving the
        Usefulness of Evaluation Results Through Responsive and
        Naturalistic Approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
        Publishers, 1981.

Habermas, Jurgen. Communication and the Evolution of Society.
        Boston: Beacon Press, 1979.

Havelock, R.G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education.
        Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications,
        1975.

Havelock, R.G. and Huberman, A.M. Solving Educational Problems: The
        theory and reality of innovation in developing countries.
        Paris: UNESCO; and, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies
        in Education, 1978.

Havighurst, R.J. Developmental Tasks and Education (Third Edition).
        New York: Longman's, Inc., 1979.

Holdcroft, L.E. The Rise and Fall of Community Development in
        Developing Countries, 1950 - 1965: A Critical Analysis and
        Annotated Bibliography. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan
        State University, Department of Agricultural Economics,
        1978.

Institute of Cultural Affairs. A spotlight on eighty-four community
        projects and programmes in Canada. Edmonton: The
        Canadian Institute of Cultural Affairs, 1984.

Jung, C.G. (Ed.). Man and His Symbols. New York: Dell Publishing
        Co., Inc., 1979.

Kemp, J.E. Instructional Design: A Plan for Unit and Course Devel-
        opment (Second Edition). Belmont, CA: Fearon Publishers,
        Inc., 1977.

Kerr, D.W. The Instructional Skills Program. A Major Paper
        Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of the
        Degree of Master of Education (Adult Education), University
        of British Columbia, 1980.

Kidd, J.R. How Adults Learn. New York: Association Press, 1973.

Kidd, J.R. and Selman, G.R. Coming of Age: Canadian Adult Education
        in the 1980's. Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult
        Education, 1978.

Knowles, M.S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy vs
        Pedagogy. New York: Association Press, 1972.

        . A History of the Adult Education Movement in the United
        States. Huntington, NY: Robert E. Krieger Publishing
        Company, 1977.

Knox, A.B. Adult Development and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-
        Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1977.

Langer, S.K. Problems of Art. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,
        1957.

Leithwood, K.A., Holmes, M., and Montgomery, D.J. Helping Schools
        Change: Strategies Derived from Field Experience. Toronto:
        The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.

Leskiw, R.J. and Moir, P.E. (Eds.). Compromise, Collaboration or
        Competition in Higher Education. Proceedings of the
        Forty-First Annual Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher
        Education. 10-12 October, 1979. Corvallis, OR: Oregon
        State University Press, 1982.

Levinson, D.J. The Season's of a Man's Life. New York: Ballantine
          Books, Inc., 1979.

Loye, D. The Knowable Future: A Psychology of Forecasting and
          Prophecy. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Lynch, K. Managing the Sense of a Region. Cambridge, MA: The MIT
          Press, 1976.

Mager, R.F. Preparing Instructional Objectives (Second Edition).
          Belmont, CA: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Maslow, A.H. Toward a Psychology of Being (Second Edition). New
          York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968.

_____. Motivation and Personality (Second Edition). New York:
          Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

McNeil, J.D. Curriculum - A Comprehensive Introduction. Boston:
          Little, Brown and Company, 1977.

Mezirow, J.D. Dynamics of Community Development. New York: The
          Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1963.

Naisbett, J. Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives.
          New York: Warner Books, 1982.

Novak, J.D. A Theory of Education. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University
          Press, 1981.

Oliver, D.W. Education and Community: A Radical Critique of Inno-
          vative Schooling. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing
          Corporation, 1976.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).
          External Examiners' Report on Educational Policy in
          Canada. Toronto: Canadian Association of Adult Education,
          1975.

Perry, W.G. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the
          College Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Pinar, W. (Ed.). Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan
          Publishing Corporation, 1975.

Polanyi, M. Knowing and Being (Edited by M. Grene). Chicago: The
          University of Chicago Press, 1969.

_____. Meaning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Razik, T.A. A Systems Approach to Teacher Training and Curriculum Development: The Case of Developing Countries. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, 1972.

Regan, E.M. and Leithwood, K.A. Effecting Curriculum Change. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Research in Education Series 4, 1974.

Roberts, H. Community Development: Learning and Action. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Rogers, E.M. and Shoemaker, F.F. The Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach. New York: The Fress Press, A Division of MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Roszak, T. Person/Planet: The Creative Disintegration of Industrial Society. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1978.

Russell, H.H., Leithwood, K.A., and Baxter, R.P. The Peterborough Project: A Case Study of Educational Change and Innovation. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973.

Sarason, S.B., Zitnay, G., and Grossman, F.K. The Creation of a Community Setting. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation, 1971.

Sarason, S.B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

_____. The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1974.

Schindler-Rainman, E. & Lippitt, R. Building the Collaborative Community: Mobilizing Citizens for Action. Riverside, CA: University of California Extension, 1980.

Schmuck, R.A., Runkel, P.J., Arends, J.H., and Arends, R.I. The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1977.

Schumacher, E.F. Small is Beautiful. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973.

_____. A Guide for the Perplexed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977.

Servan-Schreiber, J.J. The World Challenge. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.

Taba, H. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York:
     Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Turner, V. The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure.
     Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Tyler, R.W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.
     Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

UNESCO. Developments in Technical and Vocational Education. A
     comparative Study. Paris: UNESCO, 1978.

Unruh, G.G. Responsive Curriculum Development: Theory and Action.
     Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.

Verner, C. A Conceptual Scheme for the Identification and Classifi-
     cation of Processes for Adult Education. Chicago: Adult
     Education Association of the USA, 1962.

Wilson, B. (Ed.). Rationality. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977.

World Bank. World Development Report 1980. Washington, D.C.: World
     Bank Publications, 1980.

Yankelovich, D. New Rules. New York: Random House, Inc., 1982.

Zais, R.S. Curriculum. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976.

REFERENCE ARTICLES

_____

Abbey, E. Review of R.L. Thomas, The Youngest Science. New York:
        The Viking Press, 1983. The Sun. Friday 22 July 1983, p.
        L32.

Alchin, E.W. and Decharin, P. An Ecosystems Approach to Community
        Development Research. In E.J. Blakely (Ed.), Community
        Development Research. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Anderson, R.M. Successful Teacher-Centered Curriculum Development
        in the Social Studies. History and Social Science Teacher,
        Fall 1979, 15(1), 11 - 16.

_____. The need for order in external influences on curriculum
        policy-making: Provincial and federal influences from
        outside the official education sector. In J.J. Bernier and
        G. Tomkins (Eds.). Curriculum Canada, II: Curriculum
        Policy and Curriculum Development. Vancouver: Center For
        The Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of
        British Columbia, 1980, 100-112.

Aoki, T. Theoretic Dimensions of Curriculum: Reflections from a
        Micro-Perspective. Canadian Journal of Education, 1977,
        2(1), 49-56.

_____. A Reconceptualization of Curriculum Intervention.
        Summer Institute for Teacher Education, July 1980.

Bailey, A.Y. The Educational Equality Project: Focus on Results.
        Phi Delta Kappan, September 1983, 65(1), 22 - 25.

Baker, W.B. Community Development in Canada and Abroad. In J.R.
        Kidd and G.R. Selman (Eds.), Coming of Age: Canadian Adult
        Education in the 1980's. Toronto: Canadian Association for
        Adult Education, 1978.

Benne, K.D. The Current State of Planned Changing in Persons,
        Groups, Communities, and Societies. In W.G. Bennis et al
        (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart,
        and Winston, 1976.

_____. Educational Field Experience as the Negotiation of
        Different Cognitive Worlds. In W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.),
        The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and
        Winston, 1976.

Bennis, W.G. Some Value Dilemmas of the Change Agent. In W.G.
        Bennis et al (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York:
        Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

_____. Leadership and Development. <u>Training and Development Journal</u>, October 1981. <u>35</u>(10), 7-9.

_____. The Art Form of Leadership. <u>Training and Development Journal</u>, April 1982, <u>36</u>(4), 44-46.

Bentley, R. International Programs: Considerations for Participation. Speech delivered at the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) Workshop on International Education. Vancouver Community College, 24-25 January 1983.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M.W. Implementation of Educational Innovation. <u>The Educational Forum</u>. March 1976, 344-370.

Bergquist, W.H. and Phillips, S.R. A Community Development Approach to Faculty Development. In Bergquist and Phillips (Eds.), <u>A Handbook for Faculty Development: Vol. II.</u> Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Bergquist, W.H. The liberal arts college. In J. Lindquist (Ed.), <u>Designing Teaching Improvement Programs.</u> Washington, D.C. The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1979.

Boulding, E. Learning to Image the Future. In W.G. Bennis <u>et al</u> (Eds.), <u>The Planning of Change.</u> New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Bowman, J., Kierstead, F. and Dede, C. Education in the 1980's: An Appraisal. In Frank Feather (Ed.). <u>Through the 80's: Thinking Globally, Acting Locally.</u> Washington, D.C.: World Future Society, 1980.

Boyd, W.L. The politics of curriculum change and stability. <u>Educational Researcher</u>, 1979, <u>80</u>, 12-18.

Briggs, L.J. Instructional Design: Present Strengths and Limitations and a View of the Future, <u>Educational Technology</u>, October 1982, <u>22</u>(10), 18-22.

Campbell, J. The Need for New Myths. <u>TIME</u>, 17 January 1972.

Cary, L.J. The Role of the Citizen in the Community Development Process. In L.J. Cary (Ed.), <u>Community Development as a Process.</u> Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1970.

Cavanagh, G. and Styles, K. The Implementation of New Curriculum Guidelines and Policies. <u>Education Canada</u>. Spring 1983, <u>23</u>(1), 9-15.

Chin, R. and Benne, K.D. General Strategies for Effecting Changes
    in Human Systems. In W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.), The
    Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston,
    1976.

Churchman, D. A New Approach to Evaluating the Implementation of
    Innovative Educational Programs. Educational Technology,
    May 1979, 17(5), 25 - 28.

Clark, B.R. The Organization of the Higher Education System: Core
    Elements and Cross-National Comparisons. The Pen: Post-
    Secondary Education Newsletter (AERA). June 1983, p. 3

Common, D.L. A Conceptualization for the Implementation Process.
    University of British Columbia, September 1979.

_____. Focus on Implementation - The Missing Link in Our
    Curricular Knowledge. Unpublished paper, .Simon Fraser
    University, 1980.

_____. Two Decades of Curricular Innovation and So Little
    Change. Education Canada. Fall 1981, 21(3), 42-47.

_____. Some Notes Towards Rational Curriculum Theory. Based
    partially on papers presented at i) Journal of Curriculum
    Theorizing Conference, Airlie, Virginia, September 1981,
    and ii) Canadian Society for the Study of Education
    Conference, Ottawa, Ontario, June 1982.

_____. Dialogue: Interpretations of Implementation Data
    (Teacher Power and Settings for Innovations). Curriculum
    Inquiry, 1983, 13(4), 435 - 446.

Compton, J.L. and McClusky, H.Y. Community Education for Community
    Development. In J.L. Compton and H.Y. McClusky (Eds.),
    Serving Personal and Community Needs Through Adult
    Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Connelly, F.M. The functions of curriculum development. Interchange,
    1972, 3(2-3), 161 - 176.

Connor, D.R. and Patterson, R.W. Building Commitment to Organiza-
    tional Change. Training and Development Journal, April
    1982, 36(4), 18-30.

Corey, K.E. Structures in the Planning of Community Change: A
    Personal Construct. In W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.), The
    Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston,
    1976.

Cramer, C. All Things New. Paper presented to the Institute of Cultural Affairs, Chicago, 18 December 1981.

Crowfoot, J.E. and Chesler, M.A. Contemporary Perspectives on Planned Social Change: A Comparison. In W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Dalin, Per. Case Studies as an Approach to Analyzing Educational Change. A document prepared for the International Management Training for Educational Change (IMTEC) seminar in Germany, June 1975.

Devon, R.F. Cause for a New Paradigm: Ideology and Salience in Political Socialization Research. The Generator, Spring 1983, 12(3), 35-47.

Doyle, W. and Ponder, G.A. The Practicality Ethic in Teacher Decision-Making. Interchange, 1977, 8(3), 1-12.

Egan, K. What is Curriculum? Curriculum Inquiry, 1978, 8(1), 65-72.

Elbaz, Freema. The Teacher's Practical Knowledge: Report of a Case Study. Curriculum Inquiry. 1981, 11(1), 43-71.

Eisner, E. On the Differences Between Scientific and Artistic Approaches to Qualitative Research. Educational Researcher, April 1981, 10(4), 5-9.

Eyford, G.A. Culture: Key to Development. Development Directions. March-April 1979, p. 17.

Faris, R. Report of the Committee on Continuing and Community Education in British Columbia. B.C. Ministry of Education, December, 1976.

Fifth City Human Development Project. Fifth City: Chicago. A Report to the North American Continental Council of the ICA, 3-6 September 1982.

Forman, D.C. and Richardson, P. Course Development by Team: How Many Cooks Does it Take to Spoil the Broth? Educational Technology, December 1977, 17(12), 30-35.

Foster, S.F. Institutional Collaboration for Professional Development and International Education. In R.J. Leskiw and P.E. Moir (Eds.), Compromise, Collaboration or Competition. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 1982.

Fowler, J.W. Faith Development Theory and the Aims of Religious Socialization. In G. Durka and J. Smith (Eds.), Emerging Issues in Religious Education, New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Fox, R.S.   Innovation in Curriculum: An Overview. Interchange.
        1972, 3(2, 3), 131-143.

Franklin, R. Toward the Style of the Community Change Educator. In
        W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New
        York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Fullan, M. and Pomfret, A. Research on Curriculum and Instruction
        Implementation. Review of Educational Research, Winter
        1977, 47(2), 335-397.

Fullan, M. Conceptualizing Problems of Curriculum Implementation.
        Outline of remarks for the Symposium on Curriculum Inquiry
        in Canada. University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.,
        February, 1979.

Gallegos, A.M. The Growing Education Crisis in Developing Countries,
        II: Development Agencies -- The Frustrating Search for
        Educational Improvement. Educational Technology. February
        1982, 22(2), 18-25.

Gilbert, N. and Eaton, J.W. Who Speaks for the Poor? In W.G. Bennis
        et al (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt,
        Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Gleazer, Jr., Edward J. To Improve the Human Condition. Community
        and Junior College Journal. March 1981, 51(6), 7-15.

Goetsch, A. Advisory Committees: Making Them Work. Industrial
        Education, November 1982, 71(8).

Grabow, S. and Heskin, A. Foundations of a Radical Concept of
        Planning. In W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.), The Planning of
        Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Greene, M. Curriculum and Consciousness. In W. Pinar (Ed.),
        Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

_____. Public Education and the Public Space. Educational
        Researcher, June-July 1982, 11(6), 4-9.

Grow, N. The International Exposition of Rural Development (IERD)
        as Social Ritual of Reconstruction. Paper presented to the
        Institute of Cultural Affairs, May 1983.

Hall, B. Participatory research: An approach for change. Conver-
        gence. 1975, 8(2), 24-31.

Hanson, S. The Guild. Address to the North American Guardians'
        Consult, ICA, Chicago, 16-18 April 1982.

Hillery, G.A. Definitions of community: areas of agreement. Rural
        Sociology, 1955, 20.

Holland, R. Urban Economic Development. Report to the Council for
        Economic Development, New York, 1982.

Huebner, D. Curriculum Language and Classroom Meanings. In W. Pinar
        (Ed.), Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan,
        1975.

_____. Curriculum as Concern for Man's Temporality. In W. Pinar
        (Ed.), Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan,
        1975.

_____. The Tasks of the Curriculum Theorist. In W. Pinar (Ed.),
        Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

_____. Poetry and Power: The Politics of Curriculum Development.
        In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA:
        McCutchan, 1975.

Institute of Cultural Affairs. A Compend of Philosophical Presup-
        positions and Methodological Techniques. Working Paper of
        the Global Research Assembly. Chicago, July 1971.

_____. Impact Forums: A Compend of Task Force Products.
        Working Paper of the Global Research Assembly. Chicago,
        July 1979.

_____. Corporate Research Methods. IMAGE, January-March 1981,
        XI(1), 1-16.

_____. Imaginal Training Methods. IMAGE. April-June 1981,
        XI(2), 1-16.

_____. Human Development Zones. Report Presented to the Global
        Research Assembly. Chicago, July 1981.

_____. Demonstrating Human. Development. IMAGE. July-September
        1981, XI (3), 1-16.

_____. Statement of Proposed Intents: IERD Planning Meeting.
        Unpublished Working Document. Lonavela, India, 1-5 March
        1982.

_____. The IERD: Regional Implementation Manual. Report to the
        Global Research Assembly. Chicago, July 1982.

_____. International Exposition of Rural Development: Sharing
        Approaches That Work. IMAGE. 1983, XII(1), 1-16.

Jackson, G.B. Methods for Integrative Reviews. Review of Educational Research, Fall 1980, 50(3), 438-460.

Jackson, K. The Marginality of Community Development: Implications for Adult Education. International Review of Community Development. 1973, (29 and 30), 21-42.

Jackson, P.W. Naturalistic Studies of Schools and Classrooms: One Reader's Digest. In M. Apple et al (Eds.), Educational Evaluation, Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Jamieson, D. and Tannenbaum, R. Development in an Era of Paradigm Shifts, Changing Boundaries and Personal Challenge. Training and Development Journal, April 1982, 36(4), 32-42.

Jennings, T.W. On Ritual Knowledge. Journal of Religion, April 1982, 62(2), 111-127.

Kepner, C.H., Tregoe, B.B., and Cook, M. Twenty-Five Years of Change. Training and Development Journal. May 1982, 36(5), 132-140.

Keyser, J. and Nicholson, R.S. College/Chamber Synergy. Community and Junior College Journal, December 1982-January 1983, 53(4), 38-39.

Kiefer, C. and Stroh, P. A new paradigm for organization development. Training and Development Journal, April 1983, 37(4), 26-35.

Kidd, J.R. The Vast Progressive Task of Mankind. In S. Fersh (Ed.), Post-Secondary Short-Cycle Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.

Kilbourn, B. World Views and Curriculum. Interchange. 1980-81, 11(2), 1-10.

King, A.R. Role Shock in Local Community Development Dynamics. Canadian Journal of Education. 1981, 6(4), 56-76.

Klein, D. Some Notes on the Dynamics of Resistance to Change: The Defender Role. In W.G. Bennis et al (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Kliebard, H.M. Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

Knutsen, L. The Journey of Primal Community. Paper presented to the Global Research Assembly, Institute of Cultural Affairs, Chicago, July 1981.

Kolb, D.A.   Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences.   In A.W.
        Chickering (Ed.), The Modern American College: Responding
        to new realities of diverse students and a changing
        society.   San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Inc., Publishers,
        1981.

Kritek, W. Lessons from the Literature on Implementation. Educa-
        tional Administration Quarterly, Fall 1976, 12(3), 86-102.

Leithwood, K.A. and Russell, H.H.   Focus on implementation.   Inter-
        change. 1973, 4(1), 10-26.

Leithwood, K.A. and Montgomery, D.J.   Evaluating Program Implemen-
        tation. Evaluation Review, April 1980, 4(2), 193 - 214.

Leonard, J.T.   Mystery and Myth: Curriculum as the Illumination of
        Lived Experience.   Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1983,
        5(1), 17-25.

Lippitt, G. Singing: You Don't Have to Know the Words - Just Sing!
        Training and Development Journal, September 1982, 36(9),
        54-56.

_____.   Leadership: A Performing Art in a Complex Society.
        Training and Development Journal, March 1983, 37(3), 72-75.

MacDonald, J.B.   Myths About Instruction: Curriculum Concerns in a
        Revolutionary Era.   In R.R. Leeper (Ed.), Readings from
        Educational Leadership. Washington, D.C.: Association for
        Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971.

_____.   Curriculum Theory.   In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum
        Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

_____.   Curriculum and Human Interests.   In W. Pinar (Ed.),
        Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

MacKinnon, A.R.   From International Aid to International Cooperation:
        Some Thoughts in Retrospect.   International Review of
        Education, 1979, XXV, 231-247.

McLaughlin, M.W. and Berman, P.   Critical Processes in Implemen-
        tation.   A paper prepared for the International Management
        Training for Educational Change (IMTEC) seminar in Germany,
        June 1975.

McNeil, J.L.   Moral Education and the Community of Commitment.
        Canadian Journal of Education, 1982, 7(2), 34-45.

Malloy-Hanley, E.   Some Thoughts on World-Views and Education.
        McGill Journal of Education. Spring 1977, XII( ), 153-158.

Mann, D. Making Change Happen? Teachers College Record. February
        1976, 77(3), 313-322.

Mason, J. and Kerr, D. The Instructional Skills Program in British
        Columbia. Pacific Association of Continuing Education
        Newsletter, 1980, 10(4), 3-18.

Masse, M. President's Message. Canadians in the Third World: CIDA's
        year in review 1980 - 81. Ottawa: Canadian International
        Development Agency, Public Affairs Branch, 1982.

Matulich, L. Community Development: Responding to the 1980's.
        Community and Junior College Journal. March 1981, 51(6),
        16-22.

M'Bow, Amadou-Mahtar. Where the Future Begins: Introduction to
        UNESCO's Fourteen Major Programmes. The UNESCO Courier,
        January 1983, pp. 4 - 9.

Melchart, C. The Future of Religious Education: Commitment in
        Religion and Education. In G. Durka and J. Smith (Eds.),
        Emerging Issues in Religious Education, New York: Paulist
        Press, 1976.

Mellon, C.A. and Edmund, S. Perry and Piaget: Theoretical Framework
        for Effective College Course Development. Educational
        Technology, May 1981, 21(5), 29-33.

Mezirow, J.D. Community Development as an Educational Process.
        International Review of Community Development. 1960, (5),
        137-150.

Moles, J.A. Planned Social Change and the Negotiation of Reality:
        Social Scientists, Policy Makers, and Planners. In E.J.
        Blakely (Ed.), Community Development Research. New York:
        Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Morris, G.B. A Conceptualization of Education in the Future.
        Canadian Journal of Education. 1981, 7(2), 16-29.

Morris, R. The Role of the Agent in the Community Development
        Process. In L.J. Cary (Ed.), Community Development as a
        Process. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press,
        1970.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Post-Secondary
        Planning: Preparing for the Future. Centergram. 1981,
        XVI(2), 1-4.

Nwanko, J. The gap between planning and implementation in Nigerian
          education. Prospects: Quarterly Review of Education,
          1980, 10(2), 221-234.

Oberg, A. Status Report (Curriculum Research and Development in
          Canada): British Columbia. In W. Werner (Ed.), Curriculum
          Canada. 1979, 131-135.

O'Hanlon, J. Three Models for the Curriculum Development Process.
          Informal Section/Curriculum Theory Network. 1973/74, 4(1),
          64-71.

Parrett, W. Alaska's Rural Schools: A Unique Challenge for
          Responsive Curricular Development. Journal of Curriculum
          Theorizing, 1983, 5(3), 41-54.

Pena, L.B. Educational Technology: Its Impact on Culture. Educa-
          tional Technology, February 1983, 23(2), 17-21.

Phillips, K. The Balkanization of America. Harper's, May 1978, 256
          (1536), 37-47.

Pilder, W.F. and Murphy, W.J. Alternative Organizational Forms,
          Cultural Revolution and Education. In W. Pinar (Ed.),
          Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

Pinar, W. 'Currere': Toward Reconceptualization. In W. Pinar (Ed.),
          Curriculum Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

_____. Search for a Method. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum
          Theorizing. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

_____. The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies. Curri-
          culum Studies. 1978, 10(3), 205-214.

Pinar, W. and Grumet, M. Theory and practice and the reconceptuali-
          zation of curriculum studies. In Barton & Lawn (Eds.),
          Self and Practice. Birmingham, UK: Westhill College, 1980.

Ponder, G. The More Things Change ... The Status of Social Studies.
          Educational Leadership. April 1979, 36, 515-518.

Puri, S.S. Components of IRD Programmes: Approaches and Constraints
          in Implementation of IRD Under Different Conditions. In
          FAO, Joint Report on Integrated Rural Development, Vol.
          II. Rome: FAO, 1977.

Radcliffe, D. Canadian Education and World Community. In H.A. Stevenson and D. Wilson (Eds.), Policy, Precepts, and Process. London: Alexander, Blake Associates, 1977.

Regan, R.H. Curriculum Design: A Co-operative Venture. Canadian Vocational Journal. May 1980, 16(1), 37-45.

Rist, R.C. On the Relations Among Educational Paradigms: From Disdain to Detente. Anthropology and Education Quarterly. May 1977, VIII(2), 42-49.

Rivera, W. The Changers: A New Breed of Adult Educator. In Grabowski (Ed.), Paulo Freire: A Revolutionary Dilemma for the Adult Educator. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Clearinghouse on Adult Education, 1972.

Royal Bank. The community spirit. The Royal Bank Letter, January-February 1983, 64(1).

Salter, D.L. & Hart, R. Interinstitutional Cooperation - The Way For a Small College to get Further Faster: Some Experiences and Prospects. In R.J. Leskiw and P.E. Moir (Eds.), Compromise, Collaboration, or Competition in Higher Education. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 1982.

Samonte, A.G. Integrated Rural Development: Concept, Approach and Objectives. In FAO, Joint Report on Integrated Rural Development, Vol. II. Rome: FAO, 1977.

Sanders, I.T. Theories of Community Development. Rural Sociology, March 1958, 23( ), 1-12.

_____. The Concept of Community Development. In L.J. Cary (Ed.), Community Development as a Process. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1970.

Scharf, J. F. Program Development in the Fast Track. Canadian Vocational Association Journal, February 1984, 19(4), 10-14.

Schensul, J.J., Schensul, S.L., Gonzalez, M. and Caro, E. Community-Based Approaches to Social Change: The Case of the Hispanic Health Council. The Generator, Winter 1981, 12(2), 13-36.

Schindler-Rainman, E. & Lippitt, R. What we have learned from working with the poor. Human Relations Training News. 1969, 13(2), 1-3.

Schindler-Rainman, E. Community Development Through Laboratory Methods. In K.D. Benne et al (Eds.), The Laboratory Method of Changing and Learning: Theory and Application. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1975.

Schler, D.J. The Community Development Process. In L.J. Cary (Ed.),
        Community Development as a Process. Columbia, MO: The
        University of Missouri Press, 1970.

Schumacher, E.F. Using Intermediate Technologies. In G. Bell,
        (Ed.), Strategies for Human Settlements: Habitat and
        Environment. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1976.

Schwab, J.J. The Practical: A Language for Curriculum. In J.R.
        Gress and D.E. Purpel (Eds.), Curriculum. Berkeley, CA:
        McCutchan, 1978.

_____. The Practical 4: Something For Curriculum Professors To
        Do. Curriculum Inquiry. 1983, 13(3), 239-265.

Skilbeck, M. School-based curriculum development. Extracts from
        "School-based Curriculum Development and Teacher Education"
        (mimeograph/private circulation, 1975).

Spencer, R. New essentialism of radical humanness. Paper presented
        to the Global Research Assembly, Institute of Cultural
        Affairs, Chicago, July 1981.

Tornatzky, L.G., Brookover, W.B., Hathaway, D.V., Miller, S.K., and
        Passalacqua, J. Changing School Climate: A Case Study in
        Implementation. Urban Education, April 1980, 15(1), 49 -
        64.

Tyler, R. Specific Approaches to Curriculum Development. In J.R.
        Gress and D.E. Purpel, (Eds.), Curriculum. Berkeley, CA:
        McCutchan, 1978.

UNESCO. The Medium Term Plan at a Glance. The UNESCO Courier,
        January 1983, centre insert, pp. I - IV.

Vance, C. The Regional Role of the Global Servant Force. Paper
        presented to the Global Research Assembly, Chicago, July
        1981.

Verner, C. The Community Development Process. Community Develop-
        ment Review, 1962.

Vittachi, V.J. Your work is your message. Speech delivered at the
        Global Research Assembly, ICA. Chicago, July 1982.

Voth, D.E. Social Action Research in Community Development. In
        E.J. Blakely (Ed.), Community Development Research. New
        York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Walker, D.F. A Naturalistic Model for Curriculum Development.
        School Review, November 1971, 51-65.

Warren, R.L. The Context of Community Development. In L.J. Cary (Ed.). Community Development as a Process. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1970.

Weissman, E. Re-thinking a Framework for Settlement Planning. In G. Bell (Ed.), Strategies for Human Settlements: Habitat and Environment. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1976.

Werner, W. Implementation: The Role of Belief. Paper presented to an invitational conference on implementation hosted by the University of British Columbia, the B.C. Teachers' Federation, and Simon Fraser University, September 1979.

Whitehead, R.Y., Babin, P., Common, D., and Wright, R. Prescription vis-a-vis Description: The Pros and Cons of Two Contemporary Approaches to Curriculum Development. Paper presented to the Annual ASCD Conference, 1980.

Wilson, D.C. A Critical Examination of Teacher Education from the Perspective of Curriculum. Canadian Journal of Education. 1981, 6(1), 55-64.

Wolcott, H.F. Is there life after technology? Some Lessons on Change. Educational Technology, May 1981, 21(5), 24-28.

Wright, P.C. Association-Sponsored Education: Is it an Alternative to the Community College? Canadian Vocational Journal. February 1983, 18(4), 45-50.

Zemke, R. Retraining America: When All Else Fails, Try a Rational Approach. Training, May 1983, 20(5), 10-11.