Curriculum Justice

Kenneth Butcher, Ph.D.

Professor of Political Science

Maple Woods College (Metropolitan Community College), Kansas City

Introduction

Sometime ago, I went to deliver a lecture at a school district forum here in America's heartland and had the opportunity to examine the curriculum used in many parts of America's Midwest. I realized that despite the good intentions of the curriculum-decision makers, certain issues were skewed and the outline for interpretations that were presented reflected the opinions of one group. The social studies curriculum that I analyzed presented a one-sided perspective and disregarded other perspectives that contradicted the dominant narrative. When history is taught in that way, it leaves learners with the knowledge of only one side of the coin.

Social justice is not to be sought only in governmental economic and political policies alone. Pointedly, social justice is incomplete without educational justice. And educational justice cannot be achieved without fairness in the construction of the curriculum. Here in the United States and many other places around the world, some curriculum decisions do not fairly epitomize cultural relevance and complete historical facticity. Sometimes, all groups in the community are not represented in the decision-making groups. In such cases, the results of curriculum decisions sometimes favor certain groups at the expense of other groups. But if education is to be fair and balanced, curriculum decision-making must be comprehensive and accurate. This therefore places curriculum at the foundation of social/educational justice.

The Complexity of Curriculum

But what is curriculum and what makes it appear so complicated that we sometimes do not know when we have made the right or wrong decisions? The term "curriculum" is traceable to a Roman racecourse used by Gaius Julius Caesar's cohorts and other Roman chariots of the first century B.C. (Oliva, 2005). It has become a complex word in professional education and hardly lends itself without reservations to a

simple definition. In the opinion of Elizabeth Vallance (1983), "The curriculum field is by no means clear; as a discipline of study and as a field of practice, *curriculum* lacks clean boundaries…" (p. 159). Madeleine R. Grumet (1988) takes it further by calling curriculum a "field of utter confusion" (p. 4). It is difficult to draw a line at where it begins and ends. To encapsulate curriculum in a staccato form is a Herculean task. To simplify the matter, Hilda Taba identifies the following elements:

> All curricula, no matter what their particular design, are composed of certain elements. A curriculum usually contains a statement of aims and of specific objectives; it indicates some selection and organization of content; it either implies or manifests certain patterns of learning and teaching, whether because the objectives demand them or because the content organization requires them. Finally, it includes a program of evaluation of the outcomes (1962, p. 10).

Peter F. Oliva (2005) compares the idea of defining curriculum to asking blind men to describe an elephant. He further complicates the matter by attributing invisibility to the subject: "Though it may be vehemently denied, no one has ever seen a curriculum, not a real, total, tangible, visible entity called a curriculum….Nor has anyone ever photographed a curriculum" (p. 2). He argues that we may have seen "a written plan" bearing the name "curriculum," but the interactions or activities that we see are what we call instruction. Moreover, the issue is not helped by State certification laws which provide for certifying people to teach such areas as science and social studies while no one is certified to specifically teach "curriculum" at the elementary and secondary levels. But what accounts for that, and how does curriculum evolve?

> Curriculum—or its plural, curricula or curriculums (depending on the user's penchant or abhorrence for the Latin)—is built, planned, designed, and constructed. It is improved, revised, and evaluated. Like photographic film and muscles, the curriculum is developed. It is also organized, structed, and restructured, and like a wayward child, reformed. With considerable ingenuity the curriculum planer—another specialist—can mold, shape, and tailor the curriculum (Oliva, 2005, pp. 2-3).

Defining Curriculum

Curriculum is defined as "courses of study offered by an educational institution" in the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1980, p. 324). Carter V.

Good's *Dictionary of Education* presents describes it as "a systematic group of courses or sequences of subjects required for graduation or certification in a field of study, for example, social studies curriculum, physical education curriculum" (1973, p. 157). Franklin Bobbit, one of the earliest writers on curriculum, viewed it as "*series of things which children and youth must do and experience* by way of developing abilities to do things well that make up the affairs of adult life; and to be in all respects what adults should be" (1918, p. 42). His definition, to me, sounds more like a process than an action. I see it as a sociological definition of curriculum. It looks similar to what anthropologists or sociologists call the process of enculturation or the rites of passage (Lee, Spencer, & Harpalani, 2003).

Hollis Caswell and Doak Campbell wittingly or unwittingly agreed with Bobbit by designating curriculum as "all the experiences children have under the guidance of teachers" (1935, p. 66). But in the opinion of J. G. Saylor, William M. Alexander, and Arthur J. Lewis (1981), curriculum is "a plan for providing sets of learning opportunities for persons to be educated" (p. 8). "Educated," as I understand it in this context is not only the acquisition of academic knowledge but also the imbibing of cultural values necessary for navigating successfully in a society.

Lending weight to the campaign for desegregating the curriculum, Geneva Gay (1990) explains, "If we are to achieve equally, we must broaden our conception to include the entire culture of the school—not just subject matter content" (pp. 61-62). Oliva agreed basically with Gay when he went on to provide a fairly comprehensive definition and interpretations of curriculum in the following expressions:

- Curriculum is that which is taught in school.
- Curriculum is a set of subjects.
- Curriculum is content.
- Curriculum is a program of studies.
- Curriculum is a set of materials.
- Curriculum is a sequence of courses.
- Curriculum is a set of performance objectives.
- Curriculum is a course of study.
- Curriculum is everything that goes on within the school, including extra-class activities, guidance, and interpersonal relationships.
- Curriculum is that which is taught both inside and outside of school directed by the school.

- Curriculum is everything that is planned by the school personnel.
- Curriculum is a series of experiences undergone by learners in school.
- Curriculum is that which an individual learner experiences as a result of schooling (2005, p. 3).

According to Decker Walker and Jonas Soltis (2004), "curriculum is inherently a social creation, a collective design" (p. 6). In my perspective, the powers-that-be in a society uses the curriculum not only to create whatever serves their interest, but also to maintain and perpetuate it. In view of this, Ronald Doll calls the curriculum "the formal and informal content and process by which learners gain knowledge and understanding, develop skills, and alter attitudes, applications, and values under the auspices of that school" (1996, p. 15; Busby & Busby, 1996). In other words, curriculum affects all aspects of life.

There are several ways teachers, school administrators, and students engage in curriculum activities without feeling that they are doing curriculum work. For example:

> When teachers and students talk in the classroom about the rules of good conduct on the playground that is part of curriculum. When teachers plan their year's work, decide what their goals for the year will be, what content they will cover, how much they will emphasize different topics, and in what sequence they will present them, they are designing curriculum. When students choose elective courses, vote for officers in student government, or join a student organization, they are helping to shape the school's curriculum. When a principal develops a community service program for student volunteers, that becomes part of the school curriculum. When teachers decide to redirect class discussions that have veered from the main point to a relatively unimportant issue, they are making on-the-spot curriculum decisions. When they decide to set aside their plans for a social studies lesson in order to discuss events of current interest, they are exercising their professional judgment to alter earlier curriculum decisions. And when they make up tests and decide how to weight test results and other data on student's achievement in order to assign grades, they are engaged in thinking about the curriculum. In fact, the curriculum and teaching are as inseparable from one another as the skeleton is from the human body (Walker & Soltis, 2004, p. 1).

For a definition of curriculum to be meaningful, it must be done within a specific context or environment. Factors to be taken into consideration include the purpose a curriculum is intended to serve, the location or environment in which it is to be used, and the strategies to be used in the curriculum. Hypotheses, truths, and partial truths

remain the principles of curriculum. Moreover, one must realize that changes are inevitable in curriculum because it is a product of its time. Ten reasons that warrant the necessity for curriculum changes include 1) the changing world of work, 2) urban and suburban crisis, 3) the family, 4) environment, 5) equal rights, 6) changing values and morality, 7) crime and violence, 8) the Microelectronics Revolution, 9) alienation and anxiety, and 10) international issues. In view of this, the educator does not envisage an end to curriculum development (see Hass, 1987, pp. 45-48; Oliva, 2005, pp. 2-40; Wiles & Bondi, 2002).

Making Curriculum Decisions

When it comes to who has the authority to make curriculum decisions, the states and school district boards under them currently possess the legal and moral rights to control curriculum matters in their classrooms. The fifty states of the US not only have the right to determine the curriculum of their public schools but also to decide who they employ to implement those decisions. The decisions are not usually based on moral principles like the United Nations Human Right Declaration, the Ten Commandments, or the Golden Rule, but on value judgments described as "fully and fairly considered judgments." By this is meant the kinds of judgments about the merits of curriculum that are "many-valued, multifaceted, context-dependent, and relative to larger social, philosophical, and educational viewpoints" (Walker & Soltis, 2004, pp. 4-9; Perkings-Gough, 2004; Wink, 2005; Hall & Hall, 2003; Baum, Renzulli & Hebert, 1994).

Usually, a good curriculum reflects the values of the mainstream of a society and is therefore regarded as constitutional in its structure. But a curriculum can be deemed unconstitutional only when it unduly disenfranchises teachers and parents/community or denies them the freedom of speech. However, freedom of speech does not necessarily mean that teachers will teach in public schools their individual beliefs that directly contradict the written beliefs in the curriculum of the district or school boards. This therefore calls for a teacher to be responsible for developing skills necessary for joggling personal views and public responsibilities amicably (Walker and Soltis, 2004, pp. 4-9).

5

Two Types of Curriculum

There are two types of curriculum. The *first* is the narrow curriculum which is specified and sometimes exclusive. It is considered the official curriculum and is usually in written forms. Educators have argued that curriculum is not only "the official list of courses offered by the school—we call that the "official curriculum"—but also the purposes, content, activities, and organization of the educational program actually created in schools by teachers, students, and administrators" (Walker & Soltis, 2004, p. 1; And for more discussion on the subject, see also Trent, 2003; Gay, 1990; Williams, 2003; Giroux, 1988; Perkins-Gough, 2003/2004; Taba, 1962; Wessler, 2003; Sowell, 1996; Valenzuela, 2005).

The narrow curriculum is a list decided upon by school leaders to constitute the primary content areas of programs to be offered to students. It forms the core of courses from which tests/examinations are primarily drawn. In most cases, it is presented in general terms but in some cases it contains great detail. In the general school pamphlet, brochure, small catalog, contract papers and public relations book, it is presented to the public in short, staccato forms. Many a time, the curriculum is encapsulated in the educational philosophy or mission statement of a school. But in the teacher's manual, job descriptions, or academic objectives, it is likely to be spelt out in great detail to provide teachers with some comprehensive specifications with regard to course descriptions, contents, measurable objectives, purposes, time lengths, credit hours, organizational matters, activities, and marking schemes (Walker & Soltis, 2004; Sowell, 1996). This written version of curriculum constitutes the pivot of the academic programs of a school.

The *second* is the broad curriculum which is wide-ranging, inclusive and sometimes complex. It emanates in the experiences of teachers and administered at their discretions. Sometimes, it is presented in black and white in a teacher's course syllabi. Other times, it is communicated to students in other ways that a teacher deems necessary. It may be articulated before and explained at the beginning of the class or it may emerge along the way in the duration of the course. The broad curriculum encompasses the issues of additional texts sometimes considered outside, irrelevant, negligible, and unscientific. It also embraces matters of class rules, conduct, discipline,

penalty, recognition, reward, make-up work and extra mark-earnings or bonuses. Its purpose is to enrich the official curriculum, enhance learning, and broaden students' perspectives. Different teachers implement their broad/inclusive curriculum in different ways (Walker & Soltis, 2004).

But the implementation of the inclusive curriculum depends largely on the arrangement and nature of the classroom, composition of class population, available materials, geographical location of school, academic levels of the students, and the subjective intentions and expectations of the teacher. The broad curriculum provides the teacher some latitude to operate freely in an effort to achieve the class objectives. It also affords students additional options for learning and better performance.

The inclusive curriculum is where teachers and students are compelled to go outside the "box" not only to see what is outside the edges of the box but also to critique the status quo with a view to giving birth to multiculturalism. A student who does well in both the narrow and broad curriculum usually excels in the class. N. M. Williams (2003) reflects on this in a revealing article, "Thinking Outside the Bubble." In line with the contrast I made above, Peter Oliva (2005) conceives of "a narrow way" of viewing curriculum "as subjects taught" in schools, while defining its "broad way" as "all the experiences of learners, both in school and out, directed by the school" (p. 3), as earlier noted. Both types of curriculum are inseparable in practice.

Social Justice Concepts that Impact the Definitions of Curriculum

It will be too parochial and myopic to deal with contextual definitions of the curriculum without a reference to important concepts that impact or influence such definitions. These include such terms as the hidden curriculum, critical pedagogy, hegemonic masculinity (sexism), classism, traditionalism, and multiculturalism. The significance and purpose of discussing these concepts alongside the curriculum is to demonstrate how curriculum is not only defined and understood, but also practiced or implemented in different ways, different places, and different times.

Hidden Curriculum and Ethnocentrism

What we treat as broad curriculum above is what Albert I. Oliver (1977) refers to as the "hidden curriculum" (p. 4). He understands curriculum in four basic elements: "1) the program of studies, 2) the program of experiences, 3) the program of service, and 4) the hidden curriculum" (p. 8). In practice, hidden curriculum is indistinguishable from the official curriculum. Sometimes, hidden curriculum is not just the king-maker but the king in some teachers' academic assessment.

Peter McLaren defines hidden curriculum as the unwritten or unsaid pedagogy (1998, p. 45). In the same vein, Wink portrays it as "the unexpressed perpetuation of dominant culture through institutional process (2005, p. 46). It is subtle and quiet. Only the microscope of critical pedagogy is able to detect it. Sometimes, it is invisible to local teachers and administrators that practice it. Not even the victims (usually urban/minority kids) are able to explain when and how it operates. But the people at the top who mandate, encouraged, and fund it are always aware of the aims and purposes of the issue. There are secretive ways that hidden curriculum dominates activities in the classroom.

> The hidden curriculum can be seen in schools when little boys are called on more than little girls, when only Eurocentric histories are taught, when teenage girls are socialized to believe that they are not good in math and sciences, when heroes but not heroines are taught, and when counselors track nonwhites to classes that prepare them to serve (Wink, 2005, p. 47).

Curriculum and Instruction: A Symbiotic Relationship?

The relationship between curriculum and instruction is complimentary rather than competitive or rivalry. Instruction is the vehicle that conveys curriculum to its destination. It serves the second half of the purpose of curriculum. It is the channel through which curriculum accomplishes its purposes. Johnson believes that instruction "is the interaction between a teaching agent and one or more individuals intending to learn." (1967, p. 130). Curriculum is the "what" while instruction is the "how" of education. Oliva views the "curriculum as a program, a plan, content, and learning experiences, whereas we may characterize instruction as methods, the teaching act, implementation, and presentation" (2005, p. 7). Expressing similar opinion, J. B. McDonald insists that

instruction must be preceded by curriculum planning (McDonald & Leeper, 1965, pp. 5-6).

While curriculum decisions are *programmatic* in nature, those of instruction are *methodological.* Therefore, curriculum and instruction are not just central to education, they are a *sine qua non* in any serious academic exercise (Oliva, 2005, Taba, 1962).

Curriculum Models

There are at least four identifiable models of the curriculum in relation to instruction. The *dualistic model* is where curriculum and instruction run parallel to each other, and therefore never meet. The *interlocking model* shows how both overlap in some kind of interlocking relationship. They remain partly joined and inseparable in that way. The *concentric models* primarily demonstrate two things—how curriculum and instruction mutually depend on each other on the one hand, and how they are sometimes placed in ranks in some hierarchical order on the other hand. In the latter case, each can become a subordinate to the other, depending on how they are arranged in a given moment. The *cyclical model* demonstrates how curriculum and instruction feed, impact and serve each other in a continuum that never terminates. In this way, they both adapt, improve and evaluate themselves. With these characteristics, among others, curriculum and instruction constitute an important discipline of study (Oliva, 2005, p. 9; See also Johnson, 1976; Baum, Renzulli & Hebert, 1994; Saylor, Alexander, & Lewis, 1981).

Example of the Use of Curriculum for Educational Injustice

When traditional curriculum in America became a tool for hegemony and masculinity, it became the instrument of oppression. The significance of hegemonic masculinity in this society is demonstrated in the fact that it permeates all aspects of our curriculum. Our traditional curriculum was originally prepared by dominant White males and it bears their footprint. Hegemony and masculinity work (especially in our curriculum) because we take things for granted and do things the same old way we had been told, forgetting that the concepts and methods were socially constructed. Joan Wink of the California State University writes, *"Hegemony* is the domination of one

group over another with the partial consent of the dominated group. It is the control of knowledge and literacy by the dominant group…. Enriched programs can be used as a hegemonic tool to groom one group and to marginalize and silence another" (2005, p. 45-46). This happens almost every day in our schools in this country. I have witnessed it as a teacher in the Kansas City Missouri School District. The following experience of a high school teacher illustrates one of the activities of hegemony through the application of hidden curriculum:

> *"Rap music and break dancing are not allowed at our school," Mr. Smith, the principal, announced as he stormed into my classroom. He grabbed B.J. by the ear, literally pulling him out of the class. I was not physically strong enough to prevent the principal from dragging B.J. out of class and down the hall. I turned my attention back to the other students. After they were settled and working on their assignments, I walked down to Mr. Smith's office to check on B.J.*
> *"B.J. has been suspended. He has broken our rules. Perhaps this will set an example for the rest of the students that we set the rules, and when we do, we mean business," Mr. Smith told me.*
> *I just walked back to class shaking my head, but I couldn't help but reflect on the fact that Mr. Smith's (elevator) music was playing in the office of this school, which was located in the middle of the African-American community in town* (Wink, 2005, p. 45-46).

Traditionalism and Multiculturalism in Curriculum

A meticulous observer will notice that traditionalism uses hegemonic masculinity and European-American middle class hidden rules to pontificate on curriculum matters in our educational system here. But theoretically, curriculum is supposed to spark other ideas. In many cases, however, overemphasis on traditional curriculum tends to eclipse the expression of other views. This is because zealous custodians of traditional curriculum accept only views that support their beliefs. Contradictory perspectives are ignored, dismissed as inferior, admitted with reservation, insensitively de-emphasized or given lukewarm reception at the most. The result has been the silencing of dissenting voices and the dismissal of critics with a wave of the hand. We must acknowledge, though, that the recent introduction or emphasis on multicultural education is challenging the status quo and opening up the system that was originally closed.

New Teachers and Curriculum

New teachers are naturally more curious about curriculum the moment they arrive at a school. They are usually happy to go by curriculum decisions made by others until they are able to understand the system and how to incorporate their own views. They understand that they will be watched carefully on how effective they are in successful curriculum implementation. In a school where student test scores are used to determine the effectiveness of teachers, a new teacher is tempted to sheepishly parrot and inculcate only the content of the curriculum so that students will pass exams. It becomes a teach-and-learn-for-exams situation. But apart from the aforementioned negative impact, the curriculum provides the most comfort for new teachers. It gives them guidance where they are confused. It provides security in terms of the position to be taken while teaching controversial topics such as politics, sex, religion, evolution, race and history. Teachers are never legally wrong when they simply adopt the official position of their superiors (the school leadership or other authorities that designed the curriculum such as the district, state, or federal), even if the position appears illogical and erroneous. The curriculum also helps teachers, develop, sharpen or improve their skills and professionalism. As teachers work on their curriculum, consult with one another on it, conduct further studies on relevant ideas, they develop reputations as their products come to light (Walker & Soltis, 2004, pp. 4-9; See also McDonald & Leeper, 1965).

Curriculum Hegemonization vs. Critical Pedagogy of Place

The idea of a context-free curriculum of standards and testing has received strong reactions from educators (Perkins-Gough, 2004; Williams, 2003; Pinar, 1991; Adler and Goodman, 1986; Haberman, 1995; Ayers & Ford, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Baum, Renzulli & Hebert, 1994). W. Pinar explains that the attempt to hegemonize a curriculum and claim that it is applicable "anytime and anywhere" is an expression of ignorance on the impact of culture (1991, p. 165). Critical pedagogy and place-based education join forces to oppose the ideology of homogenizing curriculum of standards and testing in the contemporary school system (Gruenewald, 2003).

The need for critical pedagogy as the proper channel of curriculum for the present society remains evident. The growth of cultural diversity in US public schools shows no signs of abating. In "Managing Culturally Diverse Classrooms," John Holloway (2003) writes that the U.S. Department of Education in Washington "found that 38.8 percent of public school students were minorities in 2000, up from 29.6 percent in 1986. In addition, the number of students who spoke a language other than English at home rose from 6.3 million in 1979 to13.7million in 1999." He explained that about "Eighty percent of the teachers surveyed by Futrell, Gomez, and Bedden (2003) felt unprepared to teach a diverse student population." (p. 90). If we are to have a more balanced curriculum that should be communicated properly, critical teaching currently remains the best option.

Critical pedagogy (dangerous pedagogy) is a strong reaction to institutional and ideological domination in educational and community settings. It opposes the imposition of one tradition (a dominant one) over others (minorities or oppressed groups) in a capitalist system, primarily. According to Burbules and Berk, critical pedagogy is

> an effort to work within educational institutions and other media to raise questions about inequalities of power, about the false myths of opportunity and merit for many students, and about the way belief systems become internalized to the point where individuals and groups abandon the very aspiration to question or change their lot in life (1999, p. 50).

Critical pedagogy asks relevant questions—issues close to home. As attempts are made to generate or impose standards, critical pedagogy queries: "Whose standards? Whose culture? Whose knowledge? Whose history? Whose language? Whose perspectives?" These are asked to challenge the tendency of a society to "domesticate students into believing the dominant view" (Wink, 2005, p. 46). These questions must be seriously asked because, according to Foucault:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of truth which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (1972, p. 131).

Critical pedagogy locates its roots in the discourse of Marxist and neo-Marxist critical theory that has received more attention in recent decades (Freire, 1970/1995; Adler & Goodman, 1986; Giroux, 1988; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993; Burbules & Berk, 1999; McLaren, 2003). It is characterized by an undistracted focus on social and urban contexts (Gruenewald 2003, p. 3). Some scholars have alleged that the current focus of critical pedagogy differs from its original emphasis.

> While critical pedagogy in its early stages largely grew out of the efforts of Paulo Freire and his literacy campaigns among peasants in rural areas of Brazil and other Third World countries, subsequent generations of North American teachers and cultural workers influenced by Freire's work have directed most of their attention to urban minority populations in major metropolitan centers (McLaren & Giroux, 1990, p. 154).

Critical pedagogy has been criticized for paying too little attention to anything else other than social and urban education. Some educators are concerned that critical pedagogy is so narrowly focused on city education that "very little writing exists that deals with critical pedagogy in the rural school classroom and community" (McLaren & Giroux, 1990, p. 154). That necessitated an attempt by David Gruenewald (2003) to reconcile "critical pedagogy" and "place-based education" so that both can combine to evolve an inclusive curriculum for contemporary education.

The place-based education concentrates on ecological and rural contexts. So the combination of rural and ecological places of people's actual *habitus* or habitation (place-based pedagogy) and the urban and multicultural contexts (critical pedagogy) resulted in what Gruenewald called "a critical pedagogy of place" (2003; Hooks, 2000; Bourdieu, 1988 & 1990).

Gruenewald was not the first to raise the idea of a specifically situated pedagogy. His work builds on Haymes' 1995 book, *Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy for Black Urban Struggle.* Haymes reveals that Whites equate the inner city with race which in turn means Blackness. Such racialized critical geography invites a "pedagogy of place" for the urban context. Therefore, "in the context of the inner city, a pedagogy of place must be linked to black urban struggle" (p. 129). Haymes does not see a solution in the "assimilationist" and "Afrocentric" models of "black capitalism" as they do not differ much from the tendencies of the colonial past.

From my observation, critical pedagogy is inseparable from the social justice curriculum. The latter accommodates a theological association of liberty and personality. It is a synthesis aimed at restoring the human dignity with an educational weapon. But for liberty to be a reality in the midst of domination, oppression or even tyranny, the marginalized must be able to tell their own stories from their own worldview. This is what Haymes calls "critical narratology" and "critical multiculturalism,"—terms employed for the actualization of a "language possibility" earlier advocated by Giroux (1988). No curriculum will be exciting unless it contains voices that learners can identify with. Education can only be relevant and more meaningful when it takes account of geographical situationality (Haymes, 1995, p. 127). That is when the transformative intent of critical pedagogy becomes realizable.

> People as beings "in a situation," find themselves rooted in temporal-spatial conditions which mark them and which they also mark. They will tend to reflect on their own "situationality" to the extent that they are challenged by it to act upon it. Human beings *are* because they are in a situation. And they *will be more* the more they not only critically reflect upon their existence but critically act upon it (Freire, 1970/1995, p. 90).

Adler and Goodman agree that the "aim of critical teaching is an emancipatory one." It aims to liberate people from the prison of "taken-for-granted views of the world and the knowledge claims of which they are a part." It also aims to transform our "social structures and practices into those that are more equitable and just" (1986, p. 4). When critical pedagogy and multiculturalism play significant roles in curriculum development, the result will be fairness, equality, equity, tolerance, openness and peace.

Conclusion

The attainment of educational equity is dependent in part on a thorough comprehension of the rudiments and applications of curriculum and instruction in any educational environment. What I have done here is explore the concept of curriculum and its related uses in the American educational system. It is crucial to analyze curriculum in its multifaceted domain in order to appreciate its role and place in shaping the future of learners. This enables us to understand and hopefully reexamine whatever educational status quo we have inherited. It makes crystal clear the basis for the

demand for educational equality and social justice. The next publication will be a probe of the official curriculum in order to midwife educational justice.

References and Bibliography
Abedi, J. (2004, January/February). The No Child Left Behind Act and English Language Learners: Assessment and Accountability Issues. Educational Researcher, Vol. 33, No. 1, 4-14.
Adler, S. & Goodman, J. (1986, July-August). Critical Theory as a Foundation for Methods Courses. Journal of Teacher Education, 2-8.
Anyon, Jean. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform.* New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1993). Education Still Under Siege. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
Au, W. (2005A, Spring). No Child Left Untested: Closing the Door on Our Kids. Rethinking Schools—Online, vol. 19(3), http://www.rethinkinhschools.org/archive/19_03/clos193.shtml.
------------. (2005B, Spring). Messing With Texas: Leaving Children Behind kicks up dust in the lone star state (A Book Review). Rethinking Schools—Online, vol. 19(3), http://www.rethinkinhschools.org/archive/19_03/revi193.shtml.
Ayers, W. & Ford, P. (2004). City kids, city teachers: Reports from the front row. New York: The New Press.
Ayers, W., Hunt, J.A., & Quinn, T. (1998). *Teaching for Social Justice.* New York: The New Press.
Baldwin, J. (1998). A Talk to Teachers. In Fred Schultz, ed. Sources. Guilford, CT: Dushkin Press.
Banks, James A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks. Editors. (2001) *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives.* 4th Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Barsamian, David. (2004). The Progressive Interview. *The Progressive,* May 2004, p. 37
Baum, S.B., Renzulli, J.S. & Herbert, T. (1994). Reversing underachievement: Stories with success. Educational Leadership, 52(2), 48-52.
Beck, R.; Black, L.; Krieger, L.; Naylor, P.; & Shabaka, D. (2005). Modern World History: Patterns of Interaction. Evanston, IL.: McDougal Littell.
Bensman, D., & Lynch, R. (1987). Rushed Dreams: Hard Times in a Steel Community. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Billington, R., Hill, C., Johnston II, C., Mowat, C., & Mullett, C. (1966). *The Historian's Contribution to Anglo-American Misunderstanding: Report of a Committee on National Bias in Anglo-American History Textbooks.*
Bobbitt, F. (1918). The Curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Bourdieu, P. (1988). Homo Academicus (P. Collier, Trans.). Stanford: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1984).
Bourdieu, P. (1990). In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology (M. Adamson, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1982, 1987).

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Nice, Richard, Trans.). London: Sage Publications.

Burbules, N., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical Thinking and Critical Pedagogy: Relations, Differences, and Limits. In T. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (eds.), Critical Theories in Education. New York: Routledge.

Busby, W. & Busby, F. (1996). Children in poverty: The fundamental issue. Journal of Children and Poverty, 2, 65-91.

Caswell, H. L. & Campbell, D. S. (1935). Curriculum Development. New York: American Book Company.

Chomsky, Noam. (1988). *Language and Politics.* Ed. C.P. Otero. New York: Black Rose Books. P. 681.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as Curriculum Maker. In Phillip W. Jackson, ed. Handbook of Research on Curriculum: A Project of the American Educational Research Association. NY: Macmillan.

Connell, R. W. (2000). The men and the boys. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Daniels, H. & Zemelman, S. (2004). Out with Textbooks, In with Learning. Educational Leadership, December 2003/January 2004, 36-40.

Danzer, G., Jorge klor de Alva, J., Krieger, L., Wilson, L., & Woloch, N. (2005). The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21st Century. Evanston, Illinois: McDougal Little.

http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/ budget/budget06/nclb/index.html).

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan.

Dias, Carlos. (1992). *Multicultural Education for the 21st Century.* Washington D.C.: Professional Library, National Education Association.

Doll, R. C. (1996). Curriculum Improvement: Decision Making and Process. 9th Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Foucault, M. (1972/1977). Discipline and Punishment: the Birth of the Prison. London: Allen Lane.

Freire, P. (1970/1995). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum. (Originally published in 1970).

Freire, Paulo. (1985). *The Politics of Education.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gay, G. (1990, September). Achieving Educational Equality Through Curriculum Desegragation. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, No. 1, 61-62.

Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. (1988). Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning. South Hadley, MA: Bergin Garvey.

Good, C. V., ed. (1973). Dictionary of Education, 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grant, C.A. & Sleeter, C.E. (2003). Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003, May). The Best of Both Worlds: A Critical Pedagogy of Place. Educational Researcher, Vol. 32, No. 4, 3-12.

Grumet, Madeleine. (1988). Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching. Amherst, Mass.: The

University of Massachusetts Press.

Haberman, M. (1995). Star teachers of children in poverty. Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi.

Hall, P. S. & Hall, N. D. (2003, September). Building Relationships with Challenging Children. Educational Leadership, vol. 61, No. 1, 60-63. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Hass, G. (1987). Curriculum Planning: A New Approach, 5th Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Holloway, J. H. (2003, September). Managing Culturally Diverse Classrooms. Educational Leadership, Vol. 61, No. 1, 90-91. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Hooks, Bell. (2000). Where We Stand: Class Matters. New York and London: Routledge.

Jackson, C. (2002). "Laddishness" as a self-worth protection strategy. Gender and Education 14 (1), 37-51.

Johnson, M. Jr. (1967). Definition and Methods. Educational Theory. 17(2) p.130.

Kenway, J., & Fitzclarence, L. (1997). Masculunity, violence and schooling— Challenging "poisonous" pedagogies. Gender and Education, 9(1), 117-133.

Kimmel, M. (1996). Manhood in America: A cultural history. New York: Free Press.

Kliebard, H. M. (1998). The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon E. Beyer and Michael W. Apple, eds. The Curriculum: Problems, Politics, and Possibilities, 2nd Edition. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lee, C.D., Spencer, M.B. & Harpalani, V. (2003, June/July). "Every Shut Eye Ain't Sleep": Studying how People Live Culturally. Educational Researcher, Vol. 32, No. 5, 6-13.

Levine, D., Lowe, R., Peterson, B. & Tenorio, R. (1995). *Rethinking Schools: An Agenda for Change.* New York: The New Press.

Loewen, James W. (1995). *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong.* New York: New Press.

Marzano, R. J, & Marzano, J. S. (2003, September). The Key to Classroom Management. Educational Leadership, vol. 61, No. 1, 6-12. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Matthews, J. (2003, February). Class struggle: The ups and downs of No Child Left Behind. [on-line]. www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/articles/A56818-2003Feb11.html.

McCandliss, B. D., Kalchman, M., & Bryant, P. (2003, January/February). Design Experiments and Laboratory Approaches to Learning: Steps Toward Collaborative Exchange. Educational Researcher, Vol. 32, No. 1, 14-16.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). The making of men: Masculunities, sexualities and schooling. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

McDonald, J. B. & Leeper, R. R. (1965). Theories of Instruction. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McLaren, P. (1998, Summer). Che: The Pedagogy of Che Guevara: Critical Pedagogy and Globalization Thirty Years After Che. Cultural Circles, 3, 29-103.

McLaren, P. (2003). Life in Schools. (4th Edition). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

McLaren, P. & Giroux, H. (1990). Critical Pedagogy and Rural Education: A Challenge from Poland. Peabody Journal of Education, 67(4), pp. 154-165.

Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (2003). *Teaching to Change the World.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill

Oliva, P. F. (2005). Developing the Curriculum, 6th Edition. Boston: Pearson.

Oliver, A. I. (1977). Curriculum Improvement: A Guide to Problems, Principles, and Process, 2nd Edition. New York: Harper & Row.

Payne, Ruby K. (2003). A Framework for Understanding Poverty. Third Edition. Highlands, TX: Aha Process Inc.

Perkins-Gough, Deborah (2003, September). Special Report: Do After-School Programs
   Help Students Succeed? Educational Leadership, vol. 61, No. 1, 88. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Perkins-Gough, Deborah (2004, January). Creating a Timely Curriculum: A Conversation
   with Heidi Hayes Jacobs. Educational Leadership, December 2003/January 2004. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Pinar, W. (1991). Curriculum as Social Psychoanalysis: On the Significance of Place. In J.
   Kincheloe & W. Pinar (Eds.), Curriculum as Social Psychoanalysis (pp. 165-186). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. (1911). Emile. London: J.M. Dent and sons.

Sapon-Shevin, (2003, October). Inclusion: A Matter of Social Justice. Educational Leadership. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Saylor, J. G., Alexander, W. M., & Lewis, A. J. (1981). Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning, 4th Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schell, Jonathan. (2004). The Lexicographers. *The Nation,* (July 12, 2004), p. 10.

Shavelson, R. J., Phillips, D. C., Towne, L., & Feuer, M. J. (2003, January/February). On
   the Science of Education Design Studies. Educational Researcher, Vol. 32, No. 1, 25-28.

Sleeter, Christine E. and Peter L. McLaren. Editors. (1995). *Multicultural Education, Critical Pedagogy, and the Politics of Difference.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sowell, E. J. (1996). Curriculum: An Integrative Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Taba, Hilda. (1962). Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Tobias, S. (1990). They're not dump, they're different: Stalking the second tier. Tucson,

AZ: Research Corporation: A Foundation for the Advancement of Science.

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a Moral Craft. New York: Longman.

Trent, S.C. (2003, October). So that all people can see themselves. Educational Leadership. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Ukpokodu, N. (1996). Equity Pedagogy: Successfully Educating America's Diverse Students. Professional Educator, 18(2), 25-27.

Ukpokodu, O. (2004). The Impact of Shadowing Culturally Different Students on Pre-service Teachers' Disposition Toward Diversity. Multicultural Education, 12(2), 19-28.

U.S. Department of Education. (2003, June). No Child Left Behind: A Parents Guide. Washington D.C.: Office of the Secretary, Office of Public Affairs.

Valenzuela, Angela. Edited. (2005). Living Children Behind: How "Texas-Style" Accountability Fails Latino Youth. New York: State University of New York Press.

Vallance, Elizabeth (1983). Curriculum as a Field of Practice. In Fenwick W. English (ed.). Fundamental Curriculum Decisions, 1983 Yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Walker, Decker F. & Soltis, Jonas F. (2004). Curriculum and Aims. New York & London: Teachers College Press.

Weis, Lois. (2004). Class Reunion: The Remaking of the American White Working Class. New York and London: Routledge.

Wessler, Stephen L. (2003, September). It's Hard to Learn When You're Scared. Educational Leadership, vol. 61, No. 1, 40-43. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Wiles, Jon and Bondi, Joseph. (2002). Curriculum Development: A Guide to Practice, 6th Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Williams, B. & Newcombe, E. (1994). Building on the strengths of urban learners. Educational Leadership, May 51(8): 75-78.

Williams, N. M. (2003, November). Thinking Outside the Bubble. Educational Leadership. 82-83. (Published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

Wink, Joan. (2005). Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the Real World. 3rd Edition. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Zaritsky, R., Kelley, A. E., Flowers, W., Rogers, E., & O'Neill, P. (2003, January/February). Clinical Design Sciences: A View From Sister Design Efforts. Educational Researcher, Vol. 32, No. 1, 32-34.

Zinn, H. & Macedo, D. (2005). *Howard Zinn on Democratic Education.* Boulder; London: Paradigm Publishers.

"10 Quick Ways to Analyze Children's Books for Sexism and Racism" by/from The Council on Interracial Books for Children.

Kenneth Chukwudi Butcher specializes in American and African education and politics. He taught in Nigeria for thirteen years before coming to the United States. In the last ten years, Dr. Butcher has been involved in promoting inclusive political dialogue and

culturally relevant pedagogy in America's classrooms. He earned a Ph.D. degree in Education and Geosciences from the University of Missouri. He has taught at the University of Missouri and at Avila University. Currently, he teaches Political Science and American National Politics at Maple Woods College (Metropolitan Community College), and also serves as the President of Amara International in Kansas City, Missouri, USA.