

"Turning of the Wheel:" A Perennialist's Answer to 1970s Curricular Debates

Jayson Evaniuck
Eastern New Mexico University

Abstract

This paper utilizes archival sources and publications to underscore Harry S. Broudy's responses to 1970s curricular shifting providing a window into *Curriculum Reconceptualist* debates of the 1970s whilst offering Broudy, Smith, Burnett's (1964) curriculum study as an informative curriculum precursor. Ultimately, the author argues the *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education* offers a valuable antecedent to numerous curriculum debates of the era.

During the 1970s, significant curricular shifts transpired, polarizing the curriculum field. Multiculturalism, student choice, and values clarification emerged from the 1960s and gained momentum in the early 1970s. In the 1970s, a diverse group of reconceptualist thinkers called for a paradigm shift away from traditional curriculum theory frameworks and humanizing the curriculum field. Amid such changes within curriculum theory emerged a back-to-basics movement responding to multiculturalism and student choice. The changes within the 1970s challenged Harry Broudy's own humanist approach to curriculum. Broudy directly addressed such concerns while providing a humanistic way forward during the eras contested debates despite communicating sentiments of academic irrelevance.

Background

While exploring Harry S. Broudy's articulations on teacher education in-depth within his archival papers, an observable trend amongst the mid-1970s correspondences related to curriculum trends was discerned and worthy of succinct treatment such as this. Harry Broudy was a prominent educational philosopher of the second half of the twentieth century. He wrote

extensively on general education, aesthetics education, and teacher education. Broudy's educational philosophy fits in the realm of an educational perennialist similar to Robert Maynard Hutchins; however, Broudy's approach was quite different than Hutchins. Both thinkers contended for cultivating the intellect with disciplined study of classics or exemplars of human thought through a rigorous general education program. A significant divergence was the style of Broudy's writing and his professional associations. Harry Broudy maintained close associations with pragmatists and even behaviorists throughout his career despite vastly different epistemological assumptions. Such associations were evidenced by Broudy giving the invited John Dewey Lecture for the John Dewey Society in 1981 and serving as editor of *The Educational Forum* from 1964-1973. While Robert Hutchins chose to attack vocational schooling and pragmatism in education directly, as a philosopher, Harry Broudy generally avoided blatant attacks in favor of cogent arguments for his Aristotelian perception of the ideal (Broudy 1959). Additionally, Broudy offered a more concessionary tenor in his critiques of John Dewey's pragmatism than Hutchins (Broudy 1971).

Harry Broudy achieved substantial notoriety in aesthetics education and educational philosophy, he provided significant contributions to curriculum theory as well. Within works such as *Building a Philosophy of Education* (1954), he articulated the viability of a "third view" of the curriculum in the midst of the "subject-centered" versus "problem-centered" debates dominating the era. Broudy's "third view," based on his classical realist approach, advocated for a systematic study of the disciplines with a

concentration on problem-solving as well as aesthetic creativity. Bellack (1956) initially referred to Broudy's conception of curriculum as a broad fields approach. Kliebard (2004) identified the broad fields approach of the era as enhancing unity of the curriculum by correlating subjects traditionally taught independently (p. 247). Broudy's "third view" of curriculum received full theoretical treatment in the 1964 publication of *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education: A Study in Curriculum Theory* written with coauthors Bunny Othanel Smith and Joe Burnett. Unlike many "subject-centered" curriculum theorists, Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) attempted to systematically address the social and psychological demands inherent within curriculum theory. Pinar et al. (1995) indicated the book was focused on the disciplines rather than a more child-centered focus on socialization. Diverging from many pragmatists "problem-centered" theorists, Broudy and colleagues argued for a common curriculum framework emphasizing self-cultivation through a systematic study of exemplars of thought within the disciplines.

Shortly after Harry Broudy retired from the University of Illinois in 1974 and during his lengthy service as professor emeritus, numerous letters underscored his unease with 1970s curricular shifts. In a somewhat unexpected tenor, the typically unassailable Broudy conveyed feelings of professional inconsequentiality related to his curricular critiques during the era. The late 1960s and 1970s presented numerous shifts in curricular foci among theoreticians and schooling practitioners. Such shifts were evidenced in new curricula and approaches at the practitioner level, an increase in student choice was demonstrated by multiculturalism, values clarification, open classrooms, and increased elective offerings at the secondary levels (Abramowitz & Macari 1972; Gay 1975; Boss 1972; Greenberg & Roush 1970; Kohl 1969; Raths, Harmin, & Simon 1966). Particularly amongst theoreticians,

multiculturalism and curriculum reconceptualism gained momentum during the era. The late 1970s also spawned a back-to-basics movement in response to the new curricular approaches prompting an entire 1978 issue of *Educational Leadership* aptly titled "The Three R's: What Works." This back-to-basics approach favored core subject areas of mathematics, English, subject-centered social studies, and science, prompting powerful concerns and justifications for arts education among aesthetics education specialists (Broudy 1979; Eisner 1981). Such shifts in curriculum studies form the backdrop of why Harry Broudy found himself on the outside looking in during the 1970s and early 1980s. The paper moves from general to specific, exploring Harry Broudy's concerns with 1970s curriculum studies while analyzing his curricular answers preceding the era. Debates among theorists over the reconceptualist movement within curriculum theory receive treatment as a case study to contextualize this fascinating era.

Harry Broudy's Critiques of Curriculum Theory

By 1977, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) had long been a parent organization for theorists and practitioners of curriculum. The organization had a loyal following of notable curriculum theorists as well as school administrators and teachers. Since 1943, the ASCD remarkably brought together theorists as well as educational practitioners. Amid curricular shifts within the ASCD, Harry S. Broudy's opening statement of his 1977 invited address at the annual conference succinctly communicated concerns within curriculum studies and his feeling out of touch with curricular trends.

It has been some time since I had the privilege of addressing an ASCD audience, perhaps because my views on education have remained on the dull side, responding with caution to innovations that have generated wave

after wave of excitement, each of about five years duration. There have been at least three such flood tides in the past 15 years; the pursuit of academic excellence for the elites in the first five; relating compassionately to the disadvantaged in the second five; and basics for everyone in the third. However, we have learned that curricula, texts, the minds of teachers, and the methods of teaching, let alone real, albeit often subconscious expectations of the public, do not change so fast. (Broudy 1977a, p. 134)

The address generated enough interest for reprinting within four different sources. Oddly enough, Harry Broudy turned down a request from ERIC Clearinghouse, stating, "I very much doubt that the demand for the article 'How Basic is Aesthetic Education...' warrants reprinting" (Jun. 1, 1977). Within the brief letter and the address, Broudy suggested that his ideas were not generating popularity. *The Real World of Public Schools*, written in 1972, corroborated and deepened Broudy's reminders that innovations and trends among education theorists and policymakers are often not reflected in the public view of education and classroom instruction. The book offered numerous charges and cautions against curriculum thinkers and educationalists' propensity to be out of touch with schooling. Although much of the book aimed at explaining schooling and the education system amidst attacks, Broudy's cautions in *The Real World of Public Schools* situated his overall concerns within the field of curriculum theory in the 1970s. At root for Broudy's critiques was a newer school of humanism in the curriculum away from the confines of the formal study of the disciplines towards a curriculum encouraging choice, freedom, and student impulse. He stated,

Whatever the school can do to remove the obstacles from impulse, the neohumanists argue, it should do forthwith. Hence the

emphasis on cryptotherapy of various kinds, ranging from role playing to staging of happenings in which everything is improvised...Indeed, if wisdom means anything, it is the ability to distinguish good from bad hang-ups; necessary from unnecessary inhibitions. The humanist tradition is no more and no less the search for that wisdom; giving up the search in favor of mere impulse is a rejection of that tradition. (Broudy 1972, p. 173)

The 1972 publication signaled a beginning of future divergences Harry Broudy later articulated toward 1970s curricular trends.

Numerous letters with correspondences between 1975 and 1978 denoted Harry Broudy's concern with curricular shifting, particularly, several 1975 correspondences with an ASCD editor Louise Berman. The letters occurred amidst tumult within ASCD membership. Debates were transpiring regarding the role of curriculum promoting activism and increased free choice in student learning (Pinar et al. 2008). During the era, ASCD published numerous social and political papers and chapters advocating activism and increased student choice in learning. In responding to Berman's request for review of a paper, he stated: "...No doubt, advancing age has dulled my sensibilities; but I confess that I could not make much out of the potpourri of phenomenology, existentialism, and counter-culturist jargon. I trust that the ASCD readership is more "with" this kind of writing than I am" (Jan. 16, 1975). While the sourcing details and specific curricular concerns Harry Broudy was addressing are absent in the letter exchange, the sarcasm denoted real concerns he saw within the field of curriculum theory. Within another letter to Louise Berman, Broudy provided further evidence of his growing disconnect with curricular trends of the 1970s by providing a troubling appraisal of his role as a reviewer for ASCD.

As you are aware, my own views on the curriculum are so dissonant with those expressed in the book, that I have refrained from commenting on the last few papers you sent me. If it will make you and the Committee more comfortable, my name can be removed quietly from the Committee. I have tried to be of service to ASCD, but apparently I am no longer in tune with the drummers to which it marches. (Oct. 16, 1975)

While these two letters indeed demonstrate disconnects Harry Broudy articulated during the 1970s and the elevated tensions within ASCD during the era, the letters do not communicate specific areas of dissonance between curriculum ideas of the era and his own.

Harry Broudy's ideas on curriculum theory and his classical realist philosophical undergirding are found within both editions of *Building a Philosophy of Education* (1954; 1961). The theoretical dimensions were systematized into curricular theory within *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education: A Study in Curriculum Theory* (Broudy, Smith, & Burnett 1964). Though Ornstein and Hunkins (2013), Kliebard (2004), and Bellack (1955) characterized Broudy's curricular ideas as a broad-fields approach, Broudy and colleagues opposed the broad-fields designation on the grounds that academic battlegrounds are provoked by labels (Broudy, Smith, & Burnett 1964). As detected within Harry Broudy's archival papers, after Harry Broudy gave an address or lecture, he received written inquiries from fellow professors, superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding sources where particular ideas were addressed. When the inquiries were curricular, Harry Broudy consistently recommended the 1964 publication of *Democracy and Excellence*. Broudy and colleagues organized their secondary curriculum into five broad categories: (1) symbolics of information (English, foreign languages, and

mathematics); (2) basic sciences (general science, biology, physics, and chemistry); (3) developmental studies (evolution of the cosmos, of social institutions, and of human culture); (4) aesthetic exemplars (art, music, drama, and literature); and (5) molar problems addressing societal problems which borrow from multiple disciplines to systematically address (Broudy, Smith, & Burnett 1964, p. 247). The more specific dissonance areas between Harry Broudy's curriculum theory and late 1970s curriculum reconceptualism will be explored further after contextualizing the late 1970 and early 1980s lively curricular debates between curriculum "traditionalists" and "reconceptualists."

Curricular Debates of the Era

The context within curriculum theory in the later 1970s and early 1980s is indispensable for understanding the content behind Harry Broudy's critiques and statements of "unpopularity." Within ASCD, factions developed among membership based on numerous theoretical shifts. Most notably, a call for a reconceptualization of curriculum away from the conventional Ralph Tyler apparatus dominant in the curriculum field from 1950-1970. The reconceptualists critiqued the prevailing traditional Ralph Tyler curricular framework as technocratic and narrow. Reconceptualism shares a sense of social activism with early progressive reconstructionists such as George Counts and Harold Rugg (Ornstein & Hunkins 2013); however, the movement drew theoretical inspiration from German and French thinkers such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Jergen Habermas, Martin Heidegger, and Michel Foucault among others. Unlike their progressive predecessors, the reconceptualism field was not connected to the practical school curriculum; rather, the movement aimed at informing theory rather than curriculum practitioners (Schubert et al. 2002). Such a detachment between theory and schooling further compounded growing divisions

within ASCD. While the reconceptualists were theoretically diverse, adherents shared a unifying call for humanizing the curriculum field away from behaviorist, technocratic, and positivist frames. Reconceptualists viewed notable curriculum theorist Joseph Schwab's (1969) opening sentence of "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" as a clarion call for needed curricular reform. Schwab (1969) stated, "The field of curriculum is moribund. It is unable by its present methods and principles to continue its work and contribute significantly to the advancement of education" (p. 1). Joseph Schwab sought to move the field of curriculum theory from positivist frames towards its humanistic roots while advocating for theoretical understanding aimed at educational practice and action (Null 2011). The late 1970s and early 1980s witnessed substantial debates between notable thinkers underscoring this growing chasm. Highlighting such shifts' momenta, the 1981 ASCD hosted a debate between Ralph Tyler and reconceptualist leader William Pinar at the annual meeting (Pinar et al. 2008).

Reverberations within ASCD also infiltrated the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and its flagship publication *Educational Researcher*. In 1978, AERA invited reconceptualist William Pinar and traditionalist John McNeil, to provide the "state of the art" invited addresses to the curriculum studies division with Maxine Greene (1979a) as a respondent (Pinar et al. 2008). Shortly thereafter, Daniel and Laurel Tanner wrote a critique of the reconceptualism movement titled "Emancipation from Research: The Reconceptualist Prescription," though the critique was heavily directed at William Pinar. Tanner and Tanner (1979) argued that the movement lacked a unifying academic identity and an identifiable theory within their paper. Instead, they identified reconceptualism as a doctrine of radical critique and spillover of 1960s protest movements rather than curriculum theory. Further, they vehemently disagreed with the reconceptualist contention schools are deliberately repressive to children.

Also, they posited strong accusations of reconceptualist theory disconnected from schooling. Just two journal issues later in 1979, both William Pinar and Maxine Greene responded to Daniel and Laurel Tanner in separate letters. Pinar's (1979) concern with the Tanners' critique was that it left no room to initiate an academic conversation or provide a way forward. He further charged the Tanners' misunderstanding of his writing illustrated a chasm between traditional and reconceptualist views of the curriculum. Pinar decried the Tanners' implication of reconceptualist work emancipation from research. Instead, he harkened the importance of humanities informing research. In the letter, William Pinar agreed with the diversity of perspectives without unity while justifying the necessity of unity of thought and conversations toward shifting the paradigm from traditional curriculum conceptions. In the same issue, Maxine Greene (1979) lamented how her rebuttal at the 1978 conference was misused by Tanner and Tanner (1979) to impugn William Pinar and the reconceptualism movement and retreat within their position without a call for dialog. Additionally, Greene (1979) criticized the Tanners' use of German philosopher Jurgen Habermas in a reductionist theoretical approach.

The disputes continued into the 1979 AERA meeting as Phillip W. Jackson presented a "state of the field" invited address to the curriculum studies division titled, "Curriculum and Its Discontents" (Jackson 1980a). In the address, Jackson (1980a) presented a two-fold critique. First, he aimed at previous invited speakers' (Dwayne Huebner, William Pinar) propensity for deathly metaphors to describe the field of curriculum and the source of the metaphor, Joseph Schwab. He then criticized the content of the three noted "discontents" without linking specific ideas with individuals. Jackson identified seven recurring themes among "discontents" or reconceptualists: (1) "The Tyler rationale is out-of-date"; (2) Our present ways of addressing schools and schooling fall short of the

complexity and dignity of the human condition; (3) Technologists, test makers, textbook publishers, and school administrators control curriculum; (4) A loss of humanistic values and goals in schools; (5) "Curriculum workers have little to offer teachers..."; (6) "The aesthetic, ethical, and spiritual dimensions of the educational experience are being ignored"; and (7) "Our schools are damaging to many students, particularly to children of the poor and oppressed minorities" (Jackson 1980a, p. 167). Phillip Jackson conceded that most of the themes presented worthwhile problems for consideration. His concerns with the "discontents" approach to these issues were on several grounds. Jackson affirmed reconceptualist concerns with "narrow-minded empiricism," yet disapproved the shifting scholarly allegiance of the reconceptualist away from mainstream social science and toward "left of center" Marxist, Freudian, and existential thought. He concluded with a final concern, echoing Harry Broudy's (1977b) earlier criticism regarding the "partially digested" knowledge and weighty German theoretical positions employed topically by the reconceptualists (Jackson 1980a, p. 168).

Both William Pinar and Maxine Greene responded to the address, followed by a short rebuttal from Phillip Jackson within the same issue of *Curriculum Theory*. Maxine Green (1980) used close readings of numerous literary and philosophical sources in refuting Jackson. She ultimately argued that Jackson, in decrying the illness metaphor, failed to address the actuality the metaphor underscored. She then proceeded to justify the importance and validity of the reconceptualist scholarly shift occurring within the curriculum field. She argued that the "Tyler rationale" had shortcomings to address, namely too many links with behaviorism. Greene (1980) further suggested that the reconceptualist approach allowed students to pursue individual meaning-making while making sense of a changing and troubling world. William Pinar (1980) reiterated a similar refrain to his 1979

letter advocating the need for conversation around the issues arguing Jackson's critique. In the paper, he again addressed Daniel and Laurel Tanner's previous critique before specifically responding to Phillip Jackson. William Pinar (1980) lamented Jackson's lack of a counterclaim regarding his alarms with the moribund metaphor. He again invited a conversation through dialogical encounters rather than monologue-focused counterattacks.

Harry Broudy's Divergence

Two sources provide a more specific divergence between such curriculum ideas and Harry Broudy's own. The first source is a book review of William Pinar's (1975) edited book, *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, which voiced numerous ideas on reconceptualizing the curriculum away from the traditional Tyler approach. The authors varied substantially, borrowing from child-centered progressives, social reconstructionists, phenomenologists, and existentialists within philosophy and Marxist approaches to the curriculum (Pinar 1975). Amongst theoretic diversity, the reconceptualist movement's unifying theme was opposition to the Tyler approach, seen as a narrowly prescribed curriculum often utilized for corporate and bureaucratic influences. Instead, the curriculum needed humanization leading to increased student freedom, rights, and social activism (Pinar 1975). An additional reconceptualism of curriculum emphasized a phenomenological and autobiographical concept, the verb form of curriculum *currere*, implying a curricular role as conceiving one's educational experience (Pinar et al. 2008). Broudy's (1977b) review, published in *Teachers College Record*, criticized the reconceptualist curriculum movement for vilifying the schooling experience as a dehumanizing agency responsible for promoting students' oppression and repression. Similar critiques later were communicated by Tanner and Tanner (1979) and Jackson (1980a). He also criticized reconceptualist thinkers' tendency to

invoke Marxian social theory in their educational critiques with a limited demonstration of the entire underlying theory. Broudy raised similar concerns with the topical entreating of existentialist philosophy among numerous authors, a critique later employed by Jackson (1980a). Harry Broudy's (1977b) review is an early critique of the emerging reconceptualist movement predating the noteworthy ASCD and AERA debates in 1979 and 1980.

Since the book review came before the ASCD and AERA debates, a rebuttal would have been most insightful during this embryonic stage before academic battle positions were firmly entrenched, especially in light of Broudy sharing a humanist educational orientation of many reconceptualist thinkers. Harry Broudy referred to the reconceptualists and the emerging 1960s and 1970s humanism as "neo humanism" and distinct from the more traditional Humanism or *Humanitas* Harry Broudy advocated (Broudy 1972; Evaniuck 2020). Both William Pinar and Maxine Greene provided a valid concern regarding previous critiques of reconceptualism lacking an invitation for discussion, perhaps owing to the lack of common ground between the two camps. Based on similar commitments among varying conceptions of humanism in education among Broudy, Pinar, and Greene, such a discussion on humanistic grounds would have been fascinating and perhaps would have resembled the academic dialog William Pinar and Maxine Greene called for in both letters at the height of the debates (Greene 1979; Pinar 1979; 1980).

A second source provides personalized insights into Harry Broudy's divergence with the era's curricular shifts—a letter to a former doctoral student and close colleague in educational philosophy, Mary Anne Raywid. The esteemed colleague shared some ideological points with reconceptualist curriculum thinkers, as evidenced by Broudy referencing his 1977 review of Pinar's (1975) *Curriculum Reconceptualists* within his letter to her. Broudy wondered why she would enjoy academic

discourse at the annual Philosophy of Education Society meetings in light of her divergent interests.

I continue to wonder why our visits at PES are as you say "high points," a wonder that is underlined by your lucid statements of interests. You seem to have much more in common with those you mention who also share your commitments to conceptualism in philosophy and the New Left in sympathy than with a confirmed neo-Aristotelian. (May 5, 1978)

The tone suggests the clear divides that galvanized scholars during the era and reiterated Harry Broudy's alienation for his lack of support for the era's curriculum thinkers. Towards the end of the letter, Broudy corroborated specific philosophical concerns with curriculum reformers of the era noted in the book review while maintaining an extended olive branch over their apparent philosophical differences. The letter exchanges such as this between Raywid and Broudy demonstrated deep respect and robust scholarly discourse amongst philosophical differences in education. Such discourse is refreshing amid current specialized, entrenched, and often polarizing academic times. Later in the letter, Broudy provided an optimistic outlook amidst concerns stating, "Perhaps it is one of the small benefits of us perennialists that we know that the wheel will turn and return to just about where it was before" (May 5, 1978). Perhaps with such a reminder, Harry Broudy also was encouraging himself regarding his own deeply held commitments and over 40 years of educational work, midst feelings of waning academic and philosophical support within the academy.

Broudy and Colleagues Curriculum

The 1970s and 1980s debates exacerbated polarization within the field of curriculum studies. On one end were reconceptualist

influenced thinkers arguing for the curriculum's humanization, charging that the Tyler rationale was narrow, behaviorist, and positivist oriented. Hlebowitsh (1997) cautioned against such a dichotomy in curriculum studies based on ideological construction and entrenched battle lines. Further, Hlebowitch (1992) also warned against impugning Ralph Tyler's curriculum as behavioristic and narrow demonstrating the contrary. Entirely unpacking such ideological polarization still persistent today is beyond this paper's scope. In three dimensions, the author believes that Harry Broudy, Othaniel Smith, and Joe Burnett's curriculum directly addressed concerns raised by 1970s debates over ten years prior. Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) offered a differing humanistic way forward than the reconceptualists loud calls for humanizing the curriculum. Also, the authors directly addressed Joseph Schwab's noted calls for curriculum theory informing praxis. Third, Broudy and colleagues curriculum study provided needed moral dimensions noted as lacking within curriculum studies (Null 2011).

In 1964, Broudy, Smith, and Burnett responded to several early 1960s concerns with their study, *Democracy and Excellence in the American Secondary Education*. First, they argued growing vocational focus as well as tracking within secondary schooling weakened the liberal arts or general education offered in American secondary schools for all students regardless of socioeconomic background. The authors were also concerned with Sputnik influenced curricular foci of the time detached from critical valuative dimensions noting concerns such as behaviorism, technocratic approaches, spiritual scarcity, and narrow curriculum interests. The authors defined valuative principles as attitudes, norms, and rules of human conduct, focusing on the inculcation of the examined life. Broudy, Smith, and Burnett. (1964) argued that valuative principles are needed in the curriculum, "If the curriculum is to be designed to make individuals as intelligent about their social conduct as about their behavior

toward the material world, the content of the educational program must consist in part of valuative principles and concepts" (p. 150). A fascinating letter further illuminates Harry Broudy's argument for value principles informing education. In 1968 while serving as a resident scholar at Stanford University's Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Broudy responded to transcripts of a lecture given at the center by a fellow Advanced Study resident scholar, Phillip J. Stone. Stone was a Harvard Psychologist and an early leader in artificial intelligence and computerized content analysis. While Broudy addressed numerous dimensions related to organized school learning and electronic devices, his inquiry into valuative schemes is particularly insightful toward valuative principles in schooling.

On what "principle" shall we urge our pupils to make their decisions in the light of information, rather than the basis of nonrational factors? And of the diverse nonrational factors[,] which is to be preferred? These questions may seem trivial to the adult, especially to the adult whose value schema has already been formed and reflected upon, but they are of primary concern to the school – if it ever takes seriously the notion of changing value norms. (May 20, 1968)

Broudy's argument here echoed a recurring concept in *Democracy and Excellence in the American Secondary Education*. Schools and a curriculum must take seriously moral development of students' moral grids toward informed decision-making. Valuative development, the authors argue, is indispensable for participation in democratic life.

The authors justified and further developed the concepts applying the examples to a classroom discussion on Andrew Jackson's presidency. Initial student arguments were made in the classroom for a "strong" or "weak" presidency based on the strength of getting his

programs through and opinions denoting perceived weakness due to Jackson's decisions made upon circumstance rather than principle. The authors demonstrated that valuative criteria must be established in advance for the class to evaluate such judgments due to inherent valuative differences on topics. Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) further distinguished normative values as prescriptive (procedural), regulatory (behavioral rules), and moral (connected to virtue). Notably, the normative moral values undergird Broudy and colleagues' curriculum. The emphasis on moral valuative schemes is not indoctrination, opposing behaviorism, and conditioning of the student. The school's role in normative moral values is to encourage wisdom in students, "The school cannot teach choices and decisions, but it can teach the facts, the value definitions, and the valuative principles on which right and wise decisions are made" (p. 152). Ultimately, such a curricular program would enhance civic virtue and address the democratic purposes of schooling. The authors identified that virtue encouraged by schooling in the past was commonly connected with "minor morals" such as etiquette, manners, and social graces. The emphasis undergirding the curriculum to Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) should instead emphasize substantive moral ideals such as freedom, equality, justice, honesty, charity, fairness, and brotherhood.

While these moral dimensions of Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) curriculum are theoretical, the authors demonstrated feasibility with school examples. Further, their curriculum theory informed practice in section three of the book culminating in a chapter devoted to laying out "A Program of Studies." Perhaps the most tangible way the authors applied valuative principles is through advocating and justifying the study of exemplars of human thought and action. Exemplars help refine student tastes and affections since great works of science, art, literature, and thought represent the human race's aspirations. As implicitly covered in 1964 and

later explicitly developed in works such as *The Uses of Schooling* in 1988, Harry Broudy argued that formal study of the arts creates image stores and conceptual frames facilitating meaning and engendering moral judgments through aesthetic association. It is within Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) study of exemplars where coursework devoted to exemplary human thought and artistic contributions empowers valuative or moral development in students. Later Broudy (1967) stated, "Just as the history of science furnishes the great exemplars of our intellectual achievement, so the history of the arts furnishes great exemplars of value commitments of the great epochs of the past" (p. 119). This impressionistic approach to art education is not without critiques. Tanner (1971) as well as Tanner and Tanner (1995) posed concerns over Broudy and colleagues' emphasis on aesthetic exemplar analysis at the expense of creative expression in the arts. The critique was a common one throughout Harry Broudy's career, even one identified by close music and art colleagues (Colwell 1992). Ultimately, the authors demonstrated the need for moral principles informing curriculum theory and the practical implications of the curriculum's valuative and normative dimensions. An emphasis on moral commitments in education is categorically not too distant from the moral agency Maxine Green (1978) likewise advocated. In addition, valuative commitments is not out of touch with what Phillip Jackson, Robert Boostrom, and David Hansen (1993) observed implicitly within schools in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

A substantive challenge postulated by Tanner and Tanner (1995) of the Broudy, Smith, Burnett (1964) curriculum is divorcing content and process or "knowing" and "doing." Tanner and Tanner argue that as adolescence performance is diminished, appreciation also decreases through denial of the act of doing, making, or creating (p. 210). At the heart of the critique were differing epistemological assumptions between a pragmatist and classical

realist conception of knowledge between both sets of authors. While Broudy deals with the philosophical essence of the critique in other works (Broudy 1954; 1970), at a practical level Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) contended pragmatisms emphasis on “doing” as an instrument of learning leads to the devaluing and ultimate neglect of language as the instrument of learning (p. 22).

The 1970s was a critical period within curriculum studies. The era witnessed a continuance of age-old subject-centered versus problem-centered debates while new debates such as back to basics versus student choice, theoretical versus practical, and humanistic versus traditional curricular ideas arose to the forefront. Preceding the eras debates, Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education* directly addressed the curricular areas of contention in the 1970s and early 1980s. The authors provided a traditional humanist way forward without opposing the Tyler apparatus. Additionally, subtitled, *A Study in Curriculum Theory*, the authors intentionally reconciled theory with schooling feasibility. Lastly, the study provided a content area approach to prepare students for civic engagement in significant societal problems.

Conclusion

Though it is tempting to consider the work of Harry Broudy, Othanel Smith, and Burnett (1964) in a replicative fashion, curriculum theory gets formulated out of the problems, philosophies, and psychological developments within their respective era. A more insightful and fitting approach for evaluating historic curriculum theory work today is drawing upon insights to guide current curriculum thought. With such a frame Harry Broudy, B. Othanel Smith, and Joe Burnett's curriculum work has much to offer twenty-first century thought in three areas. First, we find an enduring argument for valuative and moral dimensions within the curriculum. Goodlad (1990) made the

case that the profession of teaching requires normative presuppositions to promote "preparation for full participation in the human conversation" (p. 28). Clark (1990) stated "What educators and parents fear most about bad teaching and celebrate most about good teaching are manifestations of fundamental moral virtues" (p. 263). Though a teacher is an independent agent, the curriculum should play a role in encouraging such teaching. Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) offered a conception of values education opposing indoctrination on the one hand and unbridled student-choice and clarification on another through exploration of exemplars in arts and thought. Second, a broad fields curricular approach was prominent among theorists in the 1950s and 1960s and demonstrated the ability to bridge ever-present gaps between subject and student-centered curriculum (Short 1986). Revisiting broad fields approaches such as Broudy, Smith, and Burnett (1964) offers a "disciplined" alternative to the concerning current trend of behavioristic teaching practices connected to standardized testing within current subject-centered iterations. Finally, in a time of increasing content insulation, hyperspecialization, and imperial agendas within schools (Davis 2005), Broudy, Smith, and Burnett's (1964) conception of curriculum provides a framework to analyze the best of human thought from numerous perspectives whilst exploring problems from multiple disciplines and the ability of exemplars to crosscut human thought and inform valuative frames.

The paradigm shifts within curriculum studies in the 1970s and the subsequent debates demonstrated differing philosophical assumptions and viewpoints of humanism. This differing view of humanism is at the heart of Harry Broudy's divergence with reconceptualism and other 1970s curricular shifts. Early in the 1970s, Broudy addressed the difference stating,

How relevant then is education? It is relevant at its deepest level only insofar

as the exfoliation of the human potential – for humanity – is its goal. In this the new humanists are obviously right. They are wrong only in believing that crudity, raw feeling, and raw aspirations are the touchstones of true humanity. On the contrary, it is the refined versions of these feelings and aspirations that are proper yardsticks for relevance. (Broudy 1972, 198)

In support of his traditional humanistic curriculum, Broudy and Colleagues offered a curriculum study addressing many of the seminal curriculum debates of the 1970s before their rise to the forefront.

References

- Abramowitz, M. W. & Macari, C. 1972. Values Clarification in Junior High School. *Educational Leadership* 27(7):621-626
- Bellack, A. A. 1956. Selection and Organization of Curriculum Content: An Analysis. In Arno A. Belleck (Ed.), *What shall the high schools teach?* 1956 Yearbook of the National Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. National Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Boss, R. 1972. Portland's Personalized Education Program. *Educational Leadership* 29(5):405-407.
- Broudy, H. S. 1954. Building a philosophy of education. Prentice Hall.
- Broudy, H.S., 1959. Realism in American Education. *School and Society* 87:11-14.
- Broudy, H. S. 1967. Art, Science, and New Values. *The Phi Delta Kappan* 49(3):115-119.
- Broudy, H. S. 1968, May 20. Letter to Philip J. Stone. Box 2, file folder S, Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois.
- Broudy, H.S., 1970. On knowing with. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society*:89-104.
- Broudy, H.S., 1971. Democratic values and educational goals. *Teachers College Record* 72(5):113-152.
- Broudy, H. S. 1972. *The Real World of the Public Schools*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Broudy, H. S. 1975, Jan. 16. Letter to Louise Berman. Box 5, file folder B, Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois.
- Broudy, H. S. 1975, Oct. 16. Letter to Louise Berman. Box 5, file folder B, Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois.
- Broudy, H. S. 1977a. How Basic Is Aesthetic Education? or Is' Rt the Fourth R? *Educational Leadership* 35:55-66.
- Broudy, H. S. 1977b. *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*, ed. by Pinar, W. (Review of). *Teachers College Record* 77(4):639-641.
- Broudy, H. S. 1977, Jun. 1. Letter to Mrs. Clarice H. Watson. Box 6, file folder W, Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois.
- Broudy, H. S. 1978, May 5. Letter to Mary Anne Raywid. Box 6, file folder R, Harry S. Broudy Papers, University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois.
- Broudy, H. S. 1979. Arts Education: Necessary of Just Nice?. *The Phi Delta Kappan* 60(5):347-350.
- Broudy, H. S. 1988. *The Uses of Schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Broudy, H. S., Smith, B. O., & Burnett, J. R. 1964. *Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education: A Study in Curriculum Theory*. Rand McNally
- Clark, C. M. 1990. The Teacher and the Taught: Moral Transactions in the Classroom. In *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 251-265). Ed. Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Colwell, R., 1992. Goodness and greatness: Broudy on music education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 26(4):37-48.
- Davis, O. L. 2005. Editorial: Imperial Delusions and Some Possible

- Consequences for the School Curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 20(4):264-270.
- Eisner, E. 1981. The Role of Arts in Cognition and Curriculum. *The Phi Delta Kappan* 63(1): 48-52.
- Evaniuck, J. 2020. Excellence without snobs and equality without slob: Harry S. Broudy's Theory of General Education. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education* 70: 33-47.
- Gay, G. 1975. Organizing and Designing Culturally Pluralistic Curriculum. *Educational Leadership* 33(3):176-183.
- Goodlad, J. I. 1990. The Occupation of Teaching in Schools. In *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 3–34). Ed Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Greenberg, J. D. & Roush, R. E. 1970. A Visit to the 'School Without Walls': Two Impressions. *Phi Delta Kappan* 51(9):480-484.
- Greene, M. 1978. *Landscapes of Learning*. Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. 1979 'Letters'. *Educational Researcher* 8(9):25–25. doi: 10.3102/0013189X008009025.
- Greene, M. 1980. Response to Philip Jackson. *Curriculum Inquiry* 10(2):172-175. doi: [10.1080/03626784.1980.11075212](https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1980.11075212)
- Hlebowitsh, P. 1992. Amid behavioural and behaviouristic objectives: reappraising appraisals of the Tyler Rationale. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 24(6):533-547.
- Hlebowitsh, P. S. 1997. OP-ED The search for the curriculum field. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(5):507-512.
- Jackson, P. W. 1980a. Curriculum and Its Discontents. *Curriculum Inquiry* 10(2):159-172. doi: [10.1080/03626784.1980.11075211](https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1980.11075211)
- Jackson, P. W. 1980b. Response to Maxine Greene. *Curriculum Inquiry* 10(2):175-177. doi: [10.1080/03626784.1980.11075213](https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1980.11075213)
- Jackson, P. W., Boostrom, R. E., & Hansen, D. T. 1993. *The Moral Life of Schools*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kliebard, H. 2004. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958* (3rd ed). Routledge.
- Kohl, H. R. 1969. *The Open Classroom*. Random House Incorporated.
- Null, W. 2011. *Curriculum: From theory to practice*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ornstein, A.C. & Hunkins, F. P. 2013. *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues* (6th ed). Pearson.
- Pinar, W. (Ed.). 1975. *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Pinar, W. F. 1979. 'Letters'. *Educational Researcher* 8(9):6, 24. doi:10.3102/0013189X008009006
- Pinar, W. F. 1980. Reply to my Critics. *Curriculum Inquiry* 10(2):199-205. doi: [10.1080/03626784.1980.11075216](https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1980.11075216)
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. 2008. *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses* (Vol. 17). Peter Lang.
- Raths, L. E., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. 1966. *Values and Teaching*. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Schubert, W.H., Schubert, A.L.L., Thomas, T.P. and Carroll, W.M., 2002. *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. P. Lang.
- Schwab, J. 1969. The Practical: A Language for Curriculum. *School Review* 78:1-24.
- Short, E. 1986. *A Historical Look at Curriculum Design. Theory into Practice* 25(1):3-9.
- Tanner, D., 1971. *Secondary curriculum: Theory and development*. Macmillan.
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. N. 1979. Emancipation from research: The reconceptualist prescription. *Educational Researcher* 8(6):8-12.
- Tanner, D. and Tanner, L.N., 1995. *Curriculum development: Theory into practice* (3rd ed): Prentice-Hall.