CHAPTER ONE

Overview of Curriculum Processes and Products

Jackson (1992) notes that the best adjective used to describe the state or affairs in curriculum is "confused," due in part to a lack of clear definitions. The questions "What is curriculum?" and "To what should this term be applied?" have several answers.

Responses to these questions form the core of communication about curriculum, as used in this text, particularly the meanings of curriculum processes considered in the context of change. The concepts introduced here are revisited in subsequent chapters, where their meanings are broadened.

Goal: To increase your understanding of the meanings of, and the relationships among, major curriculum concepts.

DEFINITIONS

Curriculum

Over the years definitions of curriculum have included the following: "1) the cumulative tradition of organized knowledge; 2) modes of thought; 3) race experience; 4) guided experience; 5) a planned learning environment; 6) cognitive/affective content and process; 7) an instructional plan; 8) instructional ends or outcomes; and 9) a technological system of production" (Tanner & Tanner, 1980, p. 36). Because curriculum emphases reflect changing social policies, these definitions are not unusual. Although somewhat disparate, they share generally the idea presented by the third edition of Webster's New World Dictionary, which provides this meaning for curriculum: "all of the courses, collectively, offered in a school, college, etc., or in a particular subject."

Differences among definitions are not unusual, because some individuals refer to curriculum levels interchangeably or do not distinguish between "curriculum" and "instruction." This text does not insist on an elaborate definition. Instead, curriculum is defined here simply as what is taught to students. This

Terms in bold are included in the glossary.
broad definition includes the intended and unintended information, skills, and attitudes that are communicated to students in schools. This definition also permits consideration of curricula based on several content sources and planned for different purposes of education.

Instruction

Instruction is how the curriculum is delivered to students. It is the interaction between a teaching agent and one or more individuals intending to learn knowledge that is appropriate for students to learn (Johnson, 1967). Of course, teachers qualify as teaching agents. But agents also include other students, school staff, instructional materials, programmed instruction, computer-assisted instruction, videos, and other technology-based instruction.

Learning

Usually learning is considered “acquired knowledge or skill” as defined in Webster’s New World Dictionary, third edition. A slightly expanded definition holds that learning is what students take from classrooms in three classes of outcomes: knowledge (facts, concepts, generalizations), techniques (processes, skills, abilities), and values (norms, attitudes, interests, appreciations, aversions) (Cuban, 1992; Johnson, 1967). In recent years learning has also been defined as meeting standards or benchmarks—statements of what students “should be able to know and be able to do” by the time they reach certain grade levels (A Standards Glossary, 1995, p. 8).

LEVELS OF CURRICULUM

Educators—as well as laypersons—sometimes refer to the different levels of curriculum interchangeably, provoking a situation that can lead to confusion about the meaning of curriculum. As used here, the term levels of curriculum refers to the degree of remoteness from the students for whom the curricula were planned. This section provides information about levels of curriculum based on the account of Goodlad and Su (1992). These levels include societal, institutional, instructional, and experiential curricula.

- **The societal level** is curriculum farthest removed from learners and is designed by the public, including politicians, representatives of special interest groups, administrators at different levels, and professional specialists. Using sociopolitical processes, these groups often decide the goals, the topics to be studied, the time to be spent, and the materials to be used.

- **Institutional curricula** serve schools and are derived largely from societal curricula with modifications by local educators and laypersons. This curriculum is commonly organized according to subjects and includes the topics and themes
to be studied. Institutional curricula include the district or school's written documents containing standards, philosophies, lesson plans, and guides. Sometimes this curriculum, also called the explicit curriculum, is the target of reform efforts.

- The instructional curriculum refers to the one that teachers plan and deliver in schools. Teachers base instructional curricula on what has been determined as necessary or desirable for their school by school authorities. As expected, however, this curriculum takes on the individual teacher's priorities, views of education, and style and is also subject to reform and criticism. An instructional curriculum that is actually used in a classroom often varies from the planned curriculum, however, because of student responses or other unforeseen circumstances.

- Finally, the experiential curriculum is the one perceived and experienced by students. What is experienced differs from one student to the next because students have different backgrounds, motivations, and levels of aspirations, to name just a few differences. For example, some students form similar purposes for learning experiences to those held by their teachers, but other students hold very different purposes or no purpose at all. Therefore, the experiential curriculum is the one internalized and made personal by learners (Goodlad & Su, 1992).

The ability to distinguish accurately among curriculum levels can prevent misinterpretations and increase your understanding of curriculum. Check your ability to make these distinctions by answering this question for situations 1–3: With which level is the curriculum in each of these statements most closely associated? Explain.

1. John Q. Public, a local banker, was reading the morning newspaper when he saw that the agenda for the school board meeting listed plans to discuss a new high school economics curriculum. On seeing this item, he promptly announced to Mrs. Public that he planned to attend the meeting.

2. Ms. Chiu was having dinner with her three school-age children. During dinner Ms. Chiu asked the children to describe something they had learned in school earlier that day.

3. Mrs. Rodriguez was pleased when her grandson Felix, a teacher who lives in a neighboring city, called to ask if he could stay overnight in her home. He indicated that he would be in town attending a district-wide curriculum development workshop, where he and his colleagues expect to begin revisions of the social studies curriculum.
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Previous discussion pointed out that the terms curriculum and instruction are sometimes used interchangeably. This section describes alternative views of the relationships between curriculum and instruction, including one in which the interchange of terms is plausible. The section also explains why knowledge of the distinctions is important.

Nature of Possible Relationships

The definitions for curriculum and instruction suggest that a relationship should exist between "what is taught" and "how it is taught." To suggest that these entities have no relationship defies common sense. That leaves two possibilities: Curriculum and instruction could either be disjoint entities with some interrelated functions or not disjoint, sharing several functions. Each possibility is described here.

Curriculum and instruction can be thought of as separate, but interrelated, entities. This means that although curricular functions are separate from those for instruction, the effects of decisions in one entity affect decisions in the other. A number of models have been proposed that show curriculum to be interrelated with instruction (Hunkins, 1980; Johnson, 1967; Miller & Seller, 1985; Oliva, 1992; Saylor, Alexander, & Lewis, 1981; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949). For example, as conceived by Johnson (1967), curriculum and instruction are systematically related; curriculum system decisions feed into an instructional system as shown in Figure 1.1.

Frequently in this model the curriculum and instructional functions are handled by different sets of people. Curriculum developers select and sequence (or structure) content from the available teachable cultural content in the form of intended learning outcomes, two actions that are clearly curricular functions. Based on their repertoires of teaching strategies, instructional planners/teachers deliver instruction that enables students to attain actual learning outcomes. As part of this process, teachers choose additional content from the same source (shown in Figure 1.1 as instrumental content) that helps students learn the intended outcomes. For example, teachers who provide vocabulary development instruction often use similes or metaphors as instrumental content to help students learn the meanings of new words.

In this model, curriculum clearly guides instruction. Although an evaluation system is not shown in Figure 1.1, Johnson's (1967) model requires that observable evidence be gathered in the instructional system. These empirical results are fed back into the curriculum system, setting up potential changes in the curriculum and completing the cycle. Curricular functions are separate from, but related to, instructional functions.
Hunter and Scheirer’s (1988) model illustrates the alternate curriculum–instruction relationship, in which the entities are not readily separable (see Figure 1.2). In this approach the planner-teacher begins by identifying a general area for study, clearly a curricular function. Then the teacher guides the initial shared experience and assists students in interactions among themselves with the content and teacher.

These interactions make the area of study meaningful through a series of instructional functions such as sharing experiences, observation, recording expressions, questioning, analyzing, and hypothesizing. In Figure 1.2, double-headed arrows suggest this two-way activity between students and teacher. The planner-teacher may also provide further input and foster closure. Beyond the first step in this particular model, curriculum and instruction are not easily distinguished.

Importance of Understanding the Relationships

How educators view the relationship between curriculum and instruction influences their approach to curriculum processes. Views of the curriculum–instruction relationship can probably be traced to educators’ interpretations of reality, which lie along an objective–subjective continuum. Individuals who view the world objectively believe it can be understood and that events proceed in an orderly fashion. Others interpret reality subjectively, believing that individual realities differ significantly and that events are not predictable.

Technical Approach Those who view curriculum and instruction as separate but related entities typically hold an objective interpretation of reality that is demon-
Stratified in a technical approach to the curriculum processes. The processes are expected to be rational and systematic. Given their commitment to rationality, these individuals are quite comfortable deciding what the intended outcomes of learning should be for students who study a curriculum.

The technical approach is the traditional way of developing curricula that focus on subject matter or subject matter standards. Typically a committee of nonteaching staff (administrators and sometimes curriculum specialists or consultants), teachers, and community members revises a curriculum for a school district. Although knowledge from teachers is included, this approach relies heavily on curriculum knowledge from nonteachers.

The result of this development is a curriculum that is usable in a variety of classroom situations because it is relatively free of concerns about the context in which it will be used (Snyder, Bolin, & Zumwalt, 1992). After the curriculum is
planned, teachers are responsible for implementing it in their particular teaching situations.

Nothing within the technical approach itself prevents teachers from assuming important roles in any of the curriculum processes. Teachers do assume major responsibilities in school-based approaches, where these types of curricula are used. Indeed, this text takes the position that teachers should be proactive in curriculum processes. The politics of curriculum decision making, a topic discussed in Chapter 2, are at work here.

Nontechnical Approach Other educators use a nontechnical approach to curriculum processes because they do not see curriculum and instruction as readily separable entities. Educators with a subjective interpretation of reality favor this approach because it allows them to interact with students and content to develop their own realities. As used here, the nontechnical approach relies heavily on teachers as the major source of curriculum knowledge because they know their students and teaching contexts. They also know why the curriculum needs revision.

A nontechnical approach is often used when the major source of curriculum content is the needs and interests of students or needs of society and culture. Particularly with these sources, curriculum developers do not state their intended learning outcomes at the outset (Klein, 1991b), because what students are expected to learn is not easily predicted. Largely because teachers are the main persons involved in nontechnical approaches, the resulting curricula are planned for specific contexts (Paris, 1993; Short & Harste, 1996; Williams, 1997).

Technical—nontechnical approaches and objective—subjective interpretations of reality are revisited in the discussion of educational change later in this chapter. The personnel involved in both approaches are described in Chapter 2, and how the approaches are put into operation is described in subsequent chapters.

CURRICULUM PROCESSES AND PRODUCTS

As used here, curriculum processes are the procedures involved in creating, using, and evaluating the curricula represented in various documents or products such as guides, syllabi, and others. This section briefly defines these terms.

Processes

Curriculum processes is a collective term that encompasses all of the considerations about which curriculum workers ponder and ultimately use to make choices in the development and evaluation of a curriculum project. These processes involve changes that some students, teachers, school staff, and community members welcome, but that others resist either actively or passively.

Rarely is a school curriculum developed from scratch, because most "new" curricula represent revisions of those in existence. However, whether generating a
brand-new curriculum or revising an existing one, curriculum development means recreating or modifying what is taught to students. Development includes a number of decisions whose outcomes aggregate as a curriculum design.

Curriculum designs are based on the primary sources of curriculum content (i.e., subject matter, needs of society-culture, or needs and interests of learners) that make possible the realization of a particular purpose of education. These purposes typically emphasize cultivating cognitive achievement (also known as transmitting the cultural heritage), developing learners to their fullest potentials, or preparing people for living in a changing, unstable world.

In addition to establishing a purpose for the curriculum project, developers also prepare a "views of education" statement outlining the anticipated relationships among teachers, students, and curriculum content. The views statement usually shows how the curriculum relates to the community beyond the school. Developers then select and organize content so that these relationships can be realized.

Curriculum use involves making arrangements for and using curriculum projects in school settings for the purpose of school program development. This term encompasses implementation and enactment used with technical and non-technical processes, respectively. Sometimes technically developed curricula are tested in a few classrooms before they are put to full use in a district.

Both curriculum development and use involve several considerations that must be managed effectively. Among these are the scope and complexity of the curricular change, communication among all the participants involved, professional development, and resources.

Curriculum evaluation encompasses the processes used in the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of programs of study (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). Specifically, the intent of these processes is to improve school programs through delineating, obtaining, and providing descriptive and judgmental information about the worth and merit of curricula. Evaluation guides decision making, serves the need for accountability, and promotes understanding of the curriculum (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 1985). Evaluation of existing curricula for the purpose of determining strengths and weaknesses may occur as the first step in curriculum revision. This evaluation is commonly referred to as needs assessment. Typically, revised curricula developed for use in classrooms are also evaluated in at least two ways: whether curricula were actually used in classrooms and how well curricula satisfy their intended purposes.

**Products**

Curriculum products or projects result from curriculum development processes and provide the bases for instructional decisions in classrooms. Curriculum projects include curriculum guides, courses of study, syllabi, resource units, lists of goals and objectives, and other documents that deal with the content of schooling.

Curriculum guides "usually include details about the topics to be taught, predetermined teaching goals and suggestions for instructional strategies (Ben-
Peretz, 1990, p. 25). Curriculum guidelines furnish information about predeter-
nined learning outcomes and are generally less complete than curriculum
guides. Courses of study or syllabi usually specify the content, the learning out-
comes, and time allocations for the various topics. Sometimes a rationale for the
choices of content is included in syllabi.

Resource units typically include learning outcomes, suggestions for teaching,
Sources of information, and prepared instructional units. Lists of curriculum
goals and objectives, along with their rationales, are another form of project.

These activities ask you to note content and audience in three real-world cur-
riculum documents. This knowledge is a practical consideration for thinking
about your own curriculum project.

Scan each of the following projects in Appendix A:

• English Language Arts Curriculum, K—8 (A3)
• Wyoming Arts Education Curriculum (A5)
• Into Adolescence: Caring for Our Planet and Our Health, Grades 5–8 (A6)

Answer these questions for each project:

1. Does the project contain goals/objectives, suggestions for teaching, or
both? Explain.
2. For whom is the project intended? Primarily curriculum developers?
Primarily classroom users? Explain.

CURRICULUM PROCESSES AS CHANGE

Educators and laypersons alike agree that social change is ongoing, but many are
unsure about how to deal with it. As a result, they appear to alternately call for
and decry reform in schools. This section defines educational change, then
describes and applies different perspectives of curriculum processes as change to
technical and nontechnical approaches.

Change Defined

Fullan (1991) draws extensively on the literature related to educational innova-
tion for The New Meaning of Educational Change, which is the basis for much of the
following discussion. Change may occur in response to outside events or because
we voluntarily initiate or participate in change as part of a situation in which we
find dissatisfaction, inconsistency, or intolerability.

Whatever its cause, the meaning of change is rarely clear at its beginning and
ambivalence reigns until the change is absorbed and made part of our thinking.
"Ultimately the transformation of subjective realities is the essence of change" (Fullan, 1991, p. 36). Change requires us to understand that behavior is based on beliefs and values and that individuals, not groups or organizations, change (Pecan. 1994).

Bridges's (1991) distinction between changes and transitions is helpful in understanding the transformation of subjective realities. For him, change is external to people and is situational—the new curriculum, the new method of evaluating the curriculum, the new way of supervising teachers as curriculum users. On the other hand, "transition is the psychological process people go through to come to terms with the new situation. Change is external, transition is internal" (Bridges, 1991, p. 5).

Transitions begin with endings, or letting go of things. In curriculum changes, teachers may have to give up their tried-and-true lecture notes or replace their favorite instructional activity. When called to supervise teachers making curriculum changes, administrators may have to relinquish staying in their offices throughout most of the school day or working on budget concerns for hours at a time. Such letting-go actions must occur if people are to enter the neutral zone. This zone represents "the no-man's-land between the old reality and the new. It's the limbo between the old sense of identity and the new" (Bridges, 1991, p. 5).

The announcement of the new curriculum (or a method of evaluating students or ways of teaching)—the change—can happen fairly quickly. But inward transitions take place much more slowly because of inner struggles, because of that sense of being in limbo. The educator finds it inappropriate to continue with the "old" ways, yet the "new" ways are difficult even to contemplate. It is important to understand the neutral zone. If educators do not expect and understand the neutral zone, they may try to rush through it and become discouraged when they learn this is impossible. Or they may be frightened in this no-man's-land and try to escape (Bridges, 1991).

The neutral zone is filled with ambivalence and uncertainty, conditions that occur naturally when people feel lost or overwhelmed by more information than they can handle (Fullan, 1991). Many teachers, for example, work in situations in which ambivalence and uncertainty are abundant. Teachers are typically isolated from colleagues, have few opportunities to reflect on what they do, and are required to make many decisions involving many different people and situations and to make them quickly (Lieberman, 1992).

If asked to participate in change, teachers may see no reason to believe in the change or to spend time finding out if it is worthwhile. When they feel pressured, teachers may try to escape the neutral zone quickly and "adjust to the 'near occasion' of change, by changing as little as possible—either assimilating or abandoning changes that they were initially willing to try, or fighting or ignoring imposed change" (Fullan, 1991, p. 36).

Such behaviors are normal because the neutral zone produces fright and confusion (Bridges, 1991). However, this is the time during which reorientation and redefinition take place. Well-designed professional development activities can spark educators' creativity and bring about their sense of self-renewal. However, educators make new beginnings only by reaching endings and spending time in the neutral zone. Unfortunately, school leaders frequently "try to start with the beginning rather than finishing with it. They pay no attention to endings. They
do not acknowledge the existence of the neutral zone, then wonder why people have so much difficulty with change (Bridges, 1991, p. 6).

Fullan (1991) further characterizes change as multidimensional. For example, at least three dimensions are involved in curriculum implementation: ‘1) the possible use of new or revised materials (direct instructional resources such as curriculum materials or technologies), 2) the possible use of new teaching approaches (i.e., new teaching strategies or activities), and 3) the possible alteration of beliefs (e.g., pedagogical assumptions and theories underlying particular new policies or programs)” (Fullan, 1991, p. 37). Unless modifications occur in each dimension, true implementation does not take place. To illustrate, teachers could use revised materials without changing their strategies. Or they could alter some strategies without understanding or operating on the beliefs underlying the change. To say that the revised curriculum has been implemented, teachers must experience change in all three dimensions.

This description affirms that educational change is a complex, time-consuming process. When the change involves more than one person, each must make meaning and resolve ambivalence individually! If you consider the sheer numbers of people involved in most curriculum processes, it is clear why true change is difficult to achieve.

Change Applied in Curriculum Processes

Depending on their preferred view of reality, those involved with curricula are likely to pursue the curriculum processes very differently. Not only do they undertake and carry out the curriculum tasks differently, but they explain the processes and results of their efforts with different terms.

One perspective (Leithwood, 1991) on curriculum processes that has been tried repeatedly follows a rational-logical process. Based on the idea that events in the world are understandable and predictable, this technical approach says that developing a revised curriculum provides a relatively complete solution to a problem in a school or school system. Individuals with this belief assume that teachers can implement the revised curriculum as the developers and school staff conceived it. Under this perspective implementation is a nonproblematic event in which teachers are expected quickly to understand, value, and carry out the practices required by the revised curriculum.

In fact, one aspect of evaluation is judging how faithfully implementers follow the planned curriculum. Of course, evaluators also check to see if the curriculum meets its intended purpose. For individuals who view the curriculum processes as described in this perspective, the change process is both rational and systematic and often involves top-down strategic planning.

Much evidence exists to show that this perspective on change is usually ineffective (Fullan, 1991; Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986). Its proponents believe that changes in programs or procedures, rather than changes in people, lead to improvement. When proponents act on these beliefs, however, they often find that procedural changes do not bring improvement. Sometimes individuals remain unconvinced and try tightening procedures even more. Most of the time
these efforts are also unsuccessful. This thinking is characteristic of school personnel who believe in a rational, objective view of reality.

A second perspective takes a different view of change. Patterson et al. (1986) propose to treat school systems as nonrational social organizations whose logic is nonlinear and complex, but understandable and amenable to influence.

"[N]onrational doesn’t necessarily mean irrational. Related to organizational life, nonrational behavior usually manifests a weak relationship among goals, structures, activities, and outcomes” (p. 23).

Nonrational systems recognize that competing forces, in and out of these systems, constantly try to make their goals the organization’s agenda. Decision makers in nonrational systems find ways of handling conflicting goals, such as dealing with them in sequence or moving along multiple fronts toward organizational goals (Patterson et al., 1986).

This second perspective fully recognizes schools as nonrational social organizations. Its proponents develop a revised curriculum to provide a partial solution to a problem in a school or school system. In a process separate from development, implementers—including teachers and school staff—collaborate with developers to adapt the revised curriculum to particular contexts where the curriculum is implemented with students. The adaptation is expected to provide teachers with ownership of the revised curriculum and enable them to use the curriculum effectively with students. Evaluation includes assessing the degree to which the negotiated curriculum is implemented as well as the degree to which its purpose is attained (Leithwood, 1991). Individuals who view the curriculum processes as described in this perspective see change processes as growth in a valued direction brought about by collaboration among the professionals involved.

A third perspective is based on a subjective view of reality. Its proponents are typically teachers characterized as having deep knowledge of their students, of what students need to learn, and of themselves as professionals (Paris, 1993). This group sees curriculum development as a mutual construction of content and meaning by teachers and students that varies with alterations among the people. As teachers acquire additional information about subject matter, teaching, students’ needs, or other pertinent matters, they design curricula that incorporate this information if it benefits students. Because the curriculum is created in the same situation in which it is used, the curriculum is said to be enacted, rather than implemented (Doyle, 1992; Snyder et al., 1992).

Working out and using the curriculum, however, typically involves negotiations among teachers as well as school staff and people in the community. In this perspective, enactment follows development very closely and is handled by the same individuals. Evaluation is assessing the degree to which the purpose of education is met. This group also sees change processes as growth in valued directions, similar to the second group. However, the change processes are more individually oriented than those within the second group.

In subsequent discussions, the processes described in the first and second perspectives are referred to as the technical approach to development and evaluation, and use in this approach is called implementation. Whenever these
### TABLE 1.1 Perspectives on Curriculum Processes as Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views of reality/ change processes</th>
<th>Technical Approaches</th>
<th>Nontechnical Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective; rational-logical; strategic planning/change in programs is deemed important.</td>
<td>Objective; nonlinear and complex logic; changes within people are deemed important.</td>
<td>Subjective; related to individuals involved; changes within people are deemed important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Revision/development represents solution to a problem.</td>
<td>Revision/development represents partial solution to a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Curriculum can be used (implemented) as conceived by developers.</td>
<td>Curriculum must be adapted for use (implemented) in particular part of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Product—checks to see if curriculum, as planned, meets its purpose. Process—checks on faithfulness of implementers in following plans.</td>
<td>Product—checks to see if curriculum, as adapted, meets its purpose. Process—checks on degree to which implementers use adapted curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results; outcomes of curriculum processes</td>
<td>Usually ineffective; implementers are not part of change process.</td>
<td>Usually growth in valued directions by groups of people occurs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Processes are discussed, the second perspective is clearly favored. The first perspective is discussed primarily because schools continue to attempt its use.

Processes described in the third perspective are referred to as the nontechnical approach to development and evaluation; use is called enactment. See Table 1.1 for a summary of these perspectives on curriculum processes as change.

Chapter 2 continues this overview through discussions of the nature of curriculum decision making and the personnel involved in curriculum. Of particular importance is the involvement of both school and community personnel.

### SUMMARY

This chapter provides information about key concepts in curriculum. Differences in definitions of curriculum and relationships between curriculum and instruction...
may be either real differences in views or simple interchanges of terminology. Curriculum personnel with an objective view of reality view a world that is knowable with orderly events, but other curriculum people hold that reality is subjective and personal, and those events are not predictable. Differences in interpretations of reality often lead to different approaches to curriculum processes.

Curriculum processes encompass valuing and decision making in developing, using, and evaluating curricula. The output of these processes is products or projects with different designations (e.g., guides, courses of study, and resource units).

Educational change requires that individuals develop their own meanings of social phenomena. Unless they do, there is little likelihood of change. Because people have different interpretations of reality, they describe the curriculum processes and the change processes differently.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Ask at least two people associated with schools and two laypersons to define curriculum and instruction. Do their definitions agree with those mentioned at the beginning of this chapter? Explain.

2. Classify the definitions of curriculum in Question 1 according to one of the levels of curriculum described in this chapter. Give reasons for your classifications.

3. Provide at least one original example for each class of learning outcomes described in the Cuban Johnson definition of learning.

4. Which of the two curriculum—instruction relationships makes more sense to you? Why?

5. Explain why it is important to evaluate curricula.

6. Explain what is meant by the statement “each individual has to make his/her own meaning of educational change.” Why is this statement important?

7. Explain the importance of distinguishing among the three perspectives on the curriculum processes described as change.

| Curriculum-instruction-learning levels of curriculum | enactment |
| Curriculum processes technical—nontechnical approaches development use implementation | evaluation needs assessment |
| | Curriculum products (projects) guidelines guides courses of study (syllabi) resource units |