

IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCES ON CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS

CLIVE MCGEE

*Department of Professional Studies
University of Waikato*

ABSTRACT *The school curriculum derives from beliefs about what schools should teach, for what purpose, and for what reasons. Over the years New Zealand schools have been influenced by differing sets of beliefs that have provided the rationale for curriculum decisions. Some decisions lie outside the control of a school and appear through curriculum documents. This article uses several ideologies as the basis of an analysis of how they have shaped curriculum documents and trends. It draws attention to the impact upon teachers and schools of changing conceptions of curriculum and policy changes as seen in curriculum documents, and in particular the documents of the 1990s.*

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum changes result from a highly complex mix of ideological, political, social, philosophical, economic and other influences. Over successive decades such influences wax and wane; some assume ascendancy over others at a particular time, only to decline at another time. There are different conceptions of what school curriculum should be. These conceptions are sometimes referred to as ideologies, or even "theories" of curriculum. Ideologies "in general are belief systems that provide the value premises from which decisions about practical educational matters are made" (Eisner, 1994, p.47). They derive from broad, international perspectives and views. Some views are unproblematic in that they are generally agreed, such as that all children should learn to read and write. Others are more controversial and problematic for example, whether evolution should be taught in schools. Naturally, there is overlap between ideologies and each does not represent a concise, clear-cut school of thought. Nevertheless, they provide a theoretical basis for analysing curriculum. This paper attempts to analyse ideological influences upon curriculum in New Zealand, particularly through the language of curriculum documents. It draws attention to changing conceptions of curriculum and how these affect teachers.

ORIENTATIONS TO CURRICULUM

There is no consensus on what constitutes a list of ideologies. A typical way of representing different ideologies has been to dichotomise or polarise, for example:

- teacher-centred versus child-centred (Plowden Report, 1967)
- traditional versus progressive (Bennett, 1976)
- open teaching versus closed teaching (Kohl, 1970)

PROGRESSIVE INFLUENCES ON NEW ZEALAND CURRICULUM

In the twentieth century one of the chief tensions in curriculum development is reflected in the views that can be labelled "progressive" and those that can be labelled "traditional", one of the dichotomies referred to earlier. Progressive educators argued against what they saw as too much emphasis upon rote memorisation of facts, repetitive drills to learn facts, harsh discipline, and curriculum content without relevance to children's day-to-day lives. However, progressives have never had a single, coherent point of view. Some have advocated a more scientific approach to education (hence, Schubert's social behaviourist). Others have taken a more romantic view and argued for recognition of the goodness of the child and a curriculum that allows self-expression and feelings to come to the fore (hence, Rousseau and the later experientialists). Others have seen the curriculum as a way of transforming the lot of the downtrodden and disadvantaged (for example, Paulo Friere) and the children who fail or are disillusioned and alienated (for example, Holt, 1964; Kozol, 1967; Postman and Weingartner, 1971).

In the early years of New Zealand's compulsory education system, the dominant curriculum ideology was traditionalism. Subjects and their content had been virtually "lifted" from England in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Openshaw, Lee and Lee (1993) have demonstrated that throughout New Zealand's state schooling history a strong conservative, traditional influence has continued. At times progressive movements have been subject to considerable criticism. These criticisms were directed at various innovations such as Montessori's ideas early this century on liberty for children, and in mid-century the so-called "playway" influence in junior primary classrooms; and, more recently, "Americanised" mathematics textbooks.

The 1920s and 1930s saw a tide of progressive influence from overseas in terms of ideas to be considered, but with seemingly little impact on curriculum in schools. From England came the Hadow Report and new ideas in philosophy and psychology from writers like Nunn, Isaacs, Neill; from America the ideas of Dewey and Kilpatrick (project method); and from Europe names like Comenius, Rousseau, Froebel and Pestalozzi became known to New Zealand teachers. Textbooks used in teachers colleges gradually spread their ideas from the 1920s. Child-centred learning, freedom and creativity, learner interests, the activity movement, and integration of subject matter were advocated. The 1929 Red Book (*Syllabus of Instruction for Public Schools*) represented a thorough revision of the curriculum and embodied a more liberal ethos, represented by the introductory statement that it was "mainly suggestive" and "Teachers are to consider themselves free to make any alteration or rearrangement of work they think desirable" (Ewing, 1970, p.308). Unfortunately for the progressivists, little of this was realised due to the continuance of the proficiency examination. However, a visit to New Zealand by a number of eminent educators who had attended the New Education Fellowship Conference in Australia in 1937 coincided with the year of the abolition of proficiency. For the many teachers who attended meetings to hear these educators, new visions of teaching must have emerged from their progressive ideas such as the view that artistic expression should be a key part of the curriculum.

In the 1940s a system of "rolling revision" began under which each syllabus was reviewed and revised separately; a system that continued until the 1990s. The syllabuses themselves began to show a change from overly-prescriptive to more open-ended and suggestive. Of course, an assumption that must accompany such change is that teachers have the competence to implement curriculum less prescriptive documents. This assumption is problematic in a situation of longstanding tension between teachers and government, with the latter historically employing inspectors to check on the work of teachers which is hardly conducive to teacher innovation and "risk taking" in decisions about curriculum in the classroom.

English Curriculum Documents

English is a good example of how the 1950s and 1960s documents reflected the liberal direction. Developments in primary language, or English saw the official curriculum move from a rigid, prescriptive-style statement to a much briefer open-ended statement in the 1961 *Language in the Primary School: English*. It reaffirmed the aims of the 1929 and 1946 syllabuses that children should become good writers, speakers, readers and listeners and be able to express themselves clearly, fluently and correctly. But the important change came in the way content was arranged. Language skills were to be taught across the curriculum. Teaching was to have "no limits" and teachers would select content and activities once they knew the needs, interests and "capacities" of their pupils. Furthermore, it was argued that children must understand what they do. The significance for teachers was that it gave them more freedom. This is the essence of an official curriculum document that treats teachers as what Hoyle (1969) called extended professionals as opposed to restricted professionals.

Gone from the syllabus was the safety net of detailed class programmes, of exercises and activities to be followed without question. Teachers of junior primary classes could get their pupils to make radio programmes, write scripts for plays and puppet plays, use the telephone, tell stories and jokes, and so on. At the same time, the expectation was that children would progressively learn language skills.

It is difficult to know with any certainty the extent to which teachers took up the teaching style encouraged by the syllabus. What is known is that in the same decade the Department of Education published *Suggestions for Teaching English in the Primary School* (1969) which showed that at least some teachers were experimenting with more contextualised programmes. Originally published as three separate booklets in the early 1960s, the suggestions represented a collection of notes and articles from teachers and inspectors to give ideas about how the syllabus might be implemented in classrooms. A strong child-centred emphasis is shown in the introduction: "Children will make the best progress if they are helped to be most fully themselves so that they have time to enjoy each stage of growth before it gives way to the next" (p.6). Some of the notes focus upon developmental teaching and learning. For example:

In the primary school it is more useful to think of language as a form of behaviour, a means of thinking, and a means of communicating ideas,

than as a subject or series of subjects. Therefore development of the capacity to use language is best promoted not by exercises practised in isolation from any real purposes but by placing children in an active and vital classroom where there is every incentive to think, talk, listen, and to read and write (p.15).

The following is part of a description of a rural junior classroom:

Between the piano and the walls a space gives children playing in the home corner easy access to the shop, which is arranged where there are convenient shelves along the wall. A desk serves as the counter. In the other back corner of the room underneath more windows, there is a space for building with blocks, and along the backwall between these is a large table which children use for screen printing and for the construction of large models (p.25).

It goes on to talk about children's use of make-believe, imagination, "doing things for themselves", doing their "own kind of writing", dance, percussion instruments, dressing up, and constructing. Flexible organisation was recommended:

The syllabus cannot effectively be put into operation if we continue to organise our days into short periods devolved to teaching lessons of the same type each day. Under such conditions, how can there be plenty to do, to listen to, to think about, to talk about, to read about, to write about? (p.33).

Further, in discussing junior classes, the progressive influences of Ashton-Warner, (1963) are echoed.

The organic growth of a day should be taken into account so that the timetable is not a mere succession of activities isolated one from another ... activities grow out of one another.....(p.47).

There are descriptions of how language is linked to other subjects through visits connected to science and social studies, reflecting the Deweyan influence that curriculum should relate to the life and experience of pupils. There are also descriptions of how to teach language skills such as editing and correcting writing and approaches teachers might take to marking and assessment. Again, Dewey's influence is evident in placing rigour alongside exploration, inquiry, and curiosity. Here, too, we see the emergence co-operative learning, integration, and whole language approaches that have continued to the present day and have their roots in the experientialist ideology.

Similar progressive influences are evident in the curriculum documents of many other primary school subjects. Emerging beliefs about knowledge from learning theory supported the more liberal approaches of teachers. The work of Piaget, Vygotsky and others influenced teachers to consider the construction of knowledge from their students' perspectives. There was increasing recognition that children construct their own knowledge in different ways and teachers came

to see themselves as facilitators who help children explore meanings that make sense to them.

Teachers' writing

Apart from official documents the progressive influence in New Zealand was also symptomatic of the work of educators such as Sylvia Ashton-Warner and Elwyn Richardson who wrote about their attempts to liberalise curriculum. Ashton-Warner (1963) wrote of her organic reading which freed Māori children to express themselves and related their reading matter to their own lived experience within the school system. Richardson's *In the Early World* (1964) described and explained his attempts to implement ideas of progressive education in a small rural school especially through art and creativity. The methods he tried seem to have a close affinity with the ideas included in the handbooks on English referred to earlier. This liberal-progressive tradition has been continued by teachers and authors in both official and unofficial publications. For example, a Ministry of Education publication *Dancing with the Pen* (1992) has an existential tendency in advocating that children's writing can enable them "to discover, clarify, and share personal interpretations of events and ideas" (p.11).

THE TECHNOCRATIC INFLUENCE

At the same time as these progressive influences were having an effect on curriculum and the actions of teachers, there was also a contradictory influence from a more technocratic ideology. In spite of the earlier claim that progressive ideology has dominated in recent decades, Codd, (1990) has described a technocratic image of schooling that is evident in the influential Currie Report of 1962. The language of the report, in part, reflected this image with its discussion of the need for schools to teach work skills, and talk of "inputs", "outputs", "productivity", "efficiency", and a proposal that national "checkpoint" testing should occur at several age levels in the school system. In this we see the language of Schubert's (1986) social behaviourist.

The Tyler (1949) rationale referred to earlier epitomised this ideology. In seeking answers to curriculum questions, advocates relied on a scientific, rational approach to curriculum design. Coupled with the behaviourism of Pavlov, Watson, Skinner, Gagné and others, curriculum objectives were numerous and precise. Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives influenced curriculum designers to list objectives that related to different kinds of cognitive functioning. Known as behavioural objectives, they atomised curriculum content into numerous observable behaviours. Other psychologists like Bruner (1966) advocated a broader "scientific" approach through discovery learning; albeit a carefully guided form of discovery based upon precisely prepared curriculum resources and teacher guides. Teacher education programmes have devoted a lot of time to showing student teachers how to plan for teaching in this detailed, prescriptive manner in the quite well intentioned belief that learners will get a better deal when lessons are prepared systematically.

Expression of this technocratic ideology was seen in the post-Sputnik curriculum movement and the so-called accountability movement that took hold

in the United States in the 1960s. It was associated with a systems approach to curriculum planning that had been borrowed from industry and commerce going back at least as far as the factory-based time and motion studies of Taylorism in the 1920s. Curriculum packages from the United States were used in New Zealand schools in reading and mathematics. Some were deliberately organised and structured so that the teacher was reduced to a technician, following directions rather than the "artist" advocated by a progressive like Eisner, (1994). Coincidentally, in research on teaching methods there was a drive to discover a science of teaching (Joyce and Weil, 1980). Once found, it would enable absolute control of both curriculum design and curriculum implementation. It never was. The language of technocracy was, however, to emerge again in the 1980s to influence government curriculum policy.

A DECADE OF CONFLICTING IDEOLOGY

In the official documents of the 1980s there were signs of continuing traditional emphasis, but also signs of reaction to political and social issues regarding equity and educational opportunity. The report on the core curriculum (*A Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools 1984*) claimed that a core curriculum is necessary to give New Zealand primary and secondary students a broad general education. It acknowledged that a school's scheme was the mechanism for ensuring balanced programmes. So there was a progression from syllabus to school scheme to class programme. The time spent on each subject has been a long-established convention and the report reaffirmed a subject hierarchy by nominating time allocations. Language-reading, including spelling and handwriting, was ranked first and mathematics second.

It was still an open document in that beyond time allocations, it did *not* suggest how the time should be used. However, it noted the problem of an additive approach to curriculum and the pressure from various lobbies to include additional content. It also noted that curriculum offerings had continued to diversify in spite of an already crowded curriculum. It advocated the further development of Māori language and bilingual (Māori-English) studies, without going so far as recommending Māori language as part of the compulsory core.

Curriculum reassessment in the 1980s continued with *The Curriculum Review* (1986). This report was the result of major undertaking to seek the views of the general public about what schools should be doing and how they should be doing it. The form of the report was interesting in that it included, along with a formal summary of the many responses from the public, excerpts from submissions. The excerpts show clearly that there is no coherent public ideology for curriculum planners to use as a benchmark. Not unexpectedly, there were many conflicting and contradictory views. For example, the following are some responses as to what schools should teach:

Emphasis [should be] on skills and attitudes.

...children should learn to imagine the sort of future society they would like to live in, and plan the sort of steps needed to get them there.

Pride in our country, yes, but knowing it's not Godzone.

We expect our son to leave school knowing he is part of a Western civilisation whose history can be traced back for thousands of years. He should also have a good knowledge of Pacific cultures, especially Māori culture.

To read and write correctly, use grammar correctly, spell accurately and handle mathematics (p.27-28)

There was a strong advocacy for the improvement of schooling for Māori children, even though some individual comments were against the school carrying responsibility for Māori language. This equity emphasis extended to advocacy for a non-sexist curriculum. Further, the report advocated closer communication between a school and its community, from individual teachers and the families of their students to broader management of the school. Of course, it should be realised that the writers of the report had to make decisions about what they included and excluded. The process of report writing is, in itself, a values-laden exercise. It will be seen later that the broad values reflected in this report took a sharp shift of direction in the 1990s.

The report also reflected a continuing theme first argued over two decades earlier by the Currie Commission (*Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*, 1962), that there should be a co-ordinated curriculum covering all the years of primary and secondary schooling. By the 1980s, this concept was becoming firmly embedded, for example, in *A Review of the Core Curriculum in Schools* (1984). Also emerging in the 1980s were more clearly articulated curriculum principles that might provide a rationale for a co-ordinated curriculum. *The Curriculum Review* (1986) built on earlier reports when identifying fourteen principles. Taken as a group, there are problematic issues in translating them into an actual school curriculum, for example, matching a co-operatively designed curriculum (meaning students, parents, teachers) with principles of a common curriculum, a whole curriculum, and a balanced curriculum.

This is a good example of the contradictions in particular official curriculum documents. Codd (1990) has demonstrated how the text of a document like the review can be deconstructed to reveal plural meanings. He suggested that in the face of such plurality no single document could, when put into practice, fulfil the wishes of all individuals in society. There is also a post-modern dimension in these multiple goals which stress alternative contexts and experiences in a curriculum.

Following hard on the heels of the above review was the *National Curriculum Statement: a Discussion Document for Primary and Secondary Schools* (1988). Drafted by a curriculum Review Action Group of the Department of Education, it outlined a curriculum framework which covered primary and secondary students. Eight subjects (called aspects) were proposed: culture and heritage; language; creative and aesthetic development; mathematics; practical abilities; living in society; science, technology and the environment; health and well-being. Teachers were seen as the key decision-makers about day-to-day curriculum content.

Partnership between teachers, parents and the wider community was advocated as a way of bringing about curriculum development. Equity, balance, coherence and cultural identity were key principles. Taking up the direction signalled by *The Curriculum Review*, it was intended to be used by schools and communities to "help schools put their own curriculum into effect" (p.4).

Overall, the statement reflected a strong emphasis upon linking what was done in the curriculum with the life experiences of students. It was arranged in broadly-stated learning sequences. The writers were at pains to point out that "these levels are not to be rigidly interpreted..." (p.13) and "...each student learns at a pace in keeping with his or her individual development" (p.13). Furthermore, the five levels were very broad, spanning junior primary to senior secondary. Clearly, an assumption in the statement was that teachers carry the principal responsibility for decision-making about what should constitute classroom curriculum beyond a generalised, open-ended national prescription. There was evidence that the Left-wing critiques of the 1980s and 1990s (Apple, 1979; Grundy, 1987; McCulloch, 1991) were being heeded, and a fairer, transformative curriculum was emerging.

Even before the document was finished, however, political events intervened. Educational administration became a major issue in the late 1980s. Following the 1987 election, the government set up a task force to investigate the administration of schools and recommend how decentralisation might be achieved to lessen the influence of central agencies and increase school-based decision-making. The Picot task force and subsequent policy document, *Tomorrow's Schools* (Lange, 1988) reaffirmed the existing syllabuses as comprising the official national curriculum, but provided for local school curriculum initiatives. Because schools were preoccupied with adjusting to administrative change in 1989 and 1990, the status quo largely continued in curriculum matters.

INTO THE 1990s

All that changed in 1990 - 91. A new government came into power and almost immediately addressed the issue of a revision to the national curriculum. By early 1991 a discussion document *The National Curriculum of New Zealand* had been published by the new Ministry of Education. It represented some clear changes of direction from the previous documents of the 1980s in terms of its ideology and purposes. Different forms of language were evident and indicated different messages. The foreword by the Minister of Education drew attention to a perceived need to compete in the modern international economy and achieve standards in order to prosper alongside other nations in the international marketplace and argued that people's future standard of living will depend on this. Clear learning objectives and related assessment procedures were stated. English, mathematics, science and technology were nominated as the basic subjects. At the same time, the foreword claimed to leave schools the freedom to develop their own programmes, provided they related to prescribed national directions. Social sciences, the arts, and physical and personal development were the remaining areas of knowledge. Thus, health was subsumed into the last area, technology was a new subject that was designed to meet economic goals, and music and art were merged.

Seven groups of essential skills were outlined that would, according to the document, be taught across the curriculum. Eight achievement levels were proposed and the intention was that all aims and objectives would be linked to particular levels. Classroom assessment was to be related to these levels. National monitoring of student achievement was to occur at several levels in the basic subjects. It was suggested that new curriculum statements would be written that would be modelled on the 1988 National Curriculum of England and Wales, and examples of "Statements of Attainment" from this document were provided. Immediately, it could be seen that a radical shift had occurred in the language and associated ideology of curriculum statements. In place of the more general statements of the 1988 *National Curriculum Statement* were specific statements such as "Know that 5000 is 5 thousands or 50 hundreds or 500 tens or 5000 ones" (p.34).

Thus the chief influence upon the style of the new curriculum document was revealed: the curriculum for England and Wales. According to Lawton (1989), New Right ideology lay behind the development of the new national curriculum. Liberal-humanist ideology which embraces a broad compulsory common curriculum gave way to a narrow, subject-based instrumental curriculum (Chitty, 1988, p.43). National testing at several levels was proposed, and Chitty believed it would lead to curriculum standardisation, yet be ideologically consistent with the idea of providing evidence to measure individual schools which would be linked to the concept of choice in schooling. The same influences can be seen in the New Zealand draft curriculum framework.

When *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* was published in 1993, it did not differ greatly from the 1991 draft. It more overtly stated a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi. Subjects - called essential learning areas - changed from science and environment to science, and from physical and personal development to health and physical well-being. Competitive skills were added to the list of skills. A statement on attitudes and values was added which argued that there are commonly held values across society as well as particular values held by individuals.

Like all curriculum documents the framework is values-laden. What sort of citizens should the curriculum help produce? The list of essential skills suggests a citizen of multiple talents and abilities: a person who has both competitive and co-operative skills, physical and work skills, and multicultural and self-management skills. The emphasis upon self-management and competitive skills is stronger and more overt than in previous documents.

Following the drafting of a new curriculum framework in 1991, the government set about writing new syllabuses, or curriculum statements as they were called, for the various learning areas. The official "pecking order" of subjects is reflected in the priority given to writing science, mathematics, English and technology in the first round. The Ministry of Education settled upon a consistent format for each statement, a format in stark contrast to the variations in formats used in syllabuses for over forty years. The format is:

1. General aims and achievement aims.
2. A statement of teaching and learning approaches.
3. Content arranged in strands (usually five or six).

4. A prescription for each strand arranged into content levels, listing achievement objectives, learning contexts ("pointers" in mathematics) and activities, and exemplar assessment tasks.

The clock would have to be turned back to 1928 to find more prescriptive syllabuses, particularly in the case of the primary school years of schooling. The new mathematics statement is a book of 216 pages, compared with much smaller syllabuses of previous decades. Content is now clearly and precisely itemised along with behavioural-type objectives. Elley (1993) has expressed reservations that they represent a return to mindless behaviourism that could result in a technicist approach to curriculum delivery. Nevertheless, personal communication with teachers has revealed that some of them consider the new mathematics objectives too broad and lacking specific directions as to what, precisely, should be taught.

From a political standpoint, the 1990s have seen a Minister of Education with a greater hands on approach to curriculum policy and development than his predecessors (Capper, 1992, p.18). The liberal emphasis in the 1980s curriculum documents ran up against the Minister's stated preference for a narrow functionalist core curriculum. As Capper has observed, however, the Minister has been open to changing his views in the face of his educational advisers. For example, a more moderate view has been adopted for policy on national testing, especially in the light of difficulties with testing in England. Nevertheless, the driving force in recent curriculum reform is the perceived need by power holders to increase the skills levels of the new generation, to enhance New Zealand's international competitiveness and the attendant (assumed) spin-off for the standard of living of the nation.

Overall, the review of the national curriculum was overdue. The system of rolling revision (Ewing, 1970) had operated for over four decades. Arguably, it had become fragmented as each subject went its own way under the leadership of different groups. Syllabuses had become very general. For the teaching profession this situation has been problematic. Some teachers viewed the general, broad and liberal syllabuses as an unique opportunity to practice their professionalism; to practice autonomously in what Hoyle (1969) called extended professionalism. These were teachers who could adapt curriculum to the needs of their students in ways that went beyond a perceived need to "toe the party line" or follow the latest fad or orthodoxy just because it was fashionable to do so. Their decisions were based upon educationally-sound considerations of the complex factors that make up schools and classrooms and influence learning and teaching.

On the other hand, there were teachers who preferred to practice from a more precisely-prescribed curriculum which makes clear what is to be taught and learned - what Hoyle (1969) called restricted professionalism. And, of course, there were other teachers who were located between these two types. In these circumstances, it might be argued that what is required is a set of curriculum statements that satisfy different approaches to curriculum delivery. It is my contention that to a large extent the new curriculum statements provide the props and direction needed by some teachers, yet leave the way open for variations and alternative approaches. For example, flexibility is implied in the English statement when it is stated that "Teaching and learning examples are

provided as possible starting points and directions for teachers in their planning", and "In practice the three language strands are often combined, and many of the examples indicated opportunities for teachers to plan an integrated approach to learning and teaching" (*English in the New Zealand Curriculum*, 1994, p.20). Further scrutiny of the syllabus shows that reasonably specific achievement objectives and learning and assessment activities are listed for each strand and level. One of the ten principles in the framework itself is that teachers have the flexibility to design programmes to suit local conditions. Given all this, how the first few curriculum statements are being interpreted by teachers is anybody's guess.

Interpretations will also be influenced by the activities of the Education Review Office and the effectiveness reviews which it is obligated to carry out. First hand communication with schools suggests that teachers might easily fall into the old trap of delivering curriculum in ways that they perceive to be correct or right or approved by external agencies rather than making their own judgments. Traditional forms of assessment can limit teachers, too, and reduce them to a narrow technicist approach (Willis, 1994). The recently-published policy on assessment (*Assessment: Policy to Practice*, Ministry of Education, 1994) is a very comprehensive outline of school-based assessment strategies. At best, it offers guidance to teachers to engage in curriculum decisions about assessment in an empowered manner; what Willis (1994) called working within an educative paradigm. At worst, teachers might feel pressured to retreat to the narrowness of testing and checklisting skills and facts; data collection could very easily become the end rather than the means in assessment. Already, personal contacts with schools have revealed the latter tendency.

For too long, the teaching profession has been adversely affected by its acceptance of external checking to see that teaching is being done to an acceptable standard. As pointed out earlier, in these circumstances closed prescriptive syllabuses flourish. To avoid this, teachers need to demonstrate their professionalism by their confidence to make curriculum decisions which they justify by the results of their students.

CONCLUSION

Returning to the ideological influences underlying the curriculum developments of the 1990s, a study of recent documents reveals shifts in ideological emphasis. Each of the three ideologies described earlier, can be identified. The intellectual traditionalist ideology is represented in the preservation of a liberal arts tradition in the curriculum framework. However, it has been weakened by the continuing content inclusions of more recent aspects such as technology and topics closer to students' immediate interests and daily lives. What has been retained is the tradition of dividing content into separate subjects.

The experientialist ideology has been very influential since the 1950s. The liberal-progressive orientation of the child-centred influences of Europe and North America in the early decades of this century finally took hold in New Zealand curriculum documents and practices. The principles in the 1993 curriculum framework have a strong experientialist "flavour", at least in rhetoric. This is shown through terms like "success for all students", "empower students to

take increasing responsibility for their own learning", "respond to the educational needs, experiences, interests and values of all students" and "broad and balanced education". Thus, it appears that this ideology has some continuing influence.

The social behaviourist ideology has also been influential in recent decades, and arguably, it has gained ground in the recent framework. The principles of the framework include reference to the necessity to produce citizens who can play their part in a competitive world economy and who have learned skills to be used in the "world of work". Interestingly, in recent decades this ideology has battled against the experientialist ideology. As has been shown, both have been evident; both have been influential.

It can be seen therefore that Schubert's (1986) conciliation ideology, too, is evident in the framework. That is, elements of the three main ideologies can be discerned. The dominance of one over the others continues to be an area of debate and scrutiny. Teachers are, of course, influenced by ideology. It affects their beliefs about teaching and curriculum and hence their practice. In making decisions about curriculum teachers can be helped if they have an understanding of the ideological forces that have shaped the curriculum. Currently, there is a struggle between an advocacy for a core curriculum containing a prescription of what all children should come to know, and an advocacy for a curriculum that emphasises thinking processes and skills and uses cultural knowledge as a means to the end of producing educated citizens. The future direction of curriculum development probably lies in some combination of each advocacy. In the mid-1990s we are, indeed, at a watershed in curriculum development.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M.J. (1982). *The Paideia Proposal; an Educational Manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Apple, M.W. (1979). *Ideology and the Curriculum*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ashton-Warner, S. (1963). *Teacher*. London: Secker and Warberg.
- Bennett, S.N. (1976). *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*. London: Open Books.
- Bloom, B.S. (ed) (1956). *Taxonomy of Education Objectives: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Bruner, J.S. (1966). *Toward a Theory of Instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Capper, P (1992). Curriculum 1991, *New Zealand Review of Education*, 1:1991 Victoria University of Wellington. pp.15-27.
- Children and their Primary Schools* (1967). The Plowden Report. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Chitty, C. (1988). Two models of a National Curriculum: origins and interpretation. In D. Lawton and C. Chitty (eds), *The National Curriculum*, (pp.34-48). London: University of London.
- Codd, J. (1990). Policy documents and the official discourse of the state. In J. Codd, R. Harker and R. Nash (eds.) *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*. Second Edit (pp.133-149). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

- Department of Education (1969) *Suggestions for Teaching English in the Primary School*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Education (1984). *A Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Education (1986) *The Curriculum Review*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Education (1988). *National Curriculum Statement: A Discussion Document for Primary and Secondary Schools*. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Doll, R.C. (1982). *Curriculum Improvement: Decision making and process*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eisner, E.W. (1994). *The Educational Imagination; on the design and evaluation of educational programmes*. New York: Macmillan.
- Elley, W. (1993). Curriculum Reform: Forwards or Backwards, *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 3:1993, Wellington.
- Ewing, J.C. (1970). *Development of the New Zealand Primary School Curriculum 1877-1970*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: product or praxis?* London: Falmer Press.
- Holt, J. (1964). *How Children Fail*. New York: Pitman.
- Hoyle, E. (1969). How does the curriculum change? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 132-141
- Issacs, S. (1930). *Intellectual Growth of Young People*. London: Routledge.
- Joyce, B. & Weil, M. (1980). *Models of Teaching*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kemmis, S., Cole, P. & Suggett, D. (1994). Orientations to curriculum. In E. Hatton (ed). *Understanding Teaching*. (pp.128-135). Sydney: Harcourt Brace.
- Kohl, H.R. (1970). *The Open Classroom*. New York: Vintage.
- Kozol, J. (1967). *Death at an Early Age*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lange, D. (1988). *Tomorrow's Schools: the Reform of Educational Administration in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Lawton, D. (1988). Ideologies of education. In D. Lawton & C. Chitty (eds), *The National Curriculum*, (pp.10-20). London: University of London.
- McCulloch, G. (1991). The ideology of educational reform; an historical perspective. In S. Middleton, J.Codd, and A.Jones (eds.) *New Zealand Education Policy Today*. (pp.53-67). Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Ministry of Education (1991). *The National Curriculum of New Zealand: A Discussion Document*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (1992). *Dancing with the Pen*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (1992). *Mathematics in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (1993). *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (1994). *Assessment: Policy to Practice*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (1994). *English in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.

- New Zealand Education Department (1929). *Syllabus of Instruction for Public Schools*. Wellington.
- Openshaw, R., Lee G. & Lee, H. (1993) *Challenging the Myths; Rethinking New Zealand's Educational History*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Postman, N. & Weingartner, C. (1971). *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Pratt, D. (1994). *Curriculum Planning: a Handbook for Professionals*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Report of the Commission on Education New Zealand* (1962). Currie Report. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Richardson, E.S. (1964). *In the Early World*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Rogers, C.R. (1971). *Client centred Therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schubert, W.H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schubert, W.H. (1993) Curriculum reform. In G. Cawelti (ed) *Challenges and Achievements in American Education*. 1993 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (pp.80-116). Virginia: ASCD.
- Smith, B.O., Stanley, W.O. & Shores, J.H. (1957). *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Taba, H. (1966). *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L.N. (1980). *Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walker, D. F. & Soltis, J. F. (1992). *Curriculum and Aims*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Willis, D. (1994). School-based assessment: underlying ideologies and their implications for teachers and learners, *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29(2) pp.161-174.