2
Outside Curricula and Public Pedagogy

WILLIAM H. SCHUBERT

The valuable work currently being done on public pedagogy can be enhanced by perceiving it within a legacy of curriculum studies, and its parental field, foundations of education. Historical precedent that gave birth to curriculum studies is one salient source for understanding origins of work on public pedagogy. Similarly, categories derived from the curriculum field can help frame emergent dimensions of public pedagogy.

Let us look first at precedent for public pedagogy in educational foundations and curriculum studies. Second, I consider the notions of *outside curriculum* (sometimes referred to as *non-school curriculum* or *out-of-school curriculum*) as early and parallel foci on public pedagogy. Finally, I set forth lenses, derived from curriculum studies, for illuminating public pedagogies.

Precedent

John Dewey (1916) clearly differentiated between schooling and education. Education, he claimed, should be defined as "that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p. 76). Dewey envisioned schooling as one dimension of public pedagogy wherein such reorganization could occur. He saw schools as miniature societies in which democracy and reconstructive individual inquiry might flourish. These hopes for schools as crucibles of educational and democratic life were sketched during his laboratory school experiment at the University of Chicago, 1896–1904 (see Dewey, 1899, 1902). Unquestionably, Dewey worried about the incapacity of societies that did not practice democratic values (or only gave lip service to them) to instantiate such schooling. In fact, by the mid-1930s, Dewey was convinced that the major culprit to democratic education that is built upon individual and communal interests with faith in their capacity for meaningful inquiry in their worlds of action had met a nearly ubiquitous obelisk of resistance: the acquisitive society. His call to overcome the pathos of greed that conceives acquisitive societies is sketched in his call for utopian schools in one of his many acts as a public intellectual, this time in the *New York Times* (Dewey, 1933). Later, striving alongside Boyd Bode (1938) to prevent attempts of well-meaning colleagues who were dedicated to progressive education from imploding due to internal conflict, Dewey (1938) urged them to look more deeply than merely focusing on the contentions that divided them, saying, "It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a

level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties" (p. 5). Despite Dewey's efforts, and those of Bode, to overcome the conflict among progressives—a conflict that hinged on whether primary focus should be on the child or on social reconstruction—the movement self-destructed. However, to place the blame solely on internal causes would ignore the centrality of Dewey's critique of acquisitive societies. The greed-filled ethos of acquisition had so thoroughly saturated the social, economic, and psychological milieu, that even then Dewey recognized that the essence of love, justice, and education had been corrupted by the propensity to transform even the most vital dimensions of human relationship into symbols of acquisitions, e.g., grades, test scores, diplomas, letters of recommendation, performance reports, certificates, licenses, and the like (see Schubert, 2009). Given this debased state of affairs, Dewey (1938) called for realization of the distinction between *education* and *mis-education* (pp. 37–38). He warned that schools too often are mis-educative—productive of discord rather than harmony, monotony rather than variety, and constraint instead of expansion (see Rucker, 1970, pp. 123–125). Values that mis-educate can be attributed quite readily to acquisitive society. Moreover, a call from outside the mainstream of academe captured the term *mis-education*, five years before Dewey's caveat, by Carter G. Woodson (1933) in what could be seen as a subaltern critique of racism, *The Mis-education of the Negro*. With roots in precedent tracing from Frederick Douglass (1845/1968) and W. E. B. DuBois (1903), Woodson's contribution firmly imbeds racism in acquisitive society. The need for protection of wealth by the *nouveau riche* was bolstered by racism. Realizing this from within White academic circles, George Counts (1932) simultaneously raised the question of whether school could create a new social order—clearly, meaning one that overcomes acquisitiveness, and perhaps racism—though the latter may give Counts too much credit. In any case, for substantial critique of racism we most likely should turn to African American scholars, who still remain far from fully acknowledged for their work on this matter.

Racism's accomplice, acquisitiveness, was directly assaulted by Harold Rugg (see Evans, 2007). Convener and chair of the renowned committee of curriculum scholars who met for several years to prepare an early definitive statement of foundational curriculum questions, Rugg (1927) and fellow scholars asked the following, among the 18 questions they agreed were central to *curriculum-making*:

> 3. Are curriculum-makers of the schools obliged to formulate a point of view concerning the merits or deficiencies of American civilization?
>
> 4. Should the school be regarded as a conscious agency for social improvement?
> a. Should the school be planned on the assumption that it is to fit children to "live in" the current social order or to rise above and lift it after them? Are children merely to be "adapted" to the institutions of current society or are they to be so educated that they will be impelled to modify it? Are they to accept it or to question it? (pp. 9–10)

Shortly after posing these questions for curriculum scholars and developers, Rugg decided to address students directly on these and related matters, without going through the *middlemen* of educational policy makers, school administrators, and teachers by writing actual materials to be used in classrooms. Rugg's (1929–1932) social studies curriculum was directly put into the hands of students, encouraging them to critique capitalism, the warfare state, and other bastions of acquisitive society, until conservatives caught wind of what he was doing, destroyed his books, and maligned his character. Rugg (1941) wrote of the aftermath in *That Men May Understand*, then devoted the rest of his career to research on the origins of human imagination in many cultures, published posthumously (Rugg, 1963). His purport, perhaps lay in the hope

that imagination was a key to societal reconstruction, was an early call to release imagination, a cause that Maxine Greene (1995) took up many years later. While Rugg's (1963) effort was to understand imagination as central to social reconstruction, it still smacked of one who was a product of a scholarly era that revered the empirical–analytic paradigm (Schubert, 1997, chapter 7). Greene, in contrast, derived her work from the arts, literary sources, pragmatism, phenomenology, existentialism, critical theory, postmodernism, and more. Transformations during the intervening years lend understanding to the emergence of public pedagogies within the milieu of *outside curriculum*.

Outside Curriculum

The idea of *outside curriculum* as we called for in the early 1980s (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980) and reiterated many times (e.g., Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002, pp. 499–500) was based on the necessary and neglected need to focus on curriculum, both implicit and explicit, in many kinds of educational situations. Dewey (1938) for instance, referred to *collateral learning* in order to highlight the fact that students learn much in addition to or apart from that which educators intend. Dewey's acknowledgment of the import of such learning derived from the social milieu of educational life. Others who emerged during the progressive education era have expanded on the need for students and teachers to construct their lives from their experience. Illustratively, L. Thomas Hopkins' emphasis on integrated curriculum draws from learners' experiences (1937), democratic interaction (1941), and both home and school as contributing to the emergent self (1954). Similarly, Harold Alberty (1947, 1954) advocated higher levels of core curriculum that he derived from the social lives of learners. Together, such works must be considered harbingers of later ideas about *hidden curriculum*. Philip Jackson (1968) is often credited for introducing the notion of hidden curriculum, now a diversely interpreted concept that continues to have a profound place in curriculum discourse over the years. Henry Giroux and David Purpel (1983) brought together previously published work that shed light on the hegemonic societal messages that life in schools purveys, while Jean Anyon's (1980) work in particular reveals starkly different curricula provided in schools for children of different social classes, showing that social class influence in society is a profound *curriculum* that shapes values and orientations. Together, the articles collected and presented in the Giroux and Purpel (1983) package pushed curriculum scholars to move their work to new venues (see Schubert, 2008), especially to outside curricula in society at large—specifically to cultures and communities, homes and families, peer groups and other relationships, non-school organizations (from churches to sports and street gangs), and the mass media (movies, television, popular music, dance schools, videogames, computers, and the Web).

Much of this was anticipated earlier as well, by scholars whose work was outside as well as within formal schooling. Surely Marshall McLuhan (McLuhan & Fiore, 1967) raised consciousness about the profound impact of media on human perspectives. Meanwhile, Bernard Bailyn (1960) had already called for educational history that portrayed a whole range of ways in which cultural creations are transmitted across generations, and Lawrence Cremin (1961) treated the history of progressive education not merely as a phenomenon of schooling but as a larger social, cultural, economic, and social phenomenon. Ivan Illich (1970), to whom Cremin (1976) later turned respectfully, critiqued school as no longer capable (if it ever had been) of overcoming its allegiance to its funding sources—states, churches, and wealthy individual and corporate sources of both—thus, proposing the need to *deschool society*. Society, Illich argued, was so entrenched in institutionalized (read Deweyan *acquisitive*) ways of life that it could not (perhaps never could) imagine outside the *prisons* that gave it structure**.** By *deschooling*, Illich hoped that

humans would be able to imagine and create new webs of learning that were public spaces not dependent on the brokerage of states, churches, corporations, and individual wealth. Illich's critique resounded loudly among curriculum theorists, and James B. Macdonald, Bernice Wolfson, and Esther Zaret (1973) responded—perhaps hoping that schools were loosely coupled enough that they could be revised. Their proposal to *re-school society* was not sufficiently applauded by the educational leaders within the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), by which it was published. These and other works by Macdonald (1995), Wolfson, Zaret, Greene, Dwayne Huebner, Paul Klohr, and a range of new curriculum scholars coordinated by William Pinar (1975), Janet Miller, Madeleine Grumet, and others forged new, reconceptualized forms of curriculum scholarship. Gatherings that were precursors to the Bergamo Conferences, beginning in 1973 and continuing today, have contributed greatly to curriculum that moved a significant distance from the sole end of providing wherewithal for curriculum development in schools. Paul Klohr (1980), formal and informal mentor to many of the new curriculum scholars of the 1970s and 1980s, characterized dimensions of reconceptualized curriculum theorizing as including the following: an organic view of nature; individuals as creators of curriculum knowledge and culture; preconscious experience; new sources of literature (e.g., phenomenology, existentialism, radical psychoanalysis, critical theory, Eastern thought); liberty and higher levels of consciousness; means and ends that include pluralism and diversity; political and social reconceptualization; and new language forms. The latter, perhaps, referred rather directly to both Joseph Schwab's (1970) language of practical and eclectic inquiry, and Dwayne Huebner's (1966) proposal to expand curriculum language from the technical and scientific to the political, ethical, and aesthetic.

At one such conference in 1976 in Milwaukee chaired by Alex Molnar and John Zahorik, featured speakers and respondents included Elliot Eisner, William Pinar, Dwayne Huebner, James B. Macdonald, Louis Rubin, Bernice Wolfson, Alex Molnar, Madeleine Grumet, and Ralph Tyler. Tyler reconsidered his widely-influential Rationale, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Tyler, 1949), a syllabus for curriculum development that grew from his experience as Director of Evaluation for the renowned Eight Year Study (Aikin, 1942; Kridel & Bullough, 2007). Tyler (1977) said that he would emphasize even more strongly two points: (a) the student as active social learner, and (b) the need to understand the non-school curriculum. The former is clearly Deweyan in tenor, and the latter speaks directly to the need to understand school curriculum in the context of other public pedagogies. Clearly, however, this is not to argue that Tyler wanted to emphasize the full range of curriculum discourses that would evolve to illuminate public pedagogies.

Nevertheless, when I combined Tyler's call for understanding non-school curricula with Cremin's (1976) explicit statement that held school to be one of many forms of public education, I felt challenged to formulate my own calls for curricularists to study *non-school* or *outside* curricula. In Schubert and Lopez Schubert (1981) we argued from teaching experience that if curriculum purported to be *for* students in any meaningful sense, it had to first be *of* and *by* them. This meant that it had to be based on knowledge of the experiences and perspectives they bring to any learning situation. As I pondered how such knowledge of outside curriculum could be conceptualized, I proposed conventional and alternative curriculum categories found in the literature (Schubert, 1981, 1982). Although I certainly do not contend that these writings had direct influence on contemporary works on public pedagogy, I do think that in certain small ways they contribute as part of a plethora of scholarship that moved the curriculum field from a focus on curriculum development in the institutionalized service of schools alone, toward pursual of curriculum studies (Pinar, 2008), to forge understanding of curriculum in the wide range of educational dimensions of society writ large. Such understanding embraces curriculum

as divergent and intersecting communities of discourse that include the following: historical texts; political texts; racial texts; gender texts; phenomenological texts; poststructuralist, deconstructed, and postmodern texts; autobiographical and biographical texts; aesthetic texts; theological texts, and international texts, as well as institutionalized texts, including curriculum development, and teachers and students as participants in schools (see Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995).

Emergence of Public Pedagogies

From my early proposals of outside curriculum to present, I have continued to advocate detailed exploration of diverse venues in which teaching and learning transpire; I consider these realms to be curricular. After reflecting on my previous advocacies to address outside or non-school curricula, there are many spaces that shape who any person becomes: home, family, culture, community, language, television, movies and other video, music, other arts, books and magazines, videogames, the Internet, peer groups, non-school organizations (scouts, sports, dance, theater, gangs, church, chat groups, music and art groups), work, and hobbies. This list only scratches the surface of the multitude of influences on any person. The point of such a list, however, is not to simply have an inventory of out-of-school curricular contexts; rather, as Carol Melnick (1992) suggests, it is to offer an invitation to researchers, teachers, and learners to inquire more fully into the life-scapes of one another. Let us consider some possibilities and a few examples.

Home and family. We need to know more about the home and family lives of students, particularly those of *subaltern* and *othered* backgrounds as Jose Marti (1979) and Chris Carger (1996, 2009) provide.

Culture. It is essential to understand the culture of *in-between-ness* that so many persons encounter in today's world of immigrant life, such as Ming Fang He (2003) illustrates through autobiographical and auto-ethnographic narrative.

Community. We need to understand that indigenous communities can teach much to so-called developed countries through grassroots postmodernisms (Esteva & Prakash, 1997) that help them escape the perils of state and corporate attempts to control them through schooling that purports to educate (Prakash & Esteva, 1998).

Popular Culture. We need more attempts to see the educational impact of popular culture, noting ways that such media as video games (Gee, 2007), and popular music and movies (Giroux, 1999, 2000; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 1997; Macedo & Steinberg, 2007) influence outlooks.

Non-Acquisitive Schooling. We cannot overlook valiant attempts to educate through schools by overcoming the fearful acquisitive machine. This machine's awkwardness sometimes allows opportunity to experiment with schooling to give learners opportunity for freedom and growth (Aikin, 1942; Ayers, 2004; Ayers, Klonsky, & Lyon, 2000; Klonsky & Klonsky, 2008; Kridel & Bullough, 2007; Meier, 1995; Michie, 2004; Neill, 1960; Noguera, 2003; Payne, 1996; Schultz, 2008).

To learn more about the many dimensions of life that shape human beings, one could tap literature from sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, history, philosophy, economics, biology, ecology, geography, political science, psychology—almost any discipline, sub-discipline, or area of study. Illumination of who we are, how we have become, and where we might be headed could emerge from inquiry into any realm of formal or informal knowledge. The emergent study of public pedagogy has revealed insights from many different sources—those noted above and more. I suggest that one source should be tapped to its fullest: curriculum studies. Even older

topics within curriculum development and design could be used productively to interpret and understand who we are as evidenced by what we consider worth knowing. I now suggest some categories that might help us *uncover* curricula of our lives. We hear entirely too much talk of *covering curriculum*, and I contend that we may do better to uncover the curricula instantiated in diverse public pedagogies that make us who we are. Doing so is clearly a prerequisite for deciding what curricular influences to reject, overcome, accept, and nourish.

Using Curriculum Lenses to Interpret Public Pedagogies and Outside Curriculum

If there is a basic curriculum question, it is simply: What's worthwhile? More elaborated, it becomes: What is worth knowing, needing, experiencing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, sharing, and contributing? One could read this question as prescriptive or interpretive. Prescriptively, it becomes a question of curriculum design. How can human beings be enabled to acquire certain knowledges, skills, and dispositions? Interpretively, it asks: How we have become as we are or even as we might be? Let us consider a few examples. We could imagine any particular realm of human experience as we read the categories developed by scholars sketched below. We could, for instance, think of a sport, a peer group, movies or a particular film, novels or a special author, a musical experience, a family activity—in short any realm of human experience that shapes becoming. One could consider it with broad or narrow strokes, relative to oneself or others.

Ralph Tyler (1949, 1977). What purposes, learning experiences, organizational patterns, and modes of evaluations implicitly or explicitly guide any realm of human experience? Do the purposes and other features reveal certain orientations to subject matter, societal values, or individual interests and predilections? Can experiences be perceived relative to vertical or horizontal organization? Is evaluation synchronized with purposes?

John Dewey (1902, 1916, 1933, 1938). Are interests of learners considered in initiating learning experiences? Do learners discover relevance of disciplines of knowledge and extant areas of study to their interests? Do they pursue such understanding both as individuals and as communities, and does democratic leadership flow among members of communities as different areas of expertise can be facilitated by different participants? Is learning experience continuously reconstructed as intended and unintended consequences of learning are explored?

Joseph Schwab (1970, 1971, 1973). In the constant flow of situations: Who are the teachers? Who are the students? What is the subject matter? What are the relevant milieus? How do teachers, learners, subject matter, and milieu interact with and influence one another? Are problems derived from a state of affairs rather than from agglomerations of decontextualized dimensions of different states of affairs? Does learning emerge from involvement and interaction in lived situations, rather than from detached induction about and deduction relative to situations taken *en masse*? Do learners gain understanding through discovery of situational specifics rather than through a quest for law-like generalizations? Is the end of inquiry to enhance decision and action rather than the mere amassment of knowledge for its own sake? Are learners afforded opportunities to learn by eclectically matching theories to situations, and when matches cannot be made, by tailoring, combining, and adapting theories and research findings to situational exigencies? Are learners given opportunity to build their own repertoires from situational experience to guide subsequent engagement in similar experiences?

Paulo Freire (1970, 1994, 1997, 2007). How do we enable ourselves and others to name the world, to read and write the world? How can we be hopeful and loving in oppressive times? How can we not? How can we dare to dream and keep the dream unfinished?

Maxine Greene (1965, 1971, 1973, 1978, 1988, 1995). How can we grow a private vision in public spaces? How can we grow such a vision anywhere else? How can we enliven existential encounters for all who teach and learn? How can we make the strange familiar and the familiar strange? How can we keep these questions alive in all landscapes of learning? How can we invigorate dialectics of freedom as lights in dark times (Ayers & Miller, 1997) and release the kind and quality of imagination that always utters, "I am…not yet" (Hancock, 1999; Pinar, 1998)?

Louise Berman (1968; Berman & Roderick, 1977). Where do we learn perceiving, communicating, loving, knowing, decision making, patterning, creating, and valuing? Extrapolating: What is the what, how, and why of whom we are becoming? How do these compare with learning in social studies, language arts, mathematics, sciences, the arts, and other typically taught subject matters?

Michael Apple (1979/2004, 1982/1995). Whose knowledge is considered worthwhile? By whom? How, where, and when? Who benefits from such consideration? Who is harmed by official knowledge?

William Pinar (1975, 2004; Pinar & Grumet, 1976). From where have we come? How do we experience our present? How do we anticipate possible futures with agency to create and re-create ourselves and our contexts? What do we honor and grow? What do we let go? What kinds of lives and communities do we fashion, and continuously re-fashion with personal and political consciousness?

An Imperative Conclusion

Clearly, many more scholars can be summoned to offer questions. Perhaps the central question, anticipated by many of the early progressives and carried forward by diverse pursuits in search of curricular understanding, can be stated simply as: How do I create a life worth living? Mary Catherine Bateson (1990) addresses this directly in her book, *Composing a Life*, wherein she maintains that the essential human quest is to improvise a life in the world. Understanding how this is done, or could be done, lies at the heart of the emergent literature on public pedagogies. Giroux (1999, 2000, 2003, 2006) is an exemplar, whose origins were in curriculum studies (Giroux, 1979; Giroux, Penna, & Pinar, 1981; Giroux & Purpel, 1983).

Contributors to this volume robustly expand explorations of public pedagogies. I feel that my own calls for attention to outside curricula move in a similar direction. Thus, I encourage those who address public pedagogies in multifarious ways to toggle back and forth between that realm and roots in curriculum studies to locate conceptual and practical insights that enhance their exploration.

The central point, as I see it, is to perceive more fully the great diversity of venues that shape who we have become, are becoming, and might become. Focus on curriculum and pedagogy in schooling alone presents a myopic view of what shapes human beings. Finally, it is crucial that individuals and grassroots communities see education as a search for who and how they are becoming—to see themselves as developers of curricula, *currere*, and public pedagogies as they more fully find who they are and hope to be. We cannot expect or allow the *grand acquisitors*—state or corporate—to do the job. Hope, something educators have to believe in, lies in varieties of pedagogy in and out of school, and from it can spring action that counters the rampant march of acquisitive globalization and new versions of manifest destiny that threaten survival itself (Chomsky, 2003; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2004; Schubert, 2009; Spring, 2004; Vidal, 2004). Through public intellectual advocacy and grassroots activism, we must encourage individuals and small groups to create their own curricula—thus, continuously recreating the curricula and pedagogies of their lives.

References

Aikin, W. M. (1942). *The story of the Eight Year Study*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
Alberty, H. (1947). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
Alberty, H. (1953). Designing curriculum to meet the common needs of youth. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Adapting the secondary school program to the needs of youth,* The 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (pp. 118–140). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 162*(1), 67–92.
Apple, M. W. (1979/2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
Apple, M. W. (1982/1995). *Education and power*. New York: Routledge.
Ayers, W. (2004). *Teaching toward freedom*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
Ayers, W. C., Klonsky, M., & Lyon, G. (Eds.). (2000). *A simple justice: The challenge of small schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Ayers, W., & Miller, J. (Eds.). (1997). *A light in dark times: Maxine Greene and the unfinished conversation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Bailyn, B. (1960). *Education in the forming of American society*. New York: Vintage.
Bateson, M. C. (1990). *Composing a life*. New York: Penguin (Plume).
Berman, L. M. (1968). *New priorities in the curriculum*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Berman, L. M., & Roderick, J. A. (1977). *Curriculum: Teaching the what, how, and why of living.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Bode, B. H. (1938). *Progressive education at the crossroads*. New York: Newson.
Carger, C. L. (1996). *Of borders and dreams: A Mexican-American experience of urban education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Carger, C. L. (2009). *Dreams deferred: Dropping out and struggling forward*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance.* New York: Metropolitan Books.
Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.
Cremin, L. A. (1961). *The transformation of the school*. New York: Knopf.
Cremin, L. A. (1976). *Public education*. New York: Basic Books.
Dewey, J. (1899, revised 1915). *The school and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
Dewey, J. (1933). Dewey outlines utopian schools. *New York Times*, April 23, p. 7. Also in Boydston, J. A. (Ed.). (1999), *The later works (1925–1953) of John Dewey (*Vol. 9, pp. 136–140) Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
Douglass, F. (1845/1968). *Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass: An American slave*. New York: Signet.
DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Signet.
Esteva, G., & Prakash, M. S. (1997). *Grassroots postmodernism: Beyond human rights, the individual self, and the global economy*. New York: Peter Lang.
Evans, R. W. (2007). *This happened in America: Harold Rugg and the censure of social studies*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope*. New York: Continuum.
Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.
Freire, P. (2007). *Daring to dream: Toward a pedagogy of the unfinished*. (Organized and presented by Ana Maria Araujo Freire; Translated by Alexandre K. Oliveira) London: Paradigm.
Gee, J. P. (2007). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy.* New York: Macmillan.
Giroux, H. A. (1979, December). Toward a new sociology of curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 37,* 248–253.
Giroux, H. A. (1999). *The mouse that roared: Disney and the end of innocence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Giroux, H. A. (2000). Stealing innocence: *Corporate culture's war on children*. New York: Palgrave.
Giroux, H. A. (2003). *The abandoned generation: Democracy beyond the culture of fear.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Giroux, H. A. (2006). Academic freedom under fire: The case for critical pedagogy. *College Literature, 33*(4), 1–42.
Giroux, H. A., Penna, A., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1981). *Curriculum and instruction*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Giroux, H. A., & Purpel, D. (Eds.). (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and the private vision*. New York: Random House.
Greene, M. (1971). *Existential encounters for teachers*. New York: Random House.
Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger*. New York: Wadsworth.
Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Hancock, M. (Producer). (1999). *Exclusions and awakenings: The life of Maxine Greene*. [Documentary]. (Available from Hancock Productions, 505 West End Avenue, New York, NY, 10024)
He, M. F. (2003). *A river forever flowing: Cross-cultural lives and identities in the multicultural landscape*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
Hopkins, L. T. (Ed.). (1937). *Integration, its meaning and application*. New York: Appleton-Century.
Hopkins, L. T. (1941). *Interaction: The democratic process*. Boston: D. C. Heath.
Hopkins, L. T. (1954). *The emerging self in school and home*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
Huebner, D. (1966). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In J. Macdonald & R. Leeper (Eds.), *Language and meaning* (pp. 8–26). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Illich, I. (1970). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.
Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.
Klohr, P. (1980). The curriculum field – gritty and ragged? *Curriculum Perspectives, 1*(1), 1–7.
Klonsky, M., & Klonsky, S. (2008). *Small schools: Public school reform meets the ownership society*. New York: Routledge.
Kridel, C., & Bullough, R. V. Jr. (2007). *Stories of the Eight Year Study: Reexamining secondary schooling in America*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Macdonald, J. B. (Ed.). (1995). *Theory as a prayerful act: The collected essays of James B. Macdonald*. New York: Lang.
Macdonald, J. B., Wolfson, B., & Zaret, E. (1973). *Reschooling society*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Macedo, D., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Media literacy: A reader*. New York: Peter Lang.
Marti, J. (1979). *On education: Articles on educational theory and pedagogy, and writings for children from "The Age of Gold"*. New York: Monthly Review Press (Essays and stories written by Marti between 1875 and 1900, edited by P. S. Foner).
McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2004). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
McLuhan, M., & Fiore, Q. (1967). *The medium is the message: An inventory of effects*. New York: Bantam.
Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem*. New York: Beacon Press.
Melnick, C. R. (1992). The out-of-school curriculum: An invitation, not an inventory. In W. H. Schubert & W. C. Ayers, (Eds.), *Teacher lore: Learning from our own experiences* (pp. 81–105). New York: Longman.
Michie, G. (2004). *See you when we get there: Teaching for change in urban classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill: A radical approach to child rearing*. New York: Hart.
Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Payne, C. (1996). *I've got the light of freedom*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1998). *The passionate mind of Maxine Greene: "I am…not yet."* Hamden, CT: Falmer.
Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Pinar, W. F. (2008). Curriculum theory since 1950: Crisis, reconceptualization, and internationalization. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion, (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 491–513). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
Prakash, M. S., & Esteva, G. (1998). *Escaping education: Living as learning within grassroots cultures*. New York: Peter Lang.
Rucker, D. (1970). Dewey's ethics. In J. Boydston, (Ed.), *Guide to the works of John Dewey* (pp. 112–130). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
Rugg, H. O. (1927). *Foundations of curriculum making*, The 26th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company.
Rugg, H. O. (1929–1932). *Man and his changing society* (vols. 1–6). Boston: Ginn.
Rugg, H. O. (1941). *That men may understand: An American in the long armistice*. New York: Doubleday, Doran.
Rugg, H. O. (1963). *Imagination*. New York: Harper and Row.
Schubert, W. H. (1981). Knowledge about out-of-school curriculum. *Educational Forum*, *45(2)*, 185–199.
Schubert, W. H. (1982). The return of curriculum inquiry from schooling to education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 12*(2), 221–232.

Schubert, W. H. (1997). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
Schubert, W. H. (2008). Curriculum inquiry. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion, (Eds.), *Handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 399–419). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Schubert, W. H. (2009). *Love, justice, and education: John Dewey and the utopians*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1981). Toward curricula that are of, by, and therefore for students. *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *3*(1), 239–251.
Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. New York: Peter Lang.
Schultz, B. D. (2008). *Spectacular things happen along the way: Lessons from an urban classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language for curriculum*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
Schwab, J. J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79*, 493–542.
Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum, *School Review*, *81*, 501–522.
Spring, J. (2004). *How educational ideologies are shaping global society: Intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, and the decline of the nation-state*. New York: Routledge.
Steinberg, S. R., & Kincheloe, J. L. (Eds.). (1997). *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Tyler, R. W. (1977). Desirable content for a curriculum syllabus today. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorik (Eds.), *Curriculum theory* (pp. 36–44). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Vidal, G. (2004). *Imperial America*. New York: Nation Books.
Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.