

Critically appraise the proposals for a post-modern curriculum outlined by Doll (1993) in his “A Post-modern Perspective on Curriculum”

YUEN Wai-Wa, Timothy
The Hong Kong Institute of Education

INTRODUCTION

Post-modern age is perhaps one of the most often-quoted and loosely construed concepts in recent literature. In terms of historical epoch, the ending of the superstitious and ruthless Middle Ages (5th-15th century) gave rise to the Renaissance (14th to 16th century) when humankind once again concerned about their earthly living, instead of just the afterlife. The ending of the basically backward looking Renaissance, the emergence of the French Mathematician Descartes and the English Mathematician Newton marked the beginning of the Modernist Age. In the name of Enlightenment, the obsession with numerical reasoning and scientific knowledge was granted almost undisputed approval. In the modernist paradigm, the universe was conceived as a clockwork order which runs in a linear, predictable and numerically expressed code. It was in this modernist era that industrialization was born and nurtured. The increased supply of commodities in return further buttressed the faith in the scientific, mechanistic mode of thinking.

No one ever gave an all-convincing reason for the demise of modernism. Certainly, the catastrophes of the world wars and the rise of quantum physics would have a part to play. No one ever gave a clear time frame to the post-modern age about when it first started though the general belief is that it coincides largely with the emergence of the post-industrial economy in which industrial production lost its predominance to the tertiary sector. Again no one ever spoke with unshaken certainty on the meaning of a post-modern culture.

Stephen Toulman (1982) aptly expresses that it is impossible to give an overarching definition to post-modernism as the movement is too new and too varied. On the other hand, Jameson (1991) tries to give some shape to this new paradigm by outlining the following characteristics: the absence of grand narratives, the valorization of discontinuity and individuality, the rise of consumerism, the supremacy of market mentality, the utter forgetfulness of the past, the celebration of heterogeneity, and the appeal to populism. The rise of this new age and culture makes inevitable the remolding of education which until recently dovetails only the modernist paradigm.

This article reviews Doll's proposal for a post-modernist curriculum. It is hoped that educators can reflect critically on the necessary attributes of post-modernist curriculums and how existing curriculums should be reformed to meet with the challenges that comes with the post-modern age.

CURRICULUM THEORIES IN POST-MODERN EDUCATION

Against the background of the new paradigm, a new breed of curriculum theories arises. Post-modern curriculum theories reject the modernist Tyler's model which suggests that aims and objective are external to the learning process, a physicists' obsession that the static objective truth is untouched by its spectators.

Pinar is one among the earliest proponents of post-modern curriculum construction. Varied though the movement is, it is clear that the attempt is to redefine curriculum according to its original meaning "currere". Currere refers to "run the racecourse"(Cheung, 1999). Modernist curriculum lopsidedly focuses on the racecourse but forgets the hinge of curriculum "to run". Post-modernist theories endeavor to reconstruct curriculum based on the running theme, thus respecting the emerging dynamic and relativist ontology. Following the "to run" axiom, Pinar (1988) suggests that curriculum should be organized around reflections.

Post-modern curriculum thoughts represent a wide array of different notions. Yet, three strands of thoughts can be discerned, each with its own emphasis and agenda (Cheung, *ibid*). Capra (1982) expresses the environmentalist concern about the antagonism and exploitation of modernist mentality. The emphasis is on reconstructing curriculum to build up a peaceful and ecologically friendly global village.

On the other hand, Apple (1979) expresses the concern about the mirroring of existing power relationship (class, gender and race) and dominant ideologies on the making of the curriculum. Bowles and Gintis (1976), on the other hand, pinpoint on social stratification. The concern about social inequality has paved the way to reforming the curriculum to ensure emancipation. Giroux (1994) expresses the need to educate students to be critical and to read critically to transcend the border and confine of the text.

Prigogine portrays the universe as a chaotic order, thus reversing the modernist cosmological conception of linear relationship, stable order and high predictability. Doll (1993) proposes that curriculum should be reconstructed to mirror the new paradigm. The post-modernist curriculum would need to be open, complex and dynamic in nature.

DOLL'S CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Doll (1993) outlines his proposal of post-modern curriculum and explains how it converges with the more progressive thinking in the turn of the century.

Doll (1993: 155) explicitly states that " My own educational vision centers around Rorty-Kundera Statement. There does exist a fascinating, imaginative realm where no one owns the truth and everyone has the right to be understood...we are dealing not with a reality already set out there for us to discover but with multiple ways of interpreting the echo of god's laughter." Doll (*ibid*: 156) then further explains " social, political, and human failures for which our century may come to be known: war, genocide, famine, poverty, enslavement, ecological devastation are all done under the aegis of rational thought and procedures, and in many cases with good intentions. However, it appears to me that these failures have all been based on unquestioning faith in a metaphysical reality...."

This couple quotations, spirit of which permeates almost every line of the book, reflects Doll's felt grievance against the harm done to humankind by the obsession with hard science, his aspiration to see the liberation of human minds and lastly and most importantly about the way how the complex cosmos should be interpreted.

In curriculum terms, Doll portrays the following principles:

To begin with, the curriculum should not be a rigid linear sequence of pre-set learning activities. Instead, it should be a matrix. There is no beginning or end nor rigid sequential order, not to say confining and restricting boundaries. It emphasizes actions and interactions of participants and interaction of foci.

The curriculum should emphasize a practical rather than a theoretical perspective. Teaching and learning need to be concrete and particular. The preaching of grand all-encompassing theories should be withdrawn in favor of theories grounded on practices which are able to handle the chaotic nature of the universe.

The curriculum should be jointly decided on by the teachers and students involved. This devolution of power put the trust on teachers and students to be best experts of teaching and learning. The shift in the locus of control further requests central curriculum guidelines to be broad and vague to allow the treasured flexibility. Down to lesson planning, the same principle should be followed by teachers to ensure due flexibility for conjoint planning. In talking about pedagogical relations, Doll even suggests that a curriculum at the beginning can evolve to become something different at the end, following students' choice and the discourses generated in class.

The curriculum should be based on recursive reflection. The consequences of the past can be taken as the problematic for the future. This can be a way to nurture the critical attitude and sense of community for the upcoming generations.

The curriculum should be based on self-organization of the learners. Self-organization comes from timely and appropriate perturbation, instead of the fake sense of stability and predictability modernist education conveys.

To facilitate the achieving of self-organization on which real learning and ability to survive in the post-modernist world depends, two conditions need to be met. First, the learning ethos should be one of joy and relaxation instead of one which is based on pressure and rush to learn. Second, the learners should be well versed with the learning materials. Revisiting the same materials from different perspectives would help to provide the richness in content that brings forth the desired cognitive transformation.

Teachers are suggested to give up their traditional authoritative role to become partners of the learners, as the first among the equals. The classroom is to transform from being a tightly controlled ward to one marked by self-discipline and communal spirit where critical attitudes are construed in a friendly and constructive manner.

Teachers should give up the moribund modernist view of epistemology where truth is absolute, static, external and can be ascertained by rational analysis. They should join hands with their students in exploring their version of truth in an interpretative, constructive manner, at critical dialogue with the text if necessary. In terms of cultural relations, perspectives across different cultures can help illicit the force necessary for us to go beyond the confines of our customary beliefs to other facets of the truth which can be interpreted in many respectable ways.

Evaluation should not be conducted for the sole purpose of selection and screening. It should be geared towards promoting interaction between teachers and students. Students should not be measured

against straight canon according to some sort of deficiency theory. Instead feedback from students should be respected as one of the many possible interpretations of a complex truth and discussed in a warm, communal way.

Last, but most important, is that curriculum should promote a new post-modern mentality. The essence of the mentality would be the dedication to pursue different interpretations and to explore new patterns and relations rather than to seek security in any dogma or orthodox as exemplified in the modernist mode of thought which degenerates to become a form of scientific superstition.

DOLL'S CURRICULUM AS A BREAKTHROUGH

To start with, we should have a clear conception about what a significant breakthrough represents. A major curriculum breakthrough is only worthy of the name if it meets the following conditions:

First, it is markedly different from the past, not just in its outward appearance but also in its nature and underpinning philosophy. Such differences make it a better fit with its time than its predecessor.

Second, it must be internally consistent and externally appealing to its audience.

Third, it must represent a form of significant improvement over the current mode of thought.

Fourth, it can be put to implementation. This implies either the curriculum dovetails the existing state of reality or it prescribes viable ways to overcome existing obstacles to its implementation.

Using the above criteria in my analysis, I deem Doll's curriculum theory for being a breakthrough in the post-modern epoch.

To begin with, Doll's curriculum is in line with the demand of the new era, whether one calls it post-modern or late capitalist age makes no difference.

Curriculum in the modern age is based primarily on the theories of Tyler. The model that arises mirrors the cosmological construct and demands of industrial societies. Thus, there is a set of pre-determined aims to be achieved, as in the universe truth is external to its spectators. No room is provided for individual differences in learning and no allowance is ever granted to personal choice of subject matter as students are input in the manufacturing belt and standardization is a must in the manufacturing process. It reminds one particularly the scene of dropping identically masked students to the blast furnace in Pink Floyd's "The Wall". Evaluation and assessment are much emphasized as quality control, in quantitative terms at least, is accorded high priority in a factory. Underlining this modernist curriculum notion are the philosophies: perennialism and essentialism. In either philosophy, the epistemology assumes that there is a static set of knowledge, which exists, independent of time rather than as a function of time. The job of the students, thus, is to learn such knowledge from their teachers and this will enable them to survive their future life.

What can be the social consequence of such a curriculum system? It depends. When the society is developing gradually and the demand of labor force is mainly diligence and compliance, there is a good fit between the society and the educational output. This is perhaps the case in the pre and early industrial period. However in the late industrial and post-industrial period, such a system is moribund. The human resources required in the tertiary sector of the fast-developing, information-technology-driven, post-industrial society are creative, adaptive and ever-learning personalities. The modernist curriculum system, which reduces the students to passive recipients of a fixed dose of knowledge, has become totally out-fashioned especially when knowledge becomes obsolete speedily.

Doll's curriculum proposal does not presume naively there is a fixed dose of knowledge which is necessary and sufficient for a life's time. The locus of control and motivation in learning is placed in the learners themselves. That's why there is the emphasis on activity approach and discovery method. There is in Doll's theory a clear post-modernist chaotic spirit of indeterminacy, a negation of any belief of everlasting truth. Put against curriculum practice, this results in the call for learners' own reflection as the core of learning and recursive exploration of subject matter as the means to facilitate the much-cherished reflection. To further reduce the repressive nature of schools and to enhance the impression of learning as a joyous process, teachers are to become learning facilitators rather than the authoritative fountain of knowledge and the dreadful whip of learning in the perennialist and essentialist conception. Students also are given a much greater autonomy in class and in choice of subject matter. Apart from the new epistemology and cosmology implied, Doll's curriculum proposal is distinctive for the personalities it works to construct. Persons who take learning as part of their living and engage actively in them with joy at heart. Persons who bow to no dogmas whatever big names that scaffold them. Persons who actively construct reality from own reflections. These, I venture to say with cogent reasons, are exactly the personality traits post-modern humankind should possess. These are the very attributes of the surviving species Darwin's nature will sort out in the post-modern ever- changing landscape. These are the nature of the very human resources post-modern tertiary sector of production would require. Coming back to the nature of the universe, there can be a never- ending debate about whether the cosmos has no orderly pattern. Some people say the Creator's hands always move in mysterious way. Some believe that the way the trajectory of the cosmos is far more complex than humankind formerly theorized, perhaps with far more variables involved and in a more evolving rather than orbiting manner. Notwithstanding, an inquisitive mind is needed for one who lives in the post-modern time if any classic, authoritative theory and scientific explanations can be insufficient and better metaphor can emerge. This permission to liberate the human minds is found in Doll's curriculum, which provides rooms for inquisitiveness and individual interpretations.

Does the new proposal appeal to educators in this new era? This is another criterion a breakthrough should meet as expounded in my preceding discussion. Tentatively, I am optimistic. Doll's curriculum proposal manages to integrate a number of leading educational thoughts emerging since the mid-twentieth century. The following strands of thoughts are clearly discernable in Doll's Curriculum Matrix.

Dewey's concern about student-centered learning

Students are active learners who are driven primarily by curiosity. A communal classroom with teachers as friendly facilitators is most supportive to students who learn through activities.

Bruner's concern about recursive learning

Students are to learn in a recursive way via a spiral curriculum which provides the students first a bird eyes' view of the subject and then a worm eyes' view of certain portion of the landscape. Successive revisiting of the landscape enables the students to master the subject matter as well as provide the best opportunities for the students to correct former misconception.

Piaget's concern about transformation

Students are programmed to develop by stages as ordained by nature. From infancy to adulthood, we pass

through the sensory-motor, pre-operational and then formal operational stage sequentially. The locus of control is thus inside a child rather than resting on the external agents, whom we call teachers. The job of teachers would thus be serving as facilitators of growth. Through providing stimulation and challenges in the form of disequilibrium, we help students to transform by enhancing and reforming their conceptual construct.

Prigogine's chaotic universe

It is protest against the simplistic, mechanistic Newtonian cosmology. The universe is seen as a complex entity which mere mathematical formula can hardly manage to decode. The linear relationship in the old worldview is seen as too complacent, taking the shape of superstition with hard science. The real world is one where things are hardly predictable, both in direction and magnitude. Grand theories are of little use to explain local phenomena which can be interpreted in different, yet equally respectable ways.

Doll not just manages to integrate the above said strands of thought, he also organizes them into a meaningful whole.

In his own criteria of a post-modern curriculum, namely rigor, richness, relation and recursion, the theses of Dewey, Piaget, Prigogine and Bruner become united, at least instrumentally. The recognition of a vibrant universe (Prigogine), marked by uncertainty and indeterminacy, has implied that a curriculum is rigorous only if it respects multiple interpretations and transformation of knowledge. This would result only if students are able to transform cognitively (Piaget) in a rich curriculum that inspires. Such a state of affair would arise only in a recursive curriculum that allows ample chances for reflections (Bruner). A curriculum based on cultural relation is most conducive. In such a curriculum where one can find a hermeneutic frame based on many local narratives, Dewey's dictums of a critical school community based on co-operation and interest finally make sense.

Doll's curriculum proposal is highly consistent, at least internally. Using building blocks as our analogy, Doll's proposed parts fit together with an amazing degree of neatness. The important building blocks I can see are as follows:

- (i) a universe only half known ,or worse, wrongly understood (original assumption)
- (ii) people need to be enlivened intellectually (due to i)
- (iii) teachers and schools cannot claim dogmatic authority (due to i and ii)
- (iv) students should be encouraged to reflect recursively and actively seek their own interpretation of truth (largely due to i, also to ii and iii)
- (v) examination and repression in schools should be played down (due to ii and iii)
- (vi) a critical but communal environment in school (due to ii, iv, and a natural development from iii)

Furthermore, if we compare Doll's curriculum proposals to the development of public education in the developed world, we find an amazing degree of congruence.

In the case of the United States of America, for example, the aims of education as stated in *Goal 2000*, specifies that elementary education would need to foster " competency in challenging subjects including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics... and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their mind well, so they may be prepared for citizenship, further learning and productive employment..." College/ University education would need to " increase the youth's ability to understand development in science and in society, to think abstractly and critically...and to make wise decisions...The world is changing rapidly. Many jobs rely on new technology and already require more brain power than muscle power...."

In the case of Japan, the 1995 Report on Education Systems spells out that primary and secondary education should seek to " foster life-long learning attitudes...enables children to experience the joy of learning and of discovering new knowledge."

In 1998, David Blunkett, Secretary of State for Education of the United Kingdom stated in the foreword of the policy paper *The Learning Age* that " We stand on the brink of a new age. Familiar certainties and old ways of doing things are disappearing. Jobs are changing and with them the skills needed for the world of tomorrow. In our hearts we know we have no choice but to prepare for this new age, in which the success will be the education, knowledge and skills of our people"

DRAWBACKS OF DOLL'S CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

In the preceding sections, Doll's proposal is lauded for its far-sightedness, internal coherence and ability to improve education quality in this new era. As implied, we are taking Doll's theory as practical rather than pure academic theory. As such, we would need to examine the validity and limitations of Doll's thesis on both theoretical and practical grounds.

To begin with, the focus of education in Doll's theory is students, to be more specific, students' choice, motivation, and potentials to transform themselves and the knowledge they learn. This moves broadly in line with the humanistic trend of our age. This assumption about human nature is basic to any educational philosophy such as naturalism, essentialism and the like. Yet, as the platform to action, we will have to come back to the most unwelcome question: " Can it be proved?" Even if I do not intend to dispute the axiom in its broadest sense, in theoretical sense at least, we should be aware of the fact that mixed or even contrary findings are equally available. Kohlberg, for example, points out that in the pre-conventional stage (up to about age 10 at least) children are guided by pain avoidance principle. If Kohlberg is right, it is doubtful whether for this age group the active, curious learners, who are able to transcend their existing limitations through voluntary, communal, and critical dialogue, would ever emerge as envisaged by Doll and Dewey. In Maslow's motivation pyramid, on the other hand, survival and security are much more basic to that of excellence and self- realization, the couple of terms so neatly associated with Doll's ideal personalities who challenge and expand the prevailing frame of cognition, even against those preached by their teachers. Even back to Piaget who has so inspired Doll in his curriculum work; it is most worth noticing that the stage framework in concern is a rigid framework at least with reference to age. Such rigidity, I regret to say, is a negation of the ability education has to transform what has been ordained by nature. To be as positive as Doll is in his curriculum theories about the effect of schools and teachers as learning facilitators, we may need to approach Vygotsky's theories instead.

In Doll's vision, the ultimate aim of a post-modernist curriculum would be to liberate human minds so that social and scientific realities can be studied, particularly in a multi-dimensional and multi-faceted hermeneutic way. Thus there is the call for communal and critical dialogue in the classroom while teachers discard their traditional authoritative outlook. Good as the intention is, especially considering the realization of the limitations of human civilizations (illustrated by the two world wars and the countless social upheavals since the coming of the modernist age), it becomes a matter of doubt whether our education can truly become liberating agent with the change in the delivery. The basic question now becomes practical: " whether existing school curricula have the breath that allows students to think freely and even divergently?" This is particularly relevant with regard to social realities, namely social

beliefs, values and institutions. To this, Giroux (1990) answers rather negatively. He points out that schools and curriculum are so dominated by the official ideology or prevailing way of thought that they can be rather confining, parochial and restraining if the aim is to search for alternative theories. Bowles and Gintis (1976) emphasize the role existing curricula play in replicating the class structure of the capitalist society as the children of workers are forced to believe the bourgeoisie values and culture so as to be docile workers as they grow up. Bourdieu (1976), in his analysis of cultural capital, concludes that schools only favor the children of the middle class as the children from the grass root are bound to fail in a curriculum so grounded on middle class value, manner and language. Sadker and Sadker (1985) consider the matter from a gender point of view and propose that education only work to ensure male hegemony by intentionally nurturing girls to become submissive and passive. Should the above propositions be true, Doll might never achieve what he wants with his curriculum proposal, as schooling is basically a class control instrument.

Apple (1993) explains the current trend of ideological manipulation " A new alliance has been formed, one that has increasing power in educational and social policy. This power bloc combines business with the New Right and with Neo-Conservative intellectuals. Its interests are less in increasing the life chances of women, people of color, or of labor. Rather it aims at providing the educational conditions believed necessary both for increasing international competitiveness, profit, and discipline and for returning us to a romanticized past of the ideal home, family, and school...With the growth of post-modern and post-structural literature in critical educational and cultural studies, however, we have tended to move too quickly away from traditions that continue to be filled with vitality and provide essential insights into the nature of the curriculum and pedagogy that dominate schools at all level. Thus for example, the mere fact that class does not explain all can be used to deny all its power. This would be a serious error."

If education we inherit from the modernist era is ideologically biased, what should be implemented so that education can free our minds in this post-modernist era? Recent literature is rich with suggestions on how to improve existing curriculum with regard to content and pedagogical issues.

Giroux (1990, pp. 32-53) expresses the notion of a border pedagogy. Giroux explains " That is a form of engaged practice...calls into question forms of subordination that create inequalities among different groups as they live out their lives. Likewise it rejects classroom relations that relegate difference to an object of condemnation and oppression, and it refuses to subordinate the purposes of schooling to narrowly defined economic and instrumental considerations. This is a notion of critical pedagogy that equates learning with the creation of critical, rather than merely good citizens."

Accordingly, against the ideal Giroux (ibid) expounds that such border pedagogy should:

- i) offer the students opportunity to engage the multiple references that constitute different cultural codes, experiences and languages and developing a critical view of authority. (as a counter text)
- ii) disrupt traditional meaning and helps develop new forms of identity, including political, racial, class and gender identities etc. (as counter memory)
- iii) require teachers to possess a theoretical grasp of ways in which differences are made through various representations that marginalize subordinate groups and thus in the course of their teaching, students can give voice to how their past and present experiences. (as politics of difference)

Largely Swartz (1996), who wrote on the idea of emancipatory pedagogy, shares this view. Swartz (ibid) expresses " Emancipatory pedagogy is a process of teaching and learning that involves the use of multiple ways of knowing, being and behaving that contest and reconstruct dominant patterns of knowledge formation, dissemination

and perpetuation in schools...Emancipatory pedagogy is process of centering students and teachers in ways of teaching and learning that are based on posing and solving of problems.... Emancipatory pedagogy takes fundamental interest in equity and social justice."

Analyzing from another angle, Ciardiello (2000) brings forth the importance of enhancing students' critical questioning as part of the new multi-dimensional literacy in the 21st century. Ciardiello (ibid) explains that " The case for student-questioning training is based on the changing nature of literacy in the 21st century. The emergence of electronic and technological literacy has led to multi-faceted views of knowledge and different perceptions of the world." On the other hand, Sparzo et al. (1998) differentiates between knowing that (knowledge by description) and knowing how (knowledge by acquaintance) in the curriculum. It is believed that existing curriculum has come down mainly on knowing what and focus mainly on adding information. Truly empowering curriculum, it is proposed should: a) have purposeful, meaningful context (e.g., presenting information so that it can be organized, having students work on long term projects); b) helps students make connections and organize information and c) give students powerful conceptual tools to organize their knowledge (e.g., compare-contrast matrices, learning strategies, and critical thinking approaches).

Apart from the preceding review which focuses primarily on curriculum design, it's worth our attention to examine the issues of bureaucratization, social ethos and logistic support, areas Doll seemingly has ignored notwithstanding their practical significance.

We inherit from the modernist era not just educational practices, but also a bureaucratic educational structure. Curriculum changes, such as those proposed by Doll, would need to go down the huge bureaucratic web, often imbued with old conceptions and ethos, to reach the students and have impact. Midway downstream, the original design of curriculum changes might have been lost or filtered into something hardly recognizable to its originator(s). Even if the original design successfully reaches the schools, appropriate logistic arrangement and teacher training might be lacking to ensure a satisfactory outcome.

Regarding social ethos, it should be borne in mind that any educational reform like Doll's curriculum proposal can succeed only if there is favorable response from final users, especially students and parents. The more a reform deviates from the past, the higher is the risk of resistance due to inertia. This is particularly true if no extrinsic advantage can be seen and the conventionally held belief is threatened. Doll's proposal best exemplifies such a change as it tries to put up a completely new landscape in education where what parents learned as axioms in their days as students no more apply. Thus, teachers no more ensure good behavior and right beliefs in a conservative way. Examination pressure, the prime reason to learn, is withdrawn. Youngsters become less submissive and more challenging to existing values. Parents might not warmly receive all these and even students might find it difficult to adjust to their new roles.

What then is implied with reference to Doll's proposal? Either Doll spends thought on supportive socialization and structural change of the education system and the decision making apparatus, say in the direction of parental education and democratization, and specifies the way ahead, or that I would deem that no viable way to clear the hurdles has been accounted for. This, as spelt out in my preceding discussion, is one point how a curriculum proposal should be evaluated.

Last, but not the least, Doll's curriculum structure should be better discussed with reference to its implication on course structure. A curriculum of no definite beginning and end entails an open school system and a highly flexible course structure. It implies a highly complicated educational landscape with a credit course structure that can transcend

time. Such a structure is probably based on transferable credits recognized across institutes within the same country and even between institutes across the state borders. A curriculum matrix can be realized only if such a flexible structure can be successfully planned for.

CONCLUSION

Doll's curriculum proposal has been reviewed with regard to the coming of the post-modern age. It definitely represents one of the major strands of thought which is based on the assumption of a chaotic universe. As a theory, it is laudable for its internal consistency and for being appealing. It has the merits of being able to map out a new landscape of education, which liberates the human minds to explore the complicated universe the Creator ordained. However, such a new educational landscape would not surface, at least in the way Doll envisaged, unless more consideration is spent on substantiating the proposal, taking into consideration particularly the modernist structure present educational enterprise was established. A post-modernist curriculum can only emerge if all stake holders of education: curriculum planners, teachers, teacher educators, parents and students etc. can develop a culture of reform and have both a vision of the future and the courage to overcome obstacles in order to ensure that curriculum can dovetail the needs of the new age.

References

- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. (1993). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense? *Teachers College Record*, 95(2), 222-241.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1986). *Education under siege*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1976). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In R Dale (Ed.) *Schooling and capitalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bowles, C. A., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Capra, F. (1982). *The turning point: Science, society and the rising culture*. New York: Bantam.
- Ciardello, A. (2000). Student questioning and multidimensional literacy in the 21st century. *The Education Forum*, 64, 215-222.
- Department for Education and Employment (U.K.) (1998). *The learning age- a Renaissance for a new Britain*. UK: Author.
- Department of Education (USA) (1996). *Goal 2000*. USA: Author.
- Doll, W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Giroux, H. (1990). *Curriculum discourse as postmodernist critical practice*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: product or praxis*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Kenway, J. (1995). Having a postmodernist turn or postmodernist angst. In R. Smith & P. Wexler (Eds.), *After postmodernism: Education, politics and identity*. London: Falmer.
- Macpherson, E. D. (1995). Chaos in the Curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27(3), 263-279.
- Morrison, K. (1995). *Habermas and the sociology of knowledge*. (Unpublished PhD thesis with the University of Durham).

- Morrison, K. (1998). *Management theories for educational change*. London: Paul Chapman.
- National Council on Educational Reform (Japan). (1996). *Report on education system/educational reform*.
- Pinar, W. (1995). *Curriculum theorizing*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (1985, March). Sexism in the schoolroom of the 80's. *Psychology Today*, 54-57.
- Sparzo et al. (1998). Educational problems for the 21st century. *Contemporary Education*, 70(1), 4-13.
- Swartz, E. (1996). Emancipatory knowledge : A postcritical response to standard school knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 14(4), 394-417.
- 張文軍 (1999)。《後現代教育》。台北：揚智文化有限公司。