

Notes on the Relationship Between a Field and Its Journals

William F. Pinar
University of Rochester

As I begin to discuss THE JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM THEORIZING and its relationship to its field, I realize that I speak in a different voice than when I discuss autobiography as a mode of curriculum research or when I describe and propose the reconceptualization of curriculum studies. When engaged in these latter activities, I am a partisan, to some extent. That is, I feel a loyalty to the point of view I am proposing. My stance tends to be argumentative. However, the present assignment elicits another voice. The loyalty here is to the field itself, regardless what theoretic and methodologic direction it may take. As is clear, I have opinions regarding that direction, but these are suspended for this occasion. Today I speak in the "base-line" way in which we are allies, not only colleagues. We can agree here; we are speaking of our commitment to the field in which we were trained, in which we work, and the future of which is inextricably linked to our individual futures. We share this investment and commitment to the curriculum field, although we may not share ways of expressing that investment and commitment. Partly this is because our field is in what Kuhn terms crisis; partly it is the healthy and perennial condition of dissension.

I acknowledge that the Kuhn material has been misused and overused. Part of the lasting criticism of it has been the facility with which opposing points of view have appropriated the concept of "paradigm shift" to support contrasting positions. And there is the considerable controversy regarding Kuhn's vague and shifting use of the concept "paradigm." This important criticism acknowledged, there are aspects of the Kuhnian view of the history of science -- and by extension the history of any field -- that are not only true, but useful in discussing the relationship of a journal to its field.

One invaluable insight is the political character of field formation and disintegration. The conventional and usually publicly-expressed view tends to be that a field proceeds rationally, according to the logical power of certain arguments. The image is of relatively emotionless, high-minded men (only a few women allowed) deliberating over various ideas, their own self-interests absent, deciding logically which ideas warrant further study and which do not. Kuhn, as well as our experience, tells us otherwise. Yet acknowledgement that scientists and academicians generally are not especially selfless, and in fact employ a variety of non-rational strategies to advance ideas they prefer (usually advancing their careers also), has caused very heated controversy. Many are shocked and angered that someone, namely Kuhn, could suggest such a thing. This response strikes me as odd, given that even superficial participation in a field discloses the profoundly political character of its movement.

Recognizing this political character is not equivalent to endorsing it. In my view it is regrettable. To the extent we allow our differences to be settled non-rationally, through political maneuvering, is the extent to which we diminish not only our field but our individual intellectual energy as well. It is facile and inescapably anti-intellectual, for instance, to ignore a new thinker, simply refuse to respond, and by so ignoring her, attempt to dispel her. One safeguards the status quo, and conserves one's energy, by refusing to engage with

another. It is entropy. Such reliance upon political means -- she is not invited to speak at conferences for instance -- ensures intellectual parochialism, guarantees a static field. It is understandable that the "old boys" wish to protect their position, and explains why paradigms *shift* rather than *melt* gradually into each other, why a field goes into crisis when a dominant paradigm loses majority support rather than gracefully proceeds to new paradigms. The old boys hold on to their field as long as it is politically possible, and many would rather see the field die than give it over to the next generation. Thus, when the *ancien régime* does fall, it falls hard, and possibly the field does die in the ensuing power struggle. Awareness of the complex psycho-political dynamics of a field's internal process is important, not in order to legitimate these dynamics, but to assist us in becoming more rational in our participation in the development of our field.

It is obvious that the curriculum field is now, and has been for maybe twenty years (though this number is arguable) in a period of breakdown, or in Kuhn's terms, crisis. In fact, it has been near death for at least ten years as two prominent theoreticians have noted, Schwab in 1970 and Huebner six years later. Every field, Kuhn tells us, goes through such periods in its history. A dominant paradigm -- a shared sense of what our work is and how we are to conduct it -- is missing, and without a conceptual center several inchoate points of view vie for center stage. If a field passes through this period successfully, it will settle on some small number of these for a time. At the least it will agree which points of view are major, which are minor, and which are not to be considered further.

At the present time in the curriculum field's crisis period, a majority of scholars and theorists cannot so agree. A majority cannot even agree upon a characterization of the crisis, witness the controversy surrounding my writing on the notion of reconceptualization. Whether the curriculum field will resolve its present crisis is, in my mind, an open question. It may not, and may simply pass from the scene altogether. There is some evidence to support this, and several prestigious schools of education are deleting the designation from the appropriate departments. Many curriculum faculty at less prestigious schools tend to ignore, astonishingly enough, the debate, i.e., the contemporary discussion of the crisis, and they remain with curriculum ideas, such as the Tyler rationale, which are embarrassingly dated.

These questions -- will the field survive, and if so in what form -- are finally not merely interesting questions for me. I am invested in the field's survival, and I will experience relief and pleasure at the resolution of the present crisis, even if that resolution does not include in it continuing and serious investigation of autobiography as method and theme. This realization returns me to the initial reflection this topic elicited, namely that one feels a loyalty to one's field which is more basic than one's thematic and methodologic loyalties within that field.

What is the relationship of a journal to its field? In times of consensus or normal science as Kuhn terms them, it seems it is primarily a servant. Its function is to print the best work available, and the determination of "best" is not problematic, as the majority of researchers share the same vision of their work and its advancement. In a time of crisis, the relationship is somewhat more complicated. True enough, a journal must remain faithful to the field and its point of view, for if it strays too far from mainstream perspectives, or even from the tradition which is in decline, it will not have a readership. Yet, because the tradition no longer controls the field, because it is clear that one of the now-nascent points of view will someday become the new tradition, constitute the paradigm (that is if resolution occurs at

all), the journal can choose to ally itself with one or more of the nascent and competing points of view. Thus it will print, and this is so for THE JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM THEORIZING, work according to two or more sets of criteria of quality. Of course, should these ideas of quality fade from the scene so will the journal, unless it shifts emphases accordingly. This fact underscores my view that, even in times of considerable fluidity, a journal remains, if it is to survive, a servant of the field. Perhaps I can portray this relationship more completely if I briefly discuss what I see as the position of the journal editor.

This position is a dual one; it contains elements of servant and leader. He is servant to the field insofar as he must publish, to some extent, the mainstream dialogue of the field. Obviously, he has some freedom to choose what he prints, and possibly it seems to those of us who have had manuscripts rejected, he has considerable and arbitrary freedom. Yet, further reflection reveals that he must remain intellectually loyal to a significant number of colleagues, by printing work they agree is important, else lose the journal's readership. For this reason I see the basic relationship between a journal and its field, between the journal editor and his field, as primarily servant to master. In times of "normal science" or consensus, this relationship is more stable than in periods of crisis, but the relationship fundamentally is unchangeable.

In a time of crisis the editor can choose to ally himself and the journal with one or more points of view. One factor in the resolution of the crisis, and the predominance of one perspective over another, is the power of publication. The power to publish is part of the power to define the dialogue of a field, as what is printed becomes historical record in libraries, to be studied by graduate students, i.e., prospective disciplinary participants. Again, this power to publish is sharply circumscribed according to the interests of journal subscribers. A field cannot be hijacked by extremists who print in their journal only their own point of view. Such partisans, who demonstrate by their exclusivity their self-interest and unwillingness to converse with their colleagues, may survive over a period of time, but the lack of a broad constituency will eventually ensure they are not included in what we may call -- tongue in cheek -- the new coalition government. Those who constitute the mainstream, even if that mainstream is not conceptually coherent, maintain a kind of veto over their field's direction, simply by political strength of numbers. Thus, in a period of crisis, a journal and its editor may exercise some leadership; however, this leadership is carefully circumscribed by the intellectual limits and political power of his mainstream colleagues.

I want to stress that I do not view the process of change (and more specifically the crisis resolution) as exclusively political. It *is* logical. As well, it is psychological and economic, but even the briefest consideration of these aspects is beyond the scope of this obviously limited exposition. These matters could well be the subject of several studies, studies which would not only provide helpful information to us attempting to navigate our way through the present crisis, but as well would contribute to our knowledge of how fields -- nonscientific fields which to my knowledge are virtually unexplored from a Kuhnian perspective -- resolve crises and go through change generally. The role of the journal in this complex process is a modest and primarily passive one.

* * *

In the remaining moments I would like to shift my comments considerably, from the more generalized focus of the preceding to a more concrete focus upon THE JOURNAL

OF CURRICULUM THEORIZING itself. We are interested in three orders of work: theory, history, and criticism. While distinguishable, these categories overlap.

Historical work we see as important for the commensensical reason that it makes more discernible the origins of the present situation. As well, the history of the field is interesting in its own right, regardless its use in understanding the present. Criticism I see broadly as assessment of both historical and contemporary trends in curriculum theory and practice. As is the historical, the critical voice is primarily a scholarly one. That is, it carefully portrays others' work, and through argumentation, appraises that work. The third order of work, the theoretical, is by its nature less scholarly. Its emphasis is the construction of new points of view, not "new" in the sense of being unconnected with past and present perspectives, but new insofar as it aspires to extend these views. You note that I am not employing theory in any scientific sense. A scientific sense of theory is of course warranted in the field, but it is of little interest to me. I am interested in theoretical work that is intellectually experimental, and which is born in study characteristic of the humanities and the arts. Because our field has not been a scholarly field, many of us are presently preoccupied, and rightly, with standards of careful scholarship. Such persons I see as working in the historical and critical modes of research. However, there need to be, if our field is to advance, those of us who abandon such caution, refuse to be intellectually conservative. We must, if our field is not always to lag ten to twenty years behind avant garde work in the other disciplines, be willing to intellectually experiment, and create points of view for which there are no exact precedents. Only by such risk can we hope to offer important leadership to our colleagues in the university and in the schools. I have been deliberately vague about the meaning of the theoretical, partly due to considerations of time, and in order not to stipulate in advance what form this work will take.

To honor these interests THE JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM THEORIZING will publish all three orders of work. We will do so in essay and book form. The books we intend to publish will be of high scholarly and theoretical quality, but given their subject matter are of insufficient financial promise to interest commercial publishers, or of too limited focus to interest university presses. The first book appeared in the issue preceding this one. It is John Schwartz's comprehensive study of objectivity and the work of Harold Rugg. As you know, Rugg is just now beginning to receive the serious attention his importance to the field merits. The Schwartz study is particularly timely as it examines a question -- objectivity -- which is of at least peripheral concern to most of us. Further, Schwartz connects Rugg's work and the methodologic issues which preoccupied him as a curriculum writer and theorist, to the contemporary scene. Further publications include Leonard Berk's interesting study of biography as a mode of curriculum research, the proceedings of the 1974 Xavier, the 1975 Virginia, and the 1978 Georgia State conferences, and my own recently-completed study of life history and educational experience. We anticipate publishing approximately two books a year in this Rochester Series in Curriculum Theory, History, and Criticism.

One difficulty I see in the field at present is the lack of occasion for scholars and theorists to address each other. It is something of the nature of curriculum and of other Education subfields for university faculty to address their work to schoolpeople. Texts tend to be written for those who will enroll in curriculum courses. This is necessary, but it does tend to

restrict dialogue among university researchers. It tends to keep the work more introductory, as one is forever introducing the few principles and concepts which have accumulated over the years to a new audience each term. Often, the university educationalist speaks in a popular, journalistic mode to present preoccupations of school personnel, and ignores his own theoretical interests. The result is the "trendy" quality to much curriculum writing. Not until university curriculum faculty are willing to work with themselves as well as with school personnel will any curriculum knowledge and methods of lasting value be formulated. To further this development, the journal will sponsor a series of conferences, possibly yearly, expressly held to offer university faculty the occasion to speak explicitly to each other, to consider the question of the field, and its advancement. The first meeting will be held this fall in north central Virginia, at the Airlie House. The opening address will be given by Professor Theodore Brown of the University of Rochester's Department of History. Brown took his Ph.D. with Kuhn at Princeton, and he will offer us a generalized model of how fields -- such as curriculum -- pass through crisis and change. Other speakers will be selected from those proposing papers.

Depending upon financial success, we are interested in establishing THE JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM THEORIZING Foundation, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to the advancement of curriculum studies. In addition to publication of the journal and sponsoring conferences, the foundation would offer faculty study grants and graduate student fellowships for advanced study of curriculum. Finally, the Foundation would consider, as its financial condition permitted, hiring a lobbying unit to argue in Washington and elsewhere for the importance of curriculum studies.

The extent to which these proposals are realized depends, as my earlier comments make evident, upon the interests of the majority of you.

A Curriculum Journal and Its Field: A Question of "Genre"¹

William A Reid
University of Birmingham, England

JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM STUDIES was first published in 1968. One issue in that year and two in 1969 constituted volume one. Annual volumes of two issues continued to appear until 1977, then in 1978, following on a change of publisher, the number of issues was raised to four. The Journal is now in its eleventh volume and its format is little changed from that of the first issue in 1968. At the outset, it was handled by an editor and assistant editor based in Birmingham University. I became Assistant Editor in 1971 and continued in that position until 1975 when, consequent upon a reorganisation of the editorial team, my title was changed to European Editor. At that time editors were also appointed in North America and Australia. This reorganisation was perhaps the only manifestation of a definite editorial policy. This was to build the character of the Journal as an international publication rather than a British one. Our feeling was that Curriculum Studies could claim academic status only if it produced a literature that was relevant across national boundaries. The analysis of papers received and published in the period 1971-1976, which I shall discuss in a moment, appears to show that the Journal has always accepted a higher proportion of articles submitted from overseas than from the UK. A further element of policy expressed in the early days of the Journal -- to encourage the publication of articles by teachers in schools -- was never successfully implemented. Later in the paper I shall speculate on the reason for this. Otherwise the policy of the Journal was quite loosely framed and criteria for the assessment of papers, other than purely technical ones, such as length, were never published. Papers for publication have, in the main, been chosen from unsolicited contributions. We have not adopted an active stance toward the solicitation of papers, partly because it has not seemed to be a high priority in terms of available time, but mainly because we wish to avoid having to take papers because we feel an obligation to do so, rather than publishing them on the grounds that they meet criteria that seem important to the editors.

This question of "criteria" seems to me to be a central one in any discussion of how a journal relates to its field. In the case of the JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM STUDIES decisions have been exercised according to a process of "informed judgment" by editors, or editors working with referees. They have not been consciously articulated, except in relation to specific papers under consideration. Consequently, in order to discover and review them, it is necessary to analyse these individual reports. Before I describe this process, it should be noted that the editorial team has been very stable since the Journal was launched. Philip Taylor has been editor and executive editor since 1968, and I have worked with him for the past eight years. Ian Westbury has made a major contribution as North American Editor since 1975, and he had been well known to the existing editors for some years before that. In preparing this paper I undertook an analysis of editorial reports on submitted papers from the beginning of my association with the Journal until 1976, when the character of editorial decisions began to change in some ways because of the appointment of

overseas editors. During the period under review 400 papers were submitted and 77 accepted for publication, a rate of 19%.² 292 papers were of UK origin, with an acceptance rate of 15%, 43 from the US and Canada (40%), 25 from Africa (mostly from Ghana) (20%), 17 from Australia (35%) and 23 from other sources (Europe, Israel, India, West Indies) (26%).³ What I have done is to extract from the editorial reports key words relating to the overall evaluation of papers rather than to technical matters. I have then amalgamated these into groups and checked back through the protocols to see how frequently the criteria were invoked in relation to a sub-sample of about 50 papers. The categories of criteria are set out in Table 1.

The process is a rough and ready one but it does show up some interesting points that I myself was unaware of, or only dimly aware of. The first is that negatively evaluative key words outnumber of corresponding positive ones by a factor of about 4 to 1. In other words, we seem to be much clearer about the characteristics of papers that are not suitable than of those that are. The exception to this is the criterion that papers be readable and clearly written. In this case positive and negative mentions are about equal. Otherwise, the main

Table 1

General Criteria of Evaluation of articles submitted to JCS, based on a sample of editors' reports (1971-6) (Excludes technical comment).

Positive evaluation

Negative evaluation

A. Overall Impression

1. Coherent	***	Lacks unity/aimless/repetitive
2. Substantive	***	Obvious/parochial/ignores fundamental issues
3. Honest/acknowledges limitations	**	Assertive/pretentious
4. Well informed	*	Vague/naive
5. -----(N)	*	"Official" style/mass produced

B. Content

1. Has general implications	**	Lacks general interest/too technical/discipline centered
2. Original	**	Second hand
3. Has point/message	*	Unfocussed/lacks (view)point
4. Balanced	*	Over ambitious
5. Topical	*	----- (NN)

C. Style of Argument

1. Arguments are related to evidence/methodology	***	Assertive/lacks exemplification inappropriate style of argument
---	-----	--

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| 2. Thought through | ** | Alternatives not considered/lacks definitions/simplifies/confuses "is" and "ought" |
| 3. Objective/analytical | * | Hortatory/didactic/anecdotal |

D. Style of Writing

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| 1. Clear/readable | *** | Dull/obscure/jargon-ridden |
|-------------------|-----|----------------------------|

*** Above average occurrence

** Average occurrence

* Below average occurrence

(N) The positive end of this criterion is not mentioned in the reports, but is established in the following discussion.

(NN) Lack of 'topicality' is never mentioned as a ground for rejection.

positive requirement appears to be that published articles should be "coherent", "substantive" and "original" -- and these are categories which require definition. We shall return to them later.

A second interesting finding, which I was not before fully aware of, is that, provided papers are clearly written, the most important consideration relating to their acceptability is something that might be called "overall impression", and that the criteria under this heading could be thought of as applying as much to the *author* as to the *paper*. "Overall impression" is a kind of general judgmental verdict which is to quite a degree independent of the content, style of argument, or technical soundness of a paper,⁴ and labels such as "coherent", "substantive", "honest", "well informed" could as well be applied to people as to what they write. I think it is certainly true that, in judging contributions to JCS, we are making judgments about authors even when they are totally unknown to us -- as is usually the case. The implication of this is that we do not see Curriculum as a field where the goals of knowledge production are so well understood, or the "critical tradition" so widely agreed upon that criteria of judgment should be applied to the content of writing rather than to the person who produces it, as might be the case in a Physical Science field. We treat Curriculum as a contested field where the importance of a statement hinges on the authority of the person making it, as revealed in the writing, rather than as a unified field where the credibility of a statement has to be based on how closely it reflects the application of a known truth strategy.⁵ It could also be inferred that this kind of personalized judgment shows that we see the field as one which deals not so much in cumulative knowledge, as in shifting perspectives which have to be argued for as the social and political contexts within which curriculum questions are discussed change over time.

What exactly is meant by words like "coherent" can be approached by trying to see what negative evaluations stand opposite them. This is to a large extent an intuitive process, though sometimes reports explicitly make oppositions: "*I found this lacking in coherence, it is aimless and repetitive, etc.*" The idea of "substantive" seems to relate in a general way to the

quality of thinking that has gone into a paper, just as the category of "thought through" does this in more specific respects. A substantive paper is one that carries weight because the author is aware of the fundamental issues that underlie his position. Even if he does not deal with them in detail, at least he lets us know that they exist. Building on that awareness, he goes on to present a case which tells us something that we could not easily have discovered for ourselves, and, finally, that case is explicated in ways that tie in back into fundamental issues and do not leave it at the level of purely local interest. To use a criterion of "coherence" is to imply that what is looked for is an *argument*, a "thesis", if you like, which is concerned to make a point rather than simply to report findings, create an impression, conduct a review, or whatever. In making the argument the writer should show himself "honest" -- he knows where the limitations of his data, his method or his style of argument lie -- and "well informed" -- he knows what other people have said and done, he is familiar with the particulars of the situation within which the argument is developed. This discussion extends the idea of "authority" and ties it into a particular "genre" of writing.

The idea of "genre" is, I think, an important one for Curriculum Journalism. My view is that we have a relatively narrow area of manoeuvre where policy options are concerned, and that that area is delimited by what people are willing to submit in the way of papers. To an extent, their actions are determined by what a Journal calls itself. If it says it is a Journal of Curriculum Studies, then presumably that is a signal to authors whose interests lie in that field to send their papers to us. My own impression is that this is only "trivially true". Authors, in the UK at least, tend to be more interested in the academic standing of journals and in the "genre" of papers in which they deal. The reason what these are more important considerations is because they are what determine the odds that a paper will actually get published. No one, here or in the UK, is compelled to send a "Curriculum" paper to a "Curriculum" journal. Curriculum writing can be found in the HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, SCHOOL REVIEW, TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, COMPARATIVE EDUCATION, to name but a few. All of these are journals which are readily accessible in libraries, and most of them sell in larger numbers than any specialist curriculum journal. "Genre" and "academic standing" are related concepts, though they are not unidimensional concepts. "Standing" depends on your preferred reference group. One of the characteristics of writers on curriculum (here too I refer mainly to the UK) is that they tend to have multiple reference groups--a fact which can create problems for journal editors. Altogether, then, the question of "genre" might be a key one in understanding how curriculum journals work and how they relate to a field of academic endeavour.

The clues we have picked up so far lead us to three propositions about the preferred "genre" of JCS. There is relatively little concern with a close definition of suitable content, there is a valuing of personal style, and there is a demand for coherent, well-informed argumentation.⁶ I could see these preferences as having a number of sources. First of all, there are rather simple practical ones. One assumes that, in a journal which until recently appeared only twice a year, and has a broad, but rather indeterminate audience, there is a need to provide variety in an issue (JCS has never produced a 'theme' issue). Hence, articles should be reasonably short -- ten pages, perhaps--and should use that scope to present a balanced but limited argument -- not be "over ambitious". Another practical point is that one risks too

much by being over restrictive on content. Would, for example, a Journal of Curriculum Research, yield enough papers to make it viable? Another source lies in the academic biographies of the editors. The two who have worked longest with the Journal have both published quantitative research, but came to that from an education within the humanistic traditions of English universities which emphasise essay writing and careful scholarship. The third source is the editors' view of the field which is on the one hand eclectic, but on the other concerned to cultivate modes of thinking and research which are objective and analytic. The "genre" does owe a lot, perhaps, to the English tradition of essay writing within humane disciplines which is exemplified in a field like History. The style of argument is expected to be carefully related to evidence, to be appropriate to its subject matter, to be objective; but the result is expected to be an original statement with a clear point or message. A "Curriculum" essay is different from a History essay in having a stronger normative function--that is, its argument is likely to be policy-related, at some level,⁷ -- and in using opportunities to incorporate quantitative data where these help to make a case.

I am inclined to think that this idea of the "essay" provides the missing category to balance "*official style/mass produced*". An "essay" is a personalized thing, not something that uses an "approved format" or comes off a methodological conveyor belt. Nevertheless it is not a "trip"; it is somewhere anchored in publicly ascertainable data of experience, experiment and research.⁸ It is a rather finely balanced art form which leans in the direction of daring (it should not be commonplace, dull or parochial), but at the same time of safety (it is objective and "thought through"): only people who have some experience of the high wire should attempt it--otherwise they risk over ambition and an abrupt descent into pretentiousness and obscurity.

Now, one should not run away with the idea that what I am suggesting is that the notion of "genre" is strictly applied and that only "essays" get published. Firstly, one could point to papers which have been published in the Journal which are very far removed from that style. Sometimes, this is in situations where other criteria take over. For example, in the period under review, we printed three very short empirical research pieces from Ghana which had none of the characteristics of the "essay". The reason for this was that, as part of our policy of seeking contributions from countries other than the UK, we have, from time to time, taken papers that we might not have published if they had been submitted by domestic authors. In that particular instance, our interest resulted in a spate of papers of the same type, rather than an extension of the range of submissions into areas that we found more interesting. Hence our African acceptance rate turns out overall to be no more than average. Secondly, the articles that interest us range from those well in the "essay" part of the spectrum to some well outside it -- research reports or case studies. What I am suggesting is not that the preferred "genre" acts as a model, but that it acts as a source of criteria of acceptability that are applied in varying degrees according to the character of submitted papers. (It is interesting that the Journal has created sections entitled "Research", "Case Studies" and "Reports" outside its main section of articles. Ostensibly, this is in order to encourage the submission of papers which have these kinds of slants, but one wonders whether this decision does not also function as a means of applying non-standard criteria to some papers while at the same time not relaxing the conventional ones for main section articles.)

A further caveat to enter, is that what I am putting forward, although it has some empirical basis, is essentially a insider's interpretation of what is happening. Those with a less

biased viewpoint must look at what is actually printed and determine how far the declared criteria match up with the actual style and content of printed papers.

But if there is some substance in my analysis (and the fact that it alerted me to things which I had not thought about previously, but which seemed on reflection to match the reality of the editorial process suggests there is) the question that has to be asked is, what do the Journal and the field of Curriculum gain or lose by the application of such criteria? If, as I have suggested, the question of criteria can be summed up in terms of a preferred "genre", then there are conservative implications for the Journal and for the field, in so far as it influences it, in spite of an apparent de-emphasis of specific content, which would seem to point in the other direction. First of all, there is the conservatism implied in the fact that the *form* of statement we are encouraging excludes many other possible forms. Accepting that Curriculum is a policy field, and that the presentation of cogent positions may be a more important element in its literature than the accumulation of funded knowledge, it is not clear that the well argued essay is the only form in which this character can be expressed. Thoughts on curriculum can be pointed, substantive and coherent even if they are only a few lines long, they don't have to run to 5,000 words (though "essays" do because one learns to write them by writing them for a grade, and no one gets a passing grade for a paragraph). Nor need they be in prose, or even in words. If our criteria have never been put to that kind of test, it is because we have given clear signals about the boundaries of our preferred "genre", or because no one with Curriculum interests uses "non-standard" registers of expression? Secondly, there is the conservatism that results from the fact that only experienced writers can fulfill the requirements of the "genre". How can you be aware of fundamental issues, provide suitable exemplification and analyse a full range of alternatives if you are a student? Yet, as a student you may be closer to and have a better feeling for certain aspects of Curriculum than an experienced researcher, or a well read theorist. (Here we may, or may not have the key to why an original declared editorial policy of publishing material from teachers failed to stick: is it that teachers do not write the kinds of things we would like to publish, or is it that they do not write at all? We suspect it may be the latter, but we don't know).

On the positive side, one might point to the fact that it is good for a journal to operate with a consistent set of criteria for the selection of material, and that there could be advantages in keeping these at the level of "informed judgment", so that they can, without undue difficulty, be applied to be a wide-range of kinds of contributions. Though there appears to be a "genre" that hold the centre stage, nevertheless, inspection of published papers shows that it can accommodate itself to occasional quite substantial deviations from what should count as "orthodox". And, in a field where there is so little consensus about appropriate theories, arguments and research strategies, the mode of "operational judgment" may be fairer to authors than a set of tightly defined categories which are not easily adapted to papers of very different types.

A perusal of ten years of the JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM STUDIES does show a remarkable range of papers. Some might reply that from Beethoven's quartets to Mahler's Eighth Symphony is also a wide range, but it doesn't get us out of classical music, or out of the nineteenth century. However, there would seem to be very good reasons why new fields, if they exist and are profitable, should be opened up by new journals rather than existing ones. The field of educational journals is immensely variegated, and there is ample scope

for small journals to test out a field in a cyclostyled form rather than launch into a fully fledged journal format. CURRICULUM INQUIRY started life that way, and JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM THEORIZING is starting the same road now. This seems to be the right way to cater for the needs of Curriculum scholars, teachers and students: to pursue the model of the corner store rather than that of Macy's. The ecology of the Curriculum Field (nice title for an essay if someone wants to pick it up) seems to me to be one suited to local adaptations rather than to an attempt to design an all purpose animal to exploit it.

Two final points are in order: first, my analysis, for reasons of my own limited perspective, ends at the time when a North American Editor became an important member of the team. His perceptions are needed to bring the picture up to date. And finally, anyone who enjoys infinite regresses could have fun applying the criteria of Table 1 to this paper.

FOOTNOTES

1. I am grateful to Gail McCutcheon for perceptive comments on a draft of this paper.
2. This figure of 400 includes papers resubmitted after rewriting.
3. No note was kept of the country of origin of rejected papers, so I have had to rely on memory. Only about 6 papers are doubtful, and the UK total may have been inflated by that amount.
4. Though Table 1 does not include technical considerations (mainly because they are so particular and diverse) these were noted in the course of the analysis.
5. Compare K.E. Shaw, "Paradigms or contested concepts". BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY, 7, 1976, 18-24.
6. To anticipate one of the reservations to be made later, the degree to which one would expect these preferences to be reflected in any given paper would depend on the author's purpose in writing it.
7. The difference is one of degree. It can be argued that the humane arts always do have a normative aspect, though this is often muted. *"If they are to retain their distinctive character and to be capable of constituting a peculiarly humanistic subject matter (the humanistic arts) must not be merely factual or descriptive but normative."* (R.S. Crane, THE IDEA OF THE HUMANITIES, etc., University of Chicago Press, 1967, p. 168).
8. Though how "trippy" it gets to be, may be interestingly related to the perceived "substance" of the author.