Chapter 30
No Royal Road: Mapping the Curriculum for Lifelong Learning

Malcolm Skilbeck

All natures by their destinies diverse,
More or less near unto their origin;
Hence they move onward unto ports diverse
O'er the great sea of being, and each one
With instinct given it which bears it on.

(Alighieri and Longfellow 1890)

Introduction

'Curriculum' in its ordinary usage refers to learning content and processes which are structured, organised, timetabled, taught and assessed according to institutional requirements and expected outcomes. This is curriculum in the formal setting of school, college, university and so forth. Through a variety of elaborations and distinctions, the understanding of curriculum has been extended: the intended, the constructed, the experienced, the hidden and so on. Common to all of them is the institution which provides the setting and exercises authority over the learning. In this sense, schooling in one form or another is the primary vehicle or instrument of curriculum (Oakeshott 1971; Skilbeck 1984).

There is another sense of curriculum, however, as in the term curriculum vitae (c.v.), meaning an account of the course over time of a person's learning, achievements, attributes, interests and qualifications. A feature of the c.v. is what has been learnt and achieved over time, not only in formal educational institutions, but in other spheres of life. 'Curriculum' thus refers both to a course of study and to how one has spent time in ways that are perceived to be productive and of worth. In both cases, there are explicit and implicit educational standards and values, according to

M. Skilbeck (✉)
Independent researcher and writer, P.O. Box 278, Drysdale, VIC 3222, Australia
e-mail: malcolm.skilbeck@deakin.edu.au

D.N. Aspin et al. (eds.), *Second International Handbook of Lifelong Learning*,
Springer International Handbooks of Education 26, DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-2360-3_30,

which judgements are made – about the courses of studies and how people undertaking them have used their time, their opportunities for learning.

In this chapter, both senses of 'curriculum' will be brought to bear on the idea of lifelong learning conceived of as a process of mapping and construction, both personal and social. Initially, in childhood and into early adulthood, the curriculum is largely mapped and constructed for the individual learner by social means, and through the educational institution. Thereafter, the responsibility becomes more diffuse, with a key role for the individual learner, drawing upon a wide and varied array of sources, cultural and social. Beyond schooling in the broad sense noted above, the curriculum is largely mapped by the learner, interacting with a range of social agencies: employment, societies, clubs, libraries, museums, galleries and, increasingly, the world-wide web.

Much of the literature that deals with directions being taken in policy and practice, together with desirable futures for lifelong learning, builds on but extends beyond the teacher – institutionally directed approach. Its strengths are acknowledged while arguments are advanced for greater diversity of opportunity and freedom from constraints, whether personal or social. The formal educational institution, yes, but also the worksites, the home, community organisations and associations and so on have been singled out in a wave of national and international reports on recurrent, continuing lifelong learning from the 1970s and into the first decade of the twenty-first century (Faure et al. 1972; Cochinaux and de Woot 1995; Bjarnadottir et al. ca 1995; European Commission 1996; OECD 1996; Delors 1996; Coffield 1997; Ministry of Culture, Education and Science, The Netherlands 1998; Department of Education and Science Ireland 2000; Rubensen 2001; MCEETYA 2002). How to plan, finance and provide for all of this are complex policy issues, many yet to be resolved. Issues of access, equity, partnerships between government and the voluntary sector, personal responsibility and ways of establishing society-wide learning pathways must be resolved if lifelong learning for all is to become a reality.

The curriculum issue is not, however, just one of institutional provision, workplace learning, community settings or programs of continuing professional education, important as all of these are. Whereas for institutional and professional settings, it is the relevant authority that determines the parameters of the curriculum (whatever scope there may be for individual choice and creativity within or as an outreach from it), lifelong learning for all requires a broader understanding of curriculum mapping, conceived of as a process whereby individual learners creatively and critically engage with subject matter and situations in a continuous, lifelong journey. This entails a range of personal capabilities and interests – the ability to search for information, to collaborate with others, plan and design learning tasks, monitor and evaluate progress and an inquiring mind. Naturally, these requirements of the rational mind tell only part of the story. Of fundamental importance is an emotionally attuned disposition to see life as a voyage of discovery and personal fulfilment through continuous learning. To differentiate this learning from mundane or everyday life, people will need some sense of its educational worth and value, with criteria for appraising its worth. This means learning which is purposive and structured.

Of course, not all depends on individual dispositions and values since, increasingly, people are being required or find it necessary as adults to address formal

learning requirements, for example, on-the-job training, professional upgrading, obligations of civic life and meeting administrative requirements which require that learning skills and capabilities retain currency. Much of this involves mutual or shared responsibility.

Lifelong learning has an ineluctable and growing social function; no less, it is a creative process of self-fulfilment for individuals. Thus, of particular interest is how this personal dimension of lifelong learning might be framed through a systematic analysis of a lifelong curriculum with roots in a reformed schooling. As yet, curriculum planning, design and development with this idea of learning for a fulfilling life, throughout life, have received relatively little attention. Lifelong learning for all people is still an aspiration or a prospectus for the future.

The Curriculum Challenge of Lifelong Learning

Schooling in the Educative Society

Translating the ideals of universal lifelong learning and establishing policy frameworks into action which meets the needs and interests of society as a whole pose massive challenges. The belief that the next great wave of educational reform and development will incorporate lifelong learning in some systematic way for everyone is of the same order as the commitment in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to universal, compulsory schooling and its progressive extension from a few years of childhood to encompass the adolescent years and beyond. The schooling model – an expression that encompasses beliefs, assumptions, structures and programs of formal education from childhood into adulthood – is highly developed and will remain an integral part of universal lifelong learning. Restructuring and reshaping will be required, however, if it is to continue to serve as a vital foundation and point of reference. The difficulties facing reformers seeking changes in schooling and setbacks encountered have been extensively documented both in historical studies and contemporary research. There is much to learn about the complexity of large-scale educational reform (Bennis et al. 1969; Cremin 1961; Connell 1980a; Goodlad 1984; Huberman and Miles 1984; Cuban 1990, 1998; Sarason 1990; Tyack and Tobin 1994; Miles 1998; Fink and Stoll 1998).

The lifelong learning challenge is in some ways greater than that facing nineteenth century reformers and governments. On the one hand, it calls for rethinking many aspects of schooling and, on the other, there cannot be reliance on a single kind of institution – school, college, university. Sources as wide and diverse as the employment sector, health and welfare agencies, voluntary and community bodies, arts and sports organisations, museums, galleries and libraries and all levels of government, from local to national and including intergovernmental organisations must be drawn on. Indeed the enterprise of learning, universal and over the whole life cycle, is inconceivable unless society itself becomes educative and the culture of society embraces education as one of its primary values for the whole of life. It is as much a matter of developing social capital as intellectual capital, of elevating human values as raising

skill levels (Putnam 2000; Hager and Halliday 2006, Chs. 1 & 2; Aspin 2007). The contemporary expression 'learning society' or the older 'the educative society' point towards a goal – quite remote in some parts of the world, more nearly approached in others – still to be realised anywhere (e.g. compare UNESCO 2005; OECD 1995).

While the scope and scale of the challenge today is greater than when national school systems were being established, the resources are greater and the experience of more than a century of universal schooling is a substantial asset to draw upon. Notwithstanding their limitations as an adequate foundation, and the difficulties to overcome in reforming them, the institutions and processes of schooling in the generic sense of institutionalised, formal education provide an indispensable pillar of universal, lifelong learning.

Even so, reservations have been expressed about 'the schooling model' and undue emphasis on the formal sector generally. To introduce the notion of a curriculum for lifelong learning on the analogy of schooling might thus seem to beg some questions. After all, the school curriculum, or that of colleges and universities, is tied to the institution and its authority and has better served the interests of some groups – or classes – in society than others. The outcomes of schooling have not advanced the interests or met the needs of all learners. Moreover, many adults, including those who reached creative heights in adulthood, have themselves rejected schooling or found it profoundly inadequate. Nobel Prize novelist Thomas Mann was not alone among creative artists, scientists and business leaders in saying, 'I despised school, scorned it as a milieu, criticized the manner of its leaders, and early on found myself in a kind of literary opposition to its spirit, its discipline, its methods of obedience training. I had to look elsewhere for my education, that is, in the sphere of the intellect and literature' (Kurzke 2002, pp. 22–23).

Yet, in his writing, Thomas Mann expressed qualities which lie at the heart of the ideals and values of schooling, if not always its performance: mastery of expression and communication in language, empathy with the problems and dilemmas of others, imagination and creative thought and a breadth of knowledge and understanding. It is not the school as such that has failed, but there has undeniably been failure, of particular institutions and those responsible, to live up to declared aims and values.

As one of the greatest social and cultural inventions, schooling provides the strongest foundation for universal lifelong learning, despite its shortcomings. Obviously parental care and nurture are fundamental as is the social experience of life in communities. The school is the only institution, however, designed for the systematic educational care and development of everyone over the years from childhood into adolescence, and adulthood. Its impact is extended over the formative years and its values and procedures are central to growth of the whole person. The curriculum of schooling at primary, secondary and tertiary levels needs to be reconceptualised as the educational foundation of universal lifelong learning.

The importance of primary and secondary schools in providing curriculum foundations for lifelong learning can be illustrated by considering ways in which school curricula have been designed and modelled beyond the kindergarten years. The specialisation at tertiary level requires a rather different approach.

Curriculum Models

Modern curriculum theorising has traversed a wide territory, including: the social and political choices in policies for schooling and their implications; autobiography and personal narrative as ways of framing the experienced curriculum; systems theory as an analytic tool; and, post-structuralism and post-modernism as ways of challenging older ideas about structure, sequence and continuity in the curriculum.

A wide range of social, philosophical and psychological aspects of curriculum planning, design and development, and their consequences for learning, have come to dominate curriculum studies, providing insights for future action (Short and Waks 2009, passim). At the same time there is value, in the context of curriculum mapping, to recall earlier studies of typical ways in which schools, colleges and universities have organised subject content and ways for students to study and learn (Taba 1962; Smith et al. 1950).

Subjects and Syllabuses

The most familiar of the ways of structuring or modelling school curriculum, often either defended or attacked as 'traditional', is the curriculum planned, organised, taught and examined as both discrete and inter-related subjects or their derivatives. Subject matter is organised through syllabuses, texts and other learning resources, tests and examinations. Subject references are to mother tongue, both written and spoken ('literacy'), mathematics ('numeracy'), science – nature study – environmental education, history, geography and civics, arts and physical education. The accretion of subject matter has led to subdivisions, combinations, 'credit units', the designation of 'pathways' and guided student choice. Throughout, the defining characteristic of the curriculum is the prescribed subject of study, with or without 'optional' subjects. Most apparent, at the secondary stage, where study of some grouping of these subjects is a requirement for all students, the subject model also colours the primary curriculum notwithstanding looser structures and innovative methods of teaching, and tertiary education.

A common defence of the subject-based curriculum is that its purposes and structure are clear and that its elements serve as the starting point of a journey, developing skills and strategies and providing tools for future as well as present learning (hence the essentiality of 'literacy and numeracy' at the primary stage). Furthermore, the subject-oriented curriculum is justified as an introduction to major domains of human knowledge and experience, or ways of knowing the symbolic systems which are themselves defining features of civilisation and humanity (Cassirer 1944; Langer 1953; Cassirer 1953–1957; Phenix 1964):

- Language
- Literature
- Mathematical reasoning

- Science
- Art
- Music

Closer analysis of these domains draws out their potential value in developing inquiry, reasoning powers, problem solving, imagination, insight, empathy, enjoyment, happiness, spirituality, personal values, health and social solidarity. In short, they have been elevated into the structure of civilisation itself and the constituents of a good life for those who have immersed themselves to the full. In some settings, notably the undergraduate programs of American colleges and universities, these realms, forms and domains have been drawn upon in designs for general education (Keller 1982). More often, in the secondary school, they have been reduced to an assembly of discrete subjects.

Criticisms have been made of the subject-oriented curriculum as a model for universal schooling – and therefore as an adequate foundation of lifelong learning for all. Difficulties arise for many students, in that the subjects they study and the elevated reaches of the symbolic systems are too remote from their everyday life and interests. Because the connection is not seen or is of no interest, the potential richness of dialogue and encounter is not realised. The subjects of schooling are often seen even by successful students as something to leave behind, or they linger as a fading memory. Hence, the nostalgia of 'the good old school days' or the unreflective belief that the essence of schooling is, and should remain 'the basics' or the distinct subjects set out in the syllabus and as constituents of the weekly timetable. Nevertheless, the immense potential of the subject-centred curriculum, reshaped to connect with the everyday life of students, is one of the strands for a curriculum of lifelong learning, woven into a fabric of continuing personal growth and fulfilment. This is a particular challenge for tertiary education where a combination of specialisation and fragmentation is widespread even where the values of a broad general education are proclaimed.

The Activity Curriculum

A second form or structure of the school curriculum which provides, at its best, a strong foundation for lifelong learning is the so-called activity curriculum, developed in opposition and as an alternative to the subject curriculum but capable of being integrated with it when, in the words of American philosopher John Dewey, the subjects are treated as 'working resources' for the educator (Dewey 1916, p. 214).

By 'activity' is meant the present and continuing activity of the learner or, better, the interactions between learners and teachers and among the whole group of learners and their teacher(s) drawing upon wide, diverse and often adventitious subject matter and the experience of the class. By contrast, the subject curriculum derives primarily from prior human knowledge and experience, structures and domains which have evolved and been established through centuries of discoveries, inventions and creations, distilled through analysis, texts, formulae, code and symbolic

systems into the distinct languages of the 'disciplines'. Through this coding, quite precise and detailed subject content can be specified and taught and student learning assessed and measured accordingly. The activity curriculum, by contrast, resembles flux, a continuous creation (Smith et al. 1950, Part Four 'Patterns of Curriculum Organisation'; Kliebard 1978).

The activity curriculum is a fluid, flexible construction, a becoming rather than a being, which cannot be fully mapped in advance but is being continuously developed through the experience of learners and teachers together. Its roots are less obviously in the subjects of the subject curriculum but they are not disconnected since the content of the activity necessarily draws from and draws together subject matter which is linguistic, mathematical, scientific, historical, ethical, and so on. Importantly, this subject matter also includes the students' own experience, ideas and values. The origins of 'activity' is in psychological theories of learning, the insights and critiques of a long line of educational critics and reformers from Comenius, Rousseau, Froebel, Pestalozzi, Herbart and on to present day philosophers and psychologists interested in the processes of inquiry, creativity and criticism in the growth of knowledge and understanding. There is also, through John Dewey, a connection with the Darwinian theory of evolutionary adaptation, involving problem solving and constant interaction with the immediate environment.

Of particular interest for lifelong learning is the orientation of the activity curriculum towards the interests and experiences of the learner, individually and in groups, and the opportunities for the learner to interact with, shape and modify the immediate environment, that is, everyday life. The starting point of learning is, as it were, present in immediate experience, conceived of as providing momentum for inquiry and open to interrogation, hence to reflection. In this way, the activity curriculum is a challenge to the 'formal'/'informal' learning distinction. It is formal in that it developed within and for the formal structure of schooling and is mapped progressively and retrospectively against learning criteria including those derived from subject content mastery. The activity curriculum is 'informal' as a curriculum of spontaneity, dialogue, active engagement with immediate life issues and reflection. These features are well brought out in a historically rich and diverse array of educational programs and ideas ranging from J.-J. Rousseau's Emile to contemporary examples of school life as a context for informal citizenship learning.

The activity curriculum relies on the (outstanding) qualities of the teacher and a learning–teaching regime which is at once highly structured, flexible and responsive to changing needs and interests. In the early stages of its development, the activity curriculum gave rise to numerous innovations and experiments collectively referred to as 'the new education' (Boyd 1930). They include: the project method, the Dalton and Winnetka schemes, and schools such as the Chicago Laboratory School and progressive schools in the USA, Europe and Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Belgium, Germany and many others (Rousseau 1974; Makarenko 1955; Pinkevitch 1929; Ferriere 1927; Cremin 1961, Ch. 8 'The Changing Pedagogical Mainstream'; Connell 1980b, Ch. 10 'Individual Development and Social Reconstruction'; Scheerens 2009).

Except in the schooling of young children, the momentum of 'the new education' was not sustained in the later part of the twentieth century, due to difficulties in

realising the demanding requirements of the activity curriculum, and a changing political and economic landscape together with waves of academic and popular criticism. There are, nevertheless, legacies in primary and middle schooling that are relevant to policies and programs for lifelong learning. Perhaps most important of all is that the focus of curriculum thinking moved from the subject or prescribed learning tasks to student encounters, dialogue, interactions and the processes of negotiation and inquiry. For lifelong learning, beyond the security and structure of the institutionalised curriculum, this is of immense significance, summed up in the slogans 'learning how to learn' and 'learning to be'.

Core curriculum

A third pattern of organisation of particular interest for mapping the curriculum of lifelong learning is the core curriculum. In some manifestations the core is a particular way of organising the subject curriculum, whereas in others the emphasis is on student activity and social inquiry. In popular educational parlance and as currently used by government departments and agencies and often by schools themselves, 'core' is another word for the syllabus of compulsory, timetabled subjects. With associated age-based standards of performance and testing of outcomes, as measured by students' test results, this is the meaning given to core in the large-scale changes in schooling introduced in England and Wales late in the twentieth century, in a number of American states, Australia and other countries where concerns about international competitiveness became a dominant policy motif. In this meaning of the core, subjects normally include mother tongue, a foreign language, mathematics, science and history, with a variable penumbra which might extend to geography, civics, art and physical health education.

'Core subjects' or 'core learnings' have been similarly defined in many countries, such that 'core' is equated with compulsory subjects, syllabus and textbook-based instruction and formal examinations as opposed to 'elective' subjects where student choice can be exercised. Notwithstanding efforts made by teachers to encourage an inquiry mode of study or active engagement with social issues and students' declared interests, this form of core is highly prescriptive, with the stamp of authority of the state, the institution, the syllabus, text and examination.

Teachers are commonly required to teach to the syllabus of the core subjects and, while variations and divergence play a role, there is an 'essence' of required learning over which schools and teachers have no discretion. Core curriculum is in these usages highly formal – pre-planned, structured by expert views about the nature of systematic knowledge, its scope, sequence and distinctive features (concepts, modes of inquiry, ways of testing validity, etc.) and capable of translation into precise and measurable performance tasks for students.

The very wide political, professional and public currency of this highly prescriptive concept of 'core curriculum' presents considerable difficulties for an alternative

concept of core which, introduced into American educational thinking following the Second World War, is of considerable theoretical interest (Smith et al. 1950). This more critical approach to core curriculum is of potential value in mapping the curriculum of – or for – lifelong learning.

Among the interesting precursors of this alternative concept of 'core' is the so-called 'social foundations' movement in American educational theory post-Second World War. This movement was grounded in philosopher John Dewey's ideas of human experience as socially interactive, and education as a continuing process of reflection and reconstruction of that experience (Dewey 1920/1948, Ch. IV 'Changing Conception of Experience and Reason'; Dewey 1925, Ch. 1 'Experience and Philosophic Method'). Taking as a cue the role of schooling as an agency of cohesive social participation and renewal, theorists mainly at the universities of Columbia and Illinois developed the idea of a core curriculum framed by social values and directed towards social issues and problems and their resolution. This development, in the aftermath of devastating wars, reflected a deep concern over nineteenth and twentieth century irrationalism (or suprarationalism), endemic conflicts, social injustice and inequality, but also the fracturing of society into classes and self-serving special interest groups. More generally, the social core is a response to the idea of schooling as itself a form of democratic social life, leading the student into the wider realm of adult social and community life.

The 'social issues' core was not, however, restricted to what at first glance might seem to be an enlarged social studies curriculum. Rather, it treated the principles and ideals of democratic life as ways into the major domains of knowledge and experience as expressed in the subject curriculum. Similarly, social inquiry and problem solving in this concept of core echo the activity curriculum. With their roots in democratic political theory, social philosophy, social psychology and social research, the American theorists of core curriculum anticipated later pedagogical interest in social constructivist theories of knowledge (Bruner 1960; Young 1971; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Bourdieu 1977; Apple 1979).

Other versions of core curriculum have emerged, for example, in Australia where a national authority, the Curriculum Development Centre, issued, in 1978, a discussion document A Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (Curriculum Development Centre 1980; Skilbeck 1984, Chs. 6 'Possibilities and Problems in Core Curriculum' and 7 'Designing the Core Curriculum'). This document was influenced by the early American work but also by the European interest in ways of structuring knowledge, understanding and experience. A broad framework of 'areas of knowledge and experience' was proposed for Australian schools to work towards in developing student-centred or activity curricula:

- Arts and crafts
- Environmental studies
- Mathematical skills and reasoning and their application
- Social, cultural and civic studies
- Health education
- Scientific and technological ways of learning and their social applications
- Communication

- Moral reasoning and action, values and belief systems
- Work, leisure and lifestyle.

Beyond these 'areas of knowledge and experience', two further dimensions of core curriculum were identified: learning processes and learning environments. This three-dimensional concept of core was intended to suggest a framework within and through which schools, teachers and students could work together to develop curricula appropriate to the specific circumstances of the schools, the communities in which they were located, students' capabilities and interests and the broader needs and interests of society.

In Australia, neither the American social core nor the approach adumbrated by the Curriculum Development Centre has been taken up by the state and territory school systems. The heavy onus that would have been placed on schools and teachers, the endless debates over 'standards' and 'child centrism' and the powerful, long-established structures for decision making such as state bureaucracies, syllabus and examination boards, textbook publishers, together with insufficient advocacy and follow-through, have seen at the political level, and then in the systems and schools, quite different moves towards a set of required subjects with attendant syllabuses, texts and state-wide and national testing.

Core curriculum, in the sense of an open invitation to engage with social issues and the world of ideas about how understanding can be advanced through dialogue across broad fields of human culture and experience does, however, suggest possibilities for a more adventurous and inclusive future curriculum of lifelong learning.

Information Technology-Constructivist Curriculum

Although the term 'curriculum' only occasionally features in their discourse, in the learning design/learning technology community a fourth model of curriculum has emerged. Thanks to the rapid growth of on-line communication and information technology, learners of all ages are ranging far and wide, seeking answers to questions, checking the latest developments in their field of interest, reinforcing or clarifying existing knowledge, broadening understanding – or simply randomly 'surfing the web'. This is something of a technology-transformed activity curriculum, or even an outreach of the subject-centred core curriculum as the searches extend from material for an assignment for a particular course in school, college or university to self-directed inquiries on any topic of interest. Taking a sharp instructional theory turn, and drawing on cognitive and personality psychology, a new model has emerged – an information technology-constructivist curriculum. It is the searcher who directs the interactions and puts together the items collected, creating new mental structures, or reshaping existing ones. There are historical antecedents, for example, in Herbart's psychological theory of interest and 'apperception masses' whereby, through teaching, the pupil's interests and experiences were connected, and in Vygotsky's and Wittgenstein's insistence on the fundamental role of language in the development of thinking. Learning is seen as directed by mental and linguistic structures and as the technology-mediated means for constructing new

understandings, not simply assimilating existing knowledge and practice (Compayre 1908; Vygotsky 1962; Piaget 1971; Visser and Visser-Valfrey 2008).

Reforming the School Curriculum as a Foundation for Universal Lifelong Learning

What has been suggested thus far is that much that is already existing, under the rubric of schooling curriculum models and recent developments in cognitive psychology and instructional design, provides what the English educator, T.P. Nunn, once described as 'the data and first principles' of education for future development (Nunn 1947). In short, we have data for mapping a curriculum for lifelong learning. The long established, very large, and generally effective schooling model and its system-wide structure of institutions, personnel and resources for teaching and learning have been engineered to enable everyone, in principle and at least in the early years of childhood and adolescence, to participate in organised and programmed education.

Increasingly, formal schooling, including its communication and information technology outreach, is the norm for young adults and large numbers of 'mature age' students, for example, through open and distance learning. This is true of the developed world and increasingly of many parts of the so-called developing or underdeveloped world as well. The weaknesses and imperfections of the schooling model) are known researched and well documented; with the further commitment of intelligence and material resources, known deficiencies are capable of being substantially overcome, depending on political will. Some people will still leave the 'system' dissatisfied, poorly educated and hostile to further study but, on the whole, most are or can be variously equipped with the mental tools necessary for continuing study and learning. Henceforth, as their learning proceeds beyond the period of formal, institutionalised schooling, they will be mapping their own curriculum. This does, however, call for improvements in schooling.

Many people need a better understanding of just how they are to do this mapping, of how the formal stage of education will have enabled them 'to learn how to learn', to manage their own learning. To see life as, among other things, an educational journey requires further reforms in schooling itself, specifically the repositioning of the school as the starting point for everyone to continue learning, rather than as a fixed entry point to college, university programs or working life.

College and university also have to be repositioned, not only as entrees to working life, but as stages on the lifelong learning journey. A step in this direction is the effort to define graduate attributes, to help academics and students to understand the learning process (not just courses and examinations) entailed and to steer them towards the idea of the undergraduate program as a curriculum for lifelong learning (Squires 1990; Candy 1994; OECD 1998, Ch. 5 'The Design and Development of the Curriculum: Teaching and Learning'; Skilbeck 2001; Hager and Holland 2006, Parts I and II).

Since it is by no means the case that everyone completes schooling at either secondary or tertiary level with necessary attributes of the self-managed learner, with unquenched curiosity and the desire to continue learning, we must continue

questioning the existing schooling model, the directions it is taking and associated teaching and learning. The quality of teachers and teaching, the suitability of schooling as an environment for learning for everyone and the home and community life conditions of students, all come with questions, as does the adequacy of directions of public policy as the major steering mechanism. All have been questioned and criticised and there have been decades of well-considered proposals for reform. It seems, at times, that there is a flourishing industry of proposals and recommendations, arising from research and government inquiries, which is virtually self-sustaining but has tenuous links with effective change in the relevant fields of action. For effective lifelong learning for all, steps to overcome the well attested deficiencies and weaknesses in schooling must continue to be taken. Concurrently, the drive towards universal lifelong learning must become a policy imperative, not a well-meant slogan.

Instead of needed school reforms being seen as sui generis, they should be undertaken from the perspective of continuing learning by all people over the life cycle. This perspective, there are directions for action and further inquiry, as follows:

- Shifting the focus of the level of attainment of all students on completing formal education, from the terminology of numerical scores and 'subjects mastered' towards appraisals of capability for processing ideas and information in the conduct of inquiry, generic problem solving, transferable learning, insight into issues, puzzles and conundrums, and persistence in the face of difficulties. What is important is not the comparative rating (and inevitable ranking) of students and institutions but the distinctive attributes of all students as potential lifelong learners, individually and not as part of an age grade, a cohort, a numerically differentiated mass;
- Better understanding by teachers and improved ways of identifying the interests and motivations of students, their perception of their own learning difficulties and inhibitions. Students graduating from secondary schools, colleges and universities need to be fully alerted to opportunities for continued systematic learning, whether or not they enrol in tertiary level institutions;
- The overhaul of existing structures and the creation of new modalities to enable people not continuing in some form of continued, organised learning to sustain interest in learning whether as individuals or as members of communities. Studies are needed on a much larger scale than hitherto into the enhancing/inhibiting conditions for lifelong learning in workplace, home and community, especially for those whose attainments in the formal system have been modest;
- Identification through research of the kinds of learning and the learning experiences which in the formal (school) sector are most likely to enable students to become makers or mappers of their own curriculum; and,
- Greater attention in initial and continuing teacher education to the means of developing in the teaching profession at large a stronger orientation towards lifelong learning for all;
- Improved teaching conditions including better remuneration and systematic, continuous professional learning for teachers, as part of a strategy of enhanced professionalism.

There are other lines of inquiry to pursue in the continuing reform of schooling, but the emphasis here is on those best calculated to improve the transition from

school learners to lifelong learners. Of these, the development of understanding and capability of the student as a 'curriculum mapper' is the most important in the final years of schooling. It is questionable whether the present system at school of terminal external examinations and the pressures of vocational qualifications at college and university provide much scope for meeting this requirement. Clearly, competence in handling subject matter and in vocational skills is required, but debate over reforms in these areas also needs to draw in the preparedness or otherwise of students for self-directed, continuing learning. Governments need to move beyond the declarations and clarion calls of the last third of the twentieth century to develop and implement coherent policies directed at a society-wide momentum for universal, lifelong learning.

Beyond Schooling: Personal Responsibility for Mapping the Lifelong Learning Curriculum

What Is Curriculum Mapping?

The term curriculum mapping has gained some momentum in recent years, both at the higher education and school levels, following earlier exploratory work on cultural analysis and the school curriculum. The curriculum was discussed by theorists as a map or way of framing for pedagogical purposes the major domains of culture, in an echo of the social core curriculum. Mapping is now used in some groupings or networks of universities and colleges as a collegial way of interrogating the curriculum in real time, identifying strengths and gaps and making adjustments. It is also used more precisely, for example in medical education, as a managerial tool to strengthen internal coherence, match performance by students to stated goals and achieve quality improvement (Reynolds and Skilbeck 1976; Lawton 1983; Skilbeck 1984, Ch. 2 'Designs for the School Curriculum'; Anderson 2007; Willett 2008; Uchiyama and Radin 2009).

In this chapter, curriculum mapping refers to a process initiated by the individual or a group to design and undertake their own learning, building on the foundations of initial schooling and extending over the life cycle. It thus refers to the role of students, in association with other learners, in planning, constructing, initiating, reviewing and continuing their own learning. The map is a prospectus for, but also an account of, educationally rich personal and social living.

Mapping the Curriculum Leads to Making the Curriculum

Since a major difference between the school curriculum and that for lifelong learning is the responsibility for decision making that falls on the learner, not the external authority or institution, skills referred to here as 'mapping' are required. A variety of

processes is called into play, depending on which particular designing, planning, research, critical, or theoretical perspective or strategy is to the fore, and individuals will make their own informed choices. As learners become more knowledgeable about what is involved in shaping their own lifelong learning curriculum, they will become more able to select among these perspectives. Similarly, they will project their own learning strategies as those of meta-cognition, problem solving, reflective inquiry, self-management and constructivism, even if they never use this academic language. Common to all approaches is the self-determination and decision-making role of the learner in a learning situation which is not given but has to be constructed or created.

The image of 'mapping' naturally presupposes some awareness and understanding of the territory to be mapped, of the features likely to be encountered and of ways of making maps. The learning situation in a rapidly changing environment is fluid, perhaps indeterminate, but there are some familiar landmarks from previous experience. There are also instruments, procedures and approaches and a body of tested experience on how best to proceed. In other words, the mapper is already technically prepared, to some degree, knows what to expect, and is – presumably – interested and ready to engage with the project of making the map. The territory to be mapped is not so much a discovery, as a personal invention or creation, the fruit of knowledge and inquiry in action.

It is necessary, here, to reiterate the central role of schooling in setting directions and providing motivation in lifelong learning for all. It is a reasonable and increasingly important criterion of the success of schooling that it brings all learners to the point of capability for independent, self-managed learning. This, however, is still a revolutionary idea, even if often proffered as a worthy goal. The school as the one universal institution in society must reach beyond itself to form partnerships – with health, welfare agencies, community groups, families and others if the capacity for and interest in self-directed learning is to become a reality for all. The responsibility will be shared but for the foundations of systematic lifelong learning the school is the primary agent. Failure in this mission becomes a lifelong failure for some individuals and a weakening of the social fabric.

As indicated above, the school curriculum might be conceived as itself something of a map of the culture covering a wide territory of past and present human experience, serving as an introduction to a systematic ordering of human endeavour, achievements and setbacks, values and beliefs. A major weakness in traditional schooling is that the organisation of teaching, syllabus making, assessment and reporting of student progress all tend to represent subjects and subject matter in separate silos and not in their interrelations – a collection of parts instead of an integrated whole. Correspondingly, cross-curriculum processes of inquiry, analysis and reflection have tended to be submerged, although reporting procedures in this respect have improved. Schooling needs to present itself as an integral and effective partner in the human endeavour to adapt, change, solve problems and project a worthwhile future for humanity.

In negotiating the school curriculum thus conceived, the student will acquire and exercise the skills of inquiry and 'learning how to learn'. These have become part of the stated missions and aims of educational institutions at all levels. It is an

imperative of lifelong learning that they become quite central to the practice of a reformed schooling.

Beyond Schooling

Leaving institutionalised forms of education, or engaging with them periodically and episodically for professional updating, retraining and so forth, lifelong learners must turn to their own resources – their interests, ambitions, motivations, habits, circumstances, opportunities, friends, family and associates. 'If (or since) I am a lifetime learner, how do I go about it, what, where, how and indeed why do I learn?' That these are not hypothetical questions is shown by the reasons adults give for taking up formal study, sometimes quite late in life, relating long held ambitions, thwarted perhaps in youth or changed over time due to work experience, relationships and personal crises.

Whether the learning is situated in the school, the home, the office, the workshop, community centre or whether largely book-based, computer-managed, theory-bound or hands-on practical, what matters is that it be curiosity-based, problem-solving, life-centred, adaptive, constructive and creative. Across the spectrum of school reformers, adult educators, cognitive and personality psychologists, learning designers, curriculum developers and philosophers of education there is a harmonious family of understandings and beliefs about learning that have effectively undermined some of the intellectually dubious dichotomies and competitive battlegrounds between the 'formal' and the 'informal'. The common interest in learning, its conditions and enhancement provide a way of achieving a dialogue across previously divided cultures. Contestable as they are, criteria and standards for successful, effective learning within the structure of schooling have been established. There is a continuing dialogue about their meaning and value. This needs to extend into the arena of learning over the life cycle.

Learning as the Search for a Good Life

The idea of personal responsibility in mapping the curriculum is a natural extension of the idea of learning for life, since once beyond the realm of schooling it is for the individual to inquire into 'learning for what?' This question can only be satisfactorily addressed in the context of the life conditions of the individual and perceived possibilities for a fulfilling and sustainable life. At this juncture it is necessary to return to the question raised earlier in the chapter about the nature of educationally worthwhile activities. Of course, linguistically the term education is used in a purely descriptive sense without normative implication. In the use of one's time or the choice of life activities, however, questions inevitably arise about the value of one kind of activity compared with possible alternatives. The interesting debates about

educational aims and values throughout history and continuing to the present day have not been about definitions of terms, but about the ways in which individuals and societies can best learn to fulfil desires, achieve goals, express values and lead happy, rewarding lives. There does not have to be agreement about either ends or means, rather an enabling of individuals and societies to reflect, analyse, converse and develop coherent and mutually respectful beliefs – and to act. It is the meeting of that enabling requirement which sets the direction for curriculum mapping for universal lifelong learning.

Worthwhile Learning

A Wider Understanding of Worthwhile Learning

As an educational quest, the path to be followed, the curriculum to be mapped, will thus embody a self-conscious, deliberate, reflective, critical analysis of what one has already learnt in previous educational settings and a projection of how through learning one can express one's beliefs and aspirations. Here, the mapping model takes a leap into the future to embrace the idea of learning as a normative way of life informed by and expressive of cherished values. This, of course, is a claim about the nature of the educated life. It has a long history of illumination and advocacy: in the intellectual spirit of Socratic self-examination and dialogue on the streets of Athens; the soul searching of St. Augustine following the youthful pursuit of pleasure; the Latinised piety of the mediaeval monk; the heavenly city of the eighteenth century philosophers; perfectibility through the progress of science; the conception of universal happiness in nineteenth century Utilitarianism; and the popular contemporary language of well-being, wellness and happiness (Plato 1935; The Confessions of St. Augustine 1937; Le Clercq 1961; Becker 1932, Ch. IV 'The Uses of Posterity'; Halevy 1934, Part II, Ch. 3 'Bentham, James Mill and the Benthamites'; Passmore 1970, Ch. 15 'The New Mysticism: Paradise Now'; de Botton 2006; Dunn 1961). The challenge this claim poses is to appraise the life one wants to live as a continuous learning experience.

In this sceptical, secular, post-modernist era and following a century of unparalleled violence, the quest for the good life, as understood in Antiquity, by theologians, by the eighteenth century philosophers of perfectibility, or the nineteenth century Utilitarians, can seem as remote from daily life as to be of little interest to other than scholars and undergraduate students of the Humanities. However, that quest continues, sotto voce, as people seek happiness and fulfilment, not simply in fragments and passing episodes but as a sense of well-being and a meaningful, fulfilled life, both personal and communal.

A greater awareness of what is involved in the quest, and of how it has been pursued over time and in different ways is needed to counter reductionist policies, on the one hand (e.g. job-related learning to improve productivity and

economic competitiveness), and a tendency to evade the issue of what kinds of learning should be fostered, on the other.

Naturally, there are different ways of 'learning for life' just as there are different concepts of the good life. Philosophers, from J.S. Mill to R.S. Peters, have sought to differentiate 'worthwhile' from 'worthless', to privilege poetry over pushpin, to identify with Socrates rather than pigs (Mill 1963, p. 9; Peters 1966 Ch. V 'Worthwhile Activities'). In a relativist age, are there firm, clear, defensible directions to pursue? Living with uncertainty rather than absolutes, with a sense of constant change, where fixed points are dissolved by philosophers and physicists alike, calls for robust personal values and a highly developed learning capability. John Dewey argued against 'the quest for certainty' in life, while twentieth century physics undermined the old confidence in the certainty and universality of physical laws (Dewey 1929; Planck 1936). In this context of scepticism over beliefs and ethical claims, and of critical inquiry in all domains of culture, individuals and communities will make diverse choices, which are more or less defensible preferences and beliefs. For learning purposes, these preferences and beliefs set directions to pursue. Freedom in a democracy does not entail entitlement to any kind of learning activity – the open society which subscribes to ethical values does not permit unrestrained access to international child pornography sites or encourage learning how to carry out terrorist acts, for example, or incite racial hatred. But, beyond the constraints on learning in the context of unlawful and morally indefensible activity, is there any justification for elevating some directions for learning over others?

As indicated above, one argument, over the centuries, is that everyone seeks happiness, personal fulfilment, a sense of well-being, of 'the good life'. This might be in the form of the Socratic formulation: 'the unexamined life is not worth living', or Alexander Pope's lines 'Know then thyself, presume not God to scan. The proper study of mankind is man'. Alternatively religious mystics have raised entry to the Heavenly City as the object of life's journey and set out the requisite disciplines. In their desire to restore the classical age the humanists' goal is a lifelong pursuit of the seven liberal arts, a continuing thread through nineteenth and twentieth century theories of liberal general education. In the secular, democratic spirit of the Enlightenment, Jeremy Bentham set a goal for the whole of society: the greatest happiness of the greatest number. As to what that consisted of he was on the side of a continuing, secular humanist education in modern subjects.

A difficulty with this approach to happiness and fulfilment is that it has tended to privilege the intellectual and moral over the aesthetic and the practical, to favour cognitive learning over practical skills, reflecting the ancient dichotomy between 'head and hand', and in turn reinforcing invidious distinctions in society. It was for this reason among others that John Dewey set 'growth' as the goal, or aim of education, although he also had views about the worthwhileness of kinds of growth, influenced by the Utilitarian concept of action that leads to mutual benefits and shared values.

So what curriculum does the lifelong learner map, in the quest for a personally fulfilling life? The quest is not for certain knowledge, for unchallengeable beliefs; nor is the manner in which the quest is conducted free of doubt and uncertainty.

Signposts for Mapping the Lifelong Learning Curriculum

The territory to be mapped is fluid and shifting but there are signposts and there are constraints and requirements arising from changing life conditions, economic circumstances, personal and community health conditions and global threats to an orderly way of life. Again, whether in the labour market or the regulatory environment, the maintenance of professional and vocational proficiency is a pressing requirement for a growing number of adults. These will set directions for and impose limits on continued learning.

Learners do, however, have at their disposal a rich material – 'the data' deriving from what thinkers, movements and whole cultures have designated 'the good life' or 'life worth living'. They have, too, as a result of previous learning, 'principles of procedure' or ways to carry out their inquiries. These signposts are those used in widely adopted statements of the aims of education, and in their curriculum correlates. Thus in innumerable and seemingly uncontroversial statements of the aims of schooling we commonly find the development in all students of qualities and attributes designated as:

- Spiritual
- Moral
- Emotional
- Intellectual, and
- Physical.

Pursuit and development of these qualities may be in the domains of literature or sport, science or travel, history or wood-craft, botany or bushwalking, foreign languages or gardening. Whether in the domains of leisure, recreation, interpersonal or working life, the scope is enormous. Such lists provide pointers while suffering from excessive generality. The aim must be to explore all avenues to the development of human potential, guided by visions and well-reasoned beliefs about the good life for all. Such a life evokes the values of fairness, justice, freedom and respect for common or shared interests. Those values to become substantive in the common life have to be continuously created in the process of learning over the life cycle. Students, young and old, are on a continuing journey for which there is a presumption that the development process will continue and continue well if a carefully considered course, or curriculum, is followed beyond schooling and on the initiative of the individual learner or the voluntary community of learners.

If the course being pursued is governed by the reasoned, reflective ideas of personal and communal fulfilment and happiness, it must also be sustainable. Hence the moralists' denunciation of licentiousness and the mindless pursuit of pleasure. 'Sustainability' refers to several dimensions or contexts for personal effort – economic, social, political and environmental – whose challenges can be fulfilling or destructive in their impact. So people need, as far as practicable, a constantly developing capability to understand how to meet such challenges, and

there is, no less, a collective, society-wide responsibility. In short, lifelong learning entails a readiness to address the conditions of life constructively if the goal of fulfilment is to be attained. The curriculum thus becomes a way of steering and managing complex change, challenge and opportunity in one's own life, on a quest for what the Hellenistic Greeks saw as the aim of human existence, 'the fullest and most perfect development of the personality' (Marrou 1956, p. 98).

Conclusion: Finding One's Personal Pathway

It is the individual, initially under close tutelage but ultimately through resolute individual and shared choices, who will make the learning decisions, working with others on ways to bring about satisfaction, enjoyment and happiness. The maps of others, including those thinkers and writers who have drawn up utopias, spiritual guidelines, roadmaps to the good life and so forth will be consulted by some and drawn upon indirectly by many. In their quest for fulfilment adults will choose to pursue their interests whether they be esoteric or mundane. For everyone, however, there are challenges and opportunities for learning in all spheres of everyday life. The curriculum map of lifelong learning embraces them all through the question: How can I learn to meet these challenges and take up these opportunities in a fulfilling, sustainable way? The objective is to turn the incidental learning of everyday life into activities which are deliberate, purposeful, meaningful and consciously valued.

Life from this perspective is both a flux of unpremeditated, unreflective experience and a continuous, structured learning process whereby learning is equated with purposive, adaptive behaviour to meet changing environmental conditions and changes within the organism itself. People can be motivated through incentives and sanctions to learn specific things and much learning by adults in society is for specific purposes. But learning for adults is also episodic or saltatory and may take pathways which from some critical perspective can seem meandering or aimless. The idea of mapping a curriculum, by contrast, is to foster purposive learning that is grounded in inquiry and generates the reflectiveness which leads to further, purposive learning.

Educators concerned with schooling commonly see it as their role to foster learning which they can justify as of value, worthwhile, beneficial to the individual and society. Many more educators of that disposition will be needed if learning for all throughout life is itself to become dispositional. At the same time we must be prepared to acknowledge that in the open, democratic society, people have freedom to choose how, what and where they learn and will have their own reasons for the choices they make. Sources for mapping the lifelong curriculum in that sense are as rich and varied as life itself.

Acknowledgement [Thanks to Dr Helen Connell, independent researcher, and Ms Pat Knight, Cunningham Library, Australian Council for Educational Research, for assistance in preparation of this chapter].

References

Alighieri, D., & Longfellow. (1890). *The divine comedy: Paradise* (Canto 1. H. W Longfellow, Trans.). London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.

Anderson, P. M. (2007). Curriculum mapping: In J Summerfield & C Benedicks (Eds.), *Reclaiming the public university – conversations on general and liberal education* (Chapter 2, pp. 55–71). New York: Peter Lang.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and the curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Aspin, D. (2007). The ontology of values and values education. In D. Aspin & J. D. Chapman (Eds.), *Values education and lifelong learning. Principles, policies and programmes* (pp. 27–47). Dordrecht: Springer.

Becker, G. L. (1932). *The heavenly city of the eighteenth century philosophers*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bennis, W. C., Benne, K. D., & Chin, R. (Eds.). (1969). *The planning of change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bjarnadottir, V. H., et al. (c1995). *The golden riches in the grass: Lifelong learning for all*. Report from a think-tank issued by the Nordic Council of Ministers. Copenhagen: The Council.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). London/Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.

Boyd, W. (Ed.). (1930). *Towards a new education*. London/New York: Knopf.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Candy, P. C. (1994). *Developing lifelong learners through undergraduate education*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Cassirer, E. (1944). *Essay on man: An introduction to a philosophy of human culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cassirer, E. (1953–1957). *Philosophy of symbolic forms* (R. Manheim in three vols., Trans.). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cochinaux, P., & de Woot, P. (1995). *Moving towards a learning society*. A CRE/ERT Forum Report on European Education. Geneva and Brussels Association of European Universities and European Round Table.

Coffield, F. (Ed.). (1997). *A national strategy for lifelong learning*. Newcastle-on-Tyne: The University of Newcastle.

Compayre, G. (1908). *Herbart and education by instruction* (M. E. Findlay, Trans.). London: Harrap.

Connell, W. F. (1980a). *A history of education in the twentieth century world*. Canberra/New York: Curriculum Development Centre and Teachers College Press.

Connell, W. F. (1980b). A history of education in the twentieth century world, ch. 10. *Individual development and social reconstruction*. Canberra/New York: Curriculum Development Centre and Teachers College Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1961). *The transformation of the school. Progressivism in American education 1876–1957*. New York: Knopf.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(1), 10–21.

Cuban, L. (1998). How schools change reforms: Redefining reform success and failure. *Teachers' College Record, 99*, 453–477.

Curriculum Development Centre. (1980). *A core curriculum for Australian schools*. Canberra: C.D.C.

de Botton, A. (2006). *The architecture of happiness*. Camberwell: Hamish Hamilton.

Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within: Report to UNESCO of the international commission on education for the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO.

Department of Education and Science, Ireland. (2000). *Learning for Life. White paper on adult education*. Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1920/1948). *Reconstruction in philosophy*. New York: Henry Holt and Co, Enl. Edn. Boston: Beacon, 1948.
Dewey, J. (1925). *Experience and nature*. Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co. Rev. Edn.
Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty*. New York: Minton, Balch and Co.
Dunn, H. L. (1961). *High-level wellness*. Arlington: Beatty Press.
European Commission. (1996). *Teaching and learning. Toward the learning society. White paper on education and training*. Brussels: European Commission.
Faure, E., et al. (1972). *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. Report of the International Commission on the Development of Education. Paris: UNESCO.
Ferriere, A. (1927). *The activity school* (F. D. Moore & F. C. Wooton, Trans.). New York: The John Day Company.
Fink, D., & Stoll, L. (1998). Educational change: Easier said than done. In A. Hargreaves, A. Liebermann, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International handbook of educational change* (pp. 297–321). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Hager, P., & Halliday, J. (2006). *Recovering informal learning. Wisdom, judgement and community*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Hager, P., & Holland, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Graduate attributes, learning and employability*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Halevy, E. (1934). *The growth of philosophic radicalism* (M. Morris, Trans.). London: Faber and Faber Ltd.
Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). *Innovation up close: How school improvement works*. New York: Plenum Press.
Keller, P. (1982). *Getting at the core curricular reform at Harvard*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Kliebard, H. (1978). The drive for curriculum change in the united states, 1890–1958. The ideological roots of curriculum as a field of specialization. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 11*(3), 191–202.
Kurzke, H. (2002). *Thomas Mann. A biography* (L. Wilson, Trans.). London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press.
Langer, S. (1953). *Feeling and form*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
Lawton, D. (1983). *Curriculum studies and educational planning*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Le Clercq, J. (1961). *The love of learning and the desire for God* (C. Misrahi, Trans.). New York: Mentor Omega Press.
Makarenko, A. S. (1955) *The road to life (Ivy and Tatiana Litvinov)*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House (Second edition).
Marrou, H. I. (1956). *A history of education in antiquity*. London: Sheed and Ward Ltd.
Miles, M. (1998). Finding keys to school change. A forty year odyssey. In A. Hargreaves, A. Liebermann, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International handbook of educational change*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Mill, J. S. (1963). *Utilitarianism*. (Republished in Mill, J. S. (1910)). *Utilitarianism, liberty and representative government*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Limited).
Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). (2002). *Adult community education*. Carlton South: MCEETYA.
Ministry of Culture, Education and Science, The Netherlands. (1998). *Lifelong learning. The Dutch initiative*. Den Haag: The Ministry.
Nunn, T. P. (1947). *Education. Its data and first principles* (3rd ed.). London: Edward Arnold & Co (First published 1920).
Oakeshott, M. (1971, January). Education: The engagement and its frustration. *Proceedings of the Philosophy of Education Society, 5*(1), 43–76 (Reprinted in *Planning in the curriculum,* by V. Lee & D. Zeldin, Eds.,1982, Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton).
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (1995). *Reviews of national policies for education*. Sweden Part 1 The Swedish Way Towards a Learning Society. Paris: OECD.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (1996). *Lifelong learning for all*. Paris: OECD.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (1998). The design and development of the curriculum: Teaching and learning, Ch5. In *Redefining tertiary education*. Paris: OECD.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2001). *What schools for the future?* Paris: OECD.
Passmore, J. (1970). *The perfectibility of man*. London: Duckmore.
Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
Phenix, P. H. (1964). *Realms of meaning*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
Piaget, J. (1971). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. London: Longmans.
Pinkevitch, A. P. (1929). *The new education in the Soviet Republic* (G. S. Counts (ed.), N. Permutter, Trans.). New York: The John Day Company.
Planck, M. (1936). *The philosophy of physics* (W. H. Johnston, Trans.). New York: W.W. Norton and Company Inc.
Plato. (1935). *Plato in twelve volumes - I Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*. With an English Translation by Harold North Fowler. London. William Heinemann Ltd. 1977. The Loeb Classical Library.
Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Reynolds, J., & Skilbeck, M. (1976). *Culture and the classroom*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
Rousseau, J.-J. (1974). *Emile* (B. Foxley, Trans.). London: Dent.
Rubensen, K. (2001). The Swedish adult education initiative: From recurrent education to lifelong learning. In D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M. Hatton, & Y. Sawano (Eds.), *The international handbook of lifelong learning* (pp. 329–338). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Sarason, S. B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Scheerens, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Informal learning of active citizenship at school*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Short, E. E., & Waks, L. J. (Eds.). (2009). *Leaders in curriculum studies*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Skilbeck, M. (1984). *School-based curriculum development*. London: Harper and Row Publishers.
Skilbeck, M. (2001). *The university challenged. A review of international trends and issues with particular reference to Ireland*. Dublin: The Higher Education Authority.
Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1950). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. New York: Yonkers-on-Hudson.
Squires, G. (1990). *First degree. The undergraduate curriculum*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development. Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc.
The Confessions of St Augustine. (1937). Translated by Edward B. Pusey. London: Collier.
Tyack, D., & Tobin, W. (1994). The 'Grammar' of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? *American Educational Research Journal*. *Fall, 31*(3), 453–479.
Uchiyama, K. P., & Radin, J. L. (2009). Curriculum mapping in higher education: A vehicle for collaboration. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*(4), 271–280.
UNESCO. (2005). *Literacy for life*. Education for all global monitoring report. Paris: UNESCO.
Visser, J., & Visser-Valfrey, M. (2008). *Learners in a changing learning landscape*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language* (E. Haufmann & G. Vakar, Trans.). Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Willett, T. G. (2008, August). Current status of curriculum mapping in Canada and the UK. *Medical Education, 42*(8), 786–793.
Young, M. (Ed.). (1971). *Knowledge and control. New directions for the sociology of education*. London: Collier Macmillan.