



上海

上海市社会科学
博士文库

ZHISHI QUANLI KONGZHI

知识·权力·控制

——基础教育课程文化研究

黄忠敬 著

Jichu Jiaoyu Kecheng Wenhua Yanjiu

復旦大學出版社

本书出版由上海市马克思主义学术著作出版基金资助



上海市社会科学
博士文库

知识·权力·控制

——基础教育课程文化研究

黄忠敬 著

复旦大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

知识·权力·控制:基础教育课程文化研究 / 黄忠敬
著. —上海:复旦大学出版社,2003.12
(上海市社会科学博士文库)
ISBN 7-309-03819-3

I. 知... II. 黄... III. 基础教育—课程—研究
IV. G632.3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2003)第 095742 号

知识·权力·控制——基础教育课程文化研究 黄忠敬 著

出版发行 复旦大学出版社

上海市国权路 579 号 邮编:200433

86-21-65118853(发行部); 86-21-65109143(邮购)

fupnet@fudanpress.com <http://www.fudanpress.com>

责任编辑 陈士强
装帧设计 孙 曙
总 编 辑 高若海
出 品 人 贺圣遂

印 刷 句容市排印厂
开 本 850×1168 1/32
印 张 8.75 插页 1
字 数 196 千
版 次 2003 年 12 月第一版 2003 年 12 月第一次印刷

书 号 ISBN 7-309-03819-3/G·508
定 价 15.00 元

如有印装质量问题,请向复旦大学出版社发行部调换。

版权所有 侵权必究

内 容 提 要

课程是教育研究特别值得重视的一个领域。近年来，我国的课程研究取得了突破性的发展，不仅从工具理性的层面，注意了课程的设计与编制，而且从更宏观的背景，展开了对课程背后的政治、经济、文化等因素，特别是课程中知识、权力和控制之间关系的研究。本书分为“导论”；第一章“本体论”；第二章“关系论”；第三章“实践论”；“结论”等五部分，对课程内容、课程结构作了文化分析。其论点是，课程并不是中立客观的知识，而是价值负载的和意识形态渗透的；课程实质上是再生产主流文化的工具，课程应当关注边缘文化；要形成反思性、多元性的课程等。

序

课程是教育研究特别值得重视的一个领域。近年来,我国的课程研究取得了突破性的发展,特别是密切关注课程改革的现实需要,与我国的课程改革形成了互动互进的可喜局面;研究的视野也大大拓宽,不仅从工具理性的层面,注意了对怎样的课程是好课程,怎样设计、编制好课程,怎样制定和编写课程标准、课程大纲、教科书等问题的研究,提升了对课程的效率、预测、控制的水平,又注意到从更宏观的背景上,展开了对课程背后的政治、经济、文化等因素的研究,特别是课程中知识、权力、控制等关系的研究。黄忠敬博士的《知识·权力·控制——基础教育课程文化研究》一书,敏感地注意到对基础教育课程研究中知识、权力和控制之间关系的分析,并做了比较深入与全面的探索。该书从文化的多层视角来探讨课程,揭示了课程的文化特征、课程与文化的关系,以及课程文化的建构特性等问题,是一项具有创造性的成果。

忠敬的《知识·权力·控制——基础教育课程文化研究》一书,以课程史上斯宾塞的“什么知识最有价值”和阿普尔的“谁的知识最有价值”作为问题之源,把课程放到政治、经济和文化的广阔背景中去考察,围绕知识、权力与控制这条主线,从本体论、关系论与实践论三个层面上考察了课程中的文化与文化中的课程。本书中提出课程并不是中立客观的知识,而是价值负载的和意识形态渗透的;学校和课程实质上是再生产主流文化的工具,课程应当关注

边缘文化,体现多样性和丰富性;强调课堂生活中师生互动、对话的建构性课程文化等,并由此提出要形成反思性、多元性和建构性的课程文化等等,所有这些研究成果既有较强的现实关注,又具有基础理论建设功用。

《知识·权力·控制——基础教育课程文化研究》一书,是忠敬在其博士论文基础上修改而成的。在跟随我攻博的三年间,他沉醉于教育基础理论的研究与探索,广泛涉猎哲学、社会学、文化学等相关领域,大胆从新的视角来审视基础教育课程问题,在研究方法与思维方式上有了明显的拓展,博士论文答辩委员会认为“这是一篇优秀博士论文”,同时对其严肃认真、资料翔实的治学态度也给予了充分肯定。

科学的研究是无止境的。本书仅是构成对课程研究话语所可能进行的许多“阅读”当中的一种阅读,对于课程文化的研究,我们期待着更多、更密切联系中国实际、更能反映文化内涵的研究成果。

值得庆幸的是,忠敬这篇论文得到了上海市社会科学青年基金会的资助出版。这样的资助对青年学人的成长大有裨益,希望他能够以此书的出版为新的起点,不断取得教育研究的新成绩!

袁振国

2003年11月

本书摘要

19 世纪的英国社会学家斯宾塞提出了一个著名的问题：“什么知识最有价值？”他回答这一问题的技术理性和科学主义模式，对整个 20 世纪的课程研究产生了深远的影响，无论是从早期博比特的活动分析法、查特斯的工作分析法，还是到后来著名的泰勒原理，都努力追求效率与客观化，追求预测与控制。20 世纪中后期，课程研究的程序主义和结构功能分析受到了政治与意识形态分析的强烈冲击。课程问题不再被认为只是一个技术问题（如课程编制），而更被认为是一个政治的问题，其代表性的标志就是美国学者阿普尔提出了另外一个堪与斯宾塞问题相媲美的问题：“谁的知识最有价值？”也就是课程代表的究竟是谁的利益，哪些群体和阶级的知识被看作是合法化的知识。这就需要考察知识、权力与控制之间的关系，把课程放到更大的政治、经济和文化的背景中去考察。本文所进行的基础教育课程文化研究正是从这一视角出发，紧紧围绕着知识、权力与控制这条主线，来回答作为文化现象的课程本身表现出哪些文化特征，课程与文化的关系，以及实践中的课程文化有哪些表现等问题，亦即从本体论、关系论与实践论三个层面考察课程文化。

本体论意义上的课程文化，就是对已经存在的课程本身所蕴藏的丰富的文化信息进行分析。具体表现在两个方面，即课程内容文化分析和课程结构的文化分析。课程内容文化特征表现

为它的价值性,也就是说,课程内容并不是中立的和客观的知识,也不是绝对的真理,而是价值负载的,是意识形态渗透的。通过对美国与我国基础教育课程的个案分析,可以明显地看到技术理性和功利主义的意识形态对课程产生的重要影响。当然,内容离不开结构,课程结构的文化特征表现为它的控制性。在此,伯恩斯坦“分类”和“架构”的概念,以及阿普尔的控制理论可以用来帮助我们分析权力与课程结构之间的关系,阐述课程结构的控制特征。同时,我们也可以通过考察国家、地方与学校三级课程的纵向结构和各学科之间的横向结构来说明这一点。不同的国家有不同的课程权力结构,而同一个国家在不同的历史时期,也会形成不同的课程权力结构,国家课程、地方课程与学校课程三者之间的彼消此长,表明了课程权力的不同分配,也显示了不同的主体对课程控制程度的强弱。从课程的横向结构来看,各学科之间地位是不平等的,出现了高地位知识和低地位知识,这种课程地位的变化也反映了社会权力结构的变化。鉴于课程是价值负载和意识形态渗透的,我们认为有必要对课程进行批判与反思,以利于课程的健康发展。

关系论意义上的课程文化,是要探讨课程与文化的关系。任何一种课程的产生和存在都有特定的文化土壤和背景,可以说,文化是课程的母体,课程是文化的表现。课程与文化的关系复杂,从不同的角度分析可以有不同的内容,本文是从主流与支流的角度来分析:一方面,课程作为法定文化、官方知识,它体现的是主流文化的利益,通过对课程知识的整个生产过程(如课程的制定、审查、发行与选用等)的分析,我们发现课程知识与权力的关系密切,其背后隐藏着霸权的问题。同时,一些再生产理论者(如经济再生产、文化再生产和权力再生产)对课程再生产主流阶级的文化进行

了理论上的探讨,他们从经济、文化和权力等角度分析了学校与社会、课程与文化,以及知识与权力的关系,提出学校和课程实质上是再生产主流文化的工具。另一方面,课程应当关注边缘文化,也就是从阶级、种族和性别等方面来关注课程中的弱势群体。通过教科书分析,我们发现,课程往往体现的是以男性为中心的价值体系和男性霸权,忽视、歪曲甚至排斥女性的经验和情感;种族和民族问题也同样存在,在一些国家的课程中都不同程度地存在着种族与民族的歧视或偏见;阶级歧视和偏见也很常见,高社会经济地位的人往往认为低社会经济地位的人在智力、道德和文化等方面也处于低地位,并给他们贴上各种低地位的标签,这种阶级的不平等与阶级的偏见和歧视,在某种程度上反映了学生的社会背景、阶级差异,并有可能决定他们未来的经济地位。为了体现课程的多样性与丰富性,体现课程的民主与自由,体现不同主体的意志与利益,我们认为应当走向多元的课程文化。

实践论意义上的课程文化,是考察动态层面上的课程,也就是探讨课堂生活中师生共同建构的课程文化过程的特征。具体而言,包括两方面:一个是正式课程(或显在课程)如何在课堂上得以贯彻执行,即作为法定知识(或官方知识)的课程内容,到底能在多大程度上进入课堂教学的实际过程并被学生内化为其文化结构的有机成分;另一个是考察在师生的课堂日常交往过程中,潜在课程如何在其中发挥作用,它的价值与规范怎样成为促进或阻碍课程知识实践的无形之网。要考察这两者,又实实在在地离不开课堂生活。由此可见,这里所要讨论的课程文化,具体来说,是要考察课堂生活文化和课程知识的实践与分配,前者包括课堂生活的型态结构、课堂生活中的冲突,以及潜在课程的作用;后者包括正式

课程(或显在课程)的转化以及课程知识的分配。这两方面的课程实践过程都离不开师生共同的建构活动,对它们的强调,就是对课程建构特性的强调。

ABSTRACT

In the 19th century, Herbert Spencer, a famous British sociologist, put forward a famous question “What knowledge is of most worth?” His technical rationality and scientism pattern of answering this question has had far-reaching impacts on the research of curriculum over the 20th century. Both earlier F. Bobbitt’s Activity Analysis and W. W. Charters’ Job Analysis, or later the famous Tyler’s Rationale, they all did their best to pursue efficiency, objectivity, forecast and control. From the mid-20th century on, the structure-functionism research of curriculum was strongly influenced by the political and ideological analysis of curriculum. Curriculum was seen as something political rather than a technical question (for example, the design of curriculum), a representative symbol is another question “Whose knowledge is of most worth?” Expounded by Michael W. Apple in the United States, emphasizing whose interests had the curriculum embodied, and whose knowledge had become socially legitimate in schools. Therefore, curricula are not simply delivery systems of fact, they are also results of political, economic, and cultural activities of class struggles and compromises. Curricula are conceived, designed, and authored by people with real power. Legitimate knowledge in fact is the result of complex power relations and struggles among identifiable class, race, gender, and religious groups. Thus, knowledge and power

are terms of an indissoluble couplet. Based on this perspective, this research on curriculum culture revolves around the main topic of knowledge, power and control, and attempts to find some cultural characteristics of curriculum, the relationship between culture and curriculum, as well as some cultural behavior in practice. Namely, this article will study curriculum culture from three aspects: text, relationship, and praxis.

The research of curriculum culture as texts means analyzing the culture information that already exists in texts, which includes two aspects: the content and the structure. The cultural characteristic of the curriculum contents is represented by its value, namely, the contents are neither neutral and objective knowledge, nor absolute truth, they are value-loaded and ideology-penetrated. The study of America and Chinese primary and secondary curricula obviously showed the strong influence of technical rationality and utilitarian ideology. Thus, the contents cannot depart from the structure, the cultural characteristic of the curriculum structure is its ability to control. The concept of Basil Bernstein's classification and frame and Apple's theory of control can help us analyze the relationship between power and curriculum structure, expound the control of curriculum structure. At the same time, we can also explain it by reviewing the structures of the national, local and school curricula longitudinally and the structures of all subjects' horizontally. Different countries have different organizations on the structures of curricula. Also due to different historical phases in a country, there are different power structures even in one country. The changes in proportion in national, local and school curricula can indicate the different distribution of curriculum power, and also

reveal the strong or weak degree of control by different power groups. Horizontal curriculum structures indicate unequal statuses among different subjects, thus come forth high status knowledge and low status knowledge. The status change of curriculum reflects the change of social power structure. Since curriculum is value-loaded and ideology-penetrated, in order to promote the healthy development of curriculum, we consider it necessary to criticize and reflect on it.

The research on the relationship between curriculum and culture is to discuss the interaction between curriculum and culture. All curricula grow on the specific culture soil and context, and culture is the matrix of curriculum, simultaneously curriculum is the exhibition of culture. So the nexus of both are complex, the paper analyzes the relationship from the viewpoint of mainstream and branch cultures. On the one hand, curriculum as "legitimate culture" and official knowledge represents dominant class interests. The close relationship between curriculum and culture, and the hegemony behind it can be better understood by analyzing the whole process of curriculum's coming into existence. Meanwhile, some scholars of reproduction theory probed into the culture of the rule class theoretically. They discussed the relationship between school and society, curriculum and culture, as well as that between knowledge and power from the point of economy, culture and power. And then they claimed that curriculum serves as a tool in reproducing dominant class cultures. On the other hand, curriculum should pay attention to marginal cultures, such as class, race (or ethnicity), and gender questions. After analyzing the textbooks, we found that curriculum while representing male-centered

value system, and male hegemony, ignores, distorts and even excludes female experiences and feelings, also we can find race and ethnicity problems in some way, for example, racial and ethnic discrimination and prejudice exist in curricula in some countries to some extent. Class discrimination and bias are also frequent problems, involving seeing certain classes as superior or inferior to others, and discriminating against individuals and groups on the basis of class, such as intellectual, moral and cultural aspects. For example, higher socio-economic status people often think that lower people are inferior in the mentioned aspects, and thus give them various lower status labels. The discrimination and bias mirror students' social backgrounds, class diversities, and probably affect their future economic statuses. Therefore, the article thinks that in order to have more democracy and freedom in curriculum, it is necessary to enforce multicultural curricula.

Praxis theory involves the study of dynamic curricula, namely inquiring the culture characters of curriculum practice in classrooms. It focuses on the interaction among teachers and students, and includes two aspects: one is how formal curriculum is implemented in the classroom, in other word, how the contents of curriculum as legitimate knowledge are filtered in teaching practice and melted into organic components of cultural structure by students. Another is how the hidden curriculum functions in teachers and students' interaction of the classroom, and how its value and rules are turned into the immaterial net to advance or hamper curriculum praxis. Both of them cannot deviate from the classroom. Thus, the research of curriculum as praxis is to study the cultures of the classroom,

curriculum practice and distribution . The former includes the formation of the classroom, conflict in the class and the function of the hidden curriculum; the later includes the transformation of formal curriculum and the distribution of curriculum knowledge . Both aspects of praxis process involve the interaction of teachers and students , so the emphasis on process and activity means putting stress on the construct of curriculum .

目录

导 论	1
一、问题之源	1
斯宾塞问题：“什么知识最有价值？”——阿普尔问题： “谁的知识最有价值？”	
二、方法之镜	19
自然科学与社会科学——文化研究	
三、本文框架	32
文化的解释——课程的解释——研究框架	
第一章 本体论	46
一、课程内容的文化分析	46
几位学者研究成果的启示——课程内容的文化特征	
二、课程结构的文化分析	65
伯恩斯坦、阿普尔的研究成果——课程结构的文化特征	
三、小结：形成反思性的课程文化	98
第二章 关系论	104
一、课程：主流文化的体现者	105
过程分析：课程知识是如何生产的？——理论探讨： 课程再生产了主流文化？	
二、课程：关注边缘文化	137
女性主义与课程中的性别问题——后殖民理论与课程中的	

种族和民族问题——课程中的阶级问题	
三、小结:走向多元的课程文化	164
第三章 实践论	173
一、走进课堂生活	176
课堂生活的型态结构——课堂生活中的冲突—— 潜在课程的作用	
二、课程知识的实践与分配	197
课程知识的实践——课程知识的分配	
三、小结:课程文化的建构性	227
结 论	236
主要参考文献	244
后 记	262