

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v14i27.1608>

Artículos científicos

El desarrollo de la disciplina del currículo en México

The development of the curriculum discipline in Mexico

O desenvolvimento da disciplina curricular no México

Efraín Martínez Ambrosio

Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala, Facultad de Trabajo Social, Sociología y Psicología, México

educere.xxi@live.com.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2441-8658>

Crisóforo Pacheco Santos

Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala, Facultad de Trabajo Social, Sociología y Psicología, México

crpasa@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9007-6049>

Resumen

Esta investigación presenta una reflexión sobre el desarrollo del campo curricular en México a partir de la perspectiva histórica de algunos especialistas, los cuales han sido estudiosos desde el origen de la disciplina en el país. Para ello, la metodología empleada fue cualitativa y de tipo descriptivo. Se entrevistó en profundidad a cuatro especialistas curriculares mexicanos, los cuales destacaron a lo largo del desarrollo de la disciplina diversos momentos trascendentes que se pueden corroborar con la teoría. Asimismo, como hallazgo importante, cabe mencionar la identificación en los testimonios de una reconstrucción histórica del campo de manera particular, pues tienen como base su experiencia y muestran etapas de adversidad y crecimiento para el campo. Por último, se identificó en las opiniones de los participantes la importancia de conocer la perspectiva histórica de otros especialistas que vivieron la consolidación del campo curricular en México.

Palabras clave: disciplina, currículo, perspectiva histórica, especialistas, México.

Abstract

This research presents a reflection on the development of the curricular field in Mexico, but, from the historical perspective of some specialists, who have been students from the origin of the discipline in the country and who have been consolidating in the formation of the field. The methodology used was qualitative and descriptive. Four Mexican curricular specialists were interviewed in depth, who mention various moments that were transcendent throughout the development of the discipline, some of these can be corroborated with the theory and an important finding was to identify among the testimonies a historical reconstruction of the field in a particular way, since they are based on their experience and show stages of adversity and growth for the field. Finally, it was identified in the opinions of the participating specialists that it will be important to know the historical perspective of other specialists who lived through the consolidation of the curriculum field in México.

Keywords: Discipline, Curriculum, Historical Perspective, specialists, México.

Resumo

Esta pesquisa apresenta uma reflexão sobre o desenvolvimento do campo curricular no México a partir da perspectiva histórica de alguns especialistas, estudiosos desde a origem da disciplina no país. Para isso, a metodologia utilizada foi qualitativa e descritiva. Foram entrevistados em profundidade quatro especialistas curriculares mexicanos, que destacaram vários momentos importantes ao longo do desenvolvimento da disciplina que podem ser corroborados com a teoria. Da mesma forma, como achado importante, vale ressaltar a identificação nos depoimentos de uma reconstrução histórica do campo de forma particular, pois se baseiam em sua experiência e mostram etapas de adversidades e crescimento para o campo. Por fim, as opiniões dos participantes identificaram a importância de conhecer a perspectiva histórica de outros especialistas que vivenciaram a consolidação do campo curricular no México.

Palavras-chave: disciplina, currículo, perspectiva histórica, especialistas, México.

Fecha Recepción: Noviembre 2021

Fecha Aceptación: Septiembre 2023

Introduction

Curricular theory, emerged in the context of capitalism, developed and expanded in Latin America as a response to the internal crises of the region and to a hegemonic project of the United States. This project promotes an educational theory presented as a scientific alternative to challenge traditional educational practices, which is a key to its development.

On this subject, Rojas (2006) mentions the most influential writers in Western educational thought, which he orders as follows: he begins with classical Greek antiquity, represented in the work of Plato. He then addresses European educational thought during the Reformation, highlighting Comenius, the Age of Enlightenment, and the rise of nation states in the 17th and 18th centuries, with figures such as Kant, Rousseau, and Pestalozzi. Finally, he comes to the social and educational projects of the 19th and 20th centuries, identified in the works of authors from Germany, France and the United States, such as Herbart, Dilthey, Durkheim and Dewey. However, the absence of authors and works representative of Western educational thought is notorious, such as Aristotle, Saint Augustine, Juan Luis Vives and Locke, to name a few.

Among the North American authors considered classics in the curriculum literature are Ralph Tyler (1973), who exposes a rational method to analyze the problems of teaching and the curriculum. Tyler considers the curriculum as a document that anticipates the goals and results of learning, which is why he prescribes the educational experiences and the appropriate pedagogical practice to achieve them.

In the case of Mexico, Hilda Taba (1974) stands out, who proposes the need for a theory of the curricular field that generates an area on the conceptual structure of curriculum development. Her work Curriculum Development is not only a rational scheme, similar to Tyler's proposal, but also presents a methodology.

Hilda Taba's proposal continues to develop the theory on the elaboration of the curriculum, which she defines as a document that plans learning. In this sense, the curriculum is considered "as the project that supervises school educational activities, defines its intentions and provides appropriate and useful action guides for teachers who have direct responsibility for its execution" (Coll, 1991, p. 31). Coll (1991) refers to the curriculum as a useful instrument to guide pedagogical practice, that is, as an aid for the teacher. The curriculum takes into account the real conditions in which it will be developed, without replacing the initiative and responsibility of teachers. The elements that he contemplates to fulfill the functions of the curriculum are:

- a. To teach
- b. when to teach

- c. how to teach
- d. What, how and when to evaluate.

However, in Mexico, the study of curricular problems began to be registered from the 1970s, influenced by American postulates that tried to adapt to the reality of the country. In this context, Documento base (Arredondo, 1981) contains the first state of the question in the curricular field of Mexico. Subsequently, states of knowledge were carried out in 1993, 2003 and 2013 (Díaz-Barriga, 1995, 2003, 2013), under the direction of the Mexican Council for Educational Research (COMIE). Table 1 summarizes the lines of research that made up the states of knowledge in the country, from the 1970s to the present.

Table 1. Curricular knowledge in Mexico: decade of the 70s, 80s, 90s, and first decade of the XXI century

CURRICULAR KNOWLEDGE IN MEXICO	
Decade	Lines of research
1971-1981	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overview of research in curriculum development. • Some predominant trends and characteristics of curriculum development research. • Analysis of capacity in educational research on curriculum development. • Priorities and recommendations for research in curriculum development.
1982-1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies of a conceptual nature, and / or with empirical reference in the field of curriculum. • Proposals for the elaboration of plans and programs of study • Means of exchange and dissemination of research results in the field of curriculum.
1992-2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptualization of the curricular sphere. • Curriculum development. • Curriculum and vocational training • Curricular evaluation.
2002-2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptualization and development of historical visions in the field of curriculum. • Curricular policies in Mexico. Basic, middle and higher education. • Curricular innovations. • Curriculum actors in Mexico: a field of knowledge in constitution. • Evaluation and curriculum.

Source: Own elaboration.

According to De Alba (1989), towards the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, there was a period of crucial difficulty in the curricular field. During this time, a critically oriented movement that opposes the technological trend that dominates the field of higher education originates and begins to manifest itself in the country.

In a moment of crisis, when the pressures of the various social sectors on the educational system tend to become more acute and its transformations are inexorably taking place, the demystification of the critical curricular discourse is an important task [...].

The deep structural transformation of the curricular, which trains specialists in education [...] Regarding specific processes:

- The resumption of the dialogue between the builder of the word-listening, in the field of the curriculum, through:
 - o The significant and sensitive elevation of the academic level of the listener, facing the problem of their training.
 - o The formulation of the critical discourse by the constructor of the word in a language that enables communication with the listener, and allows him to establish himself as an interlocutor, dialoguing (De Alba, 1989, pp. 30-31).

According to De Alba (1989), the demystification of the curriculum represents a path towards the socialization of the advances in the field among specialists and agents of the curriculum. This process implies a critical constructive phase of the discourse that allows addressing the problem of the field in its total complexity. Therefore, the curriculum is conceived as a political-educational proposal that integrates the different conceptions, values and programs defended by various social sectors interested in defining a specific type of education, according to the political-social purposes that support it.

On the other hand, Díaz Barriga (1993) affirms that there can hardly be a single curricular approach or methodology that comprehensively addresses the diversity of problems present in the curriculum and its practice. These approaches reached their highest point in the 1960s and 1970s, although strong criticism and a reassessment of their approaches arose in the 1980s. Díaz Barriga identifies five basic approaches that present an internal coherence related to the development of curricular theory and methodology. In summary, these approaches are:

- a. The curriculum as an organizing structure of knowledge.
- b. The curriculum as a technological production system.
- c. The curriculum as an instructional plan.
- d. The curriculum as a set of learning experiences.
- e. The curriculum as knowledge reconstruction and action proposal.

Starting in the eighties, there was an evolution in the reflection and structuring of the field of curriculum linked to higher education. During this period, it was possible to observe how specialists in this field were gradually emerging and consolidating. For this reason, in the present

work an attempt has been made to answer the following question: what has been the role played by curriculum specialists in the historical development of this field in Mexico?

Methodology

Martínez (2007) highlights that "the purpose of research in Education is to know with some precision a certain educational reality, its characteristics and operation, as well as the relationship that exists between the elements that make it up" (p. 18). For this reason, and due to the lack of studies related to this topic, the objective of this research focused on identifying and understanding the role of specialists in the historical development of the curricular field in Mexico.

Following the recommendations of Hernández et al. (2010), this study was based on qualitative methodology, which is defined as research that generates descriptive data from people's own words. In accordance with this idea, Quecedo and Castaño (2002) maintain that research is inductive when it contributes to the understanding and development of concepts based on data, and seeks to understand how people experience reality and what their perspectives are. Therefore, the methodology used was qualitative, inductive, exploratory and descriptive.

Study subjects: specialists in the discipline of curriculum in Mexico

To select specialists in the curricular field in Mexico, the following inclusion criteria were taken into consideration:

- a. Mexican authors who were repeatedly referred to in national and international works; those who were not Mexicans had to live in the country.
- b. Belong to university and academic institutions.
- c. Be researchers with a doctorate degree.
- d. Be members of the National System of Researchers.

The four specialists participating in this investigation were the following. It should be noted that to identify the segments extracted from the interviews of each researcher, the following codes were assigned:

- a) Curricular discipline specialist (1:0)
- b) Curricular discipline specialist (2:0)
- c) Curricular discipline specialist (3:0)
- d) Curricular discipline specialist (4:0)

Analysis technique

The analysis technique was based on the following suggestions:

Qualitative analysis involves organizing the collected data, transcribing it to text when necessary, and coding it. Codification has two planes or levels. From the first, units of meaning and categories are generated. From the second, themes and relationships between concepts emerge. In the end, theory rooted in data is produced. (Hernández *et al.*, 2006, p. 581).

Research instrument

Hernández *et al.* (2010) suggest that the interview as a research instrument must present the three levels shown in Table 2 in the analysis categories. However, it should be mentioned that in this instrument only the question linked to the results of the development category is taught. history of the curriculum discipline.

1. The first level belongs to the categories or open coding that are required in the areas of inquiry, which correspond to the interview questions, based on the theoretical proposals of authors who are in the theoretical framework of this work.
2. The second level corresponds to the category of themes or codes, whose themes are the following: conceptualization of the curriculum, curricular policies, evaluation and curriculum, innovations and curriculum, and curriculum specialist. From these emerges the historical development of the discipline of the curriculum.
3. The third level belongs to the central category, which focuses on the objective of the research: the role of specialists in the curricular field in Mexico.

Table 2. Analysis category: historical development of the curriculum discipline

The role of specialists in the curricular field in Mexico (Level III: core category)	historical development of the curriculum discipline (Level II: theme)	Component	Defines the function and relevance of the historical development of the curriculum discipline
		Author and proposal	Educational policies and reforms as a mechanism to improve educational development. Dallanegra (2010); Vaillant (2009); Alvarado (2013); Del Castillo-Alemán (2012); De Alba (2002)
		Area of inquiry (Level I: category <i>open code</i>)	Educational reforms and educational policies Understand the importance of the historical development of the curriculum discipline
		ask	What do you consider to have been the most important moments in the historical development of the curricular field in Mexico?

Source: Own elaboration.

Results

Regarding the question "What do you consider to have been the most important moments in the historical development of the curricular field in Mexico?", the specialists identify several and describe both the circumstances and the impact that these moments have had on the development of the curriculum. discipline.

It is important to note that what follows reflects the personal perspective and experience of these intellectual authorities, but does not cover the full historical development of the field. In this sense, it is evident that the curricular proposal does not arise as a result of an academic interest, but of a social and political concern (originating in North America and introduced in Mexico) to address the educational needs and problems of a nation. However, it is at this point of introduction where groups of specialists are formed and the national curricular field begins to develop its own proposals and alternatives to the model proposed by Tyler (1973) and Taba (1974).

Specifically, and from the perspective of a specialist, it is recognized that the curricular proposal is linked to the needs of educational institutions and society, in an era of industrialization. However, it is important to note that this perspective does not refer specifically to Mexico, but to

its origin in the United States of America (2:1). This is related to the idea mentioned by the first interviewee, who maintains that the study of the curricular field was introduced in Mexico in the 1970s (1:3). The segments extracted from the interviews are the following:

It was born as a proposal linked to the needs of the educational institution and society, within the framework of industrial society, and the understanding of educational plans (2:1).

The field of curriculum in Mexico [...] has had different moments, a moment in the 70s, the emergence of the field in Mexico (1:3).

Reinforcing the previous perspectives, the specialist who was interviewed in a second moment clarifies in a very precise way the following (2:2):

Tyler arrived in Mexico in 1974 through the UNAM Teaching Center. The curricular reform for basic education objectives is in 1972, that is, Tyler did not work, the book by Glazman and Ibarrola was the first book on Study Plans of the curricular period and does not make any reference to Tyler [...]. The CCH UNAM curricular project does not refer to Tyler. It was at the UNAM didactics center when the study plan workshop that we incorporated to Tyler and Taba was created. On the other hand, Tyler was translated by Troquel with financing from the OAS in 1971, and Taba in 1974. The analysis and criticism of Tyler was promoted by Remedi and Furlán in 1980 or 81 40 years after Tyler's work, a book was produced coordinated by them where we present several of our works (2:2).

We can observe that in Mexico there was already a production related to the study plans, which represents its own and important precedent. A few years later, the proposals of Taba and Tyler were introduced, which were widely disseminated at the national level. However, the work Basic Principles of the Curriculum was criticized by other specialists in the country due to the absence of documentary references that supported the proposal, which were revealed as the study of the discipline developed.

The following opinion complements the perspectives discussed so far, since it is recognized that the incorporation of a new pedagogical field brought from North America not only had a great impact, but also continues to be valid today. (4:4):

There was a moment in the emergence of the field in which this apparition occurred as an emergent pedagogical field that was brought from North American pedagogy to our country and then a moment, a part of legitimization of that appearance, where the field of curriculum was recognized by people who develop educational research

(4:4).

Regarding the previous perspective (4:4), García Garduño (1995) points out: "Virtually, the study of the curriculum as a discipline begins in Latin America from the translation of Tyler's work in 1973" (p. 78). Certainly, there are specialist views that qualify this moment of curricular incorporation; However, an interviewee manages to describe that the field of didactics and that of the curriculum start in the opposite direction; Even so, it is suggested that these disciplines must be part of each other to complement each other. The perspective is the following:

And while the didactics see the teaching work; the teacher has to work with the students; the curriculum looks towards society and towards institutions, that is, what should be formed in primary school, secondary school, high school or university, in this sense, there is an institutional division and that has a dimension of education system (2:6).

This view (2:6) can be supported by the following:

The genesis of the curriculum as a field of study and research is not the product of a merely academic interest, but of a social and political concern to treat and solve the educational needs and problems of a country. [...] What the first studies of the curriculum seek is to give a systematic and well-founded treatment to the decisions of a country about what and how to teach (Moreno, 2010, p. 81).

From the perspective of two specialists, while this incorporation of the field of curriculum in Mexico was taking place, the interest of academics and researchers was also manifested, who were integrating work groups, which were made up of specialists who over time were consolidated (2:17). These teams were born between the Argentine and Mexican thoughts that began an important stage for the field (3:4). Investigator testimonials suggest the following:

Another stage of the curriculum in Mexico is the formation of groups of specialists, [...] we were doing it through reading the curriculum and through the curricular practice that we developed. And, that was taking us through different paths to the various specialists. (2:17)

The critical current arose between Argentine and Mexican thought, headed by Díaz-Barriga, Furlán and Remedi [...] and in some way also Follari (3:4).

The following excerpt supports these perspectives.:

The effervescence of curricular change in Mexico was a propitious field for Argentine education specialists recently arrived in Mexico due to the recently established dictatorship that had been installed in that country. The Argentine

didactic thought of that time was possibly the most creative and vital in the region. (Díaz-Barriga y García, 2014, p. 251).

In this effervescence of the Mexican curricular field during the 80s, curricular proposals are built in higher education, which were alternatives to the Tyler and Taba model, which were the dominant proposals. (2:13 y 16) y (1:4).

Mexico was one of the first countries that hybridized the field and that even built alternatives to the curricular project of Tyler, de Taba, to the dominant curricular project of that moment (2:13).

The modular system has existed since 1974, that is, in 1970 the curriculum was arriving in Mexico and in 1974 an alternative to the dominant curricular alternative was being developed in a Mexican institution (2:16).

In the 80s, the theoretical debates, the more social and political debates, where the efficient vision marked by Tyler, Taba, [...] that is, that was the first debate; then it was a series of criticisms, of questions (1:4).

Reinforcing the previous ideas, another interviewee mentions that, in the eighties, in Mexico there was a period of flourishing in the curricular field due to the innovative proposals that were generated in the universities. (3:34):

In the golden age of the eighties, because here you are right, the specialists developed and the same writings of theirs as that of Furlán and Ángel say, they developed in the light of educational innovation, in the seventies it was a flourishing of new innovations, the modular plan, the 36 medicine plan (3:34).

Supporting this perspective:

The educational proposal for objects of transformation represents a pedagogical break [...] The modular pedagogical alternative establishes as a premise the definition (selection, delimitation, justification) of objects or problems of reality around which the teaching units are elaborated. (De Alba *et al.*, 1991, p. 139).

The aforementioned researchers describe that during the eighties proposals were made in the curricular field that have not been analyzed in their successes as innovative proposals for the time. The following quote refers to this (2:15):

In Mexico, the UAM-Xochimilco model that I think has never been... from the curricular analytical point of view, well considered, [...] the modular system by objects of transformation, which when one hears, for example, the curriculum by competencies, actually the modular system already had it; when one hears that now

they say let's work around problems, the modular system if something works is around problems; When one hears that they say let's go beyond the disciplines, the modular system was precisely what they were looking for was to integrate from the disciplines of the problem (2:15).

This perspective can be understood and expanded with the following excerpt:

The curricula that marked a milestone in curricular innovation in higher education in Mexico were: the Architecture Study Plan in its self-government modality; the Plan A-36 of Medicine and the Modular System for transformation objects of the Autonomous Metropolitan University-Xochimilco. Other important study plans were that of the College of Sciences and Humanities, a secondary school created in 1971; It was a curriculum designed by the UNAM as an alternative to the traditional baccalaureate, under the assumptions of a critical education, centered on the student and with more emphasis on the social sciences and humanities than the traditional curriculum. (Díaz-Barriga y García, 2014, p. 246).

The aforementioned specialist states that another important stage began in the 1990s, as institutions promoted innovative models (flexibility, technology, skills, transversality, etc.). This is a trend in higher education institutions that is promoted through the Educational Modernization Program (en el sexenio de Carlos Salinas de Gortari) (2:20).

In the 1990s, another curricular stage came along, which is how higher education institutions, through the Educational Modernization Program, are invited to develop innovative models, then flexibility appears, technology-based curriculum appears, competency-based curriculum appears (2:20).

These proposals focus on ethical aspects that facilitate the comprehensive development of students. For this, they try to link education with life, that is, ethical aspects that guarantee a comprehensive education. In this way, curricular flexibility and competency-based curriculum are established. In this regard, Barrón and Ysunza (2003) point out: "In the nineties, these appear associated with the trend based on cross-cutting issues whose concern has been to link education with life, and include ethical aspects that guarantee integral development of the person" (p. 133). For one interviewee, research on the curricular field gave birth to new theoretical and methodological perspectives (1:9):

A blurring, even of the conception of the curriculum in the 90's [...] why?, there were [...] visions that gave meaning to the curricular field, from theoretical, methodological perspectives, to instrumentalist visions where only asked for an

adequacy of means to ends, from that perspective of international organizations (1:9).

Another interviewee explains that the National Association of Universities and Institutions of Higher Education (ANUIES), since the nineties, has collaborated through its publications and agreements in curricular innovation proposals. (1:12 y 15):

From ANUIES, the proposal of what was curricular innovation and curricular flexibility was generated in the 90's and a series of guidelines were given that had to be covered in all study plans in this country (1:12).

Based on the ANUIES agreements on what curricular innovation was, which had to do with flexibility, [...] mobility [...] skills, [...] incorporation of information technologies, [...] the promotion of values, in In the end, there is a range of options [...] and these are elements that are provided for the evaluation of the study plans by the accrediting bodies, because a model proposed on the university web page is far from what is done at times in the universities. own institutions (1:15).

Supporting these opinions, and confirming his points of view, Martínez-Lobatos (2016) explains: "The project that federal policy empowered in the 1990s through negotiation between the public university and the federal government was curricular flexibility" (p. . Four. Five). On this topic, ANUIES (2011) explains:

Curricular innovation has to stop being synonymous with the incorporation of educational innovations of the moment, without a deep reflection on its implications, nor a clear forecast of its incorporation into curricular structures or the reality of the classroom. (ANUIES, 2011, p. 34).

On the other hand, it is worth mentioning that the emergence of the reconceptualist movement in Mexico was very important for the field:

A critical reaction to the dominant technological trend in the curriculum arose the reconceptualist movement. Although this current did not constitute a homogeneous group, it did show a common trend regarding the consideration of the practical nature of the curriculum and its research. Then came the theorists who understood the practice of the curriculum as a research process and, finally, there are the scholars of the curriculum who base their position on critical theory, who propose an emancipatory curriculum theory. (Moreno, 2010, p. 81).

As a closure of this unit of analysis, the following perspective shows an interesting opportunity for field studies, since it highlights the importance of the discipline in Latin America at an international level. (2:22):

Something that was important to me in research and the evolution of the field of curriculum in Latin America was to look at how we study the English, the Australians, the Spanish, the Americans, and how we do not recognize the Latin American debate that has been producing (2:22).

Discussion

In summary, moments of great relevance are identified in the historical development of the curricular discipline in Mexico in the seventies, eighties and nineties. For example, in the seventies there were already works focused on Curriculum Design —such as those by Raquel Glazman and María de Ibarrola—, in which, although the term curriculum was not used, they did establish an inherent relationship with the proposal of Ralph W. Tyler's Curriculum Basics, which arrived in the country shortly after. It was in this decade when the field of curriculum was incorporated in Mexico and various groups of researchers were formed who became specialists.

In the eighties, the curriculum experienced a stage of curricular utopias, with nationalist proposals that responded to the needs of the country. Examples stand out such as the Medicine Plan and the Modular System for transformation objectives of the Xochimilco Metropolitan Autonomous University, as well as the Comprehensive General Medicine program of the UNAM Faculty of Medicine, known as Plan A-36, among others, which provided alternatives to the Tyler and Taba model. It was at this stage when the term curriculum began to address a variety of objects of study that enriched the university and school reality of the higher education system in Mexico.

Then, in the nineties, during the government of Carlos Salinas de Gortari, a proposal was presented for higher education institutions through the Educational Modernization Program. This invited universities to develop innovative educational models, which led to the emergence of concepts such as flexibility, curriculum with technology, and competency-based curriculum. In this period, a trend based on transversal themes stood out, with an interest in linking education with life and in including ethical aspects to promote a comprehensive education in students.

Finally, there are currently similar studies that, from the perspective of different specialists in the field of curriculum, have explored other topics. These studies—p. e.g., The specialists of the curricular field: conceptual approaches and their elucidation (Martínez, 2017), The conceptual evolution of the term curriculum in Mexico (Martínez Ambrosio, 2020) and Specialists of the

discipline of the curriculum in Mexico: precursors in the study and formation del campo (Martínez Ambrosio, 2021)—highlight the importance of understanding the historical perspective of these specialists and the valuable information they provide, which is not always found in conventional academic texts.

Conclusion

In the interviews, it was found that some of the specialists were aware of the birth of the field of curriculum in Mexico, while others were trained as this discipline was consolidated in the country. In short, each decade contributed to the growth and diversification of the curricular field in Mexico, and currently this discipline has established itself as a mature area of study in the field of curriculum.

However, although it is undeniable that significant progress has been made, there are still little explored areas of research, such as the actors of the curriculum, educational policies and the curriculum, assessment and the curriculum, and the conceptual evolution of the curriculum. These are issues that deserve further attention, especially considering the scant research focused on the Mexican precursors of the curriculum field.

Future lines of research

Although this research focused on interviewing four Mexican curriculum specialists—recognized as intellectual authorities due to their notable contributions to the field—it would be valuable to broaden the spectrum and interview others with a similar track record. In this sense, the specialists who participated in this study recognize the work of other outstanding researchers in the field of curriculum, such as Alfredo Furlán, Eduardo Remedi, Frida Díaz Barriga, Martha Casarini, Alicia de Alba, Raquel Glazman and María de Ibarrola, among others, which could provide an even more complete understanding of the history and development of the curricular field in Mexico.

References

- Arredondo, V. (coord.). (1981). *Documento base. Desarrollo curricular*. México: Congreso Nacional de Investigación Educativa.
- Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior (ANUIES) (2011). *Innovación curricular en instituciones de educación superior. Pautas y procesos para su diseño y gestión*. Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.
- Barrón, C. y Ysunza, M. (2003). Currículo y formación profesional. En Á. Díaz-Barriga (coord.), *La investigación curricular en México. La década de los noventa* (pp. 125-164). Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa.
- Coll, C. (1991). *Psicología y curriculum*. Paidós.
- De Alba, A. (1989). Del discurso crítico al mito del curriculum. En A. Furlán y M. Ángel Pasillas (comps.), *Desarrollo de la investigación en el campo del currículum* (pp. 13-33). México: ENEPI: UNAM.
- De Alba, A., Díaz-Barriga, Á. y González, E. (1991). *El campo del curriculum. Antología* (vol. I). México: CESU-UNAM.
- Díaz Barriga, F. (1993). Aproximaciones metodológicas al diseño curricular hacia una propuesta integral. *Tecnología y Comunicación Educativas*, (21), pp. 19-39.
- Díaz-Barriga, Á. (coord.) (1995). *Procesos curriculares, institucionales y organizacionales. Colección. La investigación educativa en los ochenta, perspectiva para los noventa*. Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa.
- Díaz-Barriga, Á. (coord.). (2003). *La investigación curricular en México. La década de los noventa*. Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa.
- Díaz-Barriga, Á. (coord.). (2013). *La investigación curricular en México 2002-2011*. Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior - Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa.
- Díaz-Barriga, Á. y García, J. M. (coords.) (2014). *Desarrollo del curriculum en América Latina. Experiencia de diez países*. Miño y Dávila.
- García Garduño, J. M. (1995). La consolidación de la teoría curricular en los Estados Unidos (1912-1949). *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Educativos*, 25(2), 57-81.
- Glazman, R. y De Ibarrola, M. (1975a). *Diseño de Planes de Estudio* (2.^a ed.; vol. I). Comisión de Nuevos Métodos de Enseñanza. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

- Glazman, R. y De Ibarrola, M. (1975b). *Diseño de Planes de Estudio*. (2.^a ed.; vol. II). Comisión de Nuevos Métodos de Enseñanza. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Glazman, R. y De Ibarrola, M. (1975c). *Diseño de Planes de Estudio*. (2.^a ed.; vol. III). Comisión de Nuevos Métodos de Enseñanza. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C. y Baptista, P. (2006). *Metodología de la investigación*. (4.^a ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C. y Baptista, P. (2010). *Metodología de la investigación* (5.^a ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Martínez Ambrosio, E. (2020). La evolución conceptual del término currículo en México: la opinión de tres especialistas. *Voces de la Educación*, 5(9), 118-128.
<https://www.revista.vocesdelaeducacion.com.mx/index.php/voces/article/view/196>
- Martínez Ambrosio, E. (2021). Especialistas de la disciplina del currículo en México: precursores en el estudio y conformación del campo. *RIDE Revista Iberoamericana para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Educativo*, 12(23). <https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v12i23.1015>
- Martínez, E. (2017). Los especialistas del campo curricular: aproximaciones conceptuales y su elucidación. *Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos. Educación, Política y Valores*, 4(2).
<https://dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/index.php/dilemas/article/view/394>
- Martínez, R. (2007). *La investigación en la práctica educativa: guía metodológica de investigación para el diagnóstico y evaluación en los centros docentes*. Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- Martínez-Lobatos, L. (2016). El currículo de la universidad pública mexicana a 20 años de permanecer en los programas de financiamiento extraordinario. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior*, 7(19), 42-63.
- Moreno, T. (2010). El currículo por competencias en la universidad: más ruido que nueces. *Revista de la Educación Superior*, 39(154), 77-90.
- Quecedo, R. y Castaño, C. (2002). Introducción a la metodología de investigación cualitativa. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, (14), 5-39. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=17501402>
- Rojas, I. (2006). Presencia de los clásicos en la producción discursiva de pedagogía en la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras-UNAM. *Perfiles Educativos*, 28(113), 7-37.
<http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=13211302>
- Taba, H. (1974). *Elaboración del currículo*. Troquel.
- Tyler, R. (1973). *Principios básicos del currículum*. Troquel.