

Metaphors of the Syllabus: Syllabus of Metaphors

Kaleb Ostraff

Doctoral Institution: University of Illinois
Urbana Champaign, IL

Current Position: Brigham Young University
Provo, UT

Abstract

The syllabus—one of the most ubiquitous materials of schooling—is commonly overlooked and considered innocuous because of its mundane nature. However, the syllabus ought to be treated with more careful consideration because it is something that teachers make, and it actively shapes the educational postures of teachers and students and the educational experience. This article pays specific attention to the metaphors that are used to describe the syllabus and explores what impact these metaphors might have on education.

Introduction

The syllabus—the document that every teacher makes to outline their course—is something that, at times, has been overlooked due to its ubiquitous place in education. As a result, the syllabus has quietly developed a set of conventions in terms of form and content, as well as how it is defined and used. For most of my life, I never fully considered the syllabus or the conventions that led to its current form. However, as a doctoral student in art education at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, I took a course on teaching arts at the college level that led me to reconsider the syllabus, which led to the development of my dissertation, titled “Syllabus as Artistic Material: An Incomplete and Subjective Collection of Permissions and Metaphors for Teacher Posture.” By treating the syllabus as an artistic material that could be played with and made pliable, I discovered the syllabus could be a useful proxy to reveal much about our field’s practices, ideologies, and postures as teachers. One element of my rethinking of the syllabus focused on the metaphors used to describe the syllabus, which is the focus of this article.

Metaphors for the Syllabus

The syllabus is commonly referred to as a contract, a record of what was taught, a schedule, or a course of study. It primarily functions as a communication device that describes what a course is about, what knowledge will be studied, the roles and responsibilities of students and teachers, and any pertinent policies (Snyder, 2002; Parkes & Harris, 2002; Fink, 2012). I was particularly familiar with the way that many people think of the syllabus metaphorically, and sometimes literally, as a contract, especially because when I was a middle school art teacher, my administrators would often remind my colleagues and me that our disclosure documents—the K–12 version of syllabi—were like contracts that would protect against disagreements with disgruntled parents or students. While I can see the wisdom and benefits to teachers, students, parents, and administrators of making policies known in writing, I was bothered by how it made teaching feel like a legal agreement or business exchange. In the article “Syllabus,” James Seitz (2019), a professor of rhetoric and writing at the University of Virginia, shared a similar perspective and expressed concern that if we consider the syllabus a “legal contract rather than an implied statement of pedagogical philosophy” (p. 458), we might end up turning education into a system of inputs and outputs instead of a dialogic encounter. Thinking of the

syllabus as a contract suggests a stance or posture of teaching that did not align with the kind of relationship I wanted to have with my students.

Metaphors, such as “think of the syllabus as a contract,” go beyond being mere figures of speech used to compare one thing to another; as the cognitive linguists and philosophers George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) contended in their book *Metaphors We Live By*, metaphors are the primary conceptual models or systems that humans use to think, act, and make meaning about the world. Through language and metaphors, thoughts are given a space where they can be felt, seen, and questioned. Likewise, in the article “Movements of Mind: The Matrix, Metaphors, and Re-imagining Education,” educational scholar Alison Cook-Sather (2003) claimed that every metaphor creates a vocabulary and way of naming things that “govern[s] our ways of perceiving, naming, and acting in the world. Whether we are aware or not” (p. 946). In other words, metaphors are powerful agents that shape how we think and behave.

In “The Purpose of a Syllabus,” Jay Parkes and Mary Harris (2002) argued, A syllabus reflects the instructor’s feelings, attitudes, and beliefs about the subject matters as well as about the students in the class. By making those opinions salient, a syllabus can serve as a guide to the instructor as much as a guide to the class. (Parkes & Harris, 2002, p. 59)

While Parkes and Harris specifically cited the syllabus being a useful guide for teachers and students because it captures the beliefs of the teacher, the metaphors teachers use can also be quite revealing, particularly when it comes to “teacher posture,” or the way a teacher holds themselves in relation to the dynamic and complex landscape of schools. Teacher posture is more than a physical stance or a set of practices a teacher uses in the classroom; it also includes the attitudes, beliefs, values, and worldviews that inform one’s teaching practices as well as the situational contexts in which teachers find themselves making it dynamic, complex, and highly situational.

Prior to studying the syllabus, I had a rather concretized view of the syllabus, and my vocabulary was limited to the inherited metaphors, behaviors, and traditions regarding what a syllabus is and could be, as well as how I was supposed to use it, primarily as a contract or outline. These conventions inherently shaped my teacher posture and how I approached teaching and education. As I thought about these typical metaphors for the syllabus (contract, teaching tool, record), I began to wonder if there were other metaphors that existed or could be imagined that might be more flexible or reflect different

ideologies and teaching practices. Inspired by the American Sculptor Richard Serra, who redefined what could be done with steel through the act of testing and playing with his artistic materials to “extend the vocabulary” (Davis, 2000, p. 65), I began to look for new vocabularies regarding the syllabus. This inquiry led me to study the syllabus in more depth, including its historical origins and many contemporary examples. As I was working on this scholarship, I began making a list of all the metaphors I could find describing the syllabus, which resulted in the following list of metaphors.

Historically, a syllabus was considered to be

- a title slip or tag affixed to a scroll identifying the contents (Cicero, ca. 68–44 B.C.E./ 1999; Livius, ca. 29 B.C.E./1936; Wiseman, 1970),
- a table of contents or index (Blount, 1656; Nelson, 2022; Snyder, 2002),
- a list of topics for a lecture (Snyder, 2002; See Wilkinson, 1790; Hemenway, 1884; & Cubberly, 1902),
- a list of religious beliefs (Rocha, 2020; Haag, 1912; Sullivan, 1996; see Pope Pius IX’s “Syllabus of Errors” 1864),
- a course outline (Snyder, 2002),

More recently, the syllabus has been described as

- a promise (Bain, 2004; Warner, 2018; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- an agreement of roles and responsibilities (Parkes & Harris, 2002),
- a document to signify the care of a teacher (Hockensmith, 1988; Rocha, 2020),
- a legal document (Thompson, 2007),
- a diary (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a map, road map, map of the space of learning (Rumore, 2016; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- trail of breadcrumbs (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a compass (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a travel guide or itinerary (Hockensmith, 1988; Warner, 2018; Westbury, 2008; Hilton & Ekere Tallie, 2023),
- authority’s flag (Baecker, 1998; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),

- locus of power (Luke et al., 2013),
- where theory and practice collide (Baecker, 1998),
- a set of rules or policies (German & Nicholls, 2020; Fink, 2012; Rubin, 1985; Thompson, 2007; Baecker, 1998),
- curriculum (Rocha, 2020; Shaw, 1977; Robertson, 1971; Alexander, 1979; Luke et al., 2013),
- idealized, imaginary vision of a subject (Germano & Nicholls, 2020; Kalir, 2022),
- a manifesto (Applegate, 2020; Warner, 2018; Heidbrink-Bruno, 2014; Dockray & Forster, 2018; Graziano et al., 2019; Germano & Nicholls, 2020; Kalir, 2022),
- a machine (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a memo (Rocha, 2020),
- a love letter (Rocha, 2020),
- a model (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a plan (Fink, 2012; Rocha 2020; Germano & Nicholls, 2020; Warner, 2018),
- a lesson plan (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a garden (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a narrative (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- timekeeper (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a preamble (Kalir, 2022),
- a personal biography (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a blank canvas (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a primary text (Rocha, 2020; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a living document (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a set of keys (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a vision of a field (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a set of questions (Germano & Nicolls, 2020),

- a founding document (Heidebrink-Bruno, 2014; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a point of interaction (Crispi & Stiver, 2015),
- a launching pad or starting point (Rubin, 1985; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a recipe for a meal/a grocery shopping list (Hilton & Ekere Tallie, 2023),
- assembling a toolbox (Hilton & Ekere Tallie, 2023),
- a stage manager's prompt book (Hilton & Ekere Tallie, 2023),
- an invitation (Carreiro, 2013; Baldus, 2019; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a first impression (Crispi & Stiver, 2015; Thompson, 2007),
- a theory of teaching (Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a locus of intervention (Agate et al., 2020; Kalin, 2012),
- a shadow course, an alternative, a companion to the official curriculum (See Fredric Gunve's "Shadow Course Curriculum," 2017; Nadine Kalin's "Dangerous Syllabus," 2012; Sonya Huber's "Shadow Syllabus," 2014; Lucy Bailey's "The Other Syllabus," 2010),
- scholarship (Sidorkin, 2012; Luke et al., 2013; Rocha, 2020),
- a site of social exchange and activism (Graziano et al., 2019; Dockray & Forster, 2018),
- a biographic account (Hunter, 2022; Germano & Nicholls, 2020),
- a yearbook (see *The Northwestern Syllabus*, 1885),
- something imagined, speculative, fantastical, or utopian (see Jane Sprague's "Imaginary Syllabi," 2011),
- a performance score or performative text (Shankar & Steinmetz, 2023),
- a protocol for an experiment (Shankar & Steinmetz, 2023),
- a personalized reading list (see *The Syllabus*, n.d.),
- an object or set of pedagogical toys (see Zinguer, 2015; Kohlstedt, 2022),

- and an extension of a teacher (Parkes & Harris, 2002; Hockensmith, 1988).

I conclude this rather long list with a final thought from Leon Hilton and Mariahadessa Ekere Tallie (2023), who wrote, “A syllabus is a spacious thing” (p. 14).

This expansive yet incomplete list of metaphors for the syllabus provides many options for what a syllabus could be, who can make a syllabus, and how a syllabus could be made or used that goes beyond the typical list of limited metaphors like the syllabus as a contract or outline. For example, the syllabus, which is traditionally written primarily by teachers, can also be made collaboratively with students as a performative score. Instead of the syllabus being created only at the beginning of a course, it could be made and remade throughout the course when it is seen as a living document. This feels important because it extends the vocabulary and possible postures one could take as a teacher. When we can see something or express a new way of thinking, it changes what we know and what we can do, making new and more diverse teacher postures possible.

Syllabus of Metaphors

While this list presents many new ways of thinking about a syllabus, some may wonder what is the point or value of having a more expansive list of metaphors for the syllabus. There are a few things that this list of metaphors can teach or reveal to us. Perhaps one of the first things this list of metaphors for the syllabus suggests is that the syllabus (and teaching, for that matter), which might typically be thought of as being rather concrete, is more “slippery” than we may think. *Slippery* terms are words whose meaning is difficult to understand because they are used in a variety of ways or have meanings that shift or change over time depending on the place and context (Buehler, 1981; Gilligan, 2016; Resor, n.d.). The opposite of a slippery word would be a word that is understood in the same way every time, making it singular in interpretation. These words are not ambiguous, cannot be misunderstood, and have a certain concreteness to them. As a result, we don’t have to think about the word’s meaning because we know what it is and what it means. This may lead to people, as Sam Rocha (2020) described in *The Syllabus as Curriculum*, “sling[ing] around technical terms without any concern for their meanings and histories” (p. 79). Such was the case for me in how I used the syllabus. As I studied the syllabus, its various forms, histories,

etymologies, and variations, I realized that my concept of the syllabus was concrete because I was ignorant of its history. What was singular in dimension has become multi-dimensional. I have come to see it as something that can be seen in various ways in different contexts.

The Multiplicity of the Syllabus

The many different metaphors for the syllabus point to the fact that education is a contested space that is driven by a variety of purposes, such as vocational/economic training, preparation for participating in a complex society, intellectual development, and personal or character development (Spring, 1991; Goodlad, 2004; Gage, 2009; Brint, 1998; Reese, 2000).

Sometimes, these purposes can be contradictory, compete for priority, or have varying strengths in differing contexts and are largely dependent on the position of the person making them. As we contemplate the variety of ways to approach the syllabus and teaching, it is important to keep in mind something that James Seitz (2019) said: “All pedagogical decisions come with gains and losses” (p. 459). In other words, no one approach to the syllabus will be perfect or a “panacea” (Seitz, 2019, p. 459). Every metaphor for the syllabus, like a map or interpretation of a word, affords certain kinds of beliefs, actions, or postures and limits others. The designer Donald Norman (1993) echoed this sentiment and said that everything we make will afford certain activities and make others harder. Every technology imposes its mindset or way of thinking and being upon those who use it, which led Norman to declare that “technology is not neutral” (p. 243). Likewise, I have surmised that the metaphors I subscribe to as a teacher and the actions I take matter, and they are not neutral but convey who I am and what I value.

When we look at the variety of metaphors for the syllabus, we see a variety of teacher postures being taken. Biesta and Stengel (2016) suggested several postures: “teacher as authoritarian boss in relation to the docile pupil,” “teacher as emancipator of the oppressed student,” “teacher as investor in the student as human capital,” or “teacher as carer who is engrossed with the student as cared-for” (p. 44). Some additional postures are characterized by more generic descriptions like “imperial” relations of control,” “emancipatory and democratic antiauthority relations,” or “dialogic and mutually beneficial relations of caring and cultural reconstruction” (p. 44). This brings to mind the list of metaphors that Alison Cook-Sather (2006) shared in *Education as Translation*—i.e., a teacher

is a scholar, a reflective practitioner, a researcher, a sculptor, an artist, a coach, a director, a savior, a conductor, a gardener, a dentist. All metaphors, paradigms, or genres have a coherence or logic behind them that explains the world and dictates things like truth, right and wrong, and the value of things. These models then also communicate what postures, both in mind and body, we should take.

In the formal institutions of education, the trend has been to make and perpetuate the metaphors for the syllabus that conform to a singular posture that centers around control, predictability, and getting tangible results. The development of the academic syllabus demonstrates how some have tried to use the syllabus to make education a “kinder” space (Hogarth, 2003) or one that is more predictable and controllable. In the past 75 years, the syllabus has gone from being a form where teachers mostly outlined a list of readings and a few key dates for important exams or assignments to now being a document that is extremely prescriptive in the way it outlines what will be learned, how it will be learned, and how it will be assessed. The goals of education are often flattened to focus on economic growth, global competitiveness, or social cohesion (Kalin, 2012; Luke et al., 2013). While this may make the goals for education and determining the effectiveness of teaching clearer, it can inadvertently be oppressive because it excludes other perspectives and desired outcomes.

It is easy to critique any one posture because it doesn't fit the values, beliefs, or dreams one has for education. Sometimes, I am guilty of seeing only the limitations and failures of certain postures or metaphors and not the potential they inherently have. However, because of this work, I have come to recognize that each metaphor and its corresponding posture has a time and place when it might be the right thing to achieve a certain goal. As Biesta and Stengel (2016) wisely pointed out, “A particular pedagogical relation brings both affordances and constraints, complicating the notion that any one pedagogical relation could be designated as ideal for all times and purposes” (p. 44). The real issue, then, with the metaphors or materials like the syllabus is not that they help us communicate better or fulfill a task but that we forget what work they are doing for us.

The Nature of Metaphors

At the heart of each metaphor is distinguishing or recognizing the differences or similarities among disparate things, and meaning emerges through these distinctions. As Kenneth Burke (1945/1969) stated in *A Grammar of Motives*,

“Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else. It brings out the thisness of a that, or the thatness of a this” (p. 503). When we put this in the context of education, we might say that metaphors are the primary sources for how we perceive, name, and act as teachers. Indeed, professor of teacher education Rodney Earle (1995) said in his article “Teacher Imagery and Metaphors: Windows to Teaching and Learning” that teachers rely on mental imagery, metaphors, plans, or other imagery to rehearse, envision, and establish expectations of who they will be as teachers. Earle argued that metaphors bring concreteness to ideas that are abstract (our ideas, concepts, or philosophies of teaching) and help us make meaning of human experience. Earle posed a provocative question for us to consider: “If teachers consider themselves as nurturers, coaches, cheerleaders, mold-breakers, entertainers, preachers, bridge-builders, or subject matter experts, what are the implications of these different viewpoints or images?” (p. 53). In other words, each metaphor that describes a teacher is a tool that was created to navigate the complexity of the educational world, which inherently will shape how teachers think, communicate, and behave with each other and their students.

It is easy to unintentionally be influenced by the words or metaphors we use because they are not merely words but systems of making meaning. Tim Feist (2016) cautioned that many common words that we use every day are embedded with assumptions and hidden meanings that we may not be aware of unless we study their contexts and histories. This is problematic because harmful ideologies can unknowingly be passed from generation to generation and make certain assumptions about the world feel natural, which led Feist to call for an increased criticality and conscientiousness toward the words we use. In Frank Pajares’s (1992) article about teacher beliefs, he shared a similar wariness of the power of words:

All words begin as servants, eager to oblige and assume whatever function may be assigned them, but, that accomplished, they become masters, imposing the will of their predefined intention and dominating the essence of human discourse. (Pajares, 1992, p. 308)

These authors cautioned us to be more deliberate in our consideration of how we function and the language we use.

As a tool, metaphors are designed to help us navigate new situations and make sense of a complex and diverse world. The problem with metaphors is that we forget that these devices are active and do some of our thinking for us.

It is too easy for teachers to fall into a mode of functioning where we overlook how things in our lives are actively shaping us. Biesta and Stengel (2016), in their philosophical analysis of teaching, acknowledged that the “ways we think, feel, and act are ‘disciplined’ by dominant discourses” (p. 49). As teachers, it may be easy to use language or certain forms for our syllabi and claim it was “required by our administration” or “I was just using the syllabus that my department or past instructor gave me.” Saying these things cannot remove the fact that we touched it, made it, and/or allowed the thing already made to exist and be reaffirmed. We may not be able to change and make every metaphor or word become exactly like we want, but we can at least acknowledge it and take some ownership. The metaphors we use as teachers cannot be seen as being inconsequential because they are active agents in shaping us, whether we are aware of it or not.

While some may see the slipperiness or multiplicity of the syllabus as a bad thing because it is not as easily defined and may not be as efficient in achieving certain purposes, I find it to be a good thing because it necessitates a posture that is more careful, deliberate, and thoughtful. Much like the way a person might approach walking on a slippery surface, icy path, or a mossy rock in a stream, the multiplicity of the syllabus might call for the slowing down and careful consideration of one’s environment, moment in time, and educational intent when considering the syllabus. It shifts one out of a tacit or automatic mode of functioning to a more conscious and reflective mode of functioning. When I think of the syllabus now, I cannot help myself from sliding into a rapid-fire listing of every way I have come across someone talking about the syllabus. As a result, the automatic response that has been conditioned into me over the years of engaging with the academic syllabus genre has been obliterated.

Some might wonder about the value of the expanded list of metaphors for the syllabus, especially the examples that seem absurd, extreme, and impractical. Still, for me, one of their values is the way they function as “disruptakes,” which Dylan Dryer (2016) described as things that cause one’s automatic reaction to a genre (or some other familiar thing) to misfire or pause, resulting in a person switching into a more deliberate mode of thought. This disruption could also be described as a “somatic opening” (Starr, 2019, p.54) because it provided someone the precious time to reflect on their somatic shape, or in this case, their teacher posture, and take a more deliberate and conscious posture that is aligned to their values as a teacher. Biesta and Stengel (2016) spoke about the

concept of “teacher wisdom,” which is the wisdom that comes from “constantly returning to the question of purpose, the question as to what is educationally desirable in this concrete situation, that teachers can build up their ability for wise, situated judgment” (p. 37). Knowing what posture or pedagogical move to make—whether to be student-centered or teacher-centered, flexible or inflexible, transparent or nontransparent, strict or friendly—all depends on knowing what we seek to achieve and how that action might help us or our students (Biesta & Stengel, 2016). In other words, there is no right answer that works in all situations all the time. There is no one goal for education that is the same for each teacher, student, or context.

A Call and a Choice

The idea of slowing down and thinking about the posture I take as a teacher or artist comes from a desire to find attunement between the things I say, do, or make with the values and philosophies I hold regarding education and my worldviews. I do not want my teacher posture to be formed by the subconscious part of my being that can be influenced unknowingly by external agents, whether that be other people or genres. I do not want to become too comfortable or familiar with things like the syllabus because “when teachers repeat past practices because they are familiar or comfortable with them, without thinking of underlying theories or values that they reinforce, they may unwittingly be working toward a goal with which they do not agree” (McKay & Buffington, 2013, p. 10). This desire stems from my belief that teachers are “powerful change agents” (McKay & Buffington, 2013, p. 10) or as John Dewey (1964) described, “catalytic agents” (p. xxiv). I believe how we act, the things we say, and the things we make as teachers matter.

It is easy to use and accept certain metaphors without considering where they came from and what remnants of logic are left over from another context, which will ask me to do certain things, think in specific ways, and perpetuate certain beliefs or power structures. It can be easy to blame others for the world we live in and to say, “I am not the one in charge of determining the outcomes or standards for education,” “I didn’t make a genre; I just follow it,” or “I am not the principal, dean, or administrator who has the power.” Nevertheless, each of us makes the syllabus. We all share in the making of it. As Luis Camnitzer (2020) suggested, there is a need for artists, teachers, or anyone who creates to take responsibility for the consequences of their actions. Similarly,

DéSautels and Larochelle (1997/1998) contended that every teacher ought to assume responsibility for their epistemological posture and critically examine the actions arising from the knowledge and representations of the world they are promoting as they create pedagogical contexts. The real call I am making to you and to myself is to be more aware and responsible for what we are doing as educators and artists, especially through things like the syllabus and the metaphors we use to describe it, which we often overlook.

While I see the expanded lists of metaphors for the syllabus as an opportunity to open possibilities for a type of teaching that is relational-reciprocal (breaks the rigidity of schooling as material), I also acknowledge that someone else could not want that. I see each way of teaching and using the syllabus as a valid way of doing things; each will have pros and cons. The syllabus can become an important touchpoint where we are constantly reminded of our teacher posture, allowing us to align our theory to practice and practice to theory.

I conclude with something I said in the introduction to Jorge Lucero's "Conceptualist Permissions for Teacher Posture":

Knowing there are many postures of permissions can lead us to seek more on our own. We may find ourselves in moments that once seemed impossible, rigid, or unyielding and remember permissions that enable us to take a posture that makes the space, material, or moment become more pliable and yielding—helping us to make education more generous, tolerant, and embraces education as something both relational and situational at its core. (Ostraff, 2023, pp. 7-8)

I have come to realize that I have a choice to make as a teacher: I can willingly or unwillingly accept the postures or metaphors that others have for education, or I can become more aware and deliberate in the metaphors I choose to believe in and allow to shape my teaching posture. The choice of metaphors or postures I take should be attached to a constant return to the tensions at play in education. The educational scholars DéSautels and Larochelle (1997/1998) contended that teachers must develop practices that foster the pedagogical context consistent with their ideological belief systems. In other words, there needs to be balance and harmony between the theories and philosophies of education and the practices of teachers. Gert Biesta and Barbara Stengel (2016) further contended that the ability of teachers to find a balance in their teaching practice and the ability to determine the right posture at any given moment is

what they call “educational wisdom” (p. 37). This sort of wisdom comes from years of practice. The problem is that the kind of postures that seem needed for certain kinds of learning, like emergent or relational learning, are not necessarily metaphors prevalent in education. It is these kinds of postures that I seek by examining the metaphors regarding the syllabus.

Sometimes, the desire to take a new or less understood posture or metaphor is met with resistance, but Cook-Sather (2003) made a crucial point that no matter the dominant models of schooling, which use metaphors that attempt to contain and control, “We can deliberately choose other ways of thinking, naming, and being” (p. 948). In an article for *The Systems Thinker* journal, Fred Kofman (1992) stated, “Language can serve as a medium through which we create new understandings and new realities as we begin to talk about them. In fact, we do not talk about what we see; *we see only what we can talk about*” (Language of Business section). This is the power of language and metaphors—they shape what we think, talk about, and see. Changing metaphors or creating new ones for teaching may require, as Herbert Kohl (1994) learned, some “creative maladjustment” because there is one thing that schools have shown: They can be slow, rigid, and strict at times, but there is still pliability there. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) also made a significant claim when they stated that “new metaphors are capable of creating new understandings and, therefore, new realities” (p. 236). By looking for new metaphors regarding the syllabus, one may create a new reality or reconceptualize an old one that allows for more diverse approaches to learning and teaching to be taken.

References

- Agate, N., Kennison, R., Long, C., Rhody, J., Sacchi, S., & Weber, P. (2020). Syllabus as locus of intervention and impact. *Syllabus*, 9(1), 1–2.
- Alexander, L. G. (1979). *English grammatical structure: A general syllabus for teachers*. Longman.
- Applegate, M. (2020). The syllabus as manifesto. *Syllabus*, 9(10), 1–2.
- Baecker, D. L. (1998). Uncovering the rhetoric of the syllabus. *College Teaching*, 46(2), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567559809596237>

- Bailey, L. E. (2010). The “other” syllabus: Rendering teaching politics visible in the graduate pedagogy seminar. *Feminist Teacher*, 20(2), 139–156.
<https://doi.org/10.5406/femteacher.20.2.0139>
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Harvard University Press.
- Baldus, A. (2019). *An inquiry-syllabi as curriculum* [Unpublished manuscript].
- Biesta, G. J. J., & Stengel, B. S. (2016). Thinking philosophically about teaching. In D. H. Gitomer, & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 7–68). American Educational Research Association.
https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-48-6_1
- Blount, T. (1656). *Glossographia*. Thomas Newcombe.
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A28464.0001.001/1:7.18?rgn=div2;view=>
- Brint, S. G. (1998). *Schools and societies*. Pine Forge Press.
- Buehler, M. F. (1981). Defining terms in technical editing: The levels of edit as a model. *Technical Communication*, 28(4), 10–15.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/43094307>
- Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. University of California Press. (Original work published in 1945). <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520341715>
- Camnitzer, L. (2020). *One number is worth one word* (B. Eastham, Ed.). Sternberg Press.
- Carreiro, J. M. (2013). Philosophical issues in curriculum. *Syllabus*, 2(1), 1–8.
- Cicero, M. T. (1908–1909). *The letters of Cicero: The whole extant correspondence in chronological order* (Vol. 1, E. S. Shuckburgh, Trans.). George Bell and Sons.
<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/21200/21200-h/21200-h.htm>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2003). Movements of mind: The matrix, metaphors, and re-imagining education. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 1–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810310500608>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2006). *Education is translation: A metaphor for change in learning and teaching*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Crispi, E. L. & Stiver, J. (2015). The syllabus reimagined: from paper to website. *Syllabus*, 4(2), 1–11.
<https://www.syllabusjournal.org/syllabus/issue/view/15>

- Cubberly, E. (1902). *Syllabus of lectures on the history of education*. MacMillan.
- Davis, R. E. (2000). Richard Serra talks about drawing on paper [Interview]. *Extended Vision*, 14(5), 60–102. [Http://www.jstor.org/stable/24557931](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24557931)
- DéSautels, J., & Larochelle, M. (1997/1998). About the epistemological posture of science teachers. In A. Tiberghien, E. L. Jossem., & J. Barojas (Eds.), *Connecting research in physics education with teacher education* (pp. 92–95). The International Commission on Physics Education.
- Dewey, J. (1964). *John Dewey on education* (R. D. Archambault, Ed.). Modern Library.
- Dockray, S., & Forster, B., & Public Office. (2018, February 15). 'README.md'. HyperReadings. <https://samizdat.github.io/hyperreadings/>.
- Dryer, D. (2016). Disambiguating uptake: Toward a tactical research agenda on citizens' writing. In A. Bawarshi & M. J. Reiff (Eds.), *Genre and the performance of publics* (pp. 60–79). Utah State University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7330/9781607324430.c003>
- Earle, R. S. (1995). Teacher imagery and metaphors: Windows to teaching and learning. *Educational Technology*, 35(4), 52–59. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44428288>
- Feist, T. (2016, November 7). *War and the treacheries of taxonomy*. War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2016/11/war-and-the-treacheries-of-taxonomy/>
- Fink, S. (2012). The many purposes of course syllabi: Which are essential and useful? *Syllabus*, 1(1), 1–12. <https://www.syllabusjournal.org/syllabus/issue/view/14>
- Gage, N. L. (2009). *A conception of teaching*. Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09446-5>
- Germano, W., & Nicholls, K. (2020). *Syllabus: The remarkable, unremarkable document that changes everything*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.127036>
- Gilligan, C. (2016). Race and ethnicity. In K. Cordell & S. Wolff (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of ethnic conflict*. Taylor & Francis.

- Goodlad, J. I. (2004). *A place called school* (Special 20th anniversary ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Graziano, V., Mars, M., & Medak, T. (2019). Learning from #syllabus. In Y. Calakides, M. Garrett, & I. Gloerich (Eds.), *State machines: Reflections and actions at the edge of digital citizenship, finance, and art* (pp. 115–128). Institute of Network Cultures.
- Gunve, F. (2017). *A shadow course curriculum* [Syllabus]. Gothenburg University. <https://www.gu.se/en/about/find-staff/fredricgunve>
- Haag, A. (1912). Syllabus. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Robert Appleton Company. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14368b.htm>
- Heidbrink-Bruno, A. (2014, August 27). *Syllabus as manifesto: A critical approach to classroom culture*. Hybrid Pedagogy. <https://hybridpedagogy.org/syllabus-manifesto-critical-approach-classroom-culture/>
- Hemenway, F. D. (1884). *Biblical introduction: Syllabus of lectures*. F. D. Hemenway. https://archive.org/details/biblicalintroduc00heme_0
- Hilton, L. J., & Ekere Tallie, M. (2023). The unwieldy otherwise: Rethinking the roots of performance studies in and through the black freedom struggle. *Performance Matters*, 8(2), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1099878ar>
- Hockensmith, S. F. (1988). The syllabus as a teaching tool. *Educational Forum*, 52(4), 339–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131728809335503>
- Hogarth, R. (2003). *Educating intuition: A challenge for the 21st century*. Centre De Recerca En Economia Internacional. https://crei.cat/wp-content/uploads/opuscles/090429180657_ENG_op13ang.pdf
- Huber, S. (2014, August 1). *The shadow syllabus*. Sonyahuber.com. <https://sonyahuber.com/2014/08/20/shadow-syllabus/>
- Hunter, M. (Producer). (2022, August 18–October 13). *She Hulk: Attorney at law* [TV series]. Disney+.
- Kalin, N. (2012). (de)Fending art education through the pedagogical turn. *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*, 32, 42–55.
- Kalir, R. (2022, August 8). *Annotate your syllabus 4.0*. RemiKalir.com. <https://remikalir.com/blog/annotate-your-syllabus-4-0/>

- Kofman, F. (1992). *Double-loop accounting: A language for the learning organization*. The Systems Thinker. <https://thesystemsthinker.com/double-loop-accounting-a-language-for-the-learning-organization/>
- Kohl, H. R. (1994). *I won't learn from you: And other thoughts on creative maladjustment*. Perseus Distribution.
- Kohlstedt, K. (2022, May 24). Inheriting Froebel's gifts (No. 492) [Audio podcast]. In *99% Invisible*. <https://99percentinvisible.org/episode/inheriting-froebels-gifts/transcript/>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Livius (Livy), T. (1936). *History of Rome* (Book 38, E. V. Sage, Trans.). Harvard University Press. <https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Liv.+38+56&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0166#note-link8>
- Luke, A., Woods, A., & Weir, K. (2013). *Curriculum syllabus design and equity: A primer and model*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203833452>
- McKay, S. W., & Buffington, M. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Practice theory: Seeing the power of art teacher researchers*. National Art Education Association.
- Nelson, B. (2022 February). Table of contents. *Architectures of the book*. <https://drc.usask.ca/projects/archbook/tableofcontents.php#footnote14>
- Norman, D. (1993). *Things that make us smart: Defending human attributes in the age of the machine*. Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Ostraff, K. (2023). A definition of posture for teachers. In J. Lucero, *Conceptualist permissions for teacher posture* (pp. 3–8). Center for Visual Art.
- Pajares, F. M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332. American Educational Research Association. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Parkes, J., & Harris, M. B. (2002). The purposes of a syllabus. *College Teaching*, 50(2), 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550209595875>
- Pope Pius IX. (1864). *Syllabus of errors*. Papal Encyclicals Online. <https://www.papalencyclicals.net/pius09/p9syll.htm>

- Reese, W. J. (2000). Public schools and the elusive search for the common good. In L. Cuban & D. Shippo (Eds.), *Reconstructing the common good in education* (pp. 13–31). University Press.
- Resor, C. (n.d.). Concept development: Clarifying the meaning of slippery words & concepts. *Teaching with Themes*.
<https://teachingwiththemes.com/index.php/projects/concept-development-slippery-concepts/>
- Robertson, A. S. (1971). Curriculum building. In L. C. Deighton (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of education*. Macmillan.
- Rocha, S. (2020). *Syllabus as curriculum: A reconceptualist approach*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429027901>
- Rubin, S. (1985). Professors, students, and the syllabus. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 56.
- Rumore, M. M. (2016). The course syllabus: Legal contract or operator’s manual?. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 80(10), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8010177>
- Seitz, J. (2019). Syllabus. *New Literary History*, 50(3), 457–460.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/nlh.2019.0042>
- Shankar, K., & Steinmetz, J. (2023). The syllabus is the thing: Materialities of the performance. *Performance Matters*, 8(2), 1–159.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1099876ar>
- Shaw, A. M. (1977). Foreign-language syllabus development: Some recent approaches. *Language Teaching & Linguistics: Abstracts*, 10(4), 217–233.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800003487>
- Sidorkin, A. M. (2012). Syllabus, the genre. *Syllabus*, 1(1), 1–4.
<https://www.syllabusjournal.org/syllabus/issue/view/14>
- Snyder, J. A. (2002). *Brief history of the syllabus with examples*. Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University.
- Sprague, J. (2011). *Imaginary syllabi*. Palm Press.
- Spring, J. H. (1991). *American education*. McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Starr, A. (2019). Cultivating the self: Embodied transformation for artists. In S. Jahoda & C. Woolard (Eds.), *Making and being* (pp. 47–63). Pioneer Works Press.

- Sullivan, F. A. (1996). *Creative fidelity: Weighing and interpreting documents of the magisterium*. Paulist Press.
- The Syllabus. (n.d.). *What we do*. The Syllabus. <https://www.the-syllabus.com/about>
- Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520601011575>
- Warner, J. (2018, November 25). A syllabus is not a contract. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/syllabus-not-contract>
- Westbury, I. (2008). Making curricula: Why do states make curricula and how? In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 45–65). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976572.n3>
- Wilkinson, C. H. (1790). *Syllabus*. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. link.gale.com/apps/doc/CB0126478818/ECCO?u=uiuc_uc&sid=gale_marc&xid=d8172d4f&pg=1.
- Wiseman, D. J. (1970). Books in the ancient Near East and in the Old Testament. In P. R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Bible: From the beginnings to Jerome* (pp. 30–48). University of Cambridge Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521074186.004>
- Zinguer, T. (2015). *Architecture in play: Intimations of modernism in architectural toys*. University of Virginia Press.