

Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

I S S N 1 5 4 5 - 4 5 1 7

A refereed journal of the



Action for Change in Music Education

**Volume 13 Number 2
June 2014**

Vincent C. Bates, *Editor*

Brent C. Talbot, *Associate Editor*

**Mayday! Mayday!
Help me if you can, I'm feeling down:
"The best lack all conviction, while the worst
are full of passionate intensity"**

Peter P. Grimmett

© Peter P. Grimmett. 2014. The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the authors. The ACT Journal and the Mayday Group are not liable for any legal actions that may arise involving the article's content, including, but not limited to, copyright infringement.

Special Features: When this document is open in Adobe Reader, endnotes and citations can be viewed by placing the cursor over the corresponding number or date.

Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down:
"The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of
passionate intensity"¹

Peter P. Grimmert
University of British Columbia

Abstract

This article grapples with the relationship between curriculum theory and teacher education. Using Yeat's poem, "The Second Coming," I characterize three periods of teacher education in North America, suggesting we are now on the brink of a fourth period. My premise is that teacher education is central to a Faculty of Education. Take away teacher education and you have precipitated the demise of the Faculty. Central to teacher education is curriculum theory. Take away curriculum theory, and you have precipitated the dissolution of teacher education. Hence, as we approach a new and unknown era in music teacher education, we need curriculum theory to evoke spots in time whence our minds are nourished and invisibly repaired. Keywords: curriculum theory, teacher education, music education

I begin by posing the question: *What is the relationship between curriculum theory and teacher education?* In answering this, I shall illustrate my premise that, as we approach a new and unknown era in teacher education, we need curriculum theory to nourish and invisibly repair our researching and pedagogical minds. I believe Wordsworth was onto something when he wrote about "Spots of Time" in the 12th book of his poem *The Prelude*:

Spots of Time

***There are in our existence spots of time,
That with distinct pre-eminence retain
A renovating virtue, **whence**, depressed
By false opinion and contentious thought,
Or aught of heavier or more deadly weight,***

Grimmett, Peter P. 2014. Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down:
"The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 5–29. act.maydaygroup.org

*In trivial occupations, and the round
 Of ordinary intercourse, **our minds**
Are nourished and invisibly repaired;
 A virtue, by which pleasure is enhanced,
 That penetrates, enables us to mount,
 When high, more high, and lifts us up when fallen.
 This efficacious spirit chiefly lurks
 Among those passages of life that give
 Profoundest knowledge to what point, and how,
 The mind is lord and master—outward sense
 The obedient servant of her will. **Such moments**
Are scattered everywhere.*

(William Wordsworth, *The Prelude*, Book XII)

Wordsworth's premise, that there are in our existence spots in time whence our minds are nourished and invisibly repaired, depicts for me the way in which curriculum theory nurtures and fulfills the role we undertake as teacher educators. This premise leads to my central thesis:

Thesis: *Central to a Faculty of Education is teacher education. Take away teacher education and you have precipitated the demise of the Faculty. Central to teacher education is curriculum theory. Take away curriculum theory, and you have precipitated the dissolution of teacher education. Hence, if we value Faculties of Education for the leading and cutting edge research they do, then we need to value both curriculum theory and teacher education enough to create in and through them compelling forms of inquiry and enabling forms of praxis. And in nurturing inquiry and praxis, we find that curriculum theory evokes spots in time whence our minds are nourished and invisibly repaired.*

Let me begin to illustrate my thesis with a personal story.

I was the only Bass singer who showed up for choir practice that fated Thursday evening. I always hate being solo because I feel so exposed. For a start, in long phrases, there is no possibility to stagger my breathing, so I end up staggering to the end of a line out of breath! But, more importantly, I have no one to follow. The secret to my success (some would call it coping) has always been to tap into my innate musicality, follow on a split second after the Bass section leader (whom I always stand next to) and, upon finding the note and correct pitch, to read the

intervals in the music. How was I going to survive under these conditions? I wasn't fearful. I sing because I enjoy it, not to win the choir Director's approval. But I had this nagging suspicion that I just couldn't do it.

Everyone was initially accommodating. They all appreciated the fact that I at least had showed up. But it was the other 15 per cent of the Woody Allen proverbial that worried me. I struggled. It was one of those pieces that had each of the four voices entering at different times and I was either coming in too late or entering on the wrong note. I was getting frustrated and so were others. At first, I argued (to myself, of course, because I've learned you never argue outwardly with the structuralist approach I have come to associate with most choir directors but inwardly I hate it!): how can they not even begin to appreciate how difficult it is for someone who is innately very musical (even an arranger of sorts) but has no music background? I'm doing very well given my limitations. Don't they realize that once I know a piece, that is, the music is resoundingly in my head, I can read the music, and faster than they can probably! Why don't they show me a little patience and give me some slack?

Painfully, I soldiered on and was ultimately very grateful when time was called. I went home frustrated and just a little furious at the palpable lack of understanding shown by my colleague choristers. I began to think that, while they may be competent choir members, they weren't very gracious people. Once at home, I verbalized my lament. Now, while I am quite musical and invariably singing (I try to tone it down at the university but do slip up on occasion), my younger daughter is a highly successful musician. She listened and was quite incredulous at my outburst that they should realize that until I hear the music in my head, the symbols on the treble and bass clef lines mean absolutely nothing to me, a musical dyslectic. Her quiet response was sobering. "*Dad*", she said, "*You're very clever and exceedingly quick on your feet, but I think your lack of music theory is showing. How can you know what the music notation means if you don't understand the basis on which the composer was operating?*" Ouch!! Out of the mouths of babes! Here was my youngest child calmly telling me that innate ability, while useful and sometimes necessary, is not in itself sufficient. One always needs to understand the basis on which the composer (or researcher or teacher) is operating. My experience of

frustration in a professionally strange context revealed to me something that I thought I knew in the context of curriculum and teacher education: *that uninformed (sometimes misinformed and definitely under-theorized) practice frustrates both learners and learning*. But my professionally strange context was also a gift that permitted me to grasp how theory nourishes our minds and invisibly repairs them.

I wish to return to this theme of how our minds can be nourished and invisibly repaired as we attempt to tap into the innate musical ability of students such as me. First, let me say how impressed I am with the MayDay group's Action for Change in Music Education, how humbled I am to find myself in a group of musicians who clearly know so much more than I do, and how I realize that I cannot do anything but encourage you in your endeavors because, as my daughter has convinced me, I lack the basic expertise and knowledge to talk about music. That doesn't stop me singing, however.

As agents of social change who are locally and globally bound, we create, sustain, and contribute to reshaping musical cultures at varied levels. Musical cultures are human-driven, living processes, not merely sets of works or established practices. Musical activity develops out of an emergent synergy of change and tradition within human contexts and communities of practice. Thus, we need to continually examine privilege and power surrounding these contexts and practices, including our own histories and identities, to encourage the capacity for change in our musical and educational practices. (MayDay Groups' Action for Change in Music Education)

Introduction

The field of genetics instructs us that the more we reduce diversity, the more we expose life to quick destruction. Neo-liberalism is reducing the diversity among nation states, to which universities were once central. The less diversifying role of the postmodern university provides the context in which teacher education now takes place. Neo-liberalism undermines "professionalism" and fosters "governmentality." Economic rationalist pressure pushes teacher educators toward academic drift (they seek university legitimacy solely through academic work) and professional regulatory bodies toward mimetic isomorphism (they forge their identity by aping other bureaucratic agencies). When bureaucratic creep meets academic drift, we have serious conflict. However, these micro-political struggles take place in a context

circumscribed by diversity reducing macro-political forces. The action level is what we can influence. Hence, I work to buffer teacher education practice from the extreme ravages of macro-political neo-liberalist pressures that attempt to re-professionalize teachers as “servants of the state” merely carrying out public policy, that is, where professionalism is arrogated to the uncritical carrying out of government policy. To do so, I work to increase diversity in teacher education by resisting pressures of standardization, by preparing teachers as public intellectuals, and by forging a rigorous identity for teacher education that legitimates both programs and professional bodies. Collaboration at the action level thus shields our work and ultimately bolsters our faith that neo-liberalism, because of its diversity reducing tendencies, carries within it the seeds of its own demise.

In the 1840s, much of Ireland’s population depended on potatoes for food. Since new potato plants do not come as a result of reproduction but rather from pieces of the parent plant, no genetic diversity is developed, and the entire crop is essentially a clone of one potato, it is especially susceptible to an epidemic. They planted namely the “lumper” variety of potato, which was susceptible to a rot-causing mould called *Phytophthora infestans*. This mould destroyed the vast majority of the potato crop, and left thousands of people to starve to death.

Genetic diversity plays a huge role in the survival and adaptability of a species. When a species’ environment changes, slight gene variations are necessary for it to adapt and survive. A species that has a large degree of genetic diversity among its individuals will have more variations from which to choose the most fitting allele (i.e., one member of a pair or series of different forms of a gene). Species that have very little genetic variation are at a great risk.

A National Science Foundation (2007) study found that genetic diversity and biodiversity are dependent upon each other—that diversity within a species is necessary to maintain diversity among species, and vice versa. If any one type is removed from the system, the cycle can break down, and the community becomes dominated by a single species. This is analogous to what Yeats characterized in his poem *the Second Coming* as “things fall apart, the centre cannot hold” which I want to use to frame three phases of teacher education since 1960.

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
 The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
 Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
 The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
 The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
**The best lack all conviction, while the worst
 Are full of passionate intensity.**

Surely some revelation is at hand;
 Surely the Second Coming is at hand.
 The Second Coming! Hardly are those words out
 When a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi
 Troubles my sight: a waste of desert sand;
 A shape with lion body and the head of a man,
 A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun,
 Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it
 Wind shadows of the indignant desert birds.
 The darkness drops again but now I know
 That twenty centuries of stony sleep
 Were vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle,
 And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
 Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

The Second Coming, by William Butler Yeats

William Butler Yeats wrote *The Second Coming* in 1919 after the catastrophe of World War I at a time when communism and fascism were rising. It signifies a compelling glimpse of an inhuman world about to be born. According to Yeats' cosmology, two intersecting cone-like spirals or gyres represent the sweep of history. Yeats believed that as one gyre widens over a period of two thousand years the other narrows, producing a gradual change in the age. The process then reverses after another twenty centuries have passed, and so on, producing a cyclical pattern throughout time. Yeats says in his notes to the poem:

The end of an age, which always receives the revelation of the character of the next age, is represented by the coming of one gyre to its place of greatest expansion and of the other to that of its greatest contraction. . . . All our scientific, democratic, fact-accumulating, heterogeneous civilization belongs to the outward gyre and prepares not the

continuance of itself but the revelation as in a lightning flash . . . of the civilization that must slowly take its place. (493)

Thus, in *The Second Coming* the uncontrolled flight of the falcon is representative of this primary expansion at its chaotic peak, while the coming of an antithetical disposition is symbolized in the appearance of the "rough beast" in the desert, a harbinger of the new era. More likely than not, the sphinx-like beast of the poem's second half represented the forces of violence and anarchy of the time, e.g., the Russian Revolution, World War I, the Irish Civil War of 1916, Fascism, or rising communism. But Yeats was using this image to emphasize the dreadful and foreboding nature of what was to come, and associate its emergence with the decline of western civilization.

What I want to emphasize is that at the time of this change, the best are paralyzed by lack of conviction, while the worst are fired with the 'passionate intensity' that accompanies the intoxicating effect of anarchy, fanaticism, and hatred, especially in the context of political struggles. How does this connect to music teacher education?

The poem uses many simple but powerful images: the falcon's gyre widening, disintegration, anarchy, tide of blood, drowning of ceremony of innocence, weakness and intensity. In the symbol of the falcon, the falconer represents control but stands at the lowest point of the gyre's apex, so that, as the falcon towers higher, it can no longer hear the controlling centre. "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold." A revelation is at hand. An image emerges from "Spiritus Mundi," the world's creative and active mind. But the figure is not a Phoenix rising from the ashes (Joyce and Clift 1984), but "the rough beast . . . / Slouches towards Bethlehem".

I want to suggest that the falcon can be seen as a symbol of university-based teacher education, with the falconer, the centre, representing public governance of the field of practice or the guarding of the public trust. Both the falcon and the falconer affect the flight, i.e., the field of practice. The widening gyre in this case is not "twenty centuries of stony sleep" but almost sixty years (three phases of two decades each) of theory-practice blood-seeping fissure that was vexed to nightmare by scientific-rationalism. Things have fallen apart at the end of each twenty-year phase, leading to a revelation at hand that characterized the next phase. We are

presently at the end of the six-decade period, and things are now falling apart because of contestation that is widening the theory-practice chasm, leading to the possibility in Canada (in some countries, already the reality) of an emerging “beast” that will coalesce the centre and harness control for the next 20 years or so. I want to explore this analogy for teacher education, not so much as a foreboding, more so as a discussion of what we could do to ensure that, in university-based teacher education, *the best possess energized conviction that enables them to work with passionate intensity to re-vision, co-constructively with the field and public governance, the education of teachers in ways that meet the challenges of today’s post-modern world.* In the end, I want to show that, in teacher education, the best must have all conviction and work toward it with passionate intensity. Otherwise the beast (harsh political imposition) will slouch toward Bethlehem, as it were, to be born.

Within the overarching gyre of six decades of fissure, I want to suggest there are two smaller intertwining gyres in teacher education—research and policy—consisting of three phases that each seem to go for two decades at a time. Phase 1 goes from 1960 to 1980, phase 2 from 1980 to 2000, and phase 3 from about 1990 to approximately 2010. The *research* gyre focused between 1960–1980 on teacher education as training; between 1980–2000 on learning to teach; and between roughly 1990–2010 on teacher education as policy. The *policy* gyre focused between 1960–1980 on governmental control; between 1980–2000 on institutional governance; and between roughly 1990–2010 on professional governance accompanied by de-regulation. These two gyres influenced practice between 1960–1980 to focus on direct instruction and classroom management; between 1980–2000 on reflective practice, inquiry, and social justice; and between approximately 1990–2010 on both content-based instruction and on-the-job learning.

Phase 1 (1960–1980):

Teacher Education as Training under Government Control

In this conception of teacher education as training, teaching was assumed to be content transmission and researchers presumed an unproblematic connection both between teaching and learning, and between training and teacher behavior. The focus in teacher education as training research, then, was on changing teacher

behavior that was viewed as a proxy of student achievement. Teacher education was thus conceptualized as a process that ensured that prospective teachers displayed the behaviors of effective teachers.

During this first phase, the governance of teacher education was largely in the hands of benign governments that consulted with professionals and the body politic to make policy changes affecting the practice of teacher education. Joint Teacher Education Boards advised policy makers on appropriate direction and the approach functioned with considerable good will from all parties, probably because benign government control essentially allowed institutions a lot of freedom within broad policy constraints.

Things fell apart because training, direct instruction, and an emphasis on classroom management was seen to have little or no effect on producing the kind of citizens needed for a democratic society and the workforce requisite for sustaining economic viability; as a consequence, the centre of government control could not hold. The best supporters of the training model lost conviction and the worst passionate intensity of business and academic critics came through. The catalyst for the revelation of the emphasis on teacher learning that was to characterize phase 2 was *A Nation at Risk* and the advent of the Holmes Group.

Phase 2 (1980–2000):

Teacher Education as Learning to Teach under Institutional Governance

The advent of the Holmes group, the report of the Carnegie Forum on teacher education, and the founding of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) all came about in 1986 as a response to the National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. All were committed to the idea that, to produce a professional teaching force, research had to codify the professional knowledge base of teaching and teacher education. Goodlad's (1990) study of teacher education institutions was both particularly critical of what was happening and catalytic of an emphasis on teacher learning. Hence, the language of "learning to teach (Feiman-Nemser 1983) replaced the language "teacher training." Schön's (1988) "reflective practice" superseded direct instruction. Teacher learning was more than formal preparation; it

included the beliefs, knowledge, and experiences that pre-service teachers brought with them into teacher education; it included their understanding of subject matter knowledge and how to connect it pedagogically; the way they made sense of their course work and field experiences in light of their own school experiences as students; and ways in which they developed professionally through observing other teachers' practice, talking with them about it, and generally engaging in the "joint work" that made them colleagues (Little 1982).

Institutional governance essentially took root in the first phase and has continued to the beginning of the 21st century. Some teacher educators still act as if there is no other way. In this approach, the institution responsible for the delivery of a teacher education program exercises self-governance. Gideonse (1993) noted that this idea gained credence because a teacher education institution "not only is the place where the preparation needs and conflicts have to be resolved, but also is where the specifics . . . are all supposed to come together" (6). The downside of this is the potential for both inappropriate and occasional irresponsible use of the autonomy that is granted to universities. That typically occurs when there is, at best, a highly narrow and idiosyncratic view of what must constitute the program and, at worst, an egregious misunderstanding of tenure and academic freedom for the purpose of self-indulgence.

Both these examples are grounded in a lack of attention to external stakeholders, which could be overcome if teacher education held a central place in university faculties of education. But, as Sheehan and Fullan (1995) pointed out, it has not achieved its rightful place in the broad scheme of things. In making the move from the normal school to the university, many faculty members made a "Mephistophelian bargain" (Grimmett 1998) in which the pressure to succeed on campus drew them away from teacher education that ultimately became "ill-regarded work" (Clifford & Guthrie 1988, 4). Teacher educators had succeeded in obtaining university faculty status but, regrettably, had lost sight of the mission of preparing teachers that had brought them there in the first place. The consequence of all this was that institutional governance was not regarded as a viable way of enabling innovative programs and fresh pedagogical approaches to materialize. The profession had to have a greater say.

Things fell apart toward the end of this phase because research and practice became consumed with a focus on teacher's beliefs, values, and their learning as professionals, to the neglect of attention to quality assurance and outcomes. The centre of institutional governance could not hold because universities were seen not as partners with the field but as independent institutions protecting their vested and prioritized interests. The best in universities were too busy with their own world of research and practice—much of it, as Cole's (1999, 2000a, 2000b) research points out, a case of survival in the academic world—to enter the public debate about the nature and purpose of teacher education. The worst displayed their passionate intensity in calling for the de-regulation of teacher education and the handing over of vital practice experiences to the field. The catalyst for the revelation of contrasting policies of professionalization and de-regulation was the unrelenting criticism of right-wing think tanks and the public mistrust of teacher education institutions.

Phase 3 (1990–2010): Teacher Education as Policy in a Governance Context of Professional Self-Regulation and De-Regulation

Viewing teacher education as learning to teach did not, however, concern itself with outcomes. During phase 2, Haberman (1985) and Evertson, Hawley and Zlotnik (1985) began to ask questions about whether or not teacher education made a difference to student learning in classrooms. This line of inquiry foreshadowed the shift that emerged in the 1990s toward framing teacher education around policy issues. As a consequence, much research followed the recommendations of critiques of conventional teacher education programs to focus on teacher quality and public accountability. Wasley and McDiarmid's (2003) paper tying the assessment of new teachers to student learning and teacher preparation is an example of this line of thinking.

In North America, there has been unrelenting commentary urging this shift from right-leaning organizations and critics. In the States, the Fordham Foundation and in Canada, a conservative critic (Nikiforuk 1993) and two conservative think tanks,² the Fraser Institute and the Society for Quality Education (Dare 2002), became major advocates of de-regulation of teacher education. This advocacy led in the States to the provision of alternative routes to certification (without pedagogy)

Grimmett, Peter P. 2014. Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 5–29. act.maydaygroup.org

and an unforgiving focus on results; in Canada, it led to an unremitting concern for standards and accountability. Darling-Hammond (1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c) has emerged as the primary education policy analyst to defend teacher education by countering arguments for de-regulation. Her reviews conclude that teacher preparation and certification contribute considerably to teacher effectiveness and student achievement. The battle lines have thus been drawn in the States over which evidence should inform and drive teacher education policy. In Canada, the struggle is just beginning. Now independently funded centres are sponsoring their own research. And governments are planning their own imposed reviews of teacher education programs. The agendas are thus becoming complex as the professionalization and de-regulation policy trends begin to intersect.

The professionalization agenda for teaching and teacher education has two different and sometimes competing thrusts: one toward professionalizing the practice of teaching by creating strong learning communities, assuring quality teacher preparation, and supporting professionally rewarding careers; and a second toward professionalizing the status of teaching by handing over governance to members of the profession. Advocates (Darling-Hammond 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c; Grossman 1990; Wasley & McDiarmid 2003) of the professionalization agenda make a strenuous case for the presence of pedagogy and professional course work in teacher preparation. Those who argue for de-regulation (Cowley & Easton 2003; Dare, Hepburn, & Merrifield 2006; Dare 2002; Finn & Kanstoroom 2000; Nikiforuk 1993) vigorously contest this position. The de-regulation agenda shifts the focus from pedagogy to content knowledge and verbal expression, maintaining that pedagogy and professional learning are best acquired on the job. Accordingly, advocates of the de-regulation agenda argue strongly for alternative routes to certification outside normal teacher preparation programs and professional regulation.

During phase 3, professional self-regulation became an experiment in the Anglophone world. Until 2010, there were many professional regulatory bodies in Scotland, British Columbia, Ontario, England, Wales, Northern Ireland and in Australia in Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, and Western Australia. All these professional bodies were set up with two broad purposes: 1) to regulate the

profession of teaching by maintaining and improving the standards of professional conduct among teachers, in the interests of the public, and 2) to ensure that all members of the profession, including those joining it, meet professional standards that ensure the quality of learning for students. This second purpose gave the professional bodies a role to play in the governance of teacher education. The three most senior professional bodies involved in the governance of teacher education were found in Scotland, British Columbia, and Ontario. Now, the BC College and all the UK bodies have been dissolved and the Scottish, Ontario, and Australian bodies serve under closely monitored government regulatory constraints.

As we enter the next phase of teacher education, what we are recognizing is that, when professionalization and de-regulation policies are in competition, the latter undermine not only university-based teacher education but also professional governance in the form of self-regulatory bodies. What we are witnessing at the end of phase 3 are the vestiges of thinking that was applied to universities at the end of phase 2. Now the profession and its regulatory bodies are regarded as institutions protecting their own vested interests. The logical outcome of this neo-liberalist way of thinking is that only political imposition and market forces can stem the tide of vested self-interest in the profession that is characterized as not being in the interests of children and their learning. *My thesis is that when policy makers align their thinking about education with market forces, the “beast” of harsh political imposition emerges.* It is a real stretch even to imagine how such a state of affairs can be in the best interests of children and learning. But when the discourse is arrogated toward this ideological position, even this justification can be made to sound plausible.

Clearly, advocates of the profession of teaching and teacher education must contest this co-optation of the discourse. But we in universities must also do more. We must recognize that the situation has now reached the point where we are faced with a forced choice—either professionalization or de-regulation—because the era of institutional governance has long since gone. My position is that we must choose professionalization, ensuring that we professionalize practice, as distinct from status. That means university-based teacher educators have to find a way of working with professional practitioners and regulatory bodies (where they still exist) to sustain and

improve teacher education policies and programs. This will lead to requisite stands being taken within the academy about the priority of teacher education. Likewise, it means that practitioners and professional regulatory bodies have to work well with university-based teacher educators to avoid the distorted temptation of bureaucratic expansionism and professional protectionism that comes from exuberant over-regulation. Humes (1994) maintained that ‘independent’ professional bodies or “policy communities” like professional regulatory bodies become the means whereby government directives are made more palatable, tantamount to an exercise in political control that permits *bureaucratic expansionism and professional protectionism*. Humes argues that “real power over the form of content of teacher education still lies with [the government]” (54) and professionalism is used as a mechanism of control because the historical evolution of professions shows that “over time, the self-interested impulse [to control certification, develop a mystique about the occupation, and improve rewards for the professionals] becomes stronger than the altruistic impulse [to raise standards, protect the public from the unqualified, and operate in an ethical way]” (55). We need to find a way of rendering Humes’ (1994) critique inoperative by focusing our energies on raising standards and improving teacher education. For me, it is the *delicate relationship between academic/institutional autonomy and professional governance that needs to be constructively negotiated together, so that the professional and pedagogic values embedded in teacher education can be preserved and better expressed in a manner that grapples with outcomes*. For I have no doubt that the next era of teacher education will include an extreme focus on outcomes, leading to a neo-liberalist purging of those programs that take little account of what they produce.

In the new era, the professional body must become more a partner and a conduit than an evaluator. In this way, teacher education institutions and professional bodies become co-constructors of a rigorous accountability process that attempts to be “responsible and responsive to the concerns of the public, to acknowledge the exigencies of public policy, and to preserve complexity in the press for accountability” (Cochran-Smith 2003, 4). Being accountable while honoring complexity will involve us all in fruitful conversation about non-trivial outcomes:

What is needed and generally missing from the discourse so far are discussions of outcomes measures that—ironically—make teaching harder and more complicated for teacher candidates rather than easier and more straightforward. Such measures would recognize the inevitable complexity and uncertainty of teaching and learning and acknowledge the fact that there are often concurrent and competing claims to justice operating in the decisions prospective teachers must make from moment to moment, day to day. The new teacher education ought to make room for discussions about outcomes that demonstrate how teachers know when and what their students have learned as well as how they manage dilemmas and wrestle with multiple perspectives. Outcomes ought to include how prospective teachers open their practice to public critique and utilize their own and others' research to generate new questions as well as new analyses and actions. They ought to include how prospective teachers learn to be educators as well as activists by working in the company of mentors who are also engaged in larger movements for social change. (Cochran-Smith 2001a, 180)

Holding ourselves accountable while honoring complexity will inevitably involve us in the renewal of programs. It is impossible to renew a teacher education program without open, serious, and substantive collaboration with colleagues in other Faculties who introduce prospective teachers to their subject matter content. As I pointed out over a decade and a half ago (Grimmett 1998, 1995), teacher education must be located in collaborative partnerships between faculties of education and the field on the one hand, and between faculties of education and university faculties of arts and science on the other. I further argued that such an arrangement calls for a re-visioning of teacher education around interdisciplinary study and teacher research in a manner that brings together discipline- and practice-based knowledge, involving: 1) the engagement of pre-service teachers in action research into dilemmas of teaching, and 2) the rigorous integration of liberal arts and sciences with professional pedagogy, instead of the convenient separation—I called it a Mephistophelian bargain—that is currently indulged. My views have not changed but the window of opportunity has shortened.

So that is why I'm down. The recent gyre has come to an end and a new one looms. We need to renew our conviction to act with passionate intensity in the interests of teachers and students. This will have implications for the practice of teacher education. We do not need to prepare teachers who lack all conviction about public education, nor ones who are full of passionate intensity about esoteric issues.

Rather, we need to prepare wise and poised public intellectuals deeply committed to and advocates of education both as a field of rigorous academic study and as a public trust; teachers who are a model of fairness and decorum, who possess moral courage to stand for what is right and good, whose contributions are lucid and engaging, bold and provocative; people whose very presence commands respect for all human endeavor and difference.

We need teachers who are equally at home discussing compellingly matters of international and local public policy as they are talking engagingly about artistic, musical, literary, mathematical, scientific, or social culture (Hamlet or Quantum Physics). It seems that many conceive of this in a bifurcated fashion—either they regard themselves as subject specialists and generalists or they involve themselves in public policy but in a politicized way. We need teachers who can address policy matters in a non-partisan fashion by connecting their subject matter expertise with issues of life in today's postmodern, turbulent society.

If we prepare teachers in this way for the vexing problems and dilemmas of a postmodern world, then we have to take seriously our responsibilities for research and policy in the next gyre. I believe we have a moral obligation to prepare teachers rigorously for today's world and an equally strong obligation to provide the conditions that permit continuing research and policy development. We are faced with a choice about what kind of teachers we want to prepare and about what kind of teachers we want them to become. Theoretical research, education policy, and teacher education practice must come together. So too must different university faculties with teacher educators, and teacher educators with professional bodies. It won't be easy, but it will be productive and, if we wish to keep the beast at bay, ultimately non-negotiable.

How Can We Do This?

There are many possibilities here. The one I propose to address here is pedagogical. This is where I wish to return to my initial theme that curriculum theory nourishes and invisibly repairs the mind as we face the challenge of a new era that typically forces educators into irresponsible world making with students.

Study as the Site of Education

How does curriculum theory enable responsible world making in teacher education? A spot of time occurred for me when I came across Pinar's (2011) *The Character of Curriculum Studies*. It contains a seminal idea that sheds light on responsible curriculum making, nourishing and invisibly repairing my mind. "Study [not learning] is the site of education" (Pinar 2006, 120). We acquire knowledge and insight through the struggle of study for which every individual has the capacity, though not necessarily the will. Teaching and learning may disseminate knowledge but study enables understanding. Study arises not from compliance with instructions but from an aspiration to understand the shifting vicissitudes between self and circumstances. Here, Pinar is rectifying Tyler's distorted emphasis on learning technology.

As Pinar declaims, "Not instruction, not learning, but study constitutes the process of education" (112). Study, then, is central to self-formation, or *Bildung* as the Germans would say. *Bildung* arises from our appropriation of what is around us in the world; study builds our capacity for making choices, for developing focus, for exercising critical judgment that is so central to a well-formed character. I maintain that the absence of seeing music as a living culture, as distinct from a set of works to be received could be explained by the fact that our conception of education is not guided by curriculum theory. There is still far too much social engineering present. As Pinar says, "if only we make the right adjustments—in teaching, in learning, in assessment—it will hum, and transport us to our destination, the promised land of high test scores" (109). The equivalent in music is we will know the notes but not have musicality.

Tying learning to assessment and instruction creates, according to Pinar, two traps: 1) the intellectual trap that makes students dependent on teachers for learning, and 2) the political trap, that holds teachers entirely responsible for student learning (Pinar 120). Equally, in teacher education, when we lead teacher candidates into innovative content pedagogy using instrumentalist techniques, we place false expectations and irresponsible curriculum designs on prospective teachers.

Thus, Pinar's seminal idea about study's central place in education shows how current policy and practice in K-12 schooling and teacher education violate the

attainment of learning through its misplaced and instrumentalist direct focus on learning in and of itself. Here permit me to juxtapose learning with happiness. We all want to be happy in some shape or form, and I dare say that all students want to learn. But the direct pursuit of them makes their attainment elusive. In other words, to focus narrowly and directly on either learning or happiness is to miss out because both sneak up on us when we least expect it. Happiness occurs when we become absorbed in meaningful activities and relationships; likewise, learning occurs, as Dewey (1997) has said, as a by-product of meaningful activity, that is, when we embrace the hard work of wise study and eschew a vacuous focus on learning, so central to the current audit culture that reifies the Tylerian cage.

So, Where Does Pedagogy Fit with Study?

When we grapple with what it is that teachers need to do in order to nurture appropriate curriculum conditions that propel all students in differentiated ways toward assiduous focused study to expand their minds through the understanding of new ideas, we are enacting pedagogy. Pedagogy consists of teachers and teacher educators engaging in a complicated conversation—or curriculum thinking—about how their students' and their own subjectivities can be potentially re-constructed through activities framed around the subject matter content that is central to teaching. Dewey (1997) puts it like this:

When the parent or teacher has provided the conditions which stimulate thinking and has taken a sympathetic attitude toward the activities of the learner by entering into a common or conjoint experience, all has been done which a second party can do to instigate learning . . . [When teachers] give the pupils something to do, not something to learn; and the doing is of such a nature as to demand thinking, or the intentional noting of connections; learning naturally results . . . (160, 154)

For Dewey, then, when teachers focus directly on learning (as the neo-liberalist audit culture exogenously compels them to do), rather than on the conditions and intentional activities that foster learning, they miss the point of pedagogy and their students miss out in learning opportunities. As he says so trenchantly, “frontal attacks are even more wasteful in learning than in war” (169). Hence, the aim of pedagogy is to foster student engagement, reflection, and experience through

carefully thought-out activities that promote study. Nowhere is this more salient and appropriate than in teacher education.

What I am arguing for is for a conception of pedagogy in teacher education that addresses the content *indirectly*. This goes beyond Pinar in claiming that, while the stimulus for thinking about educational activities always arises from the curriculum, the actual making or *design* of those activities in keeping with the curriculum aims and content is also an important focus in itself. And my claim is that this important focus constitutes pedagogy. In teacher education, a more technical discourse of pedagogy constructs the world of institutional text, thereby determining what teacher educators *do*. I argue that, if we are interested in how and what school students learn and particularly keen to change the institutional context in which teacher candidates learn to teach, then we need to understand how teacher educators create the educational activities that they use to enact the curriculum. Why is this important? It is important precisely because a pedagogical perspective enables the enactment of re-directive practices when teacher educators do not fully integrate the curricular aims they are working toward with the activities they choose. Hence, a pedagogical focus differs from a curriculum one in that it encompasses both how teacher educators can address the curriculum indirectly and also how their practices can be re-directed when they attempt a potentially disastrous “frontal attack” on learning, that is, ignoring meaningful activities, that often leads them into the instrumentalist trap.

My position then is that teacher educators need to live in the tension between curriculum understanding and curriculum enactment that I’m calling pedagogy. Living in the tension involves not falling into the trap of aligning design with Tyler’s rationalist cage, but rather understanding how inappropriate decisions around approaches to learning can be re-directed to practices framed around study-promoting educational activities.

Curriculum Theory as Spots in Time

It is in moments when we find ourselves given to irresponsible world making by focusing directly on learning that our teacher educator minds need the nourishment and challenge of curriculum theory to demonstrate that “other thinking [makes]

other worlds (Fry 1999, 95). Subject matter content presented in a way that disregards (and sometimes silences) issues of power, gender, race, identity and biography, culture and language, and social justice calls for the provocative interruption of the taken-for-granted and the evocative enlarging of the mind that curriculum theory brings. When teachers delve deeply into their subject content, they need to be equipped with conceptual frames that enable both “the making present of content to persons (Huebner, quoted in Grumet 1978, 278) and the making of “persons who are made present through the contact with curriculum (Grumet 1978, 278).

For example, if in Canada we present the history of Louis Riel only from the dominant White colonialist perspective of the time, we do not only a disservice to students’ understanding of history but also an offence to the large non-White and First Nations’ people of Canada, thereby forfeiting a glorious opportunity to connect learning to important contemporary issues of social justice in our understanding of Canada’s formation. Instead, we need to create opportunities for first-hand encounters with historical and current education policy documents that might inform beginning teachers’ understanding of their work with students from marginalized groups. Specifically, we could use artistic, musical, literary, mathematical, scientific, or social cultural documents in our work with pre-service teachers to help them learn how to work more effectively with students whose cultural, racial, religious and economic backgrounds are different from their own. That is, we could work toward cultivating a disposition toward encountering artistic, musical, literary, mathematical, scientific, or social cultural knowledge (e.g., in the form of archival documents and narratives) not only as artifacts from the past but also as something that makes ethical demands on us here and now.

A music example could be if we present the music of Robert Schumann as if it stemmed entirely from his apparent genius, then we dismiss the generative influence (and, in some instances, actual composition) that Clara Wieck, his wife, made on and for the quality of the music, thereby reinforcing an unfortunate and insensitive myth that men were composers and women listeners, and forfeiting the opportunity to show that music is not the product of patriarchy. In such instances, we need our thinking to be challenged and disrupted.

Or in choral settings when the composer has thrown in an *appoggiatura*—a type of ornamental grace note that clashes with the melody to create a dissonant sound—between the altos and the basses and neither voice wants to enter into the crunch for they fear the lack of consonance, thereby denying themselves and the piece a richness in its tonality and its harmony. Yet this is a wonderful opportunity in music theory to teach the benefits of embracing diversity for the richness that engaging with the “other” in honest, ethical ways brings to our lives.

Conclusion

Theory informs, evokes, provokes, and disrupts our mental frames about teaching. This is a highly complex undertaking. Curriculum theory informs us that *discourse constructs reality*. I want to argue that in the music theory context, *culture forms musicality*. In our role as educators, I am calling for the purposeful eluding of the Tylerian cage that severely diminishes possibilities in learning in favor of a re-conceptualized appreciation of educational activities that address the content indirectly. In music, I see this leading to studies of pedagogy that draw out the musicality deeply embedded in socio-cultural conditions. If we head into the new era without this emphasis, then teacher (and music) education, in most of its iterations, will remain moribund; and, if teacher education as a viable practice dies, then so too will Faculties of Education. We need curriculum theory to find spots in time whence our minds as teacher education researchers and pedagogues are nourished and invisibly repaired. Without this laparoscopic³ intervention, we will ultimately cease to be.

References

- Clifford, G., & Guthrie, J. 1988. *Ed school: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. 2003. Editorial: The unforgiving complexity of teaching: Avoiding simplicity in the age of accountability. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(1), 3–5.
- Cole, A. 1999. Teacher educators and teacher education reform: Individual commitments, institutional realities. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 24(3), 281–295.
- _____. 2000a. Case studies of reform in Canadian preservice teacher education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 46(2), 192–195.
- _____. 2000b. Toward a preliminary understanding of teacher education reform in Anglophone Canada. *McGill Journal of Education*, 35(2), 139–154.
- Cowley, P., & Easton, S.T. 2003. *The \$100,000,000 giveaway: Who says education doesn't get enough money?* Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Dare, M. 2002. How can teachers' qualifications be upgraded? *Society for Quality Education*. <http://www.societyforqualityeducation.org/teachers/9.html>
- Dare, M., Hepburn, C.R., & Merrifield, J. 2006. *Why Canadian education isn't improving*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1998. Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a national commission report. *Educational Researcher*, 27 (1), 5–15.
- _____. 2000a. How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51 (3), 166–173.
- _____. 2000b. Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: Debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record*, 102 (1), 28–56.
- _____. 2000c. Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of the state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8 (1). Retrieved April 20, 2007 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/>
- Dewey, J. 1997. *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. 1985. Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36, (3), 2–10.
- Grimmett, Peter P. 2014. Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 5–29. act.maydaygroup.org

- Feiman-Nemser, S. 1983. Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (150–170). New York: Longman.
- Finn, C., & Kanstroom. 2000. *Improving, empowering, dismantling*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Fry, T. 1999. *A new design philosophy : an introduction to defuturing*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Gideonse, H. 1993. The governance of teacher education and systemic reform. *Educational Policy*, 7(4), 395–426.
- Goodlad, J. 1990. *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grimmett, P.P. 1995. Reconceptualizing teacher education: Preparing teachers for revitalized schools. In M.F. Wideen & P.P. Grimmett (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* (202–225). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- _____. 1998. Reconceptualizing the practice of teacher education: On not throwing out the concurrent model with the reform bathwater. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 44(3), 251–267.
- Grossman, P.L. 1990. *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grumet, M. 1978. Songs and situations. In G. Willis (ed.), *Qualitative evaluation* (274–315). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Haberman, M. 1985. Does teacher education make a difference? A review of comparisons between liberal arts and teacher education graduates. *Journal of Thought*, 20 (2), 25–34.
- Humes, W.M. 1994. Teacher education in British Columbia and Scotland: A response. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 20(1), 47–57.
- Johnson, D. 2005. *Signposts of success: Interpreting Ontario's elementary school test scores*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- _____. 2007. *Ontario's best public schools: An update to signposts of success (2005)*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Joyce, B., & Clift, R. 1984. The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 13(1), 5–16.
- Little, J. W. 1982. Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19 (3), 325–340.
- Grimmett, Peter P. 2014. Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 5–29. act.maydaygroup.org

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- National Science Foundation. 2007. *Loss of genetic diversity threatens species diversity*. <http://www.enn.com/wildlife/article/23391>
- Nikiforuk, A. 1993. *School's out: The catastrophe in public education and what we can do about it*. Toronto: MacFarlane, Walter & Ross.
- Pakravan, P. 2006. *The future is not what it used to be: Reexamining postsecondary funding mechanisms in Canada*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Pinar, William. 2004. *What is curriculum theory?* New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2006. *The synoptic text today and other essays: Curriculum development after the reconceptualization*. New York: Peter Lang.
- _____. 2009. *The worldiness of a cosmopolitan education: Passionate lives in public service*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- _____. 2011. *The character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurring question of the subject*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Raptis, H., & Fleming, T. 2003. *Reframing education: How to create effective schools*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Schön, Donald A. 1988. Coaching reflective teaching. In P.P. Grimmett & G.L. Erickson (Eds.), *Reflection in teacher education*, 19–29. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sheehan, N., & Fullan, M. 1995. Teacher education in Canada: A case study of British Columbia and Ontario. In M.F. Wideen & P.P. Grimmett (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or reconceptualizing?* (89–102). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Wasley, P.A., & McDiarmid, W.G. 2003. *Tying the assessment of new teachers to student learning and to teacher preparation*. Paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). Retrieved April 3, 2007 from http://www.nctaf.org/strategies/assure/quality_teacher_preparation/assessment_of_new_teachers.htm
- Wordsworth, W. 1850. *The prelude or, growth of a poet's mind: An autobiographical poem*, (Book XII). New York, NY: Appleton & Co.
- Grimmett, Peter P. 2014. Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 5–29. act.maydaygroup.org

Yeats, W.B. 1919. The second coming. Printings: *The Dial* (Chicago), November 1920; *The Nation* (London), 6 November 1920; *Michael Robartes and the Dancer* (Dundrum: Cuala, 1921); *Later Poems* (London: Macmillan, 1922; 1924; 1926; 1931). *The Literature Network*. <http://www.online-literature.com/yeats/780/>

Notes

¹ This paper was given as the Keynote Address at the MayDay Colloquium in Vancouver at the University of British Columbia on June 28, 2013.

² These analyses differ quite markedly from the less polemic and more balanced analytical reports coming from the older, more conventional conservative think tank, the C.D. Howe Institute of Toronto (see Raptis & Fleming 2003; Johnson 2005, 2007; and Pakravan 2006)

³ Invisible laser surgery is that which repairs internal injuries without disrupting the body or breaking the skin.

About the Author

Peter P. Grimmert is Professor and Head of the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia (UBC). A former Associate Dean at Simon Fraser University (SFU), he also served as Director of the Institute for Studies in Teacher Education at SFU, was appointed by the BC Cabinet as the BC Deans of Education appointment to the Council of the BC College of Teachers (the professional body that governed teaching and teacher education in the province) between 2007-2010. He has recently been involved in a five-year Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) -funded \$2.5 million Canada-wide study of the impact of public policy decisions on conditions of teaching and learning, completed a review of teacher education program accreditation for the province of Ontario, chaired the Academy of Finland's expert panel adjudicating the Finnish social science research grants competition, and given keynote addresses at international conferences in Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto (Canada), Kansas City, Honolulu, and Seattle (USA), Oslo (Norway), Stockholm (Sweden), Lahti, Tampere, and Helsinki (Finland), Tel Aviv (Israel), Ljubjana (Slovenia), Queensland (Australia), and, most recently, Seoul (South Korea).

In total, he has published 48 refereed journal articles, written 11 books and 39 chapters in books, and in May 2000, he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Tampere, Finland, in recognition of his outstanding merits as a researcher and educator in the areas of professional development and teacher education. His most recent (2012) book (written with Jon Young), *Teacher certification and the Professional Status of Teaching in North America: The New Battleground for Public Education* (Information Age Publishing) locates recent developments in teacher certification in North America within a broader, international policy context characterized as hegemonic neo-liberalism wherein economic rationalism has begun to trump professional judgment.

Grimmett, Peter P. 2014. Mayday! Mayday! Help me if you can, I'm feeling down: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(2): 5–29. act.maydaygroup.org