

CHAPTER 7



Curriculum

Cathy Benedict

The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind.

(DEWEY, 1916/1944, P. 97)

Curriculum represents the introduction to a particular form of life; it serves in part to prepare students for dominant or subordinate positions in the existing society. The curriculum favors certain forms of knowledge over others and affirms the dreams, desires, and values of select groups of students over other groups, often discriminatorily on the basis of race, class, and gender.

(MCLAREN, 1989, P. 183)

INTRODUCTION

Whether we realize it or not, all of us have been curriculum makers. As we sat in our elementary music classes, our engagements with the music teacher shaped how the lessons and curriculum would flow. As we sat in our ensembles, not only did the repertoire shape the curriculum, but the perceived skill level of our classmates did as well. In the same way, the needs and desires of the local community often shape what a music program will be; our own discipline often dictates for us the norms and expectations of what a quality music program is, and thus what quality curriculum will be.

The history of curriculum is the history of us. It is the history of our strength and our fallibility. In ways more than one, the history of curriculum has been similar and parallel to the history of education. Certainly, and on many occasions, the history of curriculum and the history of education have been mistaken for the other. Unfortunately, this has established and helped to reproduce a curricular history of misconstruction and conceptualization. This in turn, has, in many cases, led us to think of curriculum as something that happens outside of a concern with fluidity and outside the necessity and constancy of engagement

and re-engagement with both, not as disparate elements, but as a whole. In other words, what are the challenges we face now as we move into directing and shaping our own programs that either prevent or enable us to consider those ways the norms and expectations of curriculum development can either “affirm the dreams, desires, and values of select groups of students,” or as Dewey said, define the kind of society we have in mind?

What kinds of questions are these to ask when most, if not all of us, are certain of the curricular and pedagogical path we wish to take. If it worked for us in the past, why not replicate what we know to have been successful? Why not, indeed. Because, for one reason, this world does not stand still and to desire stability is to desire a stasis that cannot exist. And because, perhaps most importantly, “success” as we have come to know it may not represent success for all. It’s not an issue of throwing out curriculum models that have engaged us—orchestra, concert choirs, jazz ensembles, indeed football bands, all curriculum models in their own ways, have for hundreds of years brought to many, not just musical joy, but social joy as well. It is, however, an issue of continually pursuing and questioning concepts and ideals such as “success” and “preparedness.”

What then is curriculum? How simple to answer with perhaps what might be the immediate and obvious. But, as we have seen throughout this book, the immediate and obvious are never what they may seem, nor does the immediate or obvious encourage interrogation of issues and reengagements with what has come before and what becomes as we engage. Has curriculum become a slogan of sorts, an ambiguous term that has “establish[ed] a mood or a form with which people can feel comfortable and affiliate with particular pedagogical practices” (Popkewitz, Autumn, 1980, p. 304)? Is curriculum a course to be run, a course or set of experiences that shape us? Are there fundamentals, basics, or essentials that each of us should “know?” Is curriculum a way in which to address social justice? Is there a difference between the stated and operationalized curriculum? What does teaching have to do with curriculum? Who does and doesn’t get to “write” curriculum? And finally, yet hardly finally, who is curriculum for and who has been left out?

As educators, we need to be mindful of curriculum theory, philosophy, modes of rationality, and the ways in which these have influenced curriculum making. As music educators, we also need to be particularly mindful of the ways in which these models have influenced, and influence, our pedagogy. We need to consider the ways in which methodologies of teaching (i.e. Orff, Kodaly, Dalcroze) and teaching “to” something (for instance teaching “to” the standards), as well as rehearsal techniques that minimize student input in order to maximize performance goals, dictates very particular curriculum models. We also need to consider that these ways of teaching and their resultant curriculum are influenced by modes of rationality that have potent, formidable historical roots. To not consider what these historical influences are, or the ways in which the parameters of these historical curriculum models have prevented us from engaging in seeing broader possibilities of what music education is and can be, is to continue

to reproduce systems of education that are dictated by, and quite possibly serve, not necessarily our needs but the needs of others.

The Function of Schooling

As the opening quotes suggest, the function of curriculum has often been to shape the ways in which students could and should be prepared to enter the world. Curriculum has often been seen as a way in which to reconcile, control, and even solve the embedded tensions between the individual and society. That said, forms of social control have been, at times, more obvious, more of a “given” and perceived as more “welcome,” than at others. Goals such as homogeneity, acquiescing to models of authority, social reform, transmission of culture, class structure, and nationalism are only a few objectives that have at times been explicitly stated as end points. Indeed, the beginnings of public schooling in the United States were regarded as a socialization process that would bridge the gap between what was seen as a breakdown of home/community.

Echoing those goals of homogeneity, transmission of culture, nationalism, and so forth, curriculum in music education has been no different. Based on the singing schools of the 19th century, in which the purpose was to “improve singing in the church service” (Birge, 1928, p. 88), the inception of public music education in 1838 had as its purpose goals that were based on the intellectual, moral, and physical contributions music would make in the lives of students. Music was seen to be “good for” memory, comparison, and attention; it was believed that “in music, the “very image of virtue and vice is perceived” and that music could even “defend . . . from diseases” (as cited in Mark, 1992, pp. 142–143). How these goals have changed or not, and the ways in which control has become hidden is that with which we must contend; for the ways in which the world has shaped and been shaped by the implications and complexity of these inherent contradictions, as well as who has been in a position to interpret and thus shape the world, has defined and framed the parameters of curricular considerations.

The Purpose of the Chapter

All of us have habits of whose import we are quite unaware, since they were formed without knowing what we were about. Consequently [habits] possess us, rather than we them. They move us; they control us. Unless we become aware of what they accomplish, and pass judgment upon the worth of the result, we do not control them. (Dewey, 1916/1944, p. 29)

This chapter seeks to address these issues and habits while at the same time presenting a way to look back and reflect; not just simply as a revisitiation, but as a process of problematizing. As such, rather than framing this chapter under headings, such as traditional and nontraditional, or even modern and postmodern, this chapter uses the concept of rationality (and ideology) as a lens and as a mode of analysis. Giroux (1981) describes rationality as both a “set of assumptions and practices” and “interests” that guides, “defines and qualifies,” shapes, constitutes,

how we are in the world, and how we “reflect” on the world (p. 8). Thus, as we look back and consider curriculum models, we consider those ways in which models have developed and been developed by a construction of knowledge bound by something outside of practices and situations, or models in which human agency, and a critical view of the process of schooling have been denied and ignored. In this process, as we interrogate the rationality that has dictated what questions can be asked, we are then better able to pose and frame those questions that have not been asked.

The first half of this chapter focuses on curriculum that has been shaped by a technical mode of rationality that can be traced to the Enlightenment. It will be suggested that this rationality—as one in which faith in science and reasoning and that which can be observed and measured is favored over all other modes of engagement—framed and continues to frame much of curriculum development in music education. The second half of this chapter focuses on what might be considered an interrogation and reconceptualization of these models.

The space constraints of this chapter prohibit an exhaustive examination of all curriculum models; consequently, there is a need to narrow down the literature. Granted, this is a subjective process. Therefore, it is hoped that this chapter affords spaces for mindful consideration and action that come from making and bringing continual sense to readings and engagements. We need to remind ourselves that these curricular models and theories were and will continue to be attempts and constructions of environments for possible learning. Schmidt (September, 2007) reminds us of this when stating:

We tend to forget in education, as in history, that our beginnings are often arbitrary, and thus that the certainty we assign to interpretations, theories and practices are, while seemingly inescapable, in fact, substantively chosen. (p. 23)

In all our engagements, we choose. In this chapter, I choose to address particular areas of curriculum through a framework that is not arbitrary; it is a framing that is deliberate and one through which I hope will provide the processes necessary for interrogating certainty.

Early Curricular Influences

Both Rousseau (1712–1778) and Pestalozzi (1746–1827) are often cited as major influences in the development of music education curriculum and methods. A closer examination of the basic tenets of these men provides a foundation upon which to consider the authority that has been afforded their work.

Rousseau believed the purpose of education was to engage in processes so that students would be able to relate to others in a natural way that would allow respect for ourselves and others. He was critical of an educative system that encouraged students to base self-worth and superiority through comparisons. Rousseau wasn't interested in parameters set by “book-learning” or methods of instruction; he was interested in the development of character so that one would enter an imperfect world and engage in virtuous acts that would lead toward

social unity. He viewed anything that challenged the common allegiance of man, such as rivalries and antisocial behavior, as disruptive. Toward that end, Rousseau believed that rather than building an educative process on a foundation of symbols/signs and representations one needed to encourage and scaffold experiences based on sensory impressions and intuitive ideas.

Among other things, Rousseau was trained as a music copyist and music teacher. He laid out this vision of the teaching learning process as it applied to music:

First give your young musician practice in very regular, well-cadenced phrases; then let him connect these phrases with the very simplest modulations; then show him their relation one to another by correct accent, which can be done by a fit choice of cadences and rests. On no account give him anything unusual, or anything that requires pathos or expression. A simple, tuneful melody, always based on the common chords of the key, with its bass so clearly indicated that it is easily felt and accompanied; for to train his voice and ear he should always sing with the harpsichord. (1956, p. 500)

This notion, further explored in Chapter 8 of this book, that music had to be introduced in manageable pieces resonates with many other curriculum makers outside and inside the domain of music education. Indeed, Pestalozzi (1894), whose own writings were influenced by those of Rousseau, articulated the “laws of teaching” and even referred to this as “Art” (p. 199). Among those stated laws was the imperative to arrange objects together through their similarities and in ways that would allow one to take them in through different senses (p. 202). Directly related to curriculum development in music education are the laws in which Pestalozzi instructs us to:

Arrange graduated steps of knowledge, in which every new idea shall be only a small, almost imperceptible addition to that earlier knowledge which has been deeply impressed and made unforgettable.

Learn to make the simple perfect before going on to the complex. (p. 202)

In 1834, the work of Pestalozzi influenced and framed the work of music educator Lowell Mason as he formulated the *Manual of Instruction*. The principles he devised included directives to teach one thing at a time (i.e. rhythm, melody, expression), teach sounds before signs, master each step before moving on, introduce principles and theory after practice, to “analyze and practice the elements of articulate sound in order to apply them to music,” and to teach note names that corresponded to the notes of instrumental music (Birge, 1928, pp. 38–39). To this day, one can see how these laws and principles have influenced the ways music educators conceive of teaching and curriculum construction: a passing familiarity with any instrumental or music series; Orff, Kodály, Gordon, Suzuki, Dalcroze, and so forth bear witness to this.

As we have seen, both Rousseau and Pestalozzi believed students needed to first experience what was to be learned prior to the process of naming and

labeling, and both believed that the distillation of the learning process into discrete manageable steps would be the most effective and efficient way to frame the teaching/learning process and thus curriculum development. In the following sections, Bobbitt and Tyler redefine, reinforce, and essentially perfect this process.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RATIONALITY

Curriculum deals with the selection of desired educational outcomes and learning experiences to achieve these outcomes. Curriculum building in music education includes the formulation of objectives for the music-education program, the organization of classes and activities in which to achieve the objectives, and the selection of experiences that are appropriate to the classes and activities and will contribute to pupil growth toward the objectives. The task of selecting experiences also implies concern with the selection of teaching materials. (Leonhard & House, 1959, p. 22)

The above quote of Leonhard and House from their book *Foundations and Principles* clearly articulates goals and objectives that appear current and on-point as to what it means to write and operationalize curriculum. Yet, one cannot but realize the date of the book, and the over 50 years that separates that time from this, and wonder how it is these words and values continue to pervade and construct our understandings and engagements with the why and how of curriculum making and implementation. Thus, a closer examination of that which influenced their thinking, and much of our thinking today, is integral to our consideration of the curriculum process.

Bobbitt (1876–1952)

Looking back as to what we might consider as curricular mileposts, Kliebard (1977) cites Bobbitt's *The Curriculum* (1918) as a reflection of what came before and what was to come. While this book did not designate curriculum as a field, scholars believed that this book was, however, indicative of the "assumptions and predispositions that were to dominate the thinking of those who were identified with the curriculum field for at least half a century and extending to the present" (Kliebard, 1977, p. 257). Indeed, in a fifty-year retrospective of Bobbitt's work, Jackson (1975) writes of Bobbitt's work and suggests that he has "hacked out the path along which many of us in American education are still traveling" (p. 121).

Bobbitt speaks to the historical purpose of schools and the educative goal as one of teaching students so that they will contribute to social progress. While the definition and engagement with what "social progress" means has been of concern to many philosophers over the centuries, and of neglect to many others, Bobbitt considered social progress as one that views the importance of the advancement of civilization and humanity through a lens of action, activity, and ability. For Bobbitt, this meant not so much what it means to know but rather

what one can do. Bobbitt speaks to this process as one that is as simple and as straightforward as finding the problem and fixing it; a process in which performance of low character is not desirable and can be eliminated through training.

Bobbitt felt that curriculum had been framed and defined by the “prepared subject-matter” that was found in textbooks, but also by a purposeful denial of the varying nature and needs of children. This denial of the process and child allowed one to simply choose the “appropriate” texts (in our case one could read “repertoire”) and fill the “empty reservoir,” in essence, making curriculum planning (and teaching) “simple and easy” (p. 46). Indeed, Bobbitt spoke of this body of abstract knowledge in textbooks as “often almost or entirely without life, embalmed, ready for the pseudo-educational process of storing their content in the memory-vaults” (1924, p. 46).

Bobbitt was particularly frustrated by the “cloudlike” language of “glorious vagueness” that spoke of objectives as “radiant” (1921, p. 607), a perhaps not-so-subtle reference to Dewey and others of the time. Searching for a systematic procedure that would move curriculum from the language of “cloudlike” to definite objectives, Bobbitt believed that the school should provide experiences and activities that were needed for advancement, stability, and consistency in life. These activities (much like the factory assembly line upon which his work was based and the scientific management movement) could be broken down from the complex into discrete subskills. In order to define and select those activities, one needed to both consult a specialist/vocationalist and go out into the world and observe the skills, abilities, and habits of men. Once these habits were identified, one could then divide these down into subsets and units so that they may be taught and learned. As a consequence of his interest in differing and varying abilities (often predicated on issues of social class), it is interesting to note that Bobbitt’s concern paved the way for ability groupings in schools.

Bobbitt’s writings were criticized by both progressivist educators, as not being child centered enough, and essentialists, as ignoring the contributions of subject matter. However, Bobbitt’s legacy and his metaphor of filling the “empty reservoirs” of students’ minds remains with us today manifesting as curriculum-as-repertoire, curriculum-as-activities, curriculum-as-fundamentals, and even as curriculum as “hear and fix” rehearsal techniques.

Tyler (1902–1994)

The curriculum work of Tyler can be anchored to his belief that the educational ends-means aims of schools were “inadequate” (1948, p. 205). For Tyler, to consider the ends-means issue was to recognize, through an either/or binary construction, that educability took on two forms, could be identified in two ways, and could provide two paths of carefully selected alternatives. One path was to identify the measurable characteristics of students that correlated with the current stated aims of the schools. This would entail identifying characteristics of students who currently flourished under a system of memorization of textbook content and did well with limited skills, such as computation and basic reading. The other, after

identifying what the characteristic would be that would lead to an “enlightened citizenship,” required redesigning the ends-means aims of public schooling so that students might not only analyze and think through clearly but would also “cherish significant and desirable social and personal values” (p. 205).

In 1949, Tyler proposed such a system and rationale for “viewing, analyzing and interpreting the curriculum and instructional program” (p. 1). This Tylerian logic of working back from the goal and objectives of a program or discipline permeates all aspects of music education. The rationale presents a model that speaks well to the ease, simplicity, clarity, and seemingly obvious and sensible goals of the traditional music education program; those which we can find so clearly articulated in the words of Leonhard and House. However, while it may appear obvious how this rationale, and Bobbitt’s framing of the purpose of education, has influenced music education, it is important that we consider the inception of the rationale so that we may critique, interrogate, and consider curriculum design in our own areas.

The Rationale

Tyler (1949) proposed four questions that he felt would guide the curriculum development process. In the following section, these questions are outlined as well as some of the applications, issues, and critiques that have been raised.

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can learning experiences be organized for effective instruction?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

In order to address the question of educational purposes, one needed to consider the learners themselves, contemporary life outside of school, the subject specialist, the use of philosophy and psychology in selecting objectives. Consequent to this, one could identify the learning experience; in behaviorist terms, that afforded control and management, or in Tyler’s words, the “interaction between the learner and the external conditions in the environment to which he can react” (1949, p. 63). After such consideration and identification, the teacher then chooses learning experiences based on the goals and purposes that were defined in the first step. For instance, if the teacher (or subject specialist) decides that being a musician means the ability to note, read, and write, then the student must have the opportunity and experiences that will allow her to practice this in ways that are satisfying to her and within her ability. Or, if the teacher decides students are to play or sing the descending minor third in-tune, the teacher needs to present a repertoire in which the interval is prevalent. These objectives needed to be stated in a particular form, for instance:

—At the completion of this rehearsal, the trumpet section will be able to play the allegro section at letter B clearly and succinctly.

- At the completion of this class, students will be able to play the descending minor third in-tune.
- At the completion of this unit, students will be able to identify the instruments of the orchestra.

Tyler believed that organization was key and influenced the efficiency of instruction and educational changes in students (p. 83); hence, the organization of the learning experiences needed to be ordered so that in their sequencing they reinforce each other. The criteria for building an “effectively organized group of learning experiences” (p. 84) was continuity; or the recurring practice of skills; sequence, having skills build upon each other; and integration, seeing how skills can be utilized in other areas.

Learning experiences in music education have often been framed by effectiveness and efficiency and are often considered the hallmarks of many classes and rehearsals; indeed, the sequential layering of experiences permeates much of the musical curriculum, whether it be music history, music theory, general music, general music methods, or a band or choral rehearsal. Continuity in the organization of this sequencing can be found embedded in the k-12 program; general music classes prepare students to read and write music; in turn, middle school programs prepare students for the sophisticated music making of high school. Both skills and the practice of skills are sequenced and layered, often dictated by teacher and a repertoire that progresses in difficulty and “sophistication.”

Determining whether purposes had been attained means assessing whether the desired results are being produced and to what extent they are being realized. This evaluative process begins by returning to the goals and objectives and then deciding what evidence will address these goals. In this process, there is continual movement through all of the steps before one can determine evaluation. Cyclical in nature, evaluation informs and thus drives the process; can the student do the teacher’s stated objective, did the final performance run smoothly, can the students read simple pattern rhythmic structures so that others may be introduced?

Critique of the Rationale

There have been several critiques of Tyler’s rationale and its accompanying process. Addressing these critiques serves to both engage with Tyler mindfully and to see those ways in which the critiques were integral to the subsequent reconceptualization of curriculum theory and curriculum development. Among many of the critiques is the question as to whether objectives and outcomes can be determined prior to the process of learning, as well as the criteria that is applied in the selection of the goals and objectives. Both Bobbitt and Tyler, rather than relying solely on the knowledge of the teacher, placed their faith in the expertise of the subject specialist. However, deciding and defining who a subject specialist is and relying on their interpretation of what it means to know and do (distilled down into discrete, sequential subskills) further separates teaching from curriculum.

The ways in which the educational objectives are worded have also been critiqued. Eisner (1985) has written that “when objectives are stated behaviorally, it is possible to have specific empirical referents to observe; thus, one is in a position to know without ambiguity whether the behavior objective has been reached” (p. 110). This very particular wording, whether it be educational objectives, instructional objectives, or performance objectives, and the subsequent behaviors that are expected of the student, frames and defines and controls in measurable terms what and how the student will know and be able to do. Nor does it necessarily take into account the pedagogical and learning processes that intertwine with each other.

One of the ways Tyler framed the “needs” of students was to consider the ways in which he believed the human organism must find balance and equilibrium, so that in meeting those needs, socially acceptable behavior would result. This not only speaks clearly to the use of a particular framing of societal needs to determine the goals and objectives but also to a system of power and control through consensus rather than conflict. This rationale, as well as Bobbitt’s framing of the curriculum process, operates as a deficit model, one in which stability and consistency, as well as “proficiency in citizenship” are determined by what citizens cannot do, and need to do in order to design a “directed training of systemized education” (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 3).

The Spiral Curriculum

Grasping the structure of a subject is to understand it in a way that permits many other things to be related to it meaningfully. To learn structure, in short, is to learn how things are related. (Bruner, 1960, p. 7)

As a cognitive psychologist, Bruner was interested in the ways internal mental processes underlie behaviors, and consequently, the ways in which structure in learning, and thus, structure of the disciplines, plays a central role in how educators might go about considering teaching/learning process and curriculum development. Learning is geared towards a general understanding of the structure of a subject matter, not just the skills, but that “use” is more important than formal naming of “operations” (p. 8). Bruner uses learning a language as an example of intuiting structures without formal naming. It is in the use and the immersion in language that we unconsciously learn the ways (and even uses) in which language can be used to communicate, rather than focusing on the “mastery of facts and techniques” (Bruner, 1960, p. 12). It is in the engagement in the process of doing in which the structure becomes internalized. Bruner calls for a “continual deepening of ones’ understanding” that comes from moving into “progressively more complex forms” (p. 13). It is not in exercises that isolate skills and techniques, nor is it accomplished by treating curriculum as sequential, bit-by-bit steps, but rather by creating an environment and context in which teaching/learning and curriculum development is embedded in the engagement with (for instance) the process of musicing. In order to accomplish this, Bruner speaks

of the spiral curriculum, one in which “the foundations of any subject may be taught to anybody at any age in some form” (p. 12).

Bruner believes that learning should bring pleasure and serve us in the future. So, while he sees this idea of transfer as “skill transfer” (i.e. using particular musical skills in more than one context), he also sees this as limited. Another way to engage with transfer of learning is to consider it as nonspecific, or the “transfer of principles and attitudes” (p. 17). As opposed to curriculum that focuses on the introduction and subsequent proving of an assertion, this type of curriculum leads through a discovery process in which connections and relations can be made between ideas and concepts so that learning is continually broadened and deepened. While he speaks of this phenomena as playing out in the sciences, a parallel could be made in music curriculum and pedagogy. For instance, repertoire is often introduced noncontextually and uncontested in interpretation and expression, as a work of art, unconditional, and void of human engagement.

Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project

In the late 60s, the work of Bruner provided the framework for the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project (MMCP). Musicians and educators came together in Purchase, New York, to develop a comprehensive music curriculum that would span prekindergarten through high school. Led by Ronald Thomas, the program evolved out of new musical movements, general curricular movements of the time (including the reform movements in the wake of Sputnik), and a desire to challenge the status quo. Echoing Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Bruner, Thomas (1991) articulated knowings and doings that had not been traditionally honored by music teachers. Thomas referred to those knowing skills as “music fluency skills,” or skills that lead toward language facility and the sounds of music rather than symbol and notational skills (p. 28).

The project was developed based on the idea that rather than focusing solely on technical and skill development, “personal meaning through critical thinking and problem solving should be at the heart of the music making experience” (Pogonowski, July, 2001, p. 25). Thomas, not only believed that “all music written must be performed if it is to have any significance in the learning process of the student” (February–March 1964, p. 106) but that students, if given the chance, could be musically conversant in the 20th century musical idiom. The underlying notion was that improvisation as the “medium of the language for thinking in musical sound” (Thomas, 1991, p. 28) permeated the project as a way to engage with the concept of the spiral curriculum. Pogonowski (July 2001) outlined musical processes that were to underlie the ways in which students and teachers were to engage with the music-making experience, extending the list to include not only composition, improvisation, but also interpretation, performing, analyzing, conducting and listening “with critical awareness” (p. 25).

While the roots of this project stem from the 60s, Pogonowski believes “its initiatives are consistent with current curriculum theory” (p. 27). Indeed,

MMCP curricula are still to be found in projects, such as the Comprehensive Musicianship Project in Iowa and Wisconsin.

National Standards in Music

In 1994, the National Standards in Arts Education were published by Music Educators National Conference (MENC). This process did not spring up overnight nor was it without precedent. When the original proposal for the *National Education Goals* (July, 1990) was articulated, the arts were not included. Through a series of advocacy movements, including Michael Greene appearing on the Grammy show and admonishing the administration and the Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander for not including the arts in the *National Education Goals*—federal funding was received enabling voluntary music standards and assessments to be created. The Music Standards make a clear stance for not prescribing any specific methodology; they are about the content of the music. They are focused “on what students should know and be able to do, on content and not methodology or educational theories” (Hope, 1994, p. 36). Reminiscent of both Bobbitt and Tyler, the Standards are concerned with which *results* are characteristic of a basic education.

While not considered curriculum, the National Standards project has influenced and shaped the goals and purposes of curriculum. The standards were based on frameworks and wording that can be traced back in many ways to a resolution passed in 1892 by the United States Music Teachers National Association Department of School Music (Birge, 1928, pp. 234–235). In 1992, when Dorothy Straub (then president of MENC) answered the query: How could a document of such magnitude and significance have been created so quickly? She replied:

Setting standards is not new for MENC. *The School Music Program: Description and Standards*, revised in 1986,¹ is a thoughtfully written, comprehensive document, widely read by the education and music education communities. . . it has served as the foundation for developing the new music standards. (p. 4)

In the content and wording of the current document, a modern and behaviorist rationality frames the standards. The nine music standards are presented as behavioral objectives, which consequently adhere more literally to what students must “know and be able to do to demonstrate that [they] are proficient in the skills and knowledge framed by content standards” (Goals 2000, p. 4). A closer examination of the Music Standards illustrates these points:

Students (will) sing; perform on instruments; improvise melodies; compose and arrange music; read and notate music; listen to, analyze and describe music; evaluate music and music performances; understand relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts; and understand music in relation to history and culture. (MENC, 1994)

¹ *The School Music Program: Description and Standards* were originally written in 1974.

Viewed through this scientific and technical rationality, the music standards appear to provide precise steps, teacher accountability, and evidence to the fact that learning music is measurable and, as a result, a necessary basic. “Since modern-day proponents of behavioral objectives insist that such objectives be quantifiably assessed as terminal products, the curriculum becomes necessarily narrow and mechanical” (Tanner & Tanner, 1980, p. 26). Consequently, even though these are presented as standards and not prescribed curriculum, the standards virtually provide a curricular framework necessitating a method of teaching divorced from a social and ethical context.

In the ensuing years, conferences and publications have been devoted to the National Music Standards. Most states in the United States have adopted some version of the National Standards which has subsequently influenced the crafting and adoption of city and community standards. Accordingly, consensus, rather than conflict born of mindful interrogation, has been the professionally mandated response to the standards. As a result, critiques of the standards often pertain to whether the Music Standards are being met and implemented, and which specific standards are being taught. Some of the critiques suggest the standards seem relevant only to the discipline of music and do not take into account the process of learning, developmental issues, or philosophical views represented by leaders in American education (Ross, 1994). Other critiques, employ a philosophical lens (Stevenson, 2007) and a lens of critical theory (Kassell Benedict, 2004; Benedict, 2006) to challenge and interrogate the vision and purpose of the standards.

As will be seen in the following section, curriculum development has continued to evolve and remain a topic of discussion, and often contestation and debate, in the general education community. Such discussion and even conflict have served to keep conversations of curriculum vital, fundamental, and even imperative to those who seek to engage meaningfully in the educative process.

CURRICULUM RECONCEPTUALIZED

Curriculum, from the learner’s standpoint, ordinarily represents little more than an arrangement of subjects, a structure of socially prescribed knowledge, or a complex system of meanings which may or may not fall within his grasp. Rarely does it signify possibility for him as an existing person, mainly concerned with making sense of his own life-world. (Greene, 1978, p. 299)

These words of Maxine Greene set the stage for us to consider the shift in the field of curriculum toward something broader than content and discipline arrangement. In 1969, setting off what was to be a flurry of debate and re-engagement, Joseph Schwab famously pronounced the field of curriculum “moribund” (p. 1). Desiring a renaissance in the field of curriculum, Schwab called for a return to the practical away from the theoretical. The lines that were drawn, the sides that were taken, the debates that followed, and the subsequent curricular

conversations that evolved have been referred to as the reconceptualization of curriculum.

As articulated by Pinar (1978), reconceptualism was intended to be interpreted as a term to “indicate a fundamental reconceiving of the field,” as a “fundamental shift —paradigm shift—in the orders of research . . . the common bond which was opposition to the traditional field” (1980, p. 200). Pinar believed that it was necessary for those in the curriculum field to step out of the “enslaving preoccupation with the classroom” so as to create intellectual distance. He was concerned that the “absorption with the application of “knowhow” (1978, p. 8) served to keep the field static. While not desiring to abandon the work of serving the practitioner, Pinar believed that “curricular possibilities” depended on generating theory that would not necessarily be used as a “prescription” or as, what Macdonald described an “empirically testable set of principles” (In Pinar, 1978, p. 7). Pinar was concerned with the practical and those ways one could conceive of “right” and “just” rather than the control technical and traditional curriculum held over teacher and student. Through the lens of Habermas, Pinar called for an emancipatory intention to guide curriculum development through reflection rather than technical manipulation. As such, Pinar believed that through curriculum research the researcher must be emancipated so that the work would be meaningful to others. He posited that if we were to continue to produce and engage in research that was mired in a static state, one characterized by an accumulation of a body of knowledge, then the curriculum field was indeed in a state of arrest.²

The work of the reconceptualists was hugely contested. The main areas of contention resided in the interpretation that they were calling for the separation of theory and practice and the abandonment of the practitioner. Tanner and Tanner (1979) reacted angrily³ to (among other issues) Pinar’s reference of Tyler as a traditionalist. They also dismissed Pinar’s belief that there was a relationship between school and society as one that functioned to “deliberately cover repressive measures” as “rhetoric rather than rigorous analysis” (p. 9). Jackson (1980), employing a charismatic discourse, joined the debate and declared that the idea of such a thing as a curriculum field made him “uneasy” (1980, p. 163) and that this body of work, conceptualized as a field, was something that existed “only in [our] heads” (p. 164). Jackson also challenged the incorporation of a framework and lens represented by the intellectual tradition of such scholars as Marx, Heidegger, Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Gramsci, and Habermas (among others) as sources from which to examine curriculum.

² Interestingly, Pinar warned that critical theory and phenomenology were not where curriculum theorists ought to reside; this was best done by movements in philosophy.

³ While it may seem that anger is an interesting choice of words, Pinar (1980), in a response to these responses, used the words ill-tempered, anger, and shouting to contextualize the response of his critiques. Indeed, a close read of these articles suggests these emotional reactions.

... they are more helpful in thinking about and understanding the richness and complexity of educational phenomena than are the intellectual frameworks that have till now dominated educational thought. (Jackson, 1980, p. 168)

Such a challenge seems foreign as we tend now to take for granted a disciplinary process that engages with intellectual traditions outside one specific domain. Yet, at the time when curriculum hung between a modernist tradition and a postmodernist tradition and the paradigm shift was seen as a threat, educators engaged with taking sides in silence and anger. However, heeding Pinar's (1980) response to these criticisms seems apropos to the discipline and field of music education. Rather than engaging in "self-crippling" behaviors, and in order to "sustain disciplinary conversations" (p. 204) that would lead toward further conversations, Pinar called for dialogue rather than cathartic reactions of "ill-temper[ment]" (p. 199). This dialogue would not be one in which an appeal for consensus and agreement would be forefront. Rather, the hallmark of this dialogue would be an articulation of issues such as power, control, identity, and resistance, and the ways in which each intertwine and essentially "need" each other. Reconceptualization was a vision that was a move away from the modern paradigm toward the postmodern, a vision of content and process, not as a false dichotomy, not even as a model (Doll, 1993), but as a way of ensuring that "becomingness of process is maintained (p. 15).

In the following section some ways in which music educators have responded to this shift will be addressed.

Special Focus

In March 2005, Music Educators Journal (MEJ) published an issue entitled: Reconceptualizing Curriculum. Throughout the issue, varying views on the ways in which the traditional, linear model of music curriculum could be broadened were addressed. Hanley and Montgomery (2005) examine this curricular shift through a lens of postmodernism and suggest that educators might consider constructivism as a way to conceptualize learning and teaching. Barrett (2005) presents a model in which planning is "open-ended and responsive rather than closed and predictive." For Barrett, the lived experience of students rather than predetermine endpoints (p. 23) should become the focal point of curriculum development. She presents a situation in which a high school instrumental teacher re-engages with the traditional rehearsal schedule by providing space for individual and small group interactions. This "garage band" model is one that has been explored in detail by such authors as Allsup (Spring 2003), and in this same MEJ issue, Green (March 2005). Concerned with the disconnect between school music and music that is made outside of the formal process of schooling, Allsup (2004) considers the issue of democracy as "community in the making" (p. 24) and undertakes a project where students break into small groups in which they are asked to compose music of their own choosing. Green (March 2005), interested in similar issues, focuses on issues such as self-teaching and peer-directed learning (p. 28).

Each of these music educators is concerned with the normative practices that permeate the profession. Each challenges and interrogates the traditional, technical rationality model that is pervasive in music education. Each also speaks to the difficulty of embracing such change, citing reluctance of peers, parents, administrators, and even students to embrace new conceptions of what an education in music might mean.

The Voice of the Critical Theorist

Related, parallel, and interwoven with the reconceptualist discussion was the work of critical theorists focusing on the concept of hidden curriculum. Vallance (1973–1974), Rolland Martin (1976), and Apple and King (1977) were calling attention to issues of control and power that had once been an explicit part of the educational discourse, but had shifted and been subsumed. Hidden curriculum, or the “unintended outcomes of the schooling process” (McLaren, 2003), refers to those ways in which behaviors are shaped outside of the overt agendas of schooling. Issues, for instance, such as whose music is heard, whose music is programmed, whose voice is respected, what forms of knowledge and discourse are valued and validated, what pedagogical engagements are enacted are functions of hidden curriculum that serve to send messages of control, compliance, and obedience.

The discussion of hidden curriculum and the maintenance of dominant interests was part of a broader examination of those ways in which societal control impacted the function of schooling. The emergence of critical theory was embraced by scholars throughout music education. Influenced by the work of the Frankfurt School, Gates and Regelski established MayDay (1993), an international think-tank as a platform and community, to examine “the status of practice in music education” and

- apply critical theory and critical thinking to the purposes and practices of music education, and
- to affirm the central importance of musical participation in human life and, thus, the value of music in the general education of all people. (<http://www.maydaygroup.org>)

Mindful of those ways in which normative practices permeate the field of music education, Regelski speaks of engaging with critical theory as a way of challenging the blind acceptance of traditional theory and as a call for recognizing those ways in which we abdicate and deny responsibility for our actions. Regelski has written of music educators’ propensity for accepting methods as curriculum models (2005, p. 13) and engagements with them as “coming close to the worship of religious idols,” and as such refers to this practice as “methodolatry” (p. 13). This theme of being silenced by a particular discourse of power (often made manifest in the normative practices in music education) resonates throughout the work of many music educators. Repertoire as curriculum, and methods as common-sense practices, is challenged and interrogated by Bradley (2007) who

examines, though the lens of Adorno, the ways in which repertoire as curriculum can become “fascistic.” While not specifically speaking to curriculum, O’Toole (January, 2005) interrogates the choir rehearsal as a site of power; embedded and made manifest in the privileged and patriarchal positioning of the conductor and repertoire. She addresses the self-regulation established in rehearsals that serves to constitute docile bodies through self-regulation, thus producing a choir member that is “more efficient and productive” (p. 10) and ensuring the subsequent reproduction of repertoire as curriculum.

Gould (September, 2005) asks us to address those ways in which class, gender, and race influence curriculum making. As such, she asks what it might mean for us to “disrupt power relations [of] heteronormativity” (p. 12). Lamb (1996), in speaking of the problematics and difficulties in reengaging with music as ideology and the conflicting discourses that permeate pedagogical and curricular concerns, eloquently and painfully addresses the inherent difficulties in embracing this process.

Not only do I find myself in conflicts with students about what the music education process is and what it means, I find myself trying to live up to expectations I cannot fulfill—and do not want to—but feel some responsibility to meet because this is a preprofessional program in music and music education. (p. 129)

The challenges of perceiving curriculum as always in flux, as rhizomatic—interconnected, moving laterally and outwardly (Gould, 2009, p. 49)—as a contest to power structures and the status quo, and as a process in which ends can’t be defined in “simple and clear terms” (Bobbitt, 1934) can also be found in the historical grappling with curriculum as “multiculturalism.”

“MULTICULTURAL” CURRICULUM

If multiculturalism is to be linked to a renewed interest in expanding the principles of democracy to wider spheres of application, it must be defined in pedagogical and political terms that embrace it as a referent and practice for civic courage, critical citizenship and democratic struggle. (Giroux, December 1992, p. 7)

Issues of hidden curriculum, power, and control have framed the multicultural movement as well. As a modern conception, multicultural music and multicultural curriculum have been interpreted as a way to (among many others) differentiate traditions, to reflect diverse populations, as a tool for unifying diverse populations, for “fostering of world understanding” (Volk, 1998, p. 49), as a method and as material, and often as a code word for race and ethnicity (Morton, Spring, 2001). Elliott (1995), who views music as a diverse human and multicultural practice, believes that “music education is multicultural.” Rather than an adjective or a noun, multicultural for Elliott “connotes a social ideal; a policy of support for exchange among different social groups to enrich all which

respecting and preserving the integrity of each” (p. 207). To this end, he views the practices of musical cultures and developing the students’ musicianship within these cultures as a way to “deepen and broaden” musicianship and as a way to “link” music education to “humanistic education” (p. 209).

In some ways, and to an unfortunate extent, the words multicultural and multiculturalism have entered our vocabulary and discipline psyche so that we often forget that these terms have been, and can be, wielded in ways that reproduce systems of oppression, rather than as critical engagements (musical and nonmusical) that challenge the status quo. Used as an adjective, these terms situate curriculum and pedagogy as something done for the “culturally different,” or “culturally deprived” children. Used as a slogan, it calls our attention to the fervent possibilities about the purpose of music, yet does very little to call attention to the complexities and contradictions.

Salvation themes of unification have historically meant favoring privileged positionings of culture that often reflect those of the dominant class. Delpit (1995) warns that to engage in the educative process from this positioning is to “ensure that power, the culture of power, remains in the hands of those who already have it” (p. 28). Rather than using music to reflect diverse musics or peoples, Morton (Spring 2001) calls for us to attend to the “ethical tensions and sociopolitical contradictions manifest in cultural perspectives and hierarchies” (p. 33). Calling for a critical vision of multiculturalism, Morton does not deny that varied musics should be embedded in our curriculum, or that we shouldn’t be considering multiple ways of engaging in/with these musics. Critical multiculturalism would entail recognizing curriculum development as one that is not neutral, one that cannot be depoliticized, one that is not color- or difference-blind, one that requires praxis, not rhetoric. In essence, multicultural curriculum is a process that embraces the contradictions inherent in the struggle with equity; not framed by the contingencies of private lessons or access to instruments, but as a struggle to address within the curriculum “misrepresentation, as well as authenticity, exclusion as well as inclusion” (p. 40).

Social Justice, Democratic Practices

Issues of democratic practice provide a way of reengaging with curriculum/pedagogy. In recent years, scholarship and thinking in music education have returned to the issue of democracy, particularly in philosophical terms rethinking and reconstructing Dewian ideals through politics and context of today’s society.

In her search to break free of a modernist framing of curriculum and pedagogy, DeLorenzo (November, 2003) seeks to move from a curriculum model that is concept driven toward one in which music can contribute to the needs of society (p. 35). Looking at issues such as the processes of decision making within the classroom and representation of disenfranchised groups, she presents differing scenarios from those of her own practice as well as those of her graduate students.

Woodford (2005), while not addressing curriculum in a specific sense, situates a political life at the center of the educative process. He calls for liberal education, but also for a rethinking of liberalism, as “thoughtful evaluation” (p. 99). As such, he calls for those who are connected to education to take on the role of public intellectuals. Allsup (MEJ, May 2007) addresses democratic teaching and learning (and thus curriculum) that revolves around skillfulness, rather than skills, living music rather than preparing music. He asks us to conceive of the educative process as one in which “tradition as a critical conversation” (p. 54) takes precedence over mindless reproduction of what has conventionally been deemed traditional repertoire and traditional teaching. By asking ourselves the question, why a specific tradition for these specific students (p. 54), we take on a moral commitment of engaging with the teaching/curriculum process as one in which there can be “no freedom from responsibility” (p. 55).

Music educators have also begun to concern themselves with curriculum and pedagogy that reflect and respond to issues of social justice. In October 2006, the first International Symposium on Music Education, Equity, and Social Justice Conference was held at Teachers College, Columbia University. The conference brought together international educators to discuss issues of educational equity and social justice. Subsequently, the *Philosophy of Music Education Review* (2007) devoted an issue to the conference, exploring issues of curriculum development, theorizing curriculum development and pedagogical concerns. Extending this discussion, *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* developed an issue focused on “Theorizing Social Justice and Equity in Music Education” (2007). The editor’s concern that music educators often embrace current issues only to drop them when the next one comes along, is one echoed by others throughout the history of music education. As such, issues that connect education and life, such as social justice, will hopefully be able to bridge and reconnect the role of education in the empowerment of a political life.

Complex Ideas in a Real World

These pages have presented complex and even complicated challenges to practices each of us has come to know and love. Once again, the point is not to throw the baby out with the bath water, but rather to consider our actions as they have come to be, and our actions as they might come to be. What of the new teacher and even experienced teacher who wants to engage differently, who wants to incorporate curricular changes into curriculum that seems to have been written in stone? What can one do when asked to sit in on curriculum committees so that these ideas and thoughts may be present in discussions? What does one do when confronted with curriculum whose parameters seems driven simply by concerts and competitions? What does one do when told either explicitly or implicitly that one’s job depends on holding steadfast to a curriculum model that “favors,” as the beginning quote pointed out, “select groups of students over other groups” (McLaren, 1989, p. 183)?

While our immediate reaction may be to rush right in and challenge standing traditions tested by what seems millennia, we need to consider that this reaction is quite similar to the one McLaren points out. The issue is never to favor one idea or group over another, but to engage in dialogue, conversations, relationships that begin slowly, yet thoughtfully. It may indeed be that curricular and pedagogical engagements move slowly; perhaps without discernable transformation. Yet, change not only takes time, but is constant and steadfast, whether we choose to engage or not.

What follows are examples from new teachers who chose to engage differently from their first year of teaching. They are teachers who teach in different situations and varying localities who have grappled with these same ethical issues and have taught in multiple levels in different venues, in varying communities. Their situations and backgrounds differ, but each has one thing in common: the desire to continually challenge and interrogate their own teaching. As such, each of the following examples emanates from situations in which each teacher intentionally examined his or her own practice. A few of the examples are deliberate and articulated teacher-as-researcher projects, others are simply examples of the ways in which these new teachers recognized moments in which they could speak and be heard. But all are examples of teachers who have implemented “successful” music programs in the eyes of their principals and parents, as well as examples of how they challenged normative practices.

Cara, who teaches in a large New York public high school in Queens, was asked, in her first year of teaching, to lead a professional development meeting for a group of music teachers. Previously, she had connected with the organizer of these presentations and had presented herself as willing to speak to and consider curricular issues seriously. She had not been afraid of articulating those ways the musical parameters she had inherited might not speak to the long-term goals she had for herself and her students. As such, Cara put together a presentation in which she asked her colleagues to articulate broader understandings they hoped for their students that weren’t just bound by musical engagements. She then asked them to realize these as musical goals, musical projects. She has since been asked to lead several city wide professional development meetings with larger groups of music teachers.

Cara also implemented a project with her women’s choir in which she and her students raised issues of identity formation and what “multiculturalism” might mean to them. Cara kept a journal and often shared with the students her own thinking processes as she moved through curricular decisions with them.

I have noticed quite a change in the women’s choir as a result of this open dialogue between us. There is a greater sense of trust with me, with themselves, and with each other. They are not afraid to question themselves and others, and to think through things, something they were hesitant to do before for fear of being ‘wrong’ or being judged by their peers. I also believe that through the process of engaging in this dialogue that they have become more aware of their identity—as a female, as a singer, as part of something that is larger to them, as

part of many groups. Whereas previously, I noticed they were only identifying themselves through their culture—that is, through national affiliation, something I have consciously begun to dismantle with them. (CB 1/08)

Christine, a middle school teacher in Brooklyn, New York chose to implement a social justice research project with her students. After brainstorming definitions of social justice, the class chose to focus on those ways music has shaped and changed the world as we know it. Each student crafted interview questions and designed final projects that consisted of an interview with a family or community member, personal reflections on social justice and music, and an analysis connecting the interview results with personal views.

This project focused on what the students learned from the people, and what they learned as researchers. Students were asked to compare their interviews to their own thoughts in order to make connections and draw conclusions about the impact of music and social justice on one's life. They made connections to themes that we explored in our initial discussions and what the students learned in their interviews. This process allowed students to link social justice issues from the past with the present concerns of family and community members. (CP 1/08)

Allison, an urban educator in New Jersey, followed her interest in language and musical development to a research project in an Arizona school district. There, she discovered that even though the community was primarily a Spanish speaking community, music teachers were asked not to teach songs in any language other than English. While the population was over 85% Latino, Proposition 213, in fact, created a situation in which no Spanish songs were allowed in the classroom. Allison then, realizing that she could no longer think through her teaching and curriculum development as she had, began rethinking this particular situation, education, and music education through a political lens.

Dion, another urban educator and a native of Barbados, spent time researching the musical communities in Barbados, assuming that locals would be listening to music of their culture. She found that in the four years she had been away, access to media and mass communication had changed the listening habits of local inhabitants. Instead of the music and listening habits she had expected to study, she found they were listening to the current musics of rap and hip-hop, and so forth. Even though Dion is herself a cultural bearer, she found herself disconnected from the speed and development of her own culture. Dion returned to New Jersey rethinking what it means to be a cultural bearer and the impact this has on one's life and one's pedagogy and curriculum development.

Each of these teachers have been impacted by the politics, policies, and practices of curriculum and curriculum development in their local school communities. And while each of the above examples differs in its origination, intent, locality, population, each has much in common. Each worked within the confines and parameters of the set curriculum in their situations, but was able to broaden the objectives and meanings found within them. Each not only reflected on their

own practice but those ways they may have not heard or seen students previous to these projects. Integral to that, each dialogued and shared with their students their thinking on curriculum and pedagogy. Each shared with parents, teachers and administrators the objectives of their projects in ways that are nonconfrontational and nonthreatening. And what's more, each understood the power of first impressions and believed, that even as new teachers, they would be taken seriously if they presented their thinking in a serious manner. Unfortunately, each has also been called naïve and simple, a new teacher who will "learn" eventually. And each has recognized that not everyone will accept or even come to hear how and why they have chosen to engage outside of expected norms. Yet, above and beyond all of this none of them have sacrificed their music programs, each has what would be considered a successful program; participation grows each year, and the caliber of musicality grows as well. They sing, they play, they dance, they tour, they perform. These aren't just communities of young vibrant musicians of all kinds; rather, these are vibrant musicians who engage critically with the world around them and who realize potentiality beyond musical engagements. These are teachers and students, indeed people, who desire, in Dewey's (1916/1944) words to "take part in correcting unfair privilege and unfair deprivation, not to perpetuate them" (pp. 119–120).

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

Any inherited system, good for its time, when held to after its day, hampers social progress. (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 1)

Considering curriculum and curriculum making has often seemed to be a second thought for music educators, it's important to know about, but the acquisition of so many other "skills" demand our time and attention. Perhaps the "overwhelm" of addressing these issues has been our ticket out. Yet, we should consider that a reluctance or unwillingness, or even the inability to address these issues has not served us well, all of which speaks to ethical engagements that call to our attending. Historically, we have not consistently spoken of curriculum as an ethical engagement. Neither have we spoken of curriculum as performative; written documents that are acts of engagement, or the discrepancies between discourses and their enactments. Schmidt (September 2007) has addressed the curricular and pedagogical disconnect that plays out in different forms of discourses between what is proposed inside teacher preparation and how this is carried out into school programs. He is concerned with the ways in which teacher preparation programs often see enactment, placed outside the interactions of the moment, as a retelling of practice and curricular traditions, thus framing the educative process as one always already engaged in a discourse of "talk about" teaching rather than through an embodiment in/of the context and the moment. Bowman (2002) asks us to first consider "what we want education to do for our children and society" (p. 74) and then the ways in which musical engagements would further this. In the attempt

to conceptualize curriculum as a series of steps that meet particular standards, in the attempt to simplify and find solutions to issues, or to create a one-size-fits-all curriculum in which processes give way to procedure, and understanding gives way to knowing, we are all—teachers, students, scholars—trapped in a rationality that does not provide for grappling with complexities and contradictions. We have, in essence, framed the needs of our children, ourselves, and society as needs determined by forces outside of us, beyond our control.

Is there any possibility in curriculum? Giroux reminds us that schools are “contradictory sites; they reproduce the larger society while containing spaces to resist its dominating logic” (1988, p. xxxiii). There is immense and awful possibility in creating spaces of small and large insurrections. I would suggest that the inherited system of which Bobbitt speaks may never have been “good for” its own time and has indeed been “bad for” and hampered our progress. If as Pinar (2000) suggests, curriculum theory is the study of “how to have a learning environment” (p. 12), I would add that such learnings necessitate practices informed by the complexity of our relations, the relearning of what has been negated, as well as constant reengagement with the history of us. A history that makes all the difference and none; one that creates possibilities and alienates. A history not separate, detached, enclosed, but one always already implicated in and through life.

Class Discussion

1. Think back to your music classes (including performance based classes) and articulate your thoughts on the intent of the curriculum? Was there a sequenced curriculum? What was the purpose of the curriculum? What was absent in the curriculum?

2. In your own words, describe the relationship between society and curriculum. How does one affect the other? Why should we concern ourselves with this relationship?

3. How has the development of curriculum shaped the ways in which music education is viewed in the United States? What does curriculum development have to do with advocacy efforts? Can you imagine any ways this has prevented music education from being seen differently than it is?

4. How could you include parents and administration in discussing how curriculum in the music program may not be serving everyone? In what ways might it not be serving everyone? Should your program serve everyone? What about programs that are settled and anchored on performances and rankings. How will you engage with challenging and broadening these programs? Should you?

Projects

1. Visit a class in both a high school and elementary setting and ask the music teacher to describe their curriculum. Is the curriculum dictated by any guidelines? Were they able to contribute to the development of the curriculum? Do they follow the prescribed curriculum? Why or why not? Do they feel the curriculum speaks to their goals as music educators?

2. In a brief paper, compare and contrast the perspective of curriculum that the National Standards in Music represents with a more *reconceptualized* approach to curriculum. Can both visions coexist? How can music teachers resolve the apparent conflict in their music classrooms?

3. In a brief paper, describe ways that you can broaden “multiculturalism” and world musics to be something more than inclusion in your curriculum? What policy changes in your school might be necessary? What changes would be necessary in your classroom or ensemble?

SUGGESTED READINGS

- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press.
- Freire, P. (1970/1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Rev. ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.