Autobiography and Teacher Development: Subjectivity and Culture in Curriculum Reform[1]

Introduction

William F. Pinar

Teacher development has emerged as a key concern in a worldwide school reform that depends now on the quality of teaching.[2] After decades of scapegoating teachers in the United States, now their centrality to students' learning is even empirically documented.[3] This contested association of teacher quality and student achievement is also made in China.[4] Crucial to teacher quality is teacher development, the subject of this volume.

A Caveat

Any effort to understand education across national borders and the cultures these contain carries multiple risks. Especially in the United States – where began[5] many neoliberal projects - there are tendencies for especially U.S. researchers to project onto "global processes" their own assumptions, not all of which are necessarily inappropriate but which can contain echoes of an imperialist era still evident in contemporary globalization.[6] Indeed, such projection risks intellectual imperialism. Any categorization scheme – see the one advanced by Dolby and Rahman 2008 – can incur this risk, although many reduce it by treading lightly and restating the obvious.[7] As Anne Phelan

(2011, 216) observes, researchers do not always appreciate how they "project old questions and frameworks on new situations."

Such projections would seem to be in play when Darling-Hammond and Lieberman (2012, 168) follow their acknowledgement that "teacher education has been differently positioned in different countries and at different times in history" with the prescription that building a "strong profession of teaching that can meet these challenges around the globe will require us to learn from each other about what matters and what works in different contexts" (Darling-Hammond and Lieberman 2012, 169). Evidently the two miss that the latter - "what works" - answers the former, "what matters." The two are not necessarily related.

Paine and Zeichner (2012, 572) notice, concluding that despite an emphasis on the centrality of teachers[8] to school reform a review of policies and practices worldwide undercuts any claim that there is in "all places a single vision of a 'good teacher' or what it means to support (the development of) such teachers." Paine and Zeichner (2012, 579) cite "some evidence" of "convergence" in teaching and teacher education, but add that there is also "substantial evidence" that "both national" and "local" historical and cultural practices, traditions, and institutions "mediate these globally informed policies and reforms."[9] That verb – "mediate" - seems to understate the situation in China, where reform does not "mediate" – meaning to negotiate an agreement in a dispute or, secondarily, to act as a medium – the presumed global convergence. Closer to the truth is that it incorporates critically – and uncritically[10] - selected ideas circulating globally, recontextualizing them according to local circumstances – including as issues in curriculum disputes – insisting on finding a Chinese way (or several).[11]

While teachers are now central to China's curriculum reform, that positioning does not convey the same political subtext, as American exceptionalism – with its individualism that exaggerates both the opportunities and liabilities of agency – surfaces in scapegoating. Since Sputnik, the government of the United States has displaced its failures – for instance its inability to address poverty - onto teachers[12] who are alleged to be responsible for student learning.[13] While corroded – as it is elsewhere - by the conversion of students into customers,[14] education in China acknowledges still the centrality of students' study in academic achievement, even if negatively.[15] While reformers in China recontextualize concepts appropriated from abroad, it is not as intermediaries adapting these to local circumstances, but as agents committed to crafting a nationally distinctive course informed yes internationally, but, culturally and historically and locally as well.[16]

The recuperation of culture, the recovery of history, and the recontextualization of concepts from abroad can be corroded when international organizations (NGOs) get involved. Discussing their role in globalization, at first Perry and Tor (2008, 517) seem imprinted by Western preoccupations in their focus on "reproduction" and "governmentality," acknowledgments of hegemonic power that understate local capacities to recontextualize, even reconstruct, what is transferred. In their discussion of "educational transfer," Perry and Tor reference (see 2008, 510) processes of imposition, diffusion, and lesson-drawing - accurate enough, one supposes, in specific circumstances - but these "mechanisms of transmitting and receiving" seem an inadequate metaphor for the often creative appropriation of Western concepts in China's curriculum reform. Zhang Wenjun reports, for instance, that the imported concept of postmodernism

functioned for some as a “cocoon” from which to criticize “traditional Chinese curriculum.” Others reformulated postmodern curriculum by the combining Western with Taoist ideas (see Pinar 2014, 121).

Finally Perry and Tor do acknowledge the “simultaneity” of the “two contrary currents,” the “diffusion” of a generic globalized educational models encouraging global “convergence” and “standardization,” *and* the “intricate dialectics of adoption, transformation, hybridization or rejection” (2008, 510). Perry and Tor “advocate” (2008, 517) a conception of educational transfer incorporating “underlying” learning processes for the “actors” – especially the “receivers” – who are implicated in the transfer. Their emphasis on social learning (see 2008, 517) – even as “diffusion” (2008, 519) - seems to accent actors’ passivity[17] not agency, while de-emphasizing the creative intersections of intellectual histories and present circumstances that Zhang Wenjun, for instance, describes.

The World Bank

Reproduction[18] and totalization risk reentering the analysis, however, when the World Bank is the topic.[19] Educational development became important to the World Bank in 1968, Joel Spring (2008, 345) reminds, when the then-president of the Bank Robert McNamara announced, "Our aim here will be to provide assistance where it will contribute most to economic development” (quoted in 2008, 345).[20] Despite economists’ admissions[21] otherwise, almost forty years later that faith remains, as the World Bank proclaimed in 2007 "Education is central to development…. It is one of the most powerful instruments for reducing poverty and inequality and lays a foundation for

sustained economic growth" (quoted in 2008, 345). At turn of the millennium the World Bank recast itself as the Knowledge[22] Bank (see Steiner-Khamsi 2012, 5), assuming the leadership[23] and the standardization agenda, predicated, as it is, on "regulation tools used by commercial banks and businesses: ratings/rankings, performance assessments, targets, benchmarks, and progress reporting" (Steiner-Khamsi 2012, 7), concepts and procedures that only enforce, not enlighten, its own worldview (see Nordtveit 2012, 22). The upshot is, Nordtveit (2012, 29) notes, "education is reduced to an investment in a service and a set of logistic issues." Ethical conviction, the primacy of relationships among teachers and students, classroom life itself,[24] the "worthwhileness"[25] of the curriculum: none of these occur to the World Bank.[26]

Nor does consistency characterize its policies: after four decades of de-emphasizing higher education, the Bank's position is now – in its WEBES 2020 statement (entitled "Learning for All: Investing in People's Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development") - that a strong higher education system is absolutely crucial for "developing countries" to be "competitive" in the "global knowledge economy" (Kamat 2012, 34). In WEBES 2020, De Siqueira (2012, 79) explains, "education is reduced to 'learning,' and learning reduced to improved results in international standardized tests, contributes to fostering the commodification, sterilization, and standardization of knowledge." "Learning for All," Samoff (2012a, 109) points out, "has hardly anything to say about learning." In it teachers are no longer professionals or even, Ginsburg (2012, 90) notes, "human beings," but, instead, instances of "human capital, a resource or input that is required for the process of producing student learning outcomes" (Ginsburg 2012, 84). Indeed, as Verger and Bonal (2012, 130), one of the "main features" of WBES 2020

is its insistence in replacing "input-driven" initiatives with "learning outcomes." No longer is the curriculum question *what knowledge is of most worth* but did you learn whatever the teacher taught, replacing knowledge with information and intellectual independence with compliance and control.[27]

That its policies have been – continue to be - decidedly negative for primary and higher education (see Kamat 2012, 35) is a fact the World Bank ignores, perhaps partly due to its ahistorical perspective (De Siqueira 2012, 72), evident in its recent System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results (SABER). Supposed an "evidence-based program," SABER promises to identify what specific reforms are needed locally in order to strengthen nations' performance against global standards and practices, e.g. those specified by the World Bank (see De Siqueira 2012, 74). Structuring this aggressive – it is also ahistorical and acontextual - intervention into nations' internal affairs, SABER requires aligning curriculum and performance criteria with outcomes, these aligned with international assessments (De Siqueira 2012, 76). What is needed instead, as Hickling-Hudson and Klees (2012, 214; see also 217) point out, is culturally inflected curriculum experimentation "in which discipline, challenge, and creativity are combined," as they are in China's curriculum reform.[28] Unfortunately, these concepts are easily appropriated by organizational and specifically corporate interests.[29]

Government, then, is hardly the "only" institution involved in the oversight of societies, Robertson (2012, 587) reminds, typified by "new centers of gravity that go well beyond the formal authority of a top-down state."[30] Referencing Bernstein and his concept of "recontextualizing rules," Robertson (2012, 589) proposes a field of recontextualization linked to "profit making, entrepreneurship, and investment." In these

concepts one hears the echo of the Perry-Tor conception of "educational transfer" rather than the creative recontextualization evident in China (and Brazil[31]). Focused on "teacher quality" (Robertson 2012, 600; Schleicher 2012, 18), "rankings" and "benchmarks" – like "drones," Robertson (2012, 603) argues - reach "deep inside national territorial borders, not only as data collectors but as agents at a distance able to frame, direct, act, and redirect without being physically present." The evocative image dramatizes the causality ascribed to discourse. But even in theory structured post-structurally – such as Macedo's (2011 and this volume) – the concept of recontextualization emphasizes agency, implying the presence of the human subject in her or his enactment of enunciation. Linking the abstract with the concrete remains analytic work to be done, Robertson concludes. That the two must be "linked" – rather than juxtaposed - strikes me as risking another "projection" emanating from the experience of powerlessness in the West.

Teacher Development

Universalization through standardization is provincial and compensatory, occurring through projection of categories local in genesis but allegedly global in applicability. This fundamental failing – fidelity to transfer not acknowledgement, indeed encouragement, of recontextualization – is evident in the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development*, wherein – in his introduction - Christopher (Day 2012, 8) associates the "effectiveness" of teacher and school development not only to "its purposes," but as well to individual's "experience" of a series of "contexts," among them "personal, social, organizational and policy." This list, he worries, might mask the "fundamental qualities, knowledge and skills" which "all" teachers need to process if they are to "succeed *within* the contexts in which they work,"

among these "presence," "devotion," "occupational identity," and the professional[32] ethics and "resilience to sustain these attributes throughout a career." By decreeing "all" teachers be in possession of "fundamental qualities" – which he then lists – installs both universalization and instrumentalism,[33] long-standing cultural imperatives of the West. Day (2012, 8) concludes that "there is a reciprocal relationship between teacher and school development," but that relationship seems less reciprocal than formulaic.

In contrast to many initiatives in the West, Lo, Lai, and Chen (2012, 25) point out, curriculum reform in China asks teachers to attend to the "all-round development of students." How to so attend in a system still structured by examinations is not clear.[34] Moreover, "the organizational culture of Chinese schools," Lo, Lai, and Chen (2012, 26) suggest, undermine teachers' willingness "to engage in change independently." That willingness to undertake such "subjective reconstruction[35]" – working from within to affirm inner freedom within structures of authority[36] - is exactly what Chen Yuting (see also Chen 2014) asks teachers to do, if with their principals' help. That individuated project undertaken with others could constitute professional development as "lived," as cultivating expertise from within.[37] As Stenhouse[38] suspected: "it is teachers who in the end will change the world of the school by understanding it." Teachers are human subjects, not "human capital" or commodities, as in the Hargreaves and Fullan (2012, 5) pecuniary image of the (ideally) intellectually independent professional as "wealth," possessing "professional capital," itself the "product of *human capital*, and *social capital*, and *decisional capital*." Must *everything* be monetized, including pedagogical expertise?

In contrast to the accumulation of "capital," Roth points to the potential of working with others, enacting what Fu Guopeng (2014) characterizes as "collective

agency." Roth (2012, 272) invokes a concept of "expansive learning" to represent "what stakeholders do" that "leads to an increase in their action possibilities, their agential room to maneuver." This learning accents working with others, teaching at the "elbow of another (*coteaching*)" and talking about teaching with others "who have also participated in some teaching/learning event (*cogenerative dialoguing*)." Roth (2012, 279) assures us that "new forms of consciousness derive from participating in the work of teaching collectively even without reflection." One wonders if that – the formation of "new" forms of consciousness - occurs everywhere and to everyone, even to those teachers chained by demands to raise student test scores.[39]

Such "performance cultures" associated with "accountability," Sachs and Mockler (2012, 33) remind, "privilege the technical aspects of teaching" over the "relational," and in doing so, reduce the opportunities for teachers to make "professional judgments," thereby reducing "teacher autonomy," demoting educators to "implementers of policy rather than arbiters of their own practice."[40] Sachs and Mockler (2012, 38) emphasize that it is the "creative" and "human" dimensions that are among the casualties of "accountability." Evidently the totality of school life is affected, including student record-keeping as well as the character of teaching. In her U.S. study, Lasky (2012, 77) found that "all districts had in place some kind of data storage and retrieval system for all students. All districts had put in place some kind of benchmark test…. [T]eachers' day-to-day work lives have changed in their efforts to meet NCLB, state, and district accountability requirements." In such a totalizing environment, Phelan (2008, 23) laments, teacher education is "reduced" to a "means," and "usefulness its ultimate standard," a standard, she notes, that undermines the possibilities of teaching and teacher

education as “democratic action” (2008, 21). Not only school reform generally but efforts to specify teachers’ professionalism also seem to undermine “possibilities,” as they insist on behavior-specifying definitions, not open-ended deliberation animated by academic study of circumstance and situation.

Professionalism

Professionalism, Goodwin (2012, 45) suggests, depends on “specialized” and “expert knowledge,” that is structured by “what,” “how,” and “why.” *What* knowledge is to be acquired by prospective teachers and *how* is it to be “delivered” to them (2012, 45)? “Why” – ordinarily a question of meaning – devolves here into one of assessment, as Goodwin (2012, 45) stipulates that the “acquisition of this body of knowledge by new professionals [must] make a difference in either the quality or quantity of outcomes.” This version of “why” displaces questions of meaning with test scores, as Goodwin (2012, 52) notes that research shows that in high-stakes testing regimes teachers have “increased” their attention to “tested subjects,” and “decreased” their attention to “non-tested subjects,” spending “more time on teaching directly for the tests.” The “what” and “how” questions dissolve, as the expansive question of “why” becomes deflated into “outcomes.”

Despite such standardizing initiatives - including organizational ones such as the European Network on Teacher Education (ENTEP) and Teacher Education Policy in Europe (TEPE) - Edwards and Ellis (2012, 303) report that the Bologna Process has enjoyed “limited” success in developing a “distinctively European” teacher education. There remain, they (2012, 302) report, “differences” between and within the member

states, so that the phrase "teacher professional development" has "different meanings across Europe, or no meaning at all." Perhaps such diversity is to be welcomed, as "partnerships" in the United States – Linda Darling-Hammond (2012, 149) extols the "alignment" of state and professional standards – only tighten the noose around the necks of teachers, forcing them into conformity, the old enemy of independent thinking and erudition that which Darling-Hammond (2012, 150) misconstrues as the "engine" for increasing teacher quality.[41] The metaphor tells all.

Throughout South America, Lüdke and Boing (2012, 84) assert, inequalities are "greater" in secondary than in primary education." In particular they cite Colombia and Peru, where students from the wealthiest 20 percent of households have an attendance rate that is 1.2 to 1.3 times higher than those from the poorest 20 percent of households. Speaking an indigenous or non-official language is perhaps one factor, as it remains, they note, "another core marker for disadvantage" (2012, 84).

Teacher salaries and working conditions, Lüdke and Boing (2012, 84) note, "do not correspond to their role in society."[42] Pre- and in-service teacher education, they report, remains a "central problem" (Lüdke and Boing 2012, 89) across the South American continent. Evidently many working teachers had received no training at all, as only 64 percent of pre-primary, 80 percent of primary and 66 percent of secondary school teachers have undergone teacher education (see Lüdke and Boing 2012, 89). In Bolivia, they point out, 19 percent of all teachers do not have a teaching degree, and 56 percent of those work in rural areas. While pupil/teacher ratios are higher in urban areas, they acknowledge, untrained teachers are more numerous in poor rural communities.[43]

Not only material circumstances structure efforts at teacher development. Zembylas and Chubbuck (2012, 139) consider how teachers respond to the "changes created by growing immigration and multiculturalism in Europe." Zembylas and Chubbuck (2012, 141) observe that "teachers' emotions … are also entangled with political issues," requiring researchers to acknowledge "the pivotal role of emotions." They suggest that a conception of "*critical emotional praxis*" might encourage teacher educators to "help teachers and school leaders cope with the emotions" associated with the increasingly multicultural character of European schools. Professionalism, then, cannot be reduced to attributes, behaviors, standards or outcomes; it is cultivated through informed, even cosmopolitan, efforts to work through the complexities of classroom life.

Emotions were evidently stirred by the appropriation by school reformers of the Maori concept of teaching and learning: *Ako*. This concept denotes, Thrupp and Mika (2012, 210) explain, a "stirring and moving in a fragile way toward learning," but in its "colonization" it degraded into "merely learning," ignoring the "state of being of the person is involved in the activity" (2012, 211). That is a testimony to appropriation – a threat about which I have worried and specifically in reference to the keywords of China's curriculum reform[44] – but it also testifies to the significance of subjectivity, specifically the subjective states of students and teachers.

"Why presence? Why now?" Rodgers and Raider-Roth (2012, 149) ask, emphasizing the "subjective, qualitative experience of the human beings who inhabit schools?" In an historical moment that in many countries is characterized by "positivism, standardization, and quantification," they answer, such an emphasis "is essential." If in different cultural terms, Thrupp and Mika might well agree. From the chapters that

follow – specifically those by Cheng Xiangming, Chen Yuting, Qian Xuyang, and Zhang Hua – it is clear that there are scholars in China who would also agree.

Both cultural and historical considerations call for questions of subjectivity, as Nicholas Ng-A-Fook (this volume) also underscores. It is the struggle for survival in this era of "new managerialism," Nixon et al. (2012, 177) suggest, that has resulted in "urgent calls" from thoughtful educators for a "reinsertion" of the "human" into the "discourses" and "practices" of education. Rationalized on "social justice grounds," such "push-back" is supported by "collaborations" between university-based and school-based educators, focusing on what matters locally. Without such a collaborative commitments to the local, Nixon et al. (2012, 183) worry, any "time" and "space" for teachers to educate "ethically" and "innovatively" would "disappear." Against the standardization globalization enforces, Nixon et al. call upon researchers to "insist" on the "importance of context in educational reform efforts if we are to make even uncertain and tenuous progress towards social justice."

Lupton (see 2012, 194) calls for contextualization, asking how to think of schools' relatedness to their local contexts? In one answer to that question, which she terms the "managerial model," a clear "distinction" is drawn between what is "internal" what is "external" to schools. In the second - the "social relations model" – schools and their contexts are considered "inseparable" (Lupton 2012, 195). Depending on school and context, cannot each model clarify courses of action? While closer school-community relations could prove productive in many – including curricular – ways, installing it as axiomatic could compromise the distance critical inquiry requires, the "pause" from

"utilitarianism" neoliberalism forecloses (see Roth 2014, 50). The importance of context is also contextual, e.g. variable according to circumstance and situation.

It is this present context of questioning teacher development that Anne Phelan's question becomes startling in its significance. She asks: "Can our work in teacher education preserve thought and action?" (2008, 30) The "thought" and "action" to be preserved are not necessarily European – or U.S. - versions, themselves embedded in structures of the neoliberal present. Preserving thought and action – culture in one conception – occurs within these insidious structures of economism and explotation. Thrupp and Mika (2012, 204) wonder "whether Maori education initiatives are radical enough to break historic social inequalities and authentically revitalize Maori language and culture." At one point, Thrupp and Mika (2012, 207) report, the "core strategy" of these initiatives became to "turn teachers away from 'deficit' discourses and positionings toward more agentic ones centered on classroom relationships. The focus is on culturally responsive pedagogy rather than curriculum or assessment." They admit that some were seduced by school reform rhetoric (see 2012, 205), specifically that teachers are responsible for student achievement (2012, 206). The "politics of blame" followed, holding teachers and parents responsible for problems "beyond their control" (2012, 206).[45] Scapegoating teachers for students' underachievement, they realize, diverts the attention of the public away from the failure of government to address child poverty (2012, 206). "The task of revealing colonized layers," Thrupp and Mika (2012, 208) conclude, "is therefore an ongoing one." In Phelan's formulation, it constitutes nothing less than the preservation of thought and action.

Layers of colonization can also be psychic, specifically forms of interpellation through which our very conceptions of ourselves as professional educators are configured. For Metcalfe and Game (2012, 159) for instance, the "awe" in which some hold their former teachers is telling, and perhaps misleading, as it overstates the capacities of teachers to influence what occurs in classrooms and how students are affected, especially over time. "Humility," they note, follows the realization one is "not in control of what happens" (2012, 159). Teacher-student relationships require the suspension of "self-certainty," the forefronting of "learning," as "agapic love is the main characteristic of relationship" (2012, 159).[46] Indeed, Metcalfe and Game (2012, 159) suggest that education that is self-centered "alienates learners from the potential of the classroom and the world." For them, that potential is inherent in "learning," a "transformation, a change not simply of mind but of being" (Metcalfe and Game 2012, 166). In my chapter, I worry that technology threatens both mind and being through the erasure of experience.

Informed by international attention to children's rights,[47] by various school improvement movements, and an interest in students-as-researchers, the concept of "student voice" has now become audible, Leitch (2012, 216) reports.[48] She (2012, 215) notes the centrality of "voice" to democratized schooling, e.g. the opportunity to speak one's mind, be heard and influence what happens. But the matter is not so straightforward, as "power" – including forms of "difference" – structures voice and its "possibilities" in schools (2012, 215). Power and difference take different forms in different settings and how calls for "student voice" are heard also vary according to place and time.[49]

In India, Rampal (2012, 249) reports, the 2005 curriculum reform[50] affirms "children's voices," including "their thinking and their intuitive theories on various concepts, and through their 'true life' narratives, to show [that] children living in adverse conditions develop agency for action that can inspire others." Expressivity and engagement are encouraged not only for the student's sake.[51] "[S]tudent disengagement," Atweh et al. (2012, 233) assert, "is the greatest hindrance to the effectiveness of any school reform." One hundred years ago U.S. progressives thought student engagement was essential to democratization, and they devoted themselves to curricular and pedagogical versions of "child-centeredness." For Atweh and his colleagues, student engagement is important insofar its absence undermines school reform. In Williamson's (2013, 50-53, 71) depiction of the curriculum of the future, student engagement becomes the means to the vocationalization of the students' souls, ensuring their future employability, not only (I worry) in its economic but also political sense.

Perhaps inadvertently complicit with the "teacher quality" rhetoric of school reform, Woods and Luke (2012, 313) proclaim that "pedagogy is the core activity of schooling," adding that educational reform focused on student outcomes can only occur within the sphere of the "enacted curriculum," e.g. the "mediated social and linguistic interaction that occurs in classrooms." Referencing Basil Bernstein, Woods and Luke (2012, 313) remind us that "pedagogy entails the sociological and interactional constitution of knowledge in a particular time and space." That seemingly vague verb seems crucial in this conceptualization; the dictionary defines "entail" as "to involve or result in something inevitably," the second infinitive in which aligns with reform's insistence that students learn what teachers teach, reflected numerically in standardized

test scores.[52] Conversation also affirms the social and dialogical character of the knowledge that is translated and reconstructed in the classroom, but the concept keeps open the question of its destination. Somehow "understanding innovative pedagogy to be the transmission of valued knowledge as a social practice that aims to be adaptive or transformative" (Woods and Luke 2012, 317) fails to inscribe the immediacy and complexity of complicated conversation, its improvisational capacity, or the long-standing – at least in the West - associations between classroom discourse and democracy that Susan Mayer (2012) so succinctly makes.[53] At least Woods and Luke (2012, 318) affirm the significance of actual, rather than virtual, interaction,[54] if still linked with outcomes, underscoring that it the "everyday face-to-face" encounters[55] that make a difference, adding "consequences" to perhaps blunt the sharp and reductionistic edge of "outcomes." Such interaction – subjective presence through dialogical encounter – cannot conclude in conformity. "Conformity is the enemy of learning," Michael S. Roth (2014, 168) reminds, "because in order to conform you restrict our capacity for experience; you constrict our plasticity."

Conformity

"[P]rofessional communities have become a popular idea," Lieberman (2012, 469) reports, their popularity evidently an indication of appropriateness and legitimacy. These, she continues, "focus on collaboration and access to a wide variety of resources and are always attempting to build mutual accountability for student growth and success" (2012, 471). Where platitudes predominate, acronyms follow. Louis (2012, 477) identifies "two approaches" to school "improvement" that are "directly related to teacher

and school development: professional community (PC) and organizational learning (OL)." We learn that "teacher development necessitates building on human capital that already exists" (2012, 477), an unfortunate metaphor devalued, fortunately, by its function in circular reasoning. Like currency, communities stress "*shared values and norms*" (2012, 479) that inform "how daily decisions are made in halls and classrooms." No individual independence here, reminiscent of the Eight-Year Study wherein each school forged a shared sense of its mission.[56]

At least Louis (2012, 479) appreciates that historical knowledge may provide passage to the future, as he sketches the antecedent of PC and OL, which he identifies as the post-World War II human relations movement. In too summary fashion, however, Louis (2012, 480) depicts the human relations movement as an exemplar of forging "group commitment" to a "specific action." For one major participant in that movement – Hilda Taba - human relations was in the service of democratization, not group cohesiveness and the conformity consensus threatens. Taba's association of human relations with democratization was evident in the Eight-Year Study as well, as teachers at the Parker School (one of the thirty schools that participated) discussed human relations in the relationship of art to society, and in that context of form to content (Thirty Schools 1943, 307). At another participating school, teachers asked students to compose their autobiographies as part of a study of human relations (see Thirty Schools 1943, 480).

At one point Taba (1962, 195) contrasted "those who think that the nature of our technological society demands a greater stress on the development of technical and scientific competencies and those who think that the greatest need is for the rationalization of human relations and for a stronger commitment to a democratic way of

life." An echo of this distinction is evident in Louis (2012, 480) characterization of "socio-technical systems thinkers" who recast organizations as a series of "networks" and "teams (social systems) linked together by common tasks (technical systems)." That concept of "common tasks" gestures to the shared social experience democracy implies but here "common tasks" represent not the result of prolonged debate and informed discussion but a series of objectives that funnel everyone's activity toward the same outcome. Such instrumental rationality – an instance of *in*human relations by my account – informs OL (see Louis 2012, 480).[57]

Associated with such "problem-solving" is the new-and-improved version of "knowledge utilization," now more militarily cast it seems, e.g. "knowledge mobilization" (Louis 2012, 481). Somehow "knowledge" has been degraded to "data," but Louis' (2012, 481) point is that data storage and retrieval are prerequisite – in both schools and businesses (see 2012, 482) in devising "effective approaches" to "define" and in "solving organizational problems." There is an issue, Louis (2012, 484) acknowledges, in bringing the PLC concept "alive" for teachers. She suggests "*trust*" (2012, 484) could be crucial. After decades of scapegoating teachers for student underachievement, why would teachers' trust be an issue?

Using somewhat different terminology, Stoll, Halbert and Kaser (2012, 494) still accept instrumentalism as they link "deeper forms of school-to-school networking" that are "highly purposeful" and "oriented to important learning outcomes for young people." Since important "outcomes" are often decades in disclosing themselves – an interest in art or social sensitivity or political activism and parental caring – can the reader be blamed for assuming these "outcomes" are indicators of compliance with school

objectives? Whatever the outcomes may be, the "inputs" are obvious: "clarity of purpose through shared focus" (Stoll, Halbert and Kaser 2012, 494). Such conformity is no superficial concession to policy objectives, it is, they emphasize, "deep," and in the same sense, it seems, that Williamson (2013, 71-72) also construes future curriculum as deep: "What is at stake here is a reengineering of both organizational souls and human souls." Stoll, Halbert and Kaser (2012, 494) emphasize that "deeper school-to-school networks have a clear sense of purpose that addresses capacity building both for the present and the future," presumably in service of underachieving students stuck in "poverty" or "social disadvantage," but still sacrificing professional autonomy and with it, academic freedom. Stoll, Halbert and Kaser (2012, 501) substitute "knowledge animation" for "knowledge utilization," but the point seems the same, e.g. aligning outcomes with objectives, or in their terms, the "power to make a difference to students' learning and future life opportunities" (Stoll, Halbert and Kaser 2012, 503). There can be no causal relationship between "student learning" and "future life opportunities," a form of magical thinking that ignores chance, economics, politics, race, gender.

Conformity characterizes much of the "teacher development" literature. Conspicuously absent is sustained attention to the canonical curriculum question "what knowledge is of most worth?" In the United States as elsewhere, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics – STEM - comprise the answer, justified by vocational and economic concerns that, if the past is any guide, overstate both the numbers of jobs associated with these fields that will become available and the centrality of these fields to overall economic growth.[58] How completely the curriculum question has been foreclosed is indicated in Levin's insistence that, as Deputy Minister of Education in Ontario, "we

set out from the start to support a rich and diverse curriculum, understanding that this was, in fact, the best way to get better achievement in literacy and numeracy" (Levin 2012, 104). One wonders how "rich" can the curriculum be if the other subjects – the arts and humanities? – are tails on the "dogs" of "literacy" and "numeracy," no doubt measured by standardized exams?[59]

Given a school system at odds with itself – struggling within tensions among creativity, innovation, and inquiry on the one hand, and an examination system that undercuts these through conformity – what is there to do? "For us," Sachs and Mockler (2012, 41) report, "one of the key challenges for teachers amid these manifestations of performance cultures is to manage … without becoming increasingly individualistic and isolated."[60] Roth (2012, 271) seems to share this concern, worrying that "teachers often experience loneliness." Surrounded by students, under surveillance by administrators, parents and sometimes colleagues, "loneliness" sounds like a prerequisite to survival, if not progress, during an era of educational decline.

The Decline of the West?

Loneliness – certainly solitude - seems unlikely in the "dynamic, unpredictable nature of classrooms" that Kington et al. (2012, 320) and her colleagues acknowledge but tame by tethering this conception to teaching and learning. Their submergence in school "reform" becomes explicit when they disclose their commitment to "observational studies" – risking a spectatorial erasure of lived experience[61] – and linking the "quality of teachers" with "pupil outcomes" (2012, 320). While they notice that an organization – the school – and not the experience of the curriculum dominates the school and teacher

effectiveness research tradition, they nonetheless embed – as "nested layers" (2012, 320) – everyone within it, if acknowledging the infinity of complexity "everyone" embodies.[62]

To the extent social science is science – emphasizing observation and outcomes that quantified and consensually validated – it obscures the complexity of those antecedent events that render experiments intelligible. To their credit, Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 380) recite events in the history of school effectiveness research, concluding that the Eight-Year Study resulted in "no significant differences" between experimental and control schools. Whether or not the differences that surfaced in the evaluation studies were "significant" or not – some asserted they were[63] - certainly participants had not studied, as Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 380) point out, "how secondary schools work."[64] They blame "this fascinating-if-almost-certainly-doomed" experiment for dampening interest in large-scale school effectiveness and improvement research (Stringfield and Teddlie 2012, 381), moving onto James Coleman et al. (1966) who, we are told, "unintentionally re-energized" such research by demonstrating "its clear antithesis," namely that schools and teachers had no differential effects on student achievement once variations in family backgrounds were taken into account (2012, 381). Researchers, Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 381) continue, have been determined to prove them wrong.

Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 381) summarize school effectiveness research by listing seven "correlates" of effective schools: 1) clear school mission; 2) high expectations for student success; 3) strong instructional leadership; 4) frequent monitoring of students' progress; 5) opportunity to learn (content coverage), and student time-on-task (TOT); 6) a safe and orderly environment; and 7) positive home-school

relationships. Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 382) conclude that research[65] has demonstrated that these "basic components" of effective schools have remained "relatively constant," rendering irrelevant class, culture, race, gender, place. Also irrelevant, it seems, is the curriculum itself, planned or enacted. There remains only one "unknown," it appears. "Remaining complications," Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 386) caution, "center on students who transfer across district or state lines," a problem with which Henderson and Danaher (2012) might be able to help.

Such slippage between correlation and causality, and the implied irrelevance of the curriculum, are also evident in the Creemers and Kyriakides' (2012, 389) definition of "Educational Effectiveness Research (EER)" as addressing the question "on what works in education and why," often focused on the "quality" of teaching.[66] Creemers and Kyriakides share not only the Springfield-Teddlie conception of the task-at-hand – finding out "what works" – but also their swift and sweeping historical perspective, as they reference the "last 35 years" of research which, they tell us, focused on "teacher behaviors" as "predictors of student achievement" (2012, 389). The "most consistently replicated findings," Creemers and Kyriakides (2012, 389) report, "link student achievement to the quantity and pacing of instruction." That verb "link" hedges their bets, as it could connote either correlation or causality, although it is clear that Creemers and Kyriakides suppose the latter, asserting that "achievement is maximized when teacher prioritize academic instruction and allocate available time to curriculum-related activities" (2012, 390). They would seem to be making the only apparently[67] obvious point that when teachers teach students are more likely to learn. Just in case one blinked at the realization that thirty-five years of research demonstrates what many teachers have

always knew, Creemers and Kyriakides (2012, 390) drive the point home: “Effective teachers spend most of their time presenting information and developing concepts through presentation of information and demonstration.” Besides the stunning restatement of the obvious, one is struck also (and again) by the evident irrelevance of the curriculum. Content does not matter – Holocaust or hoeing, it makes no difference - as it is so-called skills – as implied in standardized test questions – that constitutes “learning.”

This same reiteration of the obvious is evident in the Hargreaves and Fullan promotion of “teaching like a pro” (2012, 23). After sneering at service and the sacred – concepts embedded in the ancient calling of teaching – and debunking “caring” (see 2012, 29), Hargreaves and Fullan (2012, 55) announce that “what you get is *capability*, the first of the five Cs that define teaching like a pro.” Capability is followed by “commitment” (2012, 49), somehow linked to “career” (2012, 63). At that point the totalizing project to which they’re committed becomes clear: “you can’t fundamentally change the teacher without changing the person,” an overstatement that reminds one of Williamson’s depiction of the curriculum of the future in which the student’s soul will be altered for the sake of future employability (see 2013, 73). Crushing and catastrophic would be the two Cs more appropriately topping off that five.

Intellectual Imperialism

Tendencies toward totalization, oversimplification, and conflations of correlation with causality plague the literature on “teacher development,” tendencies that are themselves instances of intellectual imperialism, insofar as they obliterate the concrete in favor of already assumed abstractions. Among the most assumed of abstractions in the

West is “democracy,” sacrosanct in its status despite its only partial realization in the countries – like the United States – that so aggressively promote it. Not only countries but the aid agencies, Richard Tabulawa (2003, 8) has pointed out, reference the democratization of education as one of the most urgent means of promoting liberal democracy at the macro-level.

Learner-centeredness, Tabulawa continues (2003, 9) emphasizes learner autonomy, emphasizing “activity” as the “central element” in curriculum structure, a view founded, presumably, in constructivism, itself another abstraction the legitimacy of which is often assumed. Tabulawa (2003, 10) argues otherwise, that learner-centeredness is a political ideology as much as, if not more than, an educational psychology or pedagogy, part of aid institutions’ agenda to install capitalism in “periphery states” under the cover of “democracy.” This agenda, he argues, is anything but democratic but overly ideological, as it is in the service of persuading “periphery states” to “look at reality in the same way(s) as those in core states” (2003, 10). This imperialism, for Tabulawa, is the meaning of “globalization,” the “carrier” of neoliberalism.

The association of economic development with liberal democracy, Tabulawa (2003, 12) reminds, is “far older” than the aid agencies that promote it now, originating in 1950s and 1960s, decades during which U.S. social scientists devised the “modernization paradigm” (2003, 13). In that formulation Tabulawa (2003, 14) reminds, education was positioned as central, enabling the individual to detach him- or herself from cultural tradition and embrace a life of change through technology.[68] Education as modernization would “erode old social and psychological commitments,” producing “educated elites” endorsing Western values, among them entrepreneurship (2003, 14). It was during the

1980s, Tabulawa (2003, 15) continues, that aid agencies emphasized education solely in "service" to the economy, a reconceptualization that affected "all" aspects of education, from curricular content to classroom practices. Significantly, Tabulawa (2003, 18) points out, the aid agencies are exporting learned-centered pedagogy at same time it is being "denigrated" in those donor countries so aggressively exporting it. The centrality of students in the West , as Williamson's (2013) text makes clear, is no longer in the service of democratization but corporatization, rarely a politically liberal form of social organization.

If teaching and learning are "contextual" undertakings, Tabulawa (2003, 22) wonders, what "justification" can there be for a "universal" and "homogenizing" conception of education, one that devalues "indigenous knowledge." There must be "alternatives," ones to be "invented" (2003, 22) by those who live locally, who acknowledge that indigenous knowledge systems are "legitimate" and have "potential" for "enriching" educational experiences, including when juxtaposed with Western knowledge. Surely there must be ways, Tabulawa (2003, 23) concludes, the two can "complement each other." That seems optimistic to me. But it's also true that even the "tensionality" juxtaposition can create can serve a cosmopolitan cause.[69]

A succinct summary of the convergence of intellectual imperialism, economic standardization, and political aggression through the installation of "democratic" education, Tabulawa's analysis seems in sync with what in the West is termed post-colonial analysis (see Andreotti 2011), in which, as Spring (2008, 336) explains, the "dominant global school model" is denounced as "exploitive of the majority of humanity and destructive to the planet." Spring (2008, 351) registers that "many" indigenous

peoples "openly resist" Western instructional methods and work to enact "traditional" methods. Indeed, Spring (2008, 351) suggests that indigenous peoples may be "the most vocal" in their "denunciation" of the globalizing educational practices. That may be the case, but strong denunciations also occurs in the West and among Europeans and those of European descent. "*[W]hen policy makers align their thinking about education with market forces,*" Peter Grimmett (2009, 68) asserts forcefully and imagistically, *"the "beast" of harsh political imposition emerges*." In the postcolonial view, Spring (2008, 336) notes, replacing the dominant model of "human capital education" should be more "progressive forms designed to empower the masses." In that prescription are the echoes of Chinese Communist Party commitments to "the people," commitments honored in the 2001 national curriculum reform that Zhong Quiquan defends in this collection.

Organization of the collection

We start with an envisioning of teacher development as historically, culturally, and internationally inflected, a uniquely Chinese conception of teacher development articulated by Zhang Hua. "For every student's personal development" and "for every teacher's professional growth" are, Zhang Hua begins, "two sides of one question."[70] China's monumental curriculum reform and its impending reform of teacher development are, he suggests, "interdependent." The effort to rethink teacher development from both uniquely Chinese *and* international perspectives – from what Zhang Hua terms "a panoramic view of theory, practice, and policy" - becomes "a crucial task" of curriculum reform in China. Just as the reform emphasizes restructuring the hierarchical character of schooling – in fact democratizing it organizationally and pedagogically – the present

moment in curriculum reform requires a parallel reconceptualization of teacher development.

Three obstacles block that reconceptualization. The first, Zhang Hua asserts, is the current conception of teacher as "knowledge transmitter," a conception that relegates teacher development to "knowledge-transmission." The lingering influence of "Kairov's pedagogy" remains. Not only students but teachers too are forced to undergo, Zhang Hua writes, a "top-down, outside-in procedure of ready-made knowledge transmission." The second obstacle is interwoven with the first, namely a conception of teachers' professionalism as developing those "skills" that enable "knowledge-transmission." Traditional teacher education installs, Zhang Hua points out, "instrumental or skill-training," which deforms teacher development into a "package of skills or competences to impart knowledge, and these skills can be instilled, trained, and internalized from outside in." The third obstacle is such skill training is "scientifically controlled." And so teacher development "goes toward the tendency of technicism." Zhang Hua then provides a history of these circumstances, incorporating international research and in so doing setting the stage for his panoramic vision of teacher development that aligns with China's curriculum reform.

The first feature of China's new teacher development is, he suggests, the integration of teachers' "individual spiritual freedom" with ethical commitments to teach for "social equality and justice." Autobiography is a form self-study by means of which teachers can "heighten self-consciousness and gain individual spiritual freedom." Such inner freedom supports the capacity for "social criticism" and "empowering actions." The second feature of China's new teacher development supports the integration of teachers' "lived

experiences" with their "academic study." Only when, Zhang Hua argues, teacher development encourages educators to "theorize their lived experiences" can they cultivate their own "critical consciousness." Third, China's conception of teacher development encourages educators to "integrate reflection with action." Because Zhang Hua conceives of "reflection" as including the capacity for "criticism," undertaking reflection reveals the roots of the current social system, its embeddedness in "power," history and culture.

Education is," Zhang Hua declares, "a liberal cause and an emancipatory praxis." That means that "teachers are intellectuals with free personality, independent spirit, and critical consciousness." Teacher development, then, is the integration of teachers' self-reflection, social criticism, theoretical knowledge, enabling educators' practical action informed by lived experience and academic study. This panoramic vision of teacher development sets the stage not only for the deepening of China's curriculum reform, but for the reconceptualization of teacher development worldwide.

In chapter two, the inveterate reformer Zhong Quiqan goes into battle again, defending curriculum reform that places "high expectations on teachers' professional development," and that recasts primary and secondary schools as "learning communities." Against those seeking "innovation" are "conservative forces" that demonize reformers as "radical," as "despising knowledge" and unduly influenced by "foreign ideas." Other opponents of reform seek to "integrate exam-oriented education" and the reform "organically." Such integration is impossible, Zhong points out, so that the "efforts of so-called neutral forces actually become the pretext for resisting the new curriculum reform and preserving exam-oriented education."

So-called “key schools” presumably produce high test scores, and they also – presumably - provide sites for teacher development. What they provide in fact, Zhong argues, are sites for the reproduction of exam-oriented education. “Can key schools continue as the base and centre for teachers’ continuing education?” he asks. “Must the model and experience of exam-oriented education remain the benchmarks for teachers’ research and learning?” That question is addressed to those still on the sidelines, including, he suggests, many education administrators, teacher education organizations and many teachers. Zhong calls to them: “There is still time for us to reflect on our education reality.” That Zhong does, reminding his colleagues that the defining feature of public education is its public nature. The “publicness” that is public education means that “*all* children – not just a special group, an elite - are guaranteed equal opportunity for education and development.” He asks his colleagues to also remember that this defining feature derives from “the nation’s need” for “talent and qualified labour.” The current extolling of so-called key schools – depriving resources from so-called non-key schools – creates a hierarchy of inequality of opportunity that deprives the Chinese nation of the talent upon which it depends. “Wealthy areas and children with superior backgrounds enjoy schools with high quality,” Zhong rues, “while in poor areas, where many schools are prevented from reaching basic standards, children from the poorer classes languish. This disparity will eventually destroy any equality of opportunity in education.” Zhong derides the advertising campaigns of “key” schools, “always” proclaiming their “excellence.” He reminds that “excellence in education” is “not about rising above the common citizen or be distinguished from one’s own people; it is not guaranteeing the future of a handful of students at the expense of the majority of Chinese children.”

Excellence, he explains, is “not a competitive superiority but a state or spirit; no matter how difficult the conditions, people try their best.”

“Effective continuing teacher education” – what gets summarized in the phrase “teacher development” – is whatever “will enable teachers to find out their internal needs,” Zhong writes. Teacher development cannot be reduced to a formula but is instead a “search for educational experience and to reflect on such experience.” He knows that, just as teachers cannot be held responsible for student learning, “the real effects of continuing teacher education eventually depends on teachers themselves.” He lays it on the line:

> If teachers could cherish every opportunity of in-service teacher education, research and learning for the sake of children and for their professional development rather than to just follow orders or fighting for a promotion, we could finally change the image of teacher and reform the holistic culture of teaching.

In my terms, if teachers appreciated their calling is ongoing study[71] they might appreciate that curriculum reform requires “inner reform.”

Things are not entirely different in Brazil, as Elizabeth Macedo makes clear. There the federal government to establish "competences and guidelines for Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Secondary Education, which should guide the curriculum and their minimum content to ensure a common core," that last phrase familiar to students of “reform” in the United States. Macedo takes note of “the expanded scope” the government assumes for the term “National Curriculum Guidelines.” Now incorporated in these guidelines are “teachers’ initial and continued education.” This is

no act of generosity, as in Brazil (as in the United States) "teaching," is "under suspicion," by virtue of its inflation in the process of education. Macedo's point is also theoretical: "The fact that no attempt to reduce education to teaching is successful does not make political action unnecessary in the sense of its deconstruction." Such "political struggle" in the "schools' quotidian" is not the only order of intervention that is appropriate, she suggests: within the academic sphere a "responsible curriculum theory has, in my view, a commitment to enhance symbolic displacements, reinserting the play of difference in a discourse intended to be unitary." Macedo theorizes a conception of enunciation, "one way," she argues, "of impugning the centrality of school [and curriculum] as a place of teaching [only]," a conception of curriculum "as a way of instituting meaning, as enunciation." Rather than formulas that foreclose education, a theory of curriculum as enunciation "restores the unpredictability of the decision, without which there is no subject, what, from the standpoint of public policies, comprises investing in teachers´ training for responsible decision-making." Acknowledging that this is no "easy bet" - it is "full of uncertainties" - that fullness, she asserts, makes it "our best [and most productive] bet."

The order of theoretical sophistication evident in Macedo's chapter has its prerequisites, among them teachers and students' study of philosophy. In his chapter, s Zhenyu describes the "long-running and age-diversified pre-college philosophy program" known as Philosophy for Children (P4C). This program is devoted, Gao explains, to exploring the relationship between "philosophy" and "childhood," with the educational aspiration of "fostering children's high-order thinking skills by engaging them in thoughtful discussion regarding the epistemological, ethical, social and aesthetic

dimensions of philosophical experience and thereby making informed choices." As Gao appreciates, such an order of aspiration might well inspire teacher development in China, where P4C has been "recontextualized."

Such recontextualization underscores the importance of formulating conceptions of teacher development not only specific to the national cultures and histories where are replanted, but specific to the subjects teachers in fact teach. This subject – philosophy for children – seems especially apt for reconceptualizing teacher development, as it emphasizes forms of thinking that enable understanding, what Zhang Hua promotes as "life inquiry," e.g. students drawing upon the academic disciplines to inquire into the problems and events that occur in their own daily lives. What organizational form such conceptions might take is indicated in Gao's detailing of Philosophy for Children centers (associations or foundations) that "sponsor, coordinate and promote their dedication to engaging children in philosophy." These centers can be coalition builders. "By building relationships with philosophers, educators and others concerned with the fostering of children's development through philosophy," Gao explains, "these centers are capable of developing and delivering a relatively comprehensive curriculum system that can educate teachers with all required knowledge." To illustrate, he describes the efforts of the British SAPERE (*Society for the Advancement of Philosophical Enquiry and Reflection in Education*). Such teacher development is structured, he continues, by "three categories of knowledge: pedagogical content knowledge , the subject matter knowledge, and the curricular knowledge." He recommends the founding of a Chinese national Philosophy for Children organization in that would support – as have several educational NGOs – "the writing and publishing of localized philosophical stories, the holding of seminars,

workshops and even small-scale conferences to spread the idea and practice of P4C.... Designing a systematic courses for the prospective P4C teachers will become its top priority." Teacher development requires orders of understanding that philosophy can provide.

In his chapter Ng-A-Fook recalls his own development as a teacher, development that began in a program that emphasized "classroom management" and "best practices." He blames himself for failing to "question" or "critically reflect" on the "formation" of his "subjectivity," as that program prepared him to be "a future technician of children's learning." Working autobiographically to recuperate repressed traces of historical and cultural imprinting embedded in his family history, Ng-A-Fook undertakes the critical reflection that his technical training as a teacher once foreclosed. He juxtaposes these family histories with his present circumstances in order to contribute self-reflectively to *his* own development: a "Chinese-Guyanese-Irish-Scottish hyphenated Canadian curriculum theorist." His chapter, then, enacts teacher development as "developing self-knowledge (or self-understanding) as teachers by returning to the differing historical origins of our biographies in relation to the spirit of re-envisioning and reconstructing ourselves in the face of national and provincial curriculum reforms." This project, it seems to me, renders concrete and personal the call for "presence" that Day (2012, 8) decrees, that Rodgers and Raider-Roth (2012, 149) invoke. It enacts the project of self-study so central in the conception of teacher development Zhang Hua outlines.

"How might," Ng-A-Fook asks, "autobiographical research provoke teacher candidates to open up the possibility of transforming their cultural values and ideological orientations in relation to a city of youth?" By invoking the history of one's distant past –

asking the ancient autobiographical questions "who am I?" and now "whose am I?" – Ng-A-Fook wonders "what are the implications for self-understanding our subject formations as teachers?" Does situating the self support the capacity to see others in their specificity and temporal complexity, not only as someone in a class but as descendants of generations of "students" not necessarily in classrooms but caught up in decrees and migrations that throw one up on beaches at first foreign, but where – somehow - one must find one's way? Is familial history also allegorical of the journey of teacher development, where a child of immigrants must too find his way through a forever foreign land of "reform"?

Ng-A-Fook ends by returning to his beginnings as a teacher, his training in Australia, its evasion of time and place, complicit with his own disinclination to "read" the primal scene of education. Reading is not only decoding words on a page but glimpsing their political and material histories, including the "psychic dynamics" that become insinuated in reading, in study, in school. These inform, indeed, structure, what and how we read, including the texts of teaching, our calling that requires us remember its genesis in pasts our submersion in the present obscures.

From China to Canada, from past to present, the vast expanses of place and time are seamed allegorically, acknowledging history as the moving image of eternity.[72] Not theological or astronomical eternity, but these extensions across culture and time constitute recurring questions of the subject, "our subject formation within the macro historical and political contexts," as Ng-A-Fook succinctly put its, contexts that are "themselves attempting to redefine their identities in terms of their intercultural, intellectual, international, [and] educational relations." Within such flux, miniaturized in

the maelstrom of the classroom, teachers "develop" as they engage with their students in the complicated conversation we all have inherited and in which we labor to participate. Will such "autobiographical-intellectual research" survive the assaults on education now undertaken by NGOs (like the World Bank) as well as governments (like that of the United States)? Sagely, Ng-A-Fook looks for the future in the past.

Reform is not only institutional, then, it occurs through ongoing efforts at subjective reconstruction. Chen Yuting locates "the most effective drivers of teachers' professional development" as being located "within," with a disinclination to "being satisfied with routine," by "always trying to challenge oneself," and thereby "expand[ing] capacity." This is no conformist alignment of inner with outer, with "getting with the program," as too many in teacher development seem to recommend. Chen is clear: "there is no standard model of working from within." This profound insight cannot be legislated, however, only enunciated, personified, if differently, by "expert teachers," who "find their own ways to challenge routines and expand capacities, acting quite differently … despite the similarity of their circumstances." Circumstances may be similar but quickly become dissimilar as they are reconstructed by self-engaged educators who "are always exploring themselves and their circumstances in order to better communicate with students." For Chen Yuting – who has worked with thousands of teachers and hundreds of administrators - the "real secret of their success is the courage of challenging themselves and the willingness to struggle continuously. These kinds of courage come from within."

Such courage becomes expressed in schools through educators' "different ways of practicing their daily work." That work is not only behavioral – e.g. "best practices" – but

emotional. “If we are to promote teachers’ professional development,” Chen appreciates, “we must try our best to touch their hearts, because their work is structured with emotion all the time.”[73] Such a scale of teacher development – Chen Yuting links the concept with the school in her concept of “inward school-based research” – requires working from within. For “too long,” she notes, teacher development, indeed educational research generally, “has concentrated on externals.” Now, she suggests, “the main task of inward school-based research is to help teachers focus on their inner experiences…. We can never reach the destination without the compass of our internal feelings.”

Can screens be substituted for subjectivities? “Teachers and technology,” Xuyang Qian points out, “are always ‘intermingled’ nowadays.” Does that obvious but profound fact imply that teacher development depends on technological development? In 2013, the Chinese Ministry of Education (MoE), Qian notes, launched the National Project of Improving School Teachers’ ICT Competence, a project committed to “comprehensively improve” school teachers’ ability to apply information technology. One year later, the MoE issued a new “standard” —the Standard of School Teachers’ ICT Competence – in order, she notes (wryly), “to standardize such ability.” The new initiatives link the deepening of curriculum reform – with its encouragement of “teachers’ professional autonomous development” – with the promotion of the “informationalization” of education, an association Qian subjects to scrutiny. It is not obvious, for instance, how professional autonomy is encouraged by their compliance with “informationalism,” also a conception of “how students are to learn, and how the teachers are to teach.”

In her chapter Xuyang Qian evaluates the context in which the “Project” and “Standard” decrees have emerged. She suggests the assumptions that seem to underpin

them, focusing on those political-corporate interests that are also implicated. Finally, she invokes the specter of "cyborgian desire," in which teachers' subjectivity may now be embedded, and not only due to MoE initiatives. Does such desire render teachers vulnerable to the corporatization of teacher development? Are corporatization and professionalization inherently contradictory? Qian details the employment of the Intel Corporation to train China's teachers to integrate technology throughout the curriculum, thereby contributing to China's "informationalization" of education. As in the United States[74], teacher development in China has become subsumed in economic – and specifically technological – development?

That would be, I argue, unfortunate. In my chapter I remind that lived experience is prerequisite to the educational kind, without which teacher development cannot occur. Lived experience does not occur online but off-line, on the ground, where what happens cannot be predicted, like those destinations of searches Google or Bing or Baidu provides. Non-coincidence with lived experience enables learning from experience, the dynamic of subjective reconstruction that I reconceptualize teacher development to be. While not invoking that vocabulary – derived from Dewey and the U.S. progressives – Chen Xiangming and her colleagues also seem to focused on subjectivity as the site of teacher development.

In their study, Chen Xiangming and her colleagues[75] combine three concerns: Chinese teachers' "dilemmas"[76] engaging in the national curriculum reform, especially as this engagement is structured by teachers' "own perspectives," and, culturally speaking, from "indigenous points of view" formulated by "local Chinese researchers." Chen notes – and as my introduction underlines - that the existing literature on teacher professional

development, teacher learning, and teacher practical knowledge is dominated by Western constructs and assumptions. While often appreciative of such work, there is "an urgent need for more indigenous study of the viewpoints of Chinese teachers." In their research, that "more indigenous" study included self-study, as Chen and her colleagues composed "personal narratives … in order to understand personally what is at stake in the meaning-making of school teachers.[77]

Chen found that "many" - especially "expert" and "experienced" teachers - have devised their own ways of "interpreting" and "enacting" the national curriculum reform. Attentive to the specificities of their own students, their particular school culture, and making (in part, informed by their expertise and experience) "their own understanding" of the reform, these teachers have "recontextualized" the reform.[78] "The major feature of their meaning-making, Chen and her colleagues conclude, is to regard "teaching in the reform as a holistic endeavor, a problem-solving process, and embodied action."

While familiar to Western readers, these concepts also "echo" concepts traditional to Chinese culture, prominent among these a belief in the "unity" of life. What this means for these teachers is that their professional activities are no "isolated enterprise," not only "a job for making a living," not only a "technique" of knowledge transmission, nor only a "skill" designed "to improve student learning." Rather, teaching becomes a "way of being,"[79] including "their identity as human beings," including "their unique ways of existence in their world." The teachers Chen and her colleagues studied are living a "subject matter life," that is their lives are "permeated" by what they teach.

This state of being pedagogically is in sharp contrast to the situation in the United States, where the "what" of teaching – the canonical curriculum question "what

knowledge is of most worth" – has been sidelined by the "how" question, as if teaching and knowledge were separate, as if one could rescue a boring curriculum by good teaching, or a ruin a provocative one by bad teaching. Surely help or damage can be done, but – as Chen and her colleagues document - the curriculum as lived experience is structured by both, fused in a "total identification of oneself with one's subject matter." Indeed, Chen and her colleagues suggest that the teachers with whom they worked "embody the subject matter they are teaching." Despite their total devotion, these teachers were quite conscious of "their own limited impact on students," correcting the consistently inflated expectations of the "impact" that the World Bank and others insist "teacher quality" has on student learning.

Instead of demanding that student learning coincide with objectives and with teachers' implementation of them, the teachers Chen and her colleagues studied sometimes "back off," as they maintain a "balance between non-action and action." "Non-action" is no subjective evacuation, but a watchful waiting, even a sustained silent support – indeed a myriad of unspecified "actions" that do not interrupt the "natural growth" of their students. A typical class looks "loose outside and tight inside," giving a "seemingly dispersed appearance but having focused substance." Confident of their capacities and of their students' potentials, these teachers remain conscious of "what is going on even though they do not overact physically." Chen concludes: "It is in their adequate interplay between non-action and action that brings their students' learning to a fuller play." It seems to me they work from within.

Even if invoking a different vocabulary, Chen and her colleagues might agree, characterizing the teaching they observed and felt as "ontological," as the teachers with

whom they worked regarded their teaching "as something requiring a synergy of heavenly blessing, worldly advantage and human harmony," no simplistic adaptation of technique nor teaching to the test. Instead these educators work from their inner (if continually reconstructed) natures, some "selling tricks" and "burning with passion, devoting all their life to their mission of teaching," and others - the "non-action" teachers – flowing like water, around and over and even under obstacles. Chen thinks of the Chinese Taoist concept of Yin and Yang, which go "hand in hand," and "keep changing into each other." In their study they discerned "combinations of the two styles in the same teachers," as they adapted their teaching style "flexibly according to different occasions." Their phrase may mistranslate, so Chen puts the matter metaphorically, saying that to teach is "to dance with shackles," a phrase that portrays teachers' efforts to balance different tensions. The "shackled dances" of the teachers in Chen's research included "self-reliance" and "reshaping the reform discourse with their own, among others." To embody these images, Chen and her colleagues discuss the teacher Ou Yang. "Embodied teaching is more important than teaching by words," as the old Chinese saying Chen quotes goes. "Learning cannot be taught directly but influenced indirectly," she sagely concludes. So, perhaps, can the development of teachers.

Conclusion

[H]ow does teacher education research enable educators to deliberate about what is to count as education?
Anne Phelan 2011, 217

Culture can be conservative, as it often denotes customs and beliefs that have enlisted the loyalty of those who practice them. So at first it can seem puzzling for Phelan (2011, 208) to endorse a "cultural" role for research, one which, she suggests - contrary

to a conservative conception of culture - "nurtures thought" and "cultivates different ways" of "understanding" and "imagining teacher education." What becomes clear quickly is that "culture" for Phelan is not conservative, self-enclosed and uncritically committed to its perpetuation but, rather, self-consciously contingent, inviting "critical appreciation" of the ways in which "practice" encodes "culturally" informed ways of "thinking, speaking and acting" (2011, 212). As such, no one "natural" stance is customary, one that legitimates "professional compliance with the will of governments and accrediting institutions" (2011, 212). Such a professional culture installs independence as its crucial dynamic.

Phelan's language seems mild in the face of what many teachers face, and not only from policymakers in the World Bank but also from "collaborators" – in the World War II sense - within the profession. Consider Norberg's (2012, 444) admonition: "No one can or should escape, subvert or try to avoid the managerialist and performativity agendas of governments. They are, after all, our employers. The moral and ethical challenge is to put authentic learning first." There were Germans caught up in "collaboration" with the Nazi regime who spoke in such terms, imagining – as even Heidegger did for a time – that compliance could be converted to "moral" ends. What we know now is that in such an authoritarian regime only intransigence is possible (Pinar 2012, 237-238). True, intransigence promises little while it risks life itself. It is, however, the ethical expression of resolve.[80]

The educational research Phelan (2011, 208) imagines is "non-consequentialist," as it is devoted to "understanding" rather than "improvement." Moreover, it tolerates "interminable questions" as it studies, not necessarily solves, the "difficulties that its

explorations may surface" (2011, 208). Such research can recast teacher development as an "educational project" and research itself can become "praxis" (2011, 208). It is a praxis that acknowledges that theory and practice comprise a complicated conversation embodied in specific persons, embedded in specific situations of vastly varying scales: planetary, national, regional, local. If teacher development aspires to engage in a more complicated conversation that addresses these scales of situation, it might, Phelan (2011, 213) suggests, consult curriculum theory, with its acknowledgement of the school as a "microcosm" of society and the school as "experienced" by the individual. Informed by curriculum theory, Phelan (2011, 217) suggests, teacher educators may return to "practical preoccupations" with "fresh eyes."

In too exclusive a focus on reform, Terry Carson (2005) cautions, teachers and their "developers" may risk no longer thinking for themselves or for their constituencies, despite all the rhetoric about the "right to learn." Like deer, reformers can become caught in the car's headlights. This Medusa image – of being turned to stone by the gaze of another – is implied in Paine and Zeichner's (2012, 570) observation that teacher education – one subspecies of which is teacher development - has become the object of this "cross-national gaze." It is a deadening gaze our colleagues from Brazil, Canada and especially China – with their fresh eyes - seem to see through.

What is the "vision" of the "good teacher" those of us who work with teachers might commit to cultivate? For Grimmett (2009, 73), it is as "wise" and "poised public intellectuals" who care about education both as a field of study and as a "public trust." Among the elements of their professional demeanor are "fairness" and "decorum," capable of "moral courage," whose "contributions" are "lucid" and "engaging, bold and

provocative, people whose very presence commands respect" (2009, 73). He's not done: we need teachers, he continues, that can discuss "compellingly" (2009, 73) international and local issues as well as topics artistic, musical, literary, mathematical, scientific, and social. He appreciates the utopic quality of this vision, calling for a confluence of research, education policy, and teacher education practice to support it, but supporting it, he asserts, is "ultimately non-negotiable" (2009, 73). Intransigence, then, is no simple rejection of following orders from employers; it is the inner resolve professional ethics encourages, resolve that becomes formulated and expressed differently in different nations, regions, schools and within individual teachers. Recall that Paine and Zeichner (2012, 570) remind us there is no one vision of "good teacher" worldwide, a fundamental fact to which this collection testifies. In China, do fresh eyes foresee the future?

References

Alves, Nilda. 2011. Everyday life in Schools. In *Curriculum Studies in Brazil*, edited by William F. Pinar (43-53). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Andreotti, Vanessa. 2011. *Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Aoki, Ted T. 2005 (1992). Layered Voices of Teaching: The Uncannily Correct and the Elusively True. In *Curriculum in a New Key*, edited by William F. Pinar and Rita L. Irwin (187-197). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Aoki, Ted T. 2005 (1985/1991). Signs of Vitality in Curriculum Scholarship. In *Curriculum in a New Key*,
edited by William F. Pinar and Rita L. Irwin (229-233). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Aoki, Ted T. 2005 (1986/1991). Teaching as Indwelling Between Two Curriculum Worlds. In *Curriculum in a New Key: The Collected Works of Ted T. Aoki*, edited by William F. Pinar and Rita L. Irwin (159-165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Atweh, Bill, Derek Blan, Kylie Smith, and Ash Woodward. 2012. Engaging Students in Research Relationships for School Reform. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (233-242). London: Routledge.

Blackledge, Paul. 2011. Leadership or Management. Some Comments on Alasdair MacIntyre's Critique of Marx(ism). In *Virtue and Politics*: *Alasdair MacIntyre's Revolutionary Aristotelianism* (112-133), edited by Paul Blackledge and Kevin Knight. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Block, Alan A. 2007. *Pedagogy, Religion, and Practice: Reflections on Ethics and Teaching*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carson, Terry. 2005. Beyond Instrumentalism: The Significance of Teacher Identity in Educational Change. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies* 3 (2), 1-8.

Chen, Yuting. 2014. From Follower to Creator: The Past, Present and Future of the School as a Reform Subject. In *Curriculum Studies in China*, edited by William F. Pinar (69-82). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Christian, William. 2001 (1995). Editor's Introduction: George Grant's Nietzsche. George Grant's *Time as History* (vii-xli). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Clarke, Anthony 2001. The recent landscape of teacher education: Critical points and possible conjectures. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17: 599–611.

Coyle, Diane. 2007. *The Soulful Science: What Economists Really Do and Why It Matters*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. 2012. Teacher preparation and Development in the United States. In *Teacher Education around the World*. *Changing Policies and Practices* edited by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ann Lieberman (130-150). New York: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Lieberman, Ann 2012. Teacher Education Around the World. What Can We Learn from International Practice? In *Teacher Education around the World*. *Changing Policies and Practices* edited by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ann Lieberman (151-169). New York: Routledge.

Day, Christopher 2012. Introduction. Connecting Teacher and School Development: Policies, Practices and Possibilities. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (1-11). London: Routledge.

De Siqueira, Angela C. 2012. The 2020 World Bank Education Strategy: Nothing New, Or the Same Old Gospel. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*,

edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (49-65). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Dolby, Nadine and Rahman, Aliya. 2008 (September). Research in International Education. *Review of Educational Research* 78 (3), 676-726. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Edwards, Anne. 2012. Professional Learning and Development. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (265-269). London: Routledge.

Edwards, Anne and Viv Ellis. 2012. The Professional Development of Teachers: European Perspectives. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (303-311). London: Routledge.

Fu, Guopeng. 2014. *Physics Teachers and China's Curriculum Reform: The Interplay between Agency and Structure*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Ginsburg, Mark. 2012. Teachers as Learners: A Missing Focus in "Learning for All." In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (83-93). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Goodwin, A. Lin. 2012. Teaching as a Profession. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (44-56). London: Routledge.

Grimmett, Peter P. 2008. Teacher Education Governance, Policy, and the Role of the University. In *Mapping Research in Teacher Education in Canada*, edited by Thomas Falkenberg and Hans Smits (41-58). Winnipeg, CANADA: Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba.

Grimmett, Peter P. 2009. The Best Lack All Conviction While the Worst Are Full of Passionate Intensity. In *Key Notes in Teacher Education: CATE Invited Addresses 2004-2008*, edited by Alice Pitt (55-77). Ottawa, CANADA: Canadian Association for Teacher Education.

Hargreaves, Andy and Fullan, Michael. 2012. *Professional Capital*. *Transforming Teaching in Every School*. London: Routledge.

Henderson, Robyn and Patrick A. Danaher. 2012. Moving with the Times. Pedagogies for Mobile Students. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (360-371). London: Routledge.

Hickling-Hundson, Anne and Klees, Steven J. 2012. Alternatives to the World Bank's Strategies for Education and Development. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques*

and Alternatives, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (209-226). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kamat, Sangeeeta. 2012. The Poverty of Theory. The World Bank's System Approach to Education Policy. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (33-47). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kington, Alison, Christopher Day, Pam Sammons, Elaine Regan, Eleanor Brown and Judith Gunraj. 2012. What Makes Teachers Effective? Profiles of Innovative Classroom Practice. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (319-334). London: Routledge.

Kiragu, Susan, Sharlene Swartz, Jeremiah Chikovore, Fibian Lukalo, and Georgina Yaa Oduro. 212. Agency, Access, Silence and Ethics. How Young People's Voices from Africa Can Contribute to Social and Educational Change in Adult-Dominated Societies. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (255-263). London: Routledge.

Klees, Steven J. (2008) A Quarter Century of Neoliberal Thinking in Education: Misleading Analyses and Failed Policies, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6:4, 311-348.

Klees, Steven J. 2012. World Bank and Education. Ideological Premises and Ideological Conclusions. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (49-65). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Klees, Steven J., Samoff, Joel, and Stromquist, Nelly P. eds. 2012. T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kocson, Korina and Jeff Share. 2012. From New Media to Critical Media Literacies. Politics, Practice, and Pedagogy. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (351-359). London: Routledge.

Kwek, Dennis. 2012. Weaving as Frontload and Backend Pedagogies. Building Repertoires of Connected Learning. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (335-350). London: Routledge.

Lasky, Susan G. 2012. Warehousing the Schoolhouse. Impact on Teachers' Work and Lives. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (73-83). London: Routledge.

Leitch, Ruth. 2012. Student Voice in a Global Context. Rights, Benefits, and Limitations. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (215-221). London: Routledge.

Levin, Ben. 2012. Building Capacity for Sustained School Improvement. In *Teacher Education around the World*. *Changing Policies and Practices* edited by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ann Lieberman (98-109). New York: Routledge.

Lewin, Keith M. 2004. The Pre-service Training of Teachers – Does it Meet its Objectives and How Can it be Improved? "Paper commissioned for the *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, The Quality Imperative*". UNESCO. For further information, please contact efareport@unesco.org

Lo, Leslie N.K. 2012. Issues in Teacher Professionalism and Performativity. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (13-18). London: Routledge.

Lo, Leslie N.K., Manhong Lai, and Shuangye Chen. 2012. Performing to Expectations. Teachers' Dilemmas in East Asia and in Chinese Societies. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (19-32). London: Routledge.

Louis, Karen Seashore. 2012. Learning Communities in Learning Schools. Developing the Social Capacity for Change. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (477-492). London: Routledge.

Lüdke, Menga and Luiz Alberto Boing. 2012. Work and Life of South American Teachers in Their Context. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (84-93). London: Routledge.

Lupton, Ruth. 2012. Local Context, Social Relations and School Organization. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (194-203). London: Routledge.

Luxon, Nancy. 2013. *Crisis of Authority*. *Politics, Trust, and Truth-Telling in Freud and Foucault*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacBeath, John. 2012. Teacher Training, Education or Learning by Doing in the UK. In *Teacher Education around the World*. *Changing Policies and Practices* edited by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ann Lieberman (66-80). New York: Routledge.

Macedo, Elizabeth. 2011. Curriculum as cultural enunciation. In William F. Pinar (ed.) *Curriculum Studies in Brazil: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances* (135-153). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mann, John Steven. 2000 (1975). On Student Rights. In *Curriculum Studies: The Reconceptualization*, edited by William F. Pinar (167-172). Troy, NY: Educator's

International Press. [Originally published in *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.]

Mayer, Susan Jean. 2012. *Classroom Discourse and Democracy. Making Meanings Together*. New York: Peter Lang.

Metcalfe, Andrew and Ann Game. 2012. Learning as Devotional Practice. The Role of the Teacher. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (159-168). London: Routledge.

Moon, Bob. Ed. 2013. *Teacher Education and the Challenge of Development*. *A Global Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Ng-A-Fook, Nicholas. 2007. *An Indigenous Curriculum of Place: The United Houma Nation's Contentious Relationship with Louisiana's Educational Institutions*. New York: Peter Lang.

Nixon, Helen and Barbara Comer with Helen Grant and Marg Wells. 2012. Collaborative Inquiries into Literacy, Place and Identity in Changing Policy Contexts. Implications for Teacher Development. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (175-184). London: Routledge.

Norberg, Katarina. 2012. Successful Schools. A European Perspective. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (437-445). London: Routledge.

OECD 2011. *Building a High-Quality Teaching Profession*. *Lessons From Around the World*. OECD Publishing. www.oecd.org/publishing

Paine, Lynn and Kenneth Zeichner. 2012 (November). The Local and the Global in Reforming Teaching and Teacher Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 56 (4), 569-583.

Perry, Laura B. and Geok-hwa Tor. 2008. *Prospects* 38, 509-526. Published online 1 April 2009, UNESCO IBE 2009, DOI 10.1007/s11125-009-9092-3.

Phelan, Anne. 2008. A New Thing in an Old World: Teacher Education as a Project of Preservation. In *Mapping Research in Teacher Education in Canada*, edited by Thomas Falkenberg and Hans Smits (21-32). Winnipeg, CANADA: Faculty of Education of the University of Manitoba.

Phelan, Anne M. 2011. Towards a Complicated Conversation: Teacher Education and the Curriculum Turn. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 19:2, 207-220.

Pinar, William F. 2006. *Race, Religion and a Curriculum of Reparation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. Ed. 2011a. *Curriculum Studies in Brazil. Intellectual Histories*, *Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. 2011b. *The Character of Curriculum Studies: Bildung, Currere, and the Recurring Question of the Subject*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. 2012. *What Is Curriculum Theory*? [second edition] New York: Routledge.

Pinar, William F. 2013. *Curriculum Studies in the United States*. *Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. ed. 2014. *Curriculum Studies in China*: *Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William. In press a. *Educational Experience as Lived: Knowledge, History, Alterity*. New York: Routledge.

Pinar, William. In press b. *Curriculum Studies in India: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William M., Slattery, Patrick, Taubman, Peter M. 1995. *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.

Robertson, Susan L. 2012, November. Placing Teachers in Global Governance Agendas. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4, 584-607.

Rodgers, Carole R. and Miriam Raider-Roth. 2012. Presence in Teaching. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (149-158). London: Routledge.

Roth, Michael S. 2014. *Beyond the University*. *Why Liberal Education Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Roth, Wolff-Michael. 2012. The Praxis of Expansive Learning in Teaching. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (271-280). London: Routledge.

Sachs, Judyth and Nicole Mockler. 2012. Performance Cultures of Teaching. Threat or Opportunity? In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (33-43). London: Routledge.

Samoff, Joel. 2012a. More of the Same Will Not Do. Learning without Learning in the World Bank's 2020 Education Strategy. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques*

and Alternatives, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (109-121). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Samoff, Joel. 2012b. "Research Shows That…": Creating the Knowledge Environment for Learning for All. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (143-157). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Schleicher, A. ed. 2012. Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264xxxxxx-en

Smith, Eugene R., Tyler, Ralph W., and the Evaluation Staff. 1942. *Appraising and Recording Student Progress*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Soudien, Crain. 2012. "Quality's" Horizons: The Politics of Monitoring Educational Quality. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (95-107). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Spring, Joel. 2008 (June). Research on Globalization and Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, (2), 330-363.

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita. 2012. For All by All? The World Bank's Global Framework for Education. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (3-20). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Stromquist, Nelly P. 2012. The Gender Dimension in the World Bank's Education Strategy. Assertions in Need of a Theory. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (159-172). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Taba, Hilda. 1962. *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Tabulawa, Richard 2003 (February). International Aid Agencies, Learner-Centered Pedagogy and Political Democratization: A Critique. *Comparative Education* 39 (1), 7-26.

Thirty Schools. 1943. *Thirty Schools Tell Their Story: Each School Writes of Its Participation in the Eight-Year Study*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Thrupp, Martin and Carl Mika. 2012. The Politics of Teacher Development for an Indigenous People. Colonizing Assumptions within Maori education in Aotearoa, New Zealand. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (204-213). London: Routledge.

Trueit, Donna. ed. 2012. *Pragmatism, Postmodernism, Complexity Theory: The Fascinating Imaginative Realm of William E. Doll, Jr*. New York: Routledge.

Vally, Salim and Spreen, Carol Anne. 2012. Human Rights in the World Bank Education Strategy. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (173-187). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Verger, Antoni and Bonal, Xavier. 2012. "All Things Being Equal?" Public Options, Shortfalls, and Absences n the World Bank Strategy 2020. In T*he World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives*, edited by Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist (125-142). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Waghid, Yusef. 2010. Toward Authentic Teaching and Learning in Post-Apartheid South Africa: In Defense of Freedom, Friendship, and Democratic Citizenship. In *Curriculum Studies in South Africa: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*, ed. William F. Pinar (201-220). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williamson, Ben. 2013. *The Future of the Curriculum*. *School Knowledge in the Digital Age*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Woods, Annette and Allan Luke. 2012. Innovative Pedagogies. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (313-318). London: Routledge.

Zeichner, Ken and Bekisizwe Ndimande. 2008. Contradictions and Tensions in the Place of Teachers in Educational Reform: Reflections on Teacher Preparation in the USA and Namibia. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*. 14:4, 331-343.

Zembylas, Michalinos and Sharn M. Chubbuck. 2012. Growing Immigration and Multiculturalism in Europe. In the *Routledge International Handbook of Teacher and School Development* edited by Christopher Day (139-148). London: Routledge.

Endnotes

[1] Pinar, William F. 2015. Introduction. In *Autobiography and Teacher Development in China: Subjective and Culture in Curriculum Reform*, edited by Zhang Hua and William F. Pinar (1-47). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[2] The intellectual quality of the curriculum is evidently irrelevant, as it must be in schooling for employability (see Williamson 2013). What knowledge is of most worth – the canonical curriculum question – is replaced by what skills can corporations employ?

[3] For the scapegoating story, see Pinar 2012; for empirical documentation of teachers' centrality not only to student learning but to future income, see Pinar 2013.

[4] The core of China's school reform, Zhong Quiquan explains, is curriculum reform. And the core of curriculum reform is the reform of classroom teaching, itself dependent upon the professional development of teachers (see Pinar 2014, 224).

[5] Neoliberal conceptions of education – emphasizing privatization, undermining, Vally and Spreen (2012, 173) point out, the "right to education specifically, and human rights generally" - have been aggressively promoted by U.S. government agencies – such as USAID and U.S.-influenced NGOs like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), a fact widely documented; see, for instance, Klees 2008, 322; Tabulawa 2003, 18; Zeichner and Ndimande 2008, 331; Spring 2008, 332; 347. These are not the only organizations focused on teaching as the site of education; so is the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD): see Robertson 2012, 585.

[6] Among the scholar-participants with whom I worked in India, the association was explicit. See Pinar in pressb.

[7] During the 21st century, Dolby and Rahman (2008, 711) tell us, "the six approaches discussed here will change as priorities and realities shift. Yet, taken as a whole, the field of research in international education can only grow in prominence and influence as global processes become increasingly a transparent and obvious part of the everyday lives and practices of our educational communities and the research agendas of educational scholars worldwide." Being local even when influenced globally, everyday life is by definition not transparent, as evident, for example, in Brazil (Pinar 2011a). What research into the intellectual histories and present circumstances of curriculum research and development in five countries – Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa – reveals is quite the contrary, that localization is no simplistic "reproduction" of "global processes," but an opaque multivariate ever-shifting series of recontextualizations that renders "global processes" at times unrecognizable and even repudiated. As an export primarily of the United States, Klees (2008, 339) reminds, "neoliberalism has not gone unchallenged."

[8] The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development underlines "importance of developing a central role for teachers in educational change" (OECD 2013, 61). Teacher development – what OECD calls "in-service education" – closely "aligned" with "appraisal" and "reward" is key (2013, 61). Erudition, working conditions, state of mind all escape citation.

[9] In his comprehensive review of globalizing "human capital" education, Spring (2008, 353) too underscores that hybridity not "uniformity" characterize the reality.

[10] Its promotion of technology is key to school reform seems uncritical, following a global trend that, that, as chapters 7 and 8 (this volume) indicate.

[11] Zhang Hua speaks about internationalization and recontextualization; Zhang Wenjun provides a specific example in the encounter with postmodernism; and Kang emphasizes the significance of finding a Chinese way.

[12] "It is clear," Zeichner and Ndimande (2008, 340) remind, "that the solution to problems of educational quality and inequity cannot be solved through educational interventions alone."

[13] Illustrative this set-up for scapegoating are simplistic assertions such as "good learning comes from good teaching" (Hargreaves and Fullan 2012, 13) and "teachers are central to the ambition to provide an education for all children" (Moon 2013, 3). What teachers *can*

take responsibility for is the curriculum, as evidently they do in Finland, as Tero Autio points out (see Pinar 2014, 174-175) and Darling-Hammond and Lieberman (2012, 164) also note: "teachers take responsibility for curriculum and assessment development, as a major part of their professional role." Without jurisdiction over judgments of students' study, teachers cannot teach, a fact precluding any extensive use of standardized examinations. That is of course considered a contrarian view: standard is: "Teachers cannot reliably assess the learning without systematic ways of measuring learning outcomes." That view – this version is Lewin's (see 2004, 11) – is suppositional, not evidence-based.

[14] Linda Darling-Hammond (2012, 143) seems to accede to this catastrophic shift when she characterizes an earlier era of teacher preparation and development in the United States as "unresponsive" to "clients." If students are clients (or customers) we're in business not educating. She seems not to notice.

[15] As a middle-school teacher in Shandong Province, in his hometown of Laiwu, Zhang Hua "watched, participated, and experienced students' agony" as they suffered through "school regimes of competition and examination." Students from the "disadvantaged" classes – Most were peasants' descendants" – suffered most. "That's why I have been engaged in national curriculum reform" (see Pinar 2014, 15).

[16] Zhang Hua references the May Fourth Movement (see Pinar 2014, 31) as the genesis of curriculum studies – and of the neo-enlightenment, with its emphasis upon democracy and science - in China (Pinar 2014, 31), which structures the 1922 Curriculum Reform (2014, 37). For the recuperation of ancient Chinese cultures – Confucians, Taoism, Buddhism – see 2014, 233ff.). For a close-up of one localization of the contemporary reform, see Fu 2014.

[17] Certainly that seems the case in OECD's comparative review of innovative learning environments (see Schleicher 2012, 38).

[18] Reproduction theory refused to engage even its own extension through interpellation, ignoring obstinately the recurring question of the human subject (see Pinar 2011b, 25-38).

[19] Despite (or some would allege "among") its calamitous consequences for local cultures, the World Bank can be credited – along with UNESCO's Education for All – with supporting equal education for women (see Spring 2008, 349). In her gender analysis of WBES 2020, Stromquist (2012, 161) notes that "gender" is simply one consideration among others, thereby understating its importance and failing to recommend curriculum revision that might problematize local "gender ideologies and hierarchies" (2012, 162). Concerning gender, Stromquist (2012, 169) concludes, the Bank's "new education strategy … contains little change," as it fails to acknowledge that the "subjectivity" that develops within schools risks reproducing "rigid and stale forms of femininity and masculinity" (2012 170). In their formulation of "alternatives," Hickling-Hudson and Klees (2012, 211) emphasize a "rights-based" approach that would, among other things, make schools "girl-friendly," a point also emphasized by Hickling-Hudson and Klees (2012, 217-218). For a list of alternatives to the World Bank see Klees, Samof and Stromquist 2012, 235-236.

[20] "The World Bank," Verger and Bonal (2012, 126) point out, "does not have an official mandate on education due to the fact that UNESCO is formally the United Nation's

institution specializing in education." This is not the only contradiction they identify; The Bank insists on "evidence-based policies," Verger and Bonal 2012, 131) but it fails to provide any "evidence about what really works to ensure that children do learn at school." The evidence on the relationship between poverty and educational achievement the World Bank obstinately ignores (see Verger and Bonal 2012, 137). "What exactly is evidence?" Samoff (2012b, 143) asks. Whatever it is, it is obviously absent in the Bank's substitution of "contract consulting" for "critical inquiry" which, Samoff (2012b, 143; see also 147) notes, provides not evidence but reiterations of "previously asserted certainties," entirely "self-referential" (Stromquist 2012, 160). The Bank's insistence on evidence (it does not have) "functions to impose a conceptual and methodological orthodoxy that may undermine education reform and marginalize innovation" (Samoff 2012, 143). There seems no "may" about it.

[21] Historically, educational achievement and economic development have not been reciprocally related, as Coyle (2007, 51) notes. More important to economic growth (although causality seems impossible to establish), "it matters where an economy is located, and what its history has been. The accumulation of specific experience, reflected in an economy's institutions and norms of behavior, can have extremely long-lasting effects on growth performance" (Coyle 2007, 54). Not evidence-based, the World Bank's position would seem to be ideological, a point Soudien (see 2012, 100) also makes in reference to UNESCO, namely that the "vision of education: that these NGOs promulgate "is more than about the economic."

[22] The World Bank, Samoff (2012a, 111) appreciates, uses the term "knowledge" when it means "information," a "conflation" that "reinforces the notion of learning as a process of acquisition rather than a process that involves acquiring, appropriating, using, manipulating, and generating information." Those processes emphasize the dialogical and reconstructive dynamics of "knowledge" often absent in "information." Of course knowledge conveys information, but, like art, it can also bear the subjective stamp of its creator(s), its location in culture and time, although not necessarily connoting its datedness, as "knowledge" can connote (as information in this sense does not) its allegorical and even spiritual – think of the wisdom traditions – potential. In the Bank's usage, whatever "knowledge" is it is decidedly not local or indigenous (see Samoff 2012b, 147). Klees, Samof and Stromquist (2012, 228) conclude: "There is no 'knowledge bank,' only an 'opinion bank' and it only offers one opinion at that."

[23] The World Bank is a monopoly, Klees (2012, 49) points out, whose "global education policy" is "based on ideology, not evidence." Based solely on how education affects economic growth (see Kelles 2012, 51) – no causal relationship has been discovered (see Coyle 2007, 14, 17, 26, 29, 51), except "plundering" (De Siqueira 2012, 72) - its recent (WBES 2020) and past policies have been, Klees (2012, 50) judges, "an educational disaster" and "harmful to children around the world." It "should be replaced entirely"(Klees 2012, 62).

[24] There is no history, Samoff (2012b, 144) observes, of the World Bank or other assistance agencies, of interest in "what happens inside classrooms." With WBES 2020 nothing has changed (Samoff 2012b, 144).

[25] This succinct restatement of the canonical curriculum question was made by both Tero Autio and Zhang Hua (in Pinar 2014). Samoff (see 2012b, 144) also notes the Bank's inattention to the quality of curriculum or to the relation between power and knowledge.
[26] Instead the emphasis, Samoff (2012b, 144) notes, is on "governance, finance, accountability, and management." Strong school leaders are required to make sure teachers toe the line (never mind professional autonomy), and Schleicher (2012, 14) imagines defining the school goals, ensuring that instructional practices are directed toward their achievement by observation and evaluation of teachers, making modifications in their practices, and providing incentives to motivate them, all the while mollifying parents. Studies in several OECD countries, Schleicher (2012, 18) reports, show "school leaders are affected by the growing demands on their time." And, quite possibly, on their sense of proper professional conduct.
[27] No novel educational strategy, as Doll points out (see Trueit 2012, 222).
[28] See Pinar 2014.
[29] Schleicher (2012, 35) endorses "creativity" and "innovation" after sketching an authoritarian organizational scheme dominated by school leaders; Williamson (2013, 50) tells us that "affective labor and creativity in the digital economy displace faceless bureaucracies with a caring and sharing capitalism, or business with personality…. In this 'creativity explosion' business culture values creativity over routine, and education seeks to promote in children the creativity required for nonlinear thinking and generating new ideas."
[30] Various Catholic and Protestant Churches were – remain - non-governmental interventions in others, especially indigenous peoples', affairs. Historically, it almost goes without saying, churches were the instruments of state imperialism and colonization.
[31] See Pinar 2011a.
[32] "In the eyes of policymakers and the public," Lo (2012, 13) reminds, "teaching remains a semi-profession and the notion of teachers as professionals continues to be an open question." This degraded position is indicated, Lo (2012, 14) implies, by "top-down" decrees such as "performance management" that are "imposed on schools and teachers." Even so, Lo (2012, 16) suggested that "accountability" could "help teachers see the meaning of their work," but how is not obvious to me. Nor is it obvious to many of those promoting such schemes, evidenced by the fact that many reform supporters bypass "reformed" schools to send their children to private schools (Zeichner and Ndimande 2008, 333), among them the President of the United States.
[33] These tendencies in educational science derive from natural science, as has been well documented and succinctly summarized, on one occasion by Blackledge (2011, 119), himself summarizing MacIntyre: "Just as natural scientists aim to extend their control over nature through the manipulation of the known characteristics of its constituent parts, managers aim at the scientific manipulation of the managed to meet preconceived ends." Much of the so-called teacher development research I reviewed is in effect managing the managed toward preconceived ends. As Carson (2005) has observed, government has managed education professors so that they stop thinking for themselves, or from within their own intellectual traditions, and focus on reform. Carson invokes the striking image of a deer caught in a car's headlight, frozen in the gaze of another (the latter an image

Paine and Zeichner 2012, 570 also use). This was not the case with those with whom I worked in China (Pinar 2014).

[34] In China, Lo, Lai, and Chen (2012, 27) point out, "teacher evaluation serves as a useful reference for salary calculation and incentive payments for teachers." That evaluation is weighted toward student scores on standardized exams, a fact that contradicts the reform's allegiance to students "all round development," resulting in an impossible situation that has left teachers, Lo, Lai, and Chen (2012, 29) point out, "vulnerable to charges of incompetence."

[35] See Pinar 2012, 207.

[36] "Whereas contemporary liberalism has come to consider 'authority' almost entirely in terms of the rule that binds citizens and government," Nancy Luxon (2013, 19) points out, the classical liberals – she cites Locke, Rousseau, Kant – appreciated that "formative, personal relationships of authority prepare citizens to occupy common public spaces organized through words and deed." The education of children, then, was "premised," Luxon (2013, 19) continues, on "personal relationships to authority," including "parents" and "teachers," providing experiences of authority "that prepared individuals to exercise their liberty as citizens." Liberty and authority, she concludes, are paradoxically entangled, and, she adds (2013 19) "that entanglement is one to be continuously and actively negotiated rather than one to be stabilized onto the dichotomous terms of hierarchy."

[37] While not focused on the "lived," nonetheless Edwards (2012, 266) registers the first part of my association: "It is not beyond the bounds of imagination to conceive of professional development as the development of expertise." Such expertise emphasizes erudition – academic knowledge – but cannot be reduced to behaviors, as Darling-Hammond (2012, 143) risks doing when she depicts the "new" standards as specifying what teachers "should know, be like, and be able to do." Without sustained, sometimes self-directed, academic study – including coursework, which she dismisses – teachers cannot participate in the complicated conversation that is the curriculum.

[38] Quoted in Edwards and Ellis 2012, 306.

[39] Certainly it occurred to Professor Zhang Wenjun, who chaired a conference on November 15-16, 2014 on "Curriculum Consciousness, Construction, Capacity" on the campus of Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, China.

[40] Edwards (2012, 266) puts it this way: there are, she writes, "forms of teacher development which are too closely aligned to the implementation of specific policies."

[41] Soudien (2012, 96) questions "the idea of quality as a 'given'" and argues, instead, "that it is a choice." Choices, he notes, are "never apolitical" (2012, 96).

[42] Not only in South America: Schleicher (2012, 62) reports that while teachers working in OECD countries enjoyed salary increases during the last decade, salaries remained below those of other university graduates.

[43] While not understating the suffering poverty incurs, in Brazil there is underway an effort to work with the everyday life of students and teachers so that education is not crushed by the circumstances in which it occurs (see Alves 2011).

[44] See chapter 6, Pinar in press a.

[45] This has occurred in the United States, as I report (Pinar 2012, 18), and in often admired Ontario, Canada, as Levin (2012, 99) indicates: from 1995 to 2003 the provincial

government had accused teachers of "being lazy, imposing a multiple choice test prior to certification, cutting funding to school, removing some bargaining protections, and imposing a new curriculum." Teachers fled, as did students. With a new government in 2003, the situation changed, thanks, Levin (2012, 100) suggests, to government's respect for "professional knowledge and practice." Given that the author was appointed Deputy Minister by this new government – see Levin (2012, 101) - one must retain some skepticism of what could be construed as a self-serving account.

[46] Yusel Waghid underscores the force of friendship in pedagogical relationships; see 2010.

[47] For an early and important affirmation of students' rights, see Mann 2000 (1975).

[48] Voice has been a preoccupation of curriculum studies scholars for decades, as the subject index of *Understanding Curriculum* confirms (see Pinar et al. 1995, 1113).

[49] See Pinar et al. 1995, 636.

[50] The National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2005 stipulates that curriculum should be "connecting knowledge to life outside the school, ensuring that learning is shifted away from rote methods, enriching the curriculum to provide for overall development of children rather than remain textbook centric, making examinations more flexible and integrated with classroom life, and nurturing an overriding identity informed by caring concerns within the democratic polity of the country" (NCERF 2005, 5). NCERT (2005). *National Curriculum Framework 2005.* New Delhi. See Pinar in press b.

[51] Any system of standardized examinations silences children as it perpetuates inequities (see Hickling-Hudson and Klees 2012, 213) - but in some parts of the world cultural traditions also suppress children's expressivity. "The practice of consulting children and young people about their worlds," Kiragu et al. (2012, 254) report, "has not yet gained purchase in Africa." Referencing four studies in Ghana, Zimbabwe, Kenya and South Africa (see 2012, 255), Kiragu et al. (2012, 262) point to the power of certain cultural traditions that stipulate "who talks, who listens and which topics are considered taboo (e.g. sex and death). In light of the HIV pandemic such silence can be life-threatening." Despite this scenario, Zeichner and Ndimande (2008, 334) express confidence that in "many countries" there is movement away from "autocratic" classrooms to those more "learner-centered and culturally relevant."

[52] The critical literature – some of it is mine (see for instance Pinar 2012) – is vast. Klees (2008, 328) is succinct: The emphasis on standardized test scores has been "disastrous." No matter how they are designed, such tests constitute "very narrow measures of desired educational outcomes." In "much" of the United States today, Klees (2008, 328) continues, "any" material not tested receives "less and less instructional time," material like art, music, or physical education. Young children enjoy little or no recreation time. The "pressure" on teachers and administrators is sufficiently "strong" that student bathroom breaks are "rationed lest they miss something," students who are "sick are kept in class," and many teachers and principals have been caught "cheating to raise student scores." The morale of teachers and principals is "lower than ever."

[53] Nor does it depict classroom interaction in the lyrical terms Kwek (2012, 335) does, as "weaving … whereby teachers and students shift and establish connections between kinds and levels of knowledge within and across lessons." Weaving is a lovely image but

depicts process not content. The material available for weaving seems at least as important, does it not?

[54] An uncritical acceptance of technology is evident in the Kocson and Share (2012, 358) assertion that "mew media and media literacy are key to teaching and learning in the twenty-first century."

[55] "Teaching," Block (Block 2007, 68 2007, 68) asserts, "requires a face-to-face commitment."

[56] See Pinar 2011, 81.

[57] Louis (2012, 482) herself admits that "too much consensus within PLCs can constrain action." Retaining independence of mind within what Janet L. Miller terms "communities without consensus" would seem prerequisite to learning, including when vulnerability is heightened, as in candid confessions of struggle. "Teachers become better teachers," MacBeath (2012, 77) asserts, "when they talk about their own learning and share their own learning difficulties." Perhaps, but surely that depends on what is said to whom, where and when, and with what consequence.

[58] Economists aren't clear what accounts for economic growth, as economist Diane Coyle (2007, 36) acknowledges: "[W]e're not entirely sure, or every economy would be growing." Were the same honesty forthcoming in the school effectiveness literature: see my synopsis above.

[59] That is evident in Levin (2012, 109) qualified boast that "our levels of student achievement have risen, but they are not yet nearly high enough." What "levels" would be high enough? However hot(air) the hype, Darling-Hammond and Lieberman (2012, 155) are definitely on board, claiming that "Ontario, Canada, turned around a teacher-bashing context more recently." Somehow Darling-Hammond and Lieberman fail to appreciate how entirely interwoven "performance-based" conceptions of teacher development are with "teacher-bashing."

[60] In such an authoritarian setting, working from within - isolated from others - sounds appealing to me. But then, depending on their age and character, even one's students – many of whom are no longer students but now converted to customers – can also be predatory.

[61] For a reference of the hegemony of visuality in modernity, see Pinar 2012, 235; regarding the racialization of ocularcentrism, see Pinar 2006, 69-71. Regarding the lived experience of curriculum, see Aoki 2005 (1986/1991), 160.

[62] Kington (et al. 2012, 331-332) put it this way: while asserting there are "core classroom competencies," these are, they admit, "enacted differently by teachers in different sectors, year groups, subject groups and socio-economic contexts," thereby confessing they can't possibly answer the question with which they titled the chapter. Add to the infinity of complexity within classrooms the fact that many students are not physically present. Henderson and Danaher (2012, 360) point out that mobile or transient students also must be addressed, even concocting the adjective "sedentarist" (2012, 368) to emphasize their point.

[63] For one acknowledgement of controversy, see Pinar 2011, 87. Stringfield and Teddlie may comparing "apples to oranges," as the objectives of the Eight-Year Study were not focused exclusively on standardized tests scores. "A school program may be judged in part," Smith, Tyler, and the Evaluation Staff (1942, 316) point out, "by the character,

direction, and importance of the interests which is generates." These cannot be numeralized or known for years, even decades.

[64] Participants in the Eight-Year Study were interested in "democratic" not "effective" schools, a distinction evident in the final evaluation report. Smith, Tyler, and the Evaluation Staff (1942, 13) remind readers "the methods of evaluation are not limited to giving of paper and pencil tests; any device which provides valued evidence regarding the progress of students toward educational objectives is appropriate," including "observational records, anecdotal records, questionnaires, interviews, check lists, records of activities, products made, and the like." Standardized tests, then, were not the only or even main measure of "effectiveness," a point emphasized by Smith, Tyler, and the Evaluation Staff (1942, 316): "A school program may be judged in part by the character, direction, and importance of the interests which is generates."

[65] "Thousands" of studies of school effectiveness and school improvement efforts, Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 386) report, have been published. Apparently contradicting any effort to identify a "correlate" of school effectiveness is Darling-Hammond's (2012, 138) certainty that "program structure is not the determinative factor in predicting program success." She then undercuts the definitiveness of that assertion by adding that "certain structures *may* make it easier to institute some kinds of program features that *may* make a difference" (2012, 138, emphasis added). Is she hedging her bets or acknowledging a complexity that puts "correlates" snugly in their place, e.g. as correlates not causes?

[66] Slippages abound in this literature, as in Lewin's (2004, 7) assertion that "who becomes a primary teacher is a question that needs answering carefully on the basis of evidence rather than supposition," as if the latter doesn't sometimes structure the former, as when Stringfield and Teddlie (2012, 381) report that researchers were determined to disprove the Coleman findings.

[67] It is only "apparently," as many teachers are quite clear that some students do not listen when they are teaching and so do not learn, that some students cannot comprehend what is being taught but on occasion figure it out later, with friends or family or alone doing homework. And of course there are students who never grasp what is being taught, perhaps it is not, from their perspective, "worthwhile," to invoke the crucial adjective Zhang Hua and Tero Autio (in Pinar 2014) employ.

[68] That observation also – especially? – holds in education, at least in North America, but even Schleicher (2012, 44) makes a distinction between "using technology" and a "technology-driven approach," noting that the latter "often fails to take the student into account, and assumes that students and teachers will adapt to the requirements of the new technology and not vice versa." Given an earlier endorsement of administrative hierarchy within schools (see 2012, 14), this distinction and an acknowledgement that there is "no single best way of teaching" (which seems to contradict the earlier demand that "everyone should be on board" with school objectives) seem surprising. What's good for the goose isn't for the gander evidently, as technology is also endorsed because it allows administrators to "go beyond performance data" for "better empirical assessment of practices," including "quick feedback" to teachers, parents and students so that "remedial strategies' can be devised for students "falling behind." Like the prison, the school becomes a system of surveillance and total control. No wonder teachers might become

"overloaded with instructional and administrative work" (2012, 56), a situation to which Schleicher's scheme surely contributes.

[69] Tensionality is a concept that occurs throughout the important work of Ted Aoki (see, for example, Aoki 2005 (1985/1991), 232). Concerning the cosmopolitan cause of curriculum, see Pinar in press, chapter 18.

[70] Unless otherwise indicated, all quoted passages in this section are from this volume.

[71] See chapter 2, Pinar 2015.

[72] Christian (2001 [1995], xiv).

[73] This insight recalls that of Zembylas and Chubbuck (2012), cited earlier.

[74] See Pinar 2013.

[75] University researchers and schoolteachers in Beijing.

[76] Unless otherwise indicated, quoted passages are from the essay in this collection.

[77] The researchers also utilized a range of methods familiar to educational researchers: observations, interviews, participatory activities, as well as analysis of artifacts, tools and policy documents.

[78] Alice Casimiro Lopes emphasized recontextualization as central the processes of curriculum reconstruction (see Pinar 2011, 13) as did Ted Aoki (Pinar and Irwin 2005, 76).

[79] While inflected by ancient Chinese culture, ther conception of teaching as being circulates as well in Canadian curriculum studies: see Aoki 2005 (1992), 190.

[80] See Pinar in pressa, chapter 14.