



Curricular Enactment Matters Reorienting Education

*Margaret Macintyre Latta
University of British Columbia*

Abstract:

Curricular enactment can be an educative medium for living well in the world with others. This is not new thinking, but it is bold thinking that schools and communities worldwide persist in avoiding and short-changing. In this article, matters concerning roles and relations across understandings of education, knowledge and curricular enactment are sketched, and in doing so, what ought to matter is foregrounded. Turning to traditions concerning the aesthetics of human understanding and to found kinships with Indigenous ways of knowing and being, curricular modes of being and habits of practice emerge. These modes and habits insist on educators, students and communities traversing the curricular terrain together, orienting towards growth and well-being, and re-thinking the world in-the-making. This article challenges all readers to envision the significances we can no longer ignore and to consider the research implications.

Keywords: curriculum studies; aesthetics; John Dewey; curriculum matters; curricular enactment; teacher education; professional development

Mise en scène curriculaire et réorientation de l'Éducation

Résumé :

Mis en scène collectivement, le curriculum peut servir de médium éducatif, incitant au bien vivre avec les autres, sur cette terre. Moins nouvelle qu'audacieuse, cette possibilité est continuellement évitée et court-circuitée par des écoles et des communautés de par le monde. Cet article dresse le portrait des questions qui se posent au sujet des rôles et des relations dans la construction du curriculum selon les différentes acceptations de l'Éducation et, de ce fait, témoigne de ce qui devrait être mis à l'avant-scène de nos réflexions. De nouveaux modes d'exister et de nouvelles pratiques habituelles par/dans le curriculum émergent lorsque nous nous tournons vers les traditions esthétiques de l'entendement humain et lorsque nous nous reconnaissons une affinité avec les façons d'être et de savoir autochtones. Ces modes et habitudes exigent que personnel éducatif, corps étudiant and communautés fassent collectivement la traversée du terrain curriculaire en s'orientant vers la croissance, le bien-être et la refonte du monde-en-émergence. Cet article veut lancer le défi à chaque lecteur et lectrice de se forger une image des significations qu'il est devenu impossible d'ignorer et d'en considérer les implications pour la recherche.

Mots clés : étude du curriculum; esthétiques; John Dewey; questions curriculaire; mise en scène curriculaire; formation à l'enseignement; développement professionnelle

In a world where recent and repeated gun and additional forms of violence impact schools, university campuses and community settings, and where bullying and marginalization of differences continue to plague communities world-wide, why do education and community practices continue to focus on curricular fixes, interventions and workshops, often aimed at preparations for urgent action? Practices such as emergency drills, bullying workshops and suicide awareness and prevention forums may reflect very worthy initiatives, but they are typically operationalized by institutions to suggest readiness. Thus, such actions often emphasize immediate fixes to manage and maximize short-term safety and solutions. And, of course, these actions are absolutely needed. But, what can be lost altogether and/or undervalued is attention to the specifics of contexts that elicited these situations in the first place. Perhaps, making visible and scrutinizing the existing multi-dimensional and contextualized thinking, and problematizing given situations, would be more productive for the long term.

Addressing problems of education and communities as located within curricular fixes has been an ongoing historical pattern that continues to emphasize predetermined monolithic solutions or answers. It is this preoccupation with what Doll (2002) describes as “a method to bring control and order to life” (p. 34) that he argues haunts curricular visions—and my experiences concur. And, like others, rather than imposing monolithic thinking that can exclude and marginalize others, I have envisioned education as a productive vehicle for learning about and through others. But, such curricular enactment assumes participatory meaning-making modes that are vastly neglected for educators, students and associated communities, modes that include

- building dialogical multi-voiced conversations that foster enlarged and deepened thinking and transformation;
- unmasking diversities, contributing to communities strengthened through attention to diversities, rather than fearing them;
- practicing the creation of fluid, purposeful learning encounters across all disciplines and interests, negotiating difficult knowledge through seeking learner/learning connectedness and sustaining genuine inquiry; and
- recovering an individual/collective trust, pleasure and pride, dwelling within the processes of learning.

Again and again, education institutions and communities struggle to foster and support participatory meaning-making modes, disregarding what Dewey (1910) terms the presence and power of human beings’ innate resources of curiosity, suggestions and order-making¹, as habitual dispositions within learning of all kinds (p. 44). Despite persistent disregard, I find within Dewey’s thinking much wisdom. It is wisdom that I trace through varied traditions and Indigenous learning principles and ways of being. This tracing confronts how it is not activities themselves that occasion meaning-making matters and associated opportunities and powers. Rather, it is the act of continually

¹ Dewey (1910) identifies curiosity, suggestion and order-making as powerful innate human resources within all inquiries. Curiosity is the vitality within engagement. Suggestions derive through ongoing surrender and reflection within engagement. Order-making entails follow-up and linking suggestions together (pp. 30-39).

locating and navigating meaning-making matters that generates room for students' narratives of experience, curiosities, suggestions and ordering, as the needed matters, or resources for inquiry, within the conduct of activities. This distinction persists in being misunderstood. The insights and directions for reconceptualizing education through honouring meaning-making matters as resources guiding inquiries, hold significances for the nature and roles of curriculum and, thus, what it means to learn. For some time, discourses concerning curriculum's nature and roles have pointed to how curricular conceptions orient how education is understood (Dewey, 1938; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Schubert, 1986). After all, as Hansen (2001) claims, conceptions of teaching matter, and as Thornton (2005) claims, it is curriculum enactment that actually matters. So, what are these matters that ought to matter, what potential do they hold, and why are they repeatedly shortchanged? In what follows, the interdependencies and connections of curricular conceptions with the aesthetics of human understanding and Indigeneity, are foregrounded. Worthy matters are elicited, productively reorienting education.

Curricular Matters

Education theorists have turned to curriculum as lived and experienced in classrooms as the needed situational and relational educative ground for learners/learning across disciplines and interests of all kinds (Aoki, 1992; Dewey, 1904; Pinar, 2011). It is not new thinking, but envisioning and enacting curriculum as an adapting, changing, building process with other(s) that values curiosities and ensuing suggestions through generative sense-making continually gets shortchanged in classrooms and institutions of all kinds (Clarke, Triggs, & Nielsen, 2014; Cochran-Smith, Villegas, Abrams, Chavez Moreno, Mills, & Stern, 2016; Doll, 2013; Grimmett & D'Amico, 2008; Groundwater & Mockler, 2009). Curricular enactment insisting on a pedagogical stance or attitude that values attention to process, and the learning connections that ensue must be authorized. However, Dewey (1910) explains how such a stance is repeatedly betrayed when subject matter is taught "as an accumulation of ready-made material with which students are to be made familiar", rather than subject matter being taught "as an attitude of mind, after the pattern of which mental habits are to be transformed" (p. 183). Turning to Spencer's 1860 query concerning the nature of knowledge, Dewey emphasizes how knowledge

never can be learned by itself; it is not information, but a mode of intelligent practice, a habitual disposition of mind. Only by taking a hand in the making of knowledge, by transferring guess and opinion into the belief authorized by inquiry, does one ever get a knowledge of the method of knowing. (p. 188)

Dewey's thinking reveals how the betrayal of knowledge manifests through lack of participation in the makings of knowledge, reflecting over-reliance on the efficacy of acquaintance with facts. Thus, Dewey (1960) points out how knowledge becomes a noun—something to be transmitted to students—positioning learners as receivers of knowledge, rather than knowledge understood as a verb—adapting, changing and building meaning—positioning learners as creators of knowledge-building discourses.

However, the lived terms of knowledge as a noun or knowledge as a verb orient curricular enactment very differently. The lived terms of knowledge as a noun are concerned with compliance and uniformity, emphasizing covering/acquiring content and/or transferring knowledge. The lived terms of knowledge as a verb are concerned with what participants bring to every curricular situation, drawing on the varied connections and interpretations we each see and understand in all matters. Making these learner/learning connections and interpretations visible and then adapting, changing and building meaning (in)forms knowing. And, it is such practice, concretely involving participatory negotiation, that is too often undervalued or thwarted altogether. What is desired is an investment in curricular enactment that adapts, changes and builds meaning, that values multiplicities, cultural diversity, deliberation and debate as the matters worthy of time and space for individual/collective meaning-making modes. Such a Deweyan (1910) "attitude of mind" and the ensuing "pattern" of individual/collective inquiry calls my attention to parallels with the traditions undergirding the history of aesthetics, a history that maps out and authorizes the multi-dimensional, complex and social nature of human understanding (Johnson, 2007, pp. 1-15).

Aesthetics of Human Understanding

Tracing the study of aesthetics through human history reveals many stories where attention is oriented away from meaning-making processes towards an investment in finished products. Vaguely associated with the beautiful and sublime, and typically confined to artistic realms and discourses, the completed artistic creation becomes the focus of attention here, rather than the creating process from within the conduct of the undertaking itself (Ross, 1994, pp. 1-4). Yet, throughout history, philosophers and other thinkers have called attention to aesthetics as giving expression to human capacities to make meaning of all kinds, exploring the fundamental encounter of subject and world through multiple dimensions. For example, Kant (1790/1952), Schiller (1795/1954), Hegel (1835/1964), Bakhtin (1919/1990) and Gadamer (1960/1992), reflecting the German aesthetic tradition, each grappled with different complexities of the self in relation with individual and collective meaning-making, revealing again and again a compelling search for the connections, relations, interdependence and complexities of human understanding (Hammermeister, 2002). So, it is a history that surfaces what Johnson (2007) articulates as "the qualities, feelings, emotions, and bodily processes that make meaning possible" (p. x).

I find within these inherited and reconstructed traditions concerning the aesthetics of human understanding a poignantly relevant context for reframing education towards individual and collective growth and well-being. Dewey (1934) gave such a place to aesthetics. From Dewey's perspective, aesthetics entails the human capacity to create and experience meaning, a capacity that supersedes distinctions between the head and the hands, the mind and the body, seeing and acting, feeling and thinking, and nonverbal and verbal. He claims this to be unique to aesthetic experience:

The uniquely distinguishing feature of esthetic experience is exactly the fact that no such distinction of self and object exists in it, since it is esthetic in the degree in which organism and environment cooperate to institute an experience in which the two are so fully integrated that each disappears. (p. 254)

But Dewey warns, "When the linkage of the self with the world is broken, then also the various ways in which the self interacts with the world cease to have a unitary connection with one another" (p. 247). And as his warning predicted, disconnections *have been* favoured, and attention to the aesthetics of human understanding *has been* rejected, as is reflected in the outcomes-oriented curricula initiatives world-wide. It is this linkage of the self, the caring connecting of self and world through reflexive curricular engagement that very much matters, yet is dismissed. Dewey identified how sense, feeling, desire, purpose, knowing and volition fall away into separate fragments when this linkage is absent, instilling resistance, disregard, distrust and fear as ways to exist. It is this warning, manifested as teaching "severed" from curriculum (Pinar, 2009, p. 11), theory severed from practice, and mind severed from body, that education and communities encounter again and again.

Greene (1978) emphasizes how discovery is taken out of curricular enactment when "the self as participant, an inquirer, as creator of meanings has been obliterated" (p. 12). For Greene, what she terms the necessary "wide awakesness" is realized through aesthetic experiences "providing a ground for the questioning that launches sense making and the understanding of what it is to exist in a world" (p. 166). Such ground is fundamental to the arts, with the rootedness of this thinking across time and traditions re-turned to by many historical and contemporary theorists interested in revealing the meaning-making terrain—an adapting, changing, building, creating ground encountered through attention to the aesthetics of human understanding. While exploring various features of meaning-making terrains, many theorists share how connecting self and world in an ever-enlarging curricular conversation is deeply educative (see, for example, Baldacchino, 2009; Dewey, 1934; Gadamer, 2000; Garrison, 1997; Granger, 2006; Greene, 2000; Irwin & de Cosson, 2004; Jackson, 1998; Sameshima, 2017; Waks, 2009).

Elucidating why the aesthetic terrain of meaning-making needs to be embodied within curricular practices, and how it may be embodied, is a challenge that must be courageously embraced. Curricular practices at the juncture of body-world that concomitantly confront the immediacies of the world as lived in, and envision the world being created, call our very selves into question. Thus, to learn about other(s) and in turn one's self, to create meaning, and concomitantly be created, is elemental to the needed movement of thinking—to the aesthetics of human understanding. Curricular enactment experienced through such body-world junctures is attentive to the givens of context, the particulars involved, and the relational complexities that ensue. Curricular enactment then comes to form, as art does, "a complex mediation and reconstruction of experience" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995, p. 567), a translation into a curriculum of being in relation. Negotiating accordingly, investing in deliberate curricular practice in classrooms, is necessary for living well in the world with others. Hansen (2011) calls this the (diffuse) task of a cosmopolitan-minded education, to reflect ways of dwelling that keep self, other and world in generative touch (pp. 21-46). Pinar (2009) emphasizes the "worldliness" to be cultivated as living "between the local and the global, simultaneously self-engaged and worldly-wise" (p. 4). So, the ongoing task of elucidating the why and how of the aesthetic terrain of meaning-making within curricular practices ensures an attentive gaze. Such a gaze perceives through adapting, changing,

building and creating understandings with and through others. The centrality of a social, historical, cultural, political and personal curricular landscape is assumed, enlarging and deepening participatory sense-making.

Curricular Enactment's Trusting Attention to Process, to Currere

Attending to the particulars of students, context and subject matter places trust in process, as well as trust in educators' and students' capacities within process. Dewey (1938) characterizes such trust as a confidence found within the specifics of curricular situations and interactions, suggesting a worthwhile learning direction, a medium for teaching and learning that asks teachers and students to participate through adapting, changing, building and creating meaning. Curriculum comes to life through genuine inquiry into what is worth knowing, rather than simply following a curricular document. Curriculum is then restored to its roots of *currere* (Pinar, 2009), invested in prompting, sustaining and nurturing a movement of thinking that generates the substance for individual/collective meaning-making. Pinar articulates how such substance forms "complicated curricular conversations" that act as "a force of the possible" (Baldacchino, 2009, p. 58) for all involved. Such force demands that educators and their students be able to articulate why, how and what they are orienting their practices toward, and to embody these ways of being within their lived practices. But, orienting the needed knowledge-making discourses toward building relationships among self, other(s) and subject matter through complicated curricular conversations is undermined when participation in the makings of knowledge are betrayed through predetermined and imposed policies and practices that dismiss learner multiplicities, expect generic learning processes and products, and thwart differences as catalysts in growing understandings. If attention to the act of building relationships among self, other(s) and subject matter is the learning thread that authorizes meaningful curricular enactment, it is imperative that educators, students and others, better understand the nature and the curricular implications of relationship-building. Dewey warns how this is a persistent dilemma, explaining how these curricular implications are limited and discouraged as "the formation" of courses of study are "largely a matter of doing up bundles of knowledge in sizes appropriate to age and arranging for their serial distribution, each its proper year, month, and day" (p, 132). And Dewey's warning continues to be relevant today as knowledge is bundled in contemporary forms as drills, workshops, strategies, interventions, cross-disciplinary experiences, curricular integration and interdisciplinary studies. Such bundled initiatives bring varied disciplinary knowledge together, but not necessarily with room for the makings of knowledge, and therefore restrict complicated curricular conversations and short-change meaningful relations.

Shallow understandings of education persist, and the consequences shortchange curricular enactment in classrooms of all kinds and extend into the workings of communities. I sit in many meetings that favour unencumbered exchange and consumption of predetermined ideas. The pull, in these situations, towards certainty and singularity in ways of seeing, thinking and doing is violent to disciplinary knowledge and curricular inquiry, violent to educators and their students, and violent to communities. I do want to acknowledge bold educators worldwide, though. Many are reframing education through reorienting what counts as knowledge, by turning away from curricular uniformity

and predetermined learning outcomes and evaluative measures. But, again and again, these courageous efforts get shortchanged through lack of time to invest long term in educators', students' and communities' knowledge-making capacities. The needed supports, the entrusting of learning to educators and their students, the cultivation of shared language to articulate the significances for all involved, and documenting, disseminating and mobilizing the long-term significances for all involved, are undermined as the evidence of student knowledge is assessed through measures and tests that betray the makings of knowledge. What education and communities need to embrace is just how revolutionary knowledge-making can be, holding, as it does, the powers and possibilities of a curricular enactment that is oriented towards learner/learning growth, greater self-understanding, enhanced well-being, and the opportunity to continually situate self in the world alongside others. Such knowledge-making can be a vital medium for embodying and strengthening the roles of education within all institutions, communities and beyond. Furthermore, such knowledge-making reflects long-held beliefs and modes of being embodied within Indigenous wisdom traditions (Four Arrows, Cajete, & Lee, 2010).

Finding Kinships with Indigenous ways of Knowing and Being

In British Columbia (BC), Canada, the Ministry of Education's (2016) curricular emphases on Indigenizing, and on the competencies of critical and creative thinking, positions all educators to consider the concrete negotiation of what these might look and feel like within curricular enactment. This stance echoes similar provincial curricular initiatives across Canada (Campbell, 2017; Walker & von Bergmann, 2013). But, given the forty-plus years of preoccupation worldwide with compliance and uniformity concerning education policies and practices, the BC curricular plan will need to be enacted with educators willing to embrace learning processes, to cultivate the necessary curricular capacities. Given that these capacities have become increasingly estranged to all involved over the years, heightening educators' attention toward the learning possibilities and powers within such curricular enactment seems to be the place to begin (Doll, 2013; Finn, 2015; Hansen, 2011; Macintyre Latta, 2013; Macintyre Latta, Hanson, Ragoonaden, Briggs, & Middleton, 2017; Macintyre Latta, Schnellert, Ondrik, & Sasges, 2017).

Nationally, the Indigenous Education Accord (2010) formalized Canadian teacher education programs' moral and ethical responsibilities to inform prospective educators about the turbulent history of European colonization and its intergenerational impact on the Indigenous peoples of Canada. Consequently, faculties of education, adopting the role of allies, and aware of limited institutional knowledge, instigated a collaborative stance, inviting local and place-based First Nation communities to participate in the conceptualization, development and integration of academic initiatives focused on recognizing, and in some cases, introducing, the diversity of Indigenous cultures and traditions to a new generation of Canadian teachers (Association of Canadian Deans of Education, 2010). In keeping with the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, the call to action of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015) emphasizes the systemic responsibility that Canadian education institutions have to recognize and to mobilize local, place-based First Nations ways of knowing and being. Finding ways to support and honour

these efforts is vital. Curricular initiatives seeking such purposeful intersections, and optimizing reciprocal learning for all involved, foster operative modes identifying constructive practices, connecting existing related projects, and building resources towards sustaining these efforts (Rosborough, Halbert, & Kaser, 2017; Dion, 2009; Styres, 2017). Acknowledging the diversity of First Nation, Inuit and Métis (FNIM) Peoples of Canada, *First Peoples Principles of Learning* (2008) developed by the First Nations Educational Steering Committee (FNESC), characterizes such learning as holistic, reflexive, reflective, experiential and relational. The focus on connectedness, reciprocal relationships and a sense of place, forms a rich terrain for educators and their students to critically and creatively engage. The kinship of Indigenous commitments to interconnectedness, reciprocity, relationality, reverence and respect, with curricular-making commitments to greater self-understandings, draws participants nearer and nearer to lived learner/learning consequences (Archibald, 2008; Archibald & Hare, 2017; Atleo, 2009; Atleo, 2011; Battiste & Henderson, 2009; Cajete, 2015; Carter, Prendergast, & Belliveau, 2015; Cohen, 2001; Four Arrows, Cajete, & Lee, 2010; Irwin & de Cosson, 2004; Norris, 2009; Restoule, Gruner, & Metatawabin, 2013; Walsh, Bickel, & Leggo, 2015).

It is through my participation within Indigenizing curricular experiences that I personally encounter many opportunities to re-learn and to become a better ally. I note how Indigenizing curricular experiences take shape and evolve through the particulars of contexts with given educators and students, and chronicle the individual and collective narratives of learning and re-learning. My attention is increasingly drawn towards learning significances, kinships with Indigenous ways of being, and mapping reconciling paths. Specifically, a curricular experience invested within cultivating awareness of Indigenous histories, as well as migrating groups' histories from all over the world, becomes shared sense-making ground (Macintyre Latta, Hanson, et al., 2017). This ground comprises the identities, cultures, languages, values and ways of knowing that constitute and question what it means to be Canadian. Participating students, educators, symphony orchestra musicians and researchers, working alongside each other on the construction of a large-scale arts experience, continually story and re-story narratives of experience characterizing the multi-perspectival nature of Canada's history. The process is responsive to the varied ways multiple narratives, perspectives, strengths and resources hold potential for reframing and reorienting curricular enactment (Cajete, 1999; Dewey, 1938, 1934; Greene, 2000; Meyer, 2010, Pinar, 2011). A continuous reconstructing movement of thinking, finding purpose shaped both individually and collectively by all involved through provoking creative and critical negotiation unfolds (Dewey, 1902, 1934, 1938). Pinar's (2009) notion of *complicated curricular conversations*, understood as individual/collective thinking that attends to the given and arising relational complexities, productive for learners and learning, guides the co-curriculum-making efforts. Historically, Dewey (1902/1990) describes the tendencies to orient away from complicated curricular conversations to be "evils", positioning the child versus the curriculum (p. 202). Contemporary issues in education evidence how these "evils" persist, disregarding organic connections between self and the world, and resulting in limited room for internal motivation, self-reasoning powers, and the felt agency of concretely

experiencing the provoking character of curriculum. Orienting away from such evils, participants explore the terrain these complicated curricular conversations map out, re-storying Canadian history.

The curricular opportunities to learn from Indigenous peoples' experiences and perspectives offer transformative understandings that embrace the primacy of investing in classrooms as sites for disrupting colonial relationships and promoting relationship-building with Indigenous peoples. (Archibald, 2008; Donald, 2009; Hare, 2016; Lowan-Trudeau, 2014; Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017). So, it is within these sites that I encounter much kinship between Indigenous ways of knowing and being with curricular enactment, understood as entering into complicated conversations and attending to the aesthetics of human understanding through adapting, changing and building co-curricular-meaning-making (Cannon, 2012; Cohen 2001; Donald, 2009; Dion, 2009; Hare, 2016). Turning to its etymological roots, Indigenous means *born of the land*. Through connecting land and culture in relation to the self, a kinship is found within the terrain that is revealed when one reveres and closely attends to the particulars of situation, grounded within organic relationships with place (Armstrong, 1998). Traversing this curricular terrain assumes a pedagogical stance that is concomitantly watchful—mindful of situation, relations and action. Such mindfulness demands a presence within the moment, taking in, receiving and acting as situations call forth. Thus, a found attunement orienting towards learners/learning's sake, deliberately seeking the well-being of others, characterizes the ongoing watchfulness. World-wide, Indigenous connections to land, culture and the relational self convey the need for such pedagogical attunement (Haig-Brown, 2010; Kanu, 2011; Styres, 2017). And, it is within seeking such attunement that the kinship of Indigenous commitments to interconnectedness, reciprocity, relationality, reverence and respect emerge and offer the needed learning conditions, supports and participation (Atleo, M. 2009; Atleo, E. R. 2011; Archibald, 2008; Battiste & Henderson, 2009; Cajete, 2015; Carter, Prendergast, & Belliveau, 2015; Cohen, 2001; Four Arrows, Cajete, & Lee, 2010; Irwin & de Cosson, 2004; Restoule, Gruner, & Metatawabin, 2013). Education is reconceptualized through such attunement to process. A reflexive/receptive character within seeing and acting is entailed, holding the makings of knowledge that orient the direction of thinking away from being imposed to an agency coming from within the unfolding inquiry of engaged students and teachers. It is a reflexive receptivity that is not instrumental or applied, but must be practiced within the interplay of given conditions. Elucidating this curricular terrain is critical. Concretely negotiating such terrain foregrounds Indigenous kinships with traditions attending to the aesthetics of human understanding. Through such curricular negotiations, inter-related modes of being manifest, modes that are also aspects of curricular enactment: namely, its inherent relationality, generativity, need of other(s), temporal/spatial agency and interdependency with imagination. An explication of these modes follows.

Curricular Enactment's Inherent Relationality

Willingness to attend to the social, historical, cultural, political and personal experiences, perspectives and contexts that influence and interact within every situation foregrounds the relational complexities human beings bring to all sense-making. Embracing these as elemental human resources holding the genesis for inquiry of all kinds is key. Some contemporary education

Curricular Enactment Matters

scholars, drawing on their personal Indigenous stories, reveal the importance of respecting the relations offered by contextual realities and given places, and the potentialities these relations hold for varied directions inquiries may take (Archibald, 2008; Battiste, 2013; Cohen, 2001; Styres, 2017). Authorizing such inquiries manifests curricular-making that cultivates reciprocal connections with a responsibility to those developing relationships. Thus, these relationships incite challenges to self-understandings, values, assumptions and beliefs because “colonial relationships continue to influence the ways individuals and communities define themselves within contemporary contexts” (Styres, 2017, p. 20). Honouring local Indigenous histories with pedagogies responsive to relational connections to land, culture and understandings of self-in-the-world extends beyond culturally responsive and place-based education discourses and fosters learning contexts that continually grapple with the relations everyone brings to all encounters.

Curricular Enactment’s Generativity

Willingness to enter and dwell within the relationships present and already at play within situations attends to the generative process that knowledge-making invites. Suggestions unfold, and are negotiated, as paths of inquiry open up. Dewey (1938) characterizes attending to such openings as forming and informing the materials for knowledge-making, through attention to the “powers and purposes of those taught” (p. 45). Not to do so, as Dewey points out, would be “to neglect the place of intelligence in the development and control of a living and moving experience” (p. 88). Indigenous scholars have pointed out how these powers and purposes may take multiple forms, but revering and conversing with the given powers and purposes as the materials for knowledge-making has to be the necessary starting place for all inquiry (Four Arrows, Cajete, & Lee, 2010). Violent human histories speak to the realities of not doing so—seeking to eradicate Indigenous epistemologies by “imposing modern education and Christian evangelism” provides a disturbingly powerful example (Episknew, 2009, p. 5). The dire consequences positioned the child against the curriculum with no avenues to recognize and cultivate a fitting identity. The persistent costs of colonizing pedagogies that reduce understandings to monolithic, predetermined views clearly indicate that education is failing Indigenous students and communities (Battiste, 2013). But, also, education is failing all students and communities when the short and long-term consequences of complicated curricular conversations are negated as ways to learn with and through each other (Smith, 2006).

Curricular Enactment’s Need of Other(s)

Willingness to attend to the ways in which other(s) call personal understandings into question characterizes a curriculum that values interactions, debates and deliberations; it is a curriculum that recognizes itself as always in need of other ideas, experiences, perspectives and understandings. Dewey (1934) describes the knowledge-making ground thus encountered as beginning with *impulsion*, acknowledging interdependency *of self with surroundings*, learning through *resistance* and *obstacles*, and unfolding at the *junctions of old and new* experiences (pp. 58-60). Personal needs and interests initially direct efforts. These efforts are then redirected as individuals convey and begin to attend to the relations they meet and negotiate with, as thinking with and through others is made

more accessible. Understandings are reached and extended at the junctures of the old and the new. The evolving authorized inquiry is not simply the workings of an individual's interiority, but rather, is purposefully inclusive of the narratives and reflections of others. Styres (2017) recounts that such a developmental, unfolding process of self-formation and discovery is the ongoing task of all learning/living that "locates ourselves in relation to everything we do" (p. 7). Battiste (2013) recounts that such a process "nourishes the learning spirit", providing much-needed sustenance for genuine learning opportunities of all kinds.

Curricular Enactment's Temporal/Spatial Agency

Willingness to attend to temporality, to the past-present-future interplay within every situation, positions all involved to respond to the relational and interactive connections that ensue through inquiry. Dewey (1938) explains that such inquiry is growth oriented and is dynamically structured to bring the present's potential to immediate attention. Styres (2017) relates how embodied connections to the land reflect this dynamic, carrying "the storied footprints or tracks of our ancestors through (re)membering and (re)cognizing oral traditions, ancient knowledges, and very old pedagogies" (p. 84). Archibald (2008) characterizes how storywork takes participants on a circular journey that breaks down barriers and becomes a space and time of individual/collective transformation. Styres envisions teaching as just such a "storied act [developing] a living text" (p. 180) in which learning with and through experience unfolds through the character of the experience itself and not just from what is encountered. Dewey (1934) characterizes such unfolding connections as derived "about, within, and without and through repeated visits" (p. 229). And, it is these gathering connections that hold the contingencies, the unpredictable matters, that educators and communities must understand as the risks and opportunities worthy of curricular negotiation. Dewey (1938) explains that it is the sustenance gained through such understanding that occasion the kind of present that "has a favourable effect upon the future" (p. 50). Curricular connections attending to the present's potential, invest in individual/collective growth that sees and acts within the temporality at play within given circumstances.

Curricular Enactment's Interdependency with Imagination

Willingness to attend to imagination as a gateway to knowledge-making acts as a capacity to see the potential in situations, in self and in other(s), rather than as a distinct specialized faculty of the mind. Dewey (1934) claims that such participatory knowledge-making through thinking, feeling, seeing and acting "illuminates" (p. 22) understandings and fosters internalization, instilling embodied comprehension. Kanu (2009) articulates how such curricular enactment prompts a postcolonial imagination, allowing "the influences of history and global migration to inform new responses to teaching and invite curriculum workers to rethink the production, representation and circulation of knowledge so that these do not remain the monopoly and privilege of one group" (p, 110). And, such imagination is fostered, enlarged and deepened through embodied expression of self as "a relational, respectful, and reciprocal process" foundational to Indigeneity (Styres, 2017, p. 7).

Inter-related Modes of Being and Meaning-Making

Opportunities for the needed curricular practice to acquire these participatory modes and habits integral to negotiating complicated curricular conversations is limited, and in many cases, totally unfamiliar. In my efforts as a curriculum theorist and teacher educator, this translates into disinterest on the parts of some educators (and their students) who are unwilling to navigate the makings of knowledge—the given matters within all educative situations as the relational complexities integral to curricular inquiry. Educators who commit to these modes and habits in their classrooms often operate in isolation, while others are undermined by exhaustion and frustration as they find themselves continually positioned to defend their practices. The consequences of lack of concrete practice with complicated curricular conversations hold frightening significances for teacher education, professional identity and the future we are creating. Such frightening significances include initiatives that outsource teacher preparation and evaluation to the private sector; evaluative artifacts that are based on far too simple understandings of education as training, and so encompass set strategies, methods and techniques that ensure measurable outcomes; policies and practices that assume professional identity be understood as skill-based, with little-to-no room for judgment and deliberation; and, curricular mandates where the future is understood to assume a world in which all children and youth need similar skills and capacities, thus emphasizing standards for quality control and vocational port-ability. If complicated curricular conversations are not practiced by students and communities, the complications remain hidden and do not become opportunities to learn from, with and through others. And, our individual/collective practice navigating such conversations tends to be feared and resisted, remaining unfamiliar.

The inter-related modes of being and associated habits of generativity, relationality, need of other(s), temporal/spatial agency and imagination invite the individual and collective meaning-making that Dewey (1934) characterizes as “roominess, a chance to be, live and move” for all involved (p. 209). Roominess allows deliberation, intuition, anticipation, new ideas and enlarged realizations. The ongoing reciprocal nature of such roominess actively assumes individual/collective openness alongside a commitment to attend to ensuing interactions. Roominess births new ideas, which are continually re-negotiated as “the old, the stored material . . . [is] literally revived, given new life and soul through having to meet a new situation” (Dewey, 1934, p. 60). Seeking curricular life and soul assumes roominess for enlarging and deepening understandings that participants experience and embrace as always in the making. Thus, it is through individual/collective traversing of the knowledge-making terrain that deliberation, intuition, anticipation, new ideas and enlarged understandings prompt interactions and compel participants’ investment and ongoing attention. The empowering potential of such knowledge-making was recently glimpsed as thousands of students across the United States and Canada walked out of class on March 14, 2018 to demand stricter gun laws. Responding to the tragic shooting violence at Florida’s Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in February, 2018, they called on lawmakers to do something before another school falls victim to gun violence. The varied ways students took up protesting and offered tributes to the victims, alongside the varied local, national and international debates and deliberations that ensued, suggest

the significances of participatory thinking. Though arising from a crisis situation, I hear voices open to better ways to live in the world with others. Education needs to seize such openings, investing in the needed modes of being and habits over the long-term. Cultivating communities invested in seeking community and producing community through shared “thought and purpose between the child and the [human] race of which he [sic] is heir” (Dewey, 1910, p. 224), must be continually practiced. It is only by traversing the exposed curricular terrain, providing access to and practice with these modes and habits, that I envision the kinds of knowledge-making happening in education and communities that will foster meaning-making that matters. It is such matters that will invest in long-term human well-being in a shared world, reframing education locally, nationally and internationally.

The Search within Re-search

Through ongoing curricular engagement, through situating oneself in the world, the aesthetics of human understanding draws attention to the search itself. Indigenous pedagogies provide important ways of being and searching/living that value the relationality and complicity of self-in-the-world. And, in doing so, curricular enactment is oriented towards this knowledge-making movement from within the movement, reconceptualizing education with a sense of being and becoming that is always in process. A world in which cognizance of selves in the world is heightened would be a step worth taking. Our elemental human curiosities, suggestions and order-making would adapt, change and build a world we collectively invest in and care about, in relation to and interdependent with other(s). Education holds these powers, if seen and acted upon. But, education also holds the powers to mask differences, thwart genuine concerted action, stall growth of self-understanding in relation to others, and dismiss the particulars of context. History and contemporary concerns reveal how we can no longer underestimate the lived consequences. The challenges I leave readers with concern matters contributing to research reframing education in ways that not only explicate the lived consequences for all involved, but map out and vivify the responsibilities schools and communities must traverse. It is the long term investment in the supports and conditions for educators and others to do so that will cultivate the needed trust and mobilize efforts, gaining insights and resources from the greater community alongside educating the greater community. In what ways can educational researchers and communities work together to embrace these challenges?

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

References

- Aoki, T. (1992). Layered voices of teaching. In W. Pinar & W. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text* (pp. 17-27). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Archibald, J. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body and spirit*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

- Archibald, J., & Hare, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Knowing, sharing, doing: Celebrating successes in K-12 Aboriginal education in British Columbia*. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Principals' and Vice Principals' Association.
- Armstrong, J. (1998). Land speaking. In S. Ortiz (Ed.), *Speaking for the generations* (pp. 174-194), Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Association of Canadian Deans of Education (2010). *Accord on Indigenous education*. Retrieved from: <https://csse-scee.ca/acde/publications-2/#indigenous>
- Atleo, E. R. (2011). *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous approach to global crisis*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Atleo, M. R. (2009). Understanding Aboriginal learning ideology through storywork with elders. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 55(4), 453-466.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays* (V. Liapunov, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press. First published 1910.
- Baldacchino, J. (2009). *Educating beyond education: Self and the imaginary in Maxine Greene's philosophy*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich.
- Battiste, M., & Henderson, Y. J. (2009). Naturalizing Indigenous knowledge in Eurocentric education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 32(1), 5-18.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2016). *Introduction to British Columbia's redesigned curriculum*. Retrieved from: https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/sites/curriculum.gov.bc.ca/files/pdf/curriculum_intro.pdf.
- Cajete, G. A. (2015). *Indigenous community: Rekindling the teachings of the seventh fire*. St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- Campbell, C. (2017). Developing teachers' professional learning: Canadian evidence and experiences in a world of educational improvement. *Canadian Journal of Education* 40(2), 1-33.
- Cannon, M. J. (2012). Changing the subject in teacher education: Centering Indigenous, diasporic, and settler colonial relations. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, 4(2), 21-37.
- Carter, M. R., Prendergast, M., & Belliveau, G. (Eds.) (2015). *Drama, theatre and performance education in Canada: Classroom and community contexts*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association for Teacher Education/Canadian Society for the Study of Education.
- Clarke, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education: A Review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2), 163-202.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A.M., Abrams, L., Chavez Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2016). Research on teacher preparation: Charting the landscape of a sprawling field. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 439-547). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Cohen, B. (2001). The spider's web: Creativity and survival in dynamic balance. *The Canadian Journal of Native Education*. 25, 140-148.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory and practice in education. In C. A. McMurry (Ed.), *The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers: The third yearbook of the national society for the scientific study of education* (pp. 9-30). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. New York, NY: Dover.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Capricorn Books.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Dewey, J. (1960) *Quest for certainty*. New York, NY: Capricorn Books.
- Dion, S. (2009). *Braiding histories: Learning from Aboriginal peoples' experiences and perspectives*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Doll, W. (2002). Ghosts and the curriculum. In W. E. Doll Jr., & N. Gough (Eds.) *Curriculum visions* (pp. 23-70). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Doll, W. (2013). The four R's: An alternative to the Tyler rationale. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *Curriculum studies reader* (4th ed., pp. 215-222). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Donald, D. (2009). Forts, curriculum, and Indigenous métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal-Canadian relations in educational contexts. *First Nations Perspectives*, 2(1), 1-24.
- Episkenew, J. (2009). *Taking back our spirits: Indigenous literature, public policy, and healing*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.
- Finn, P. (2015). *Critical condition: Replacing critical thinking with creativity*. Windsor, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press
- First Nations Education Steering Committee (2008). *Teacher resource guide: English 12 First Peoples*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Author.
- First Nations Education Steering Committee. (2015). *First People principles of learning poster*. Retrieved from: <http://www.fnesc.ca/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/PUB-LFP-POSTER-Principles-of-Learning-First-Peoples-poster-11x17.pdf>.
- Four Arrows, Cajete, G., & Lee, J. (2010). *Critical neurophilosophy and Indigenous wisdom*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2000) *Truth and method* (G. Barden, J. Cumming, W. Glen-Doepel, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum. First published 1960.
- Garrison, J. (1997). *Dewey and eros: Wisdom and desire in the art of teaching*. New York: NY: Teachers College Press.
- Granger, D. A. (2006) *John Dewey, Robert Persig, and the art of living: Revisioning aesthetic education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grimmett, P., & D'Amico, L. (2008). Do British Columbia's recent education policy changes enhance professionalism among teachers? *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 78. Retrieved from <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/grimmett.html>
- Groundwater-Smith, S., & Mockler, N. (2009). *Teacher professional learning in an age of compliance*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Springer.

- Haig-Brown, C. (2010). Indigenous thought, appropriation, and non-Aboriginal people. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(4), 925-950.
- Hammermeister, K. (2002). *The German aesthetic tradition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching: Toward a teacher's creed*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hansen, D. T. (2011). *The teacher and the world: A study of cosmopolitanism as education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hare, J. (2016). "All of our responsibility": Instructor experiences with required Indigenous education courses. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 38(1), 101-120.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1964). The philosophy of fine art. In A. Hofstadter & R. Kuhns (Eds.), *Philosophies of art and beauty* (pp. 382-445). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. First published 1835.
- Irwin, R., & de Cosson, A. (2004). *A/r/tography: Rendering self through arts-based living inquiry*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Jackson, P. (1998). *John Dewey and the lessons of art*. Boston, MA: Yale University Press.
- Johnson, M. (2007). *The meaning of the body: Aesthetics of human understanding*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kant, I. (1952). *The critique of judgement* (J. H. Bernard, Trans). Oxford, England: Clarendon Press. First published 1790.
- Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating Aboriginal perspectives into the school curriculum: Purposes, possibilities, and challenges*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Lowan-Trudeau, G. (2014). Considering ecological métissage: To blend or not to blend? *Journal of Experiential Education*, 37(4), 351-366.
- Macintyre Latta, M. (2013). *Curricular conversations: Play is the (missing) thing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Macintyre Latta, M., Hanson, K., Ragoonaden, K., Briggs, W., & Middleton, T. (2017). Accessing the curricular play of critical and creative thinking. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 40(3), 191-219.
- Macintyre Latta, M., Schnellert, L., Ondrik, K., & Sasges, M. (2018). Modes of being: Mobilizing narrative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Sage. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418786309>
- Meyer, K. (2010). Living inquiry: Me, myself, and other. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 26(1), 85-96.
- Norris, J. (2009). *Playbuilding as qualitative research: A participatory arts-based approach*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Pinar, W. F. (2009). *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education: Passionate lives in public education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F. (2011). *The character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurring question of the subject*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1996). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Ragoonaden, K., & Mueller, L. (2017). Culturally responsive pedagogy in higher education: Indigenizing curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 47(2), 22-46.
- Restoule, J-P., Gruner, S., & Metatawabin, E. (2013). Learning from place: A return to traditional Mushkegowuk ways of knowing. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 36(2), 68-86.
<http://ojs.vre.upei.ca/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/1570>
- Rosborough, T., Halbert, J., & Kaser, L. (2017). Walking together in a spirit of respect and inquiry. In J. Archibald & J. Hare (Eds.), *Learning, knowing, sharing: Celebrating successes in K-12 Aboriginal education in British Columbia*. (pp. 28-43). Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Principals' and Vice Principals' Association.
- Ross, S. D. (1994). *Art and its significance: An anthology of aesthetic theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sameshima, P. (2017). Foreword. Those blooming identities: Who are we waiting for? In E. Lyle (Ed.), *At the intersection of selves and subject: Exploring the curricular landscape of identity* (pp. viii-xiii). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Schiller, F. (1954). *On the aesthetic education of man in a series of letters*. New York, NY: Frederick Unger. First published 1795.
- Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Styres, S. D. (2017). *Pathways for remembering and recognizing Indigenous thought in education*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Thornton, S. J. (2005). *Teaching social studies that matters: Curriculum for active learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Truth and reconciliation commission of Canada: Calls to action*. Retrieved from:
http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf
- Waks, L. J. (2009). Inquiry, agency, and art: John Dewey's contribution to pragmatic cosmopolitanism, *Education and Culture*, 25(2), 115-125.
- Walker, J., & von Bergmann, H. (2013). Teacher education in Canada: Beyond professionalization and deregulation. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 36(4), 65-92.
- Walsh, S., Bickel, B., & Leggo, C. (2015). *Arts-based and contemplative practices in research and teaching: Honoring presence*. New York, NY: Routledge.