# WHAT PHILOSOPHY CAN BRING TO MUSIC EDUCATION: MUSICIANSHIP AS A CASE IN POINT

By

Estelle R. Jorgensen

February, 2003

What can philosophy bring to music education? Over the past decade, various North American writers have examined this and related questions. Bennett Reimer (1992, 2003) laments the lack of a philosophical grounding for music education research and for doing research "responsibly" and offers his own updated philosophy of music education. Eleanor Stubley (1992) sketches various schools of philosophical thought in examining musical activities as non-propositional forms of knowledge. She argues for the centrality of "[e]pistemological questions concerning what constitutes knowledge and how human beings come to know" for music educational as other educational research (13). Beyond his own philosophy of music education (Elliott, 1995), David Elliott (2002) examines the impact of various schools of philosophical thought on research and the roles of theory and model building in music education research. Mary Reichling (1996, pp. 117, 119, 124) notes that "there is little that cannot come under the eagle eye of the philosopher." For her, philosophical method is "not something apart from the substance of philosophy itself." She cautions "against the positivistic influence that leaves philosophical research susceptible to the fatality of facticity, the finality of formula, and the stricture of structure." Extending his analysis of the various ways in which music can be construed (Bowman, 1998), Wayne Bowman (2002) examines various conceptions of education and what it is to be educated musically, noting that "[o]ur research...can be no better than the questions we choose to explore" (78). My own recent work (Jorgensen (1997, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002a, 2002b) examines the roles of philosophy in music education research, its contributions to practice, and includes my own attempts to construe music education normatively as well as descriptively. These explorations of philosophical method and its role in research and practice posit the role of philosophy as central, and the questions philosophers and researchers

ask as pivotal, in determining the results obtained.

My approach to the question "What can philosophy bring to music education?" in this essay is to offer a case in point. Through this case I point out three important tasks that philosophers can fulfill: clarifying ideas, interrogating commonplaces, and suggesting applications to practice. Doing philosophy is inseparable from the content of philosophy itself. This case illustrates the role that philosophy can have in music education and deals also with the subject matter of philosophy itself. The notion of musicianship serves as a play within a play. How this idea is clarified, interrogated, and applied is of central interest to music education just as is the task of music education philosophy itself.

Why musicianship? The word musicianship is used by music teachers in the English-speaking world to describe one of the ends of music instruction. Taken to refer to the thinking, being, and acting as a musician, musicianship is a perennial and pervasive goal of music education practice. It constitutes a way, although not the only way, of combining artistic and aesthetic elements of music, or making and taking music. Other musical objectives such as music appreciation, or the ability to listen to music in an informed way, and music's interrelationship with other arts and humanities may be insufficiently addressed in musicianship construed narrowly in terms of the development of musical skills. There are also the needs and interests of one's colleagues and students. Understanding the implications of musicianship for effective music teaching and learning and how to forge teacher communities in order to collectively provide a broad musical education is an important outgrowth of the analysis. Clarifying the meaning of musicianship, interrogating commonplaces, and suggesting applications to practice illustrates the work of philosophy in an important aspect of music education.

*Clarifying Ideas: Musicianship as Idea and Practice*

What is meant by musicianship? The word itself gets short shrift in music dictionaries. Its etymological roots suggest the attributes of a "musician," one who practices or does music. Whether one practices music as a vocation or an avocation, the musician does certain things, possesses particular skills, and employs given knowledge in the making of music. I am judged as a musician with reference to the particular tradition(s) I practice and the public's expectations about my performance.

One way in which musicianship can be construed focuses on the practices of music making and taking, what David Elliott (1995) and Christopher Small (1998) variously call music(k)ing, or even more narrowly on the development of technical skills. Viewed from these perspectives, it may be seen as a principal means through which one comes to know music. In this sense, it evokes notions of doing music or actively engaging it. And it may be tempting to extend the argument to propose that one can only come to know music as one musics or does it in whatever role, be it composer, performer, or listener, or, as Small would have it, contributes to it in other ancillary or supportive roles such as concert hall janitor, usher, ticket seller, impressario, sound engineer, and recording distributor.

Another way to construe musicianship is to view it as an "ideal type" or "theoretical type" in counterpoint with music appreciation, where musicianship and appreciation are construed comparatively as polar opposites yet potentially merging in the midst of the continuum. Percy Scholes (1970, 46) describes appreciation as "educational training designed to cultivate in the pupil an ability to listen to seriously conceived music without bewilderment, and to hear with pleasure music of different periods and schools and varying degrees of

complexity." In the United States, the word appreciation has been used to refer to "the rubric under which instruction in music is provided "to students with little or no previous training in music" in order to "give them some familiarity with and appreciation for music as distinct from a rigorous technical understanding of it" (*New Harvard Dictionary of Music,* 519). Although the roots of music appreciation lie within the Western classical tradition, its use has since broadened to include other musical traditions including popular music. Nowadays, it is typically used in conjunction with performance-based music programs to focus on the process of hearing, seeing, and receiving music as spectators or audience, or more rarely, cultivating physical response to music by dancers.

Viewing musicianship as oriented towards the practice of music and appreciation as focused on its appraisal and reception suggests a tension in music, similar to the other arts, between the artistic (or making) and the aesthetic (or taking) elements. John Dewey (1934/1980) writes that in the English language two words are used to think about the arts including music, painting, sculpture, dance, and drama. One word, "aesthetic," is often taken to refer to the response that listeners and watchers have to what has been created by the artist; it may evoke awe, wonder, mystery, indignation, joy, fear, disgust, among an array of ideas, emotions and bodily responses. The other, "artistic," is often used to describe what artists do in creating music, painting, sculpture, dance, and drama; it connotes the doing of these arts or the making of them. Dewey (1938/1963) observes characteristically that educators ought to be about breaking down "Either/Or" dichotomies, and creating wholes and unities. For him, both aesthetic and artistic experiences are important, and he thinks it unfortunate that there is not a word in the English language to describe both the making and taking of the arts. Using gerunds

such as music(k)ing, drawing, painting, dancing, and the like may go some way towards resolving this dilemma, but doesn't overcome the resilience of the aesthetic/artistic distinctions in English-language philosophical discourse. Language can bring about a philosophical problem. Those languages that do not distinguish aesthetic and artistic may not have a philosophical problem, a point that may help to explain the puzzlement I have encountered elsewhere in the world over the North American debate between aesthetic and praxial notions of music education.

Satisfactorily combining the doing and undergoing of music has eluded music educational thinkers. I see a cyclical movement in North American and British music curricular history between an emphasis on performance and listening and other methodological matters. Witness the nineteenth century debates about music teaching methods in England and the United States (Rainbow, 1967, 1989; Cox, 1993; Pitts, 2000), and twentieth-century quarrels about the psychology of music and its implications for music learning between Carl Seashore and James Mursell (Jorgensen, in press). During the greater part of the past three decades, following the writings of Charles Leonard (Leonard & House, 1959), Abraham Schwadron (1967) and Bennett Reimer (1970, 1989), music education was construed as a form of aesthetic education. Many music teachers may have invoked the mantra "music education is aesthetic education" without understanding what the word "aesthetic" meant. These teachers knew that aesthetic education had something to do with the value of musical experience aside from other benefits of music education that had been touted, including its role in promoting health, social order, religious worship, and patriotism.

More recently, writers such as Elliott (1995) have questioned the assumption that music

education should be understood as a form of aesthetic education. For many North American music teachers, music is a performative art–that is, one does it with one's students as well as thinks about it. Elliott's suggestion that music education should be praxial (after Alperson, 1993), in the sense of cultivating music performance and improvisation as central activities in music education and contextualizing music as an individual and social practice, resonates with many music teachers in the United States. Under the banner of "praxial music education" not only is performance stressed (and composition and listening among other activities as they centered on or were expressed in performance) but music is to be studied in its social context, as the social activity musicians around the world intuitively understand it to be.

A similar recent movement towards composition and performance is evident in the United Kingdom. Here, secondary school music teachers had traditionally focused on music history and theory, and John Paynter (1982) and Keith Swanwick (1999) are among those to call for the inclusion of musical composition and performance in school music curricula. While the history and reasoning behind the creation of a more inclusive music curriculum in British schools differs from that in the United States, it nevertheless exemplifies a shifting perspective and practice between the knowing about music and its doing.

What difference have these debates regarding the methods and ends of music education actually made to the practice of music education? If one could do what one wanted as a music teacher, namely, instruct one's students to the best of one's ability in ways in which one felt comfortable, and invoke words like "appreciation", "musicianship", "aesthetic", and "praxis" to cover what one is doing, why fuss? Have these debates been more about matters of nuance, emphasis, and perspective on the work of music education rather than about its heart and soul,

doctrinal quarrels rather than paradigmatic shifts? Is there a real difference in the curriculum and instruction of teachers who claim one word or another as their guiding principles? If so, how can these theories and the practices of such music teachers be reconciled? And what role does musicianship play in their educational work?

Musicianship is known to North American music educators principally in the context of the comprehensive musicianship movement of the 1960s and 1970s summed up in the Yale Seminar of 1963 (Seminar on Music Education [1963: Yale University] 1964) and evolving thought in the context of the Contemporary Music Project (1971). This movement focused on integrating the various aspects of musical study that were too often studied separately, including the study of music history and theory in performance-oriented programs, or performing within general music (or music appreciation) programs (Mark & Gary, 1992, 361, 362). At first, the Western classical tradition was regarded as normative, although proponents now advocate the study of other musics in their cultural contexts and the making of connections between musics and the other arts (Buehl 2002).

I see the comprehensive musicianship movement in the United States as one attempt to marry a skills-based approach to music making with its appreciation, to overcome the bifurcation between the doing and receiving of music, and to create an holistic and integrated approach to musical instruction. A similar approach to blending elements of composing, performing, and listening is evident in the move towards more integrative music examinations in British secondary school music curricula (Pitts, 2000). John Dewey (1938/1963) would applaud these practical efforts to overcome Either/Or dichotomous thinking between what he saw as the aesthetic and artistic elements of art, the doing and undergoing of them, in order to forge a more

balanced and integrative approach to musical education. This integrative notion of musicianship, or the constituent skills and their attainments that together exemplify a musician (e.g., Howard, 1982, 183), along with the needs and interests of those who receive music as listeners or interpret it as dancers, suggests a broad view of music education that extends over the gamut between theory and practice, or composition, performance, and listening.

It is interesting that despite the rhetoric, the practice of comprehensive musicianship as advocated in the Yale Seminar immediately ran into institutional apathy and resistance in the United States. Even though the Yale Seminar included academic representation, prominent schools of music such as the School of Music at Indiana University did not pursue it when the opportunity arose. The music education establishment in MENC was miffed that it had not been included officially in the Yale Seminar and the criticism of school music programs was so strenuous, and it held its own rival Tanglewood Symposium a few years later (Mark, 2000). The rise of the music education as aesthetic education movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s was taken by some to emphasize teaching music as a humanity rather than as a performing art. And teachers were daunted by the level of musicianship necessary to teach to the standards recommended by the Yale Seminar. Without academic and professional leadership, comprehensive musicianship's translation into tertiary, secondary, and elementary music programs eventually faltered. There were other problems as well. The rise of popular mediated musics expressing values very different from contemporary classical music, questions about whose music(s) should be taught in general education, the "culture wars," immigrations from former European and American colonies and protectorates and sometimes massive movements of people from one country to another carrying their musics with them resulted in more

pluralistic views of music than had been heretofore evident. Viewing music as practice also raised important questions: For which musical practices are music teachers responsible for developing musicians? How ought musicians in these practices be prepared? Is it practical to prepare musicians for multiple practices? Are the practices themselves flawed and what are the responsibilities of music educators towards changing those practices? Understanding these theoretical and practical difficulties, many music teachers selected music from traditions of which they were exponents, bridged the popular and classical as best they could, with a nod to music from other cultures (even if it was "westernized" in the process of learning and performance). Witness competition repertoire and that regularly performed at music education conferences. The overall result was a fragmented and bifurcated approach to musicianship and appreciation, necessitating recent renewed calls for performing with understanding–something akin to the idea of comprehensive musicianship (Reimer, ed., 2000).

What does history teach us about what music teachers actually do? Evidence including national standards and national curricula in music suggests that the profession expects music teachers and their students to be engaged in making and taking music by singing, playing instruments, composing and improvising music, learning the historical and theoretical elements of music, its relation to the wider culture, and about varieties of music. This suggests a form of *comprehensive musicianship* that includes performance and appreciation with a comparative musicological twist. Objectives similar in scope to those endorsed in the United States national standards and in British national music examinations are to be found in antiquity and are remarkably resilient and pervasive. One might quibble about how musicianship might be accomplished, which musics and musical elements should be emphasized, and how successfully

the practical and theoretical aspects of music have been integrated in the past, but by-and-large, music educators have been a remarkably consistent breed for millennia. Throughout history, they have sung, played instruments, composed and improvised music, learned the historical and theoretical elements of music, its relation to the wider culture, and about varieties of music, all in a more-or-less integrated program of study.

The same is true of music instruction in centers of advanced learning. In European universities in which *musica theoretica* was the primary emphasis, students were expected to acquire an understanding of *musica practica* elsewhere, and many university professors were also practicing musicians (Chanan, 1994). Later, conservatories emphasized practical instruction but expected students to pick up theoretical and historical knowledge as they went along (Rainbow, 1989). Likewise, in the United States, college and university music departments and schools attempted to combine performance and academic studies in music (National Association of Schools of Music, *2002-2003 Handbook*). This long tradition, sometimes imperfectly and often differently realized in practice, exemplifies remarkable consistency–a balanced, comprehensive system of education in music.

Were one to survey music teachers around the world, it might be clear that although teachers and their students study different musics, approach the musics of their choice from different angles and go about learning these musics in different ways, they act in their studios, classrooms and all the other places they teach as if music is their raison d'etre. Most would like to see themselves in the business of cultivating musicianship and appreciation of one or more musics within the restrictions surrounding their work, the limitations of their own preparation and music skills, and the mandates that direct their work. The best music teachers I have

observed take their students into account in planning their musical activities, employ their own talents, experiences and expertise to best advantage in organizing their curricula, and music is at the center of what they do, no matter how variously they do it or think of it. They also regard music as good for improving attitudes to and performance in academic subjects, developing good social skills, expressing patriotic feeling, and the like, as well as for its own sake in its spiritual contributions to the lives of people, and its contributions to general schooling and society.

A philosopher examining this situation may reflect on two somewhat interconnected strands–on the one hand, various theories about what music teachers ought to do with important philosophical questions still unresolved, and on the other, a long line of music teaching and learning practice that reflects an ongoing devotion to the claims of music and education as teachers variously see it. By its very nature, music education is both theory and practice, and the task of music education philosophy is to engage both theory and practice. Breaking down the bifurcations between theory and practice, melding these two streams, and forging a more integrated theory-practice requires reflection on practice and the writings of philosophers and theorists, and a reciprocity between theory and practice in thought as well as practice.

*Interrogating Commonplaces: Problems and Potentials*

In our time, sensitivities to the claims of various musical practices and their corresponding value-sets raise issues that need to be thought through philosophically and applied practically. It takes much more time to become a musician than to learn about a particular tradition, and the limitations of available time in school music make it hard enough to develop a musician in one tradition let alone an exponent of multiple traditions. As a Western-trained

musician, I may play classical, rock, country, and jazz. I might be able to play popular musics from other cultures that apply Western theoretical ideas in their creation and performance. If I do so, I probably draw mostly on my knowledge of Western musical skills and idioms to translate from one musical tradition to another. But I cannot go very far beyond this except as a neophyte who glimpses other musical traditions. I may achieve an intuitive grasp of what is going on in these other musics but I lack the instrumental skills and wisdom that come with more advanced understanding of them. This practical reality suggests that music teachers' objectives regarding musicianship need to be much narrower and less ambitious regarding the practice of multiple musics than their appreciation. But how to move beyond the rhetoric of multiplicities and pluralities of music making and taking to its practice in the phenomenal world. What is clear to the musician is that describing individual performance-based music programs as genuinely multi-cultural is a misnomer. At best, music teachers may be musically bi-lingual or tri-lingual regarding the practice of closely related musics. One can only speak of multi-cultural music education either academically in the sense of learning about musical cultures (and maybe experiencing them to a limited degree) or in terms of the variety of musical traditions represented by a community of music teachers (Jorgensen, 1998).

Defining musicianship also necessitates distinguishing the sorts of preparation needed to make music at advanced levels of professional performance from those necessary for amateur enjoyment as an avocation. What level of prowess is meant by the word musicianship? Is it to be defined principally with regard to exemplary or advanced levels of performance practiced by seasoned professionals or does it also cover the efforts of neophytes? Vernon Howard (1982) distinguishes exemplary performance as practice in contrast to the efforts of students to attain

mastery as practise. Musicians (both professionals and amateurs) regularly differentiate between those who are in the process of developing expert practice and those who have already mastered their craft-art and are regarded as exemplars of it by the community of those whose practice it is (Booth, 1999). Throughout history, educators have pointed their students towards examples of excellence in each field of study while also taking into account the abilities and attainments of their students. And amateurs have recognized limits on their ability to achieve the technical prowess of professional performers just as they have faulted professionals for a lack of a love of music that drives amateur music making (Booth 1999).

At first glance, this distinction between practitioners and those who are practising to become practitioners may be taken to suggest that developing an expert musician is quite a different matter from cultivating an audience for these musicians. Take the analogy of athletic training. On the one hand, are the Olympic athletes; on the other, are those who simply enjoy sports activities. The training and accomplishments of these two groups may be very different. Likewise, music can be pursued differently in terms of the amount of time spent and the intensity of effort expended. These differences might be so marked as to suggest that the differences are qualitative rather than quantitative, that is, two very different things in terms of competition, lifestyle, or mode of instruction. At a time in which comparatives are readily available in the form of concert performances and musical recordings, an observer might conclude that developing an expert practitioner of the western classical tradition is quite a different matter than cultivating a love of music, an ability to listen intelligently and to perform in amateur musical ensembles. The sheer amount of repertoire, scope of technical and critical skills, and commitment of time and resources needed to become a professional musician are such that

relatively few in our time have the resources to devote to musical study sufficient to become expert practitioners. As a result, it might be argued that many may need to be content with being amateurs for whom music constitutes an enjoyable activity or avocation.

Seeing music making this way, in terms of a gulf between the comparatively few professional musicians and the many others who enjoy their work or, at most, play and sing for the love of music, invites the suggestion that musical instruction ought to be similarly bifurcated. Intensive musical training is made available for the especially talented ones, with the great majority being offered instruction that will prepare them as listeners or, at the most, amateur performers. Practicing teachers regularly act as if these distinctions ought to exist and set up their music programs accordingly. They seek to accommodate some who may become musicians and provide quite different activities for those whose commitment to music making is limited or who are content to enjoy listening to others make music.

The philosopher asks, ought music education be thought of and conducted in this way? Is one justified in creating two-tiered systems–one for the relatively few musically talented ones, and another for the great majority of people–in general education? The fact that school music curricula in the United States have swung between an emphasis on performance and appreciation respectively suggests that those who have thought about the aims of music education have not been altogether satisfied with a focus on one or the other. Teachers have become dissatisfied with one and then the other as each generation has reacted to the one before it. The idea of bringing together musicianship and appreciation may be theoretically appealing but practically elusive; instead, one or the other comes to dominate the curriculum and balance is hard to achieve within the strictures of contemporary music instructional environments. And explaining

exactly how one ought to prepare professional and amateurs and how these approaches ought to intersect and diverge turns out to be a complex issue that defies easy resolution in practice.

What if musicianship is seen differently from the way our athletics analogy would suggest? Consider two botanical analogies with quite different implications. The first is that of a rose bush in our garden. We prepare the ground, plant the rose bush, cultivate, prune, water, fertilize and otherwise do the things that are necessary for the bush to bloom. As it matures, buds appear on the stems, and as they mature, discernable flowers gradually open out. In full bloom, our rose bush is, hopefully, a mass of blooms, each of which we hope will become a full-blown rose. When I pick a rose bud, it is no less a rose than it is when full blown. Even without the roses yet in bloom, the newly planted rose bush covered in green leaves without a bud in sight has the potential to sprout rose buds and eventually roses. It is just a matter of time, patience, and tender loving care, and this bush puts out buds and then flowers as we hope it will when we plant it. Of course, not all our rose bushes do well. Sometimes they may be infected with diseases or insects. The soil and climate may not be to their liking. Or the quality of the stock may differ from one plant to the next. In the same way, becoming a musician and exemplifying the qualities of the musician is a complex phenomenon and a developing process from the most elementary to advanced levels of performance. It is not easy to predict who will become a professional musician and who will not. As Israel Scheffler (1991, pp. 18-29) notes, human potential is dependent upon various factors including the individual decision of the student as to what he or she will do. What can be said is that the neophyte musician is simply in the process of becoming an accomplished musician, and as she or he goes along, demonstrates more and more of the characteristics associated with an accomplished musician in a particular

practice. And what if the person should never achieve the end of the accomplished musician? Shinichi Suzuki (1969) would press the point that this does not matter. What is of greatest importance is that the student become a better person through the play and effort of becoming a musician.

The second analogy is the case of the young Canadian hemlock in our garden, beaten down to the ground when a violent storm blew down a massive old maple tree upon it. Its central trunk destroyed, we trained one of its branches upward. Gradually, this branch became a "trunk" and from this new trunk new branches emerged. Now, it stands proudly in a stand of hemlock trees and to look at it you might not recognize its history unless you are a trained horticulturist. How can this happen? Scientists posit the notion of the fractile, the idea that the blueprint of the whole is evident in a part of the whole. This redundancy enabled the hemlock to sprout a new "trunk" even if its first was destroyed. Iris Yob suggests that this idea may be applied to music education.[1] To study music and exemplify the qualities of a musician, one need not tackle the whole of music. A part of it may suffice. Such a position would support Zoltán Kodály's (1974, 140) assertion that teachers can convey the "chief basic phenomena of music" to their students through "54 well-chosen songs." Or, if one avenue is cut off, another may take its place. For example, a trombonist may become a cellist, or a listener a performer.

These analogies suggest that the neophyte musician can demonstrate some of the selfsame characteristics as the expert as she or he develops toward mastery of a particular musical practice. I notice this especially when musical instruction is in the hands of musicians who know what they are doing. For example, consider the members of the Los Angeles Children's Choir, the Harlem Boys Choir, the Tapeola Children's Choir, the Vienna Boys Choir,

among a host of children's choirs in publicly and privately supported schools around the world taught and conducted by musicians. In all these situations, the children are taken seriously. Instructors seek to assess the musicality of the students, provide a graduated system of instruction appropriate to their musical achievements and interests, set high expectations of them, and treat them all, even the beginners, as persons of worth and as if they are already musicians and are capable of becoming musicians. The assumption that at every level of development the student can demonstrate musicianship, albeit in differing ways, challenges the validity of bi-focal music education, i.e., one for the relatively few musically talented and another for the majority (those whose musical aptitude and achievement is assumed to be low and therefore restricted to listening or comparatively low levels of performance). Christopher Small (1980) argues that musicality may be far more widespread than is commonly believed in the West. This being true, all students need to be taken seriously in terms of musical instruction, and many more are capable of demonstrating musicianship than may have been traditionally believed.

Is it necessary to make music in order to understand it? Israel Scheffler (1991, pp. 30-41) unmasks this fallacy in his distinction between knowing how something was made and understanding the completed work. True, process and product are ambiguous, each feeding into the other. Still, there are different sorts of knowledge–procedural and propositional, or 'knowing how' and 'knowing that', respectively. One who has never composed or performed music may come to a knowledge about music and possess the ability to hear music musically, that is, as exponents of this musical practice or an informed audience might hear it. Another who has performed music may not have developed an ability to listen sufficiently due to a preoccupation with acquiring performing skills. Teachers seem to recognize this reality

intuitively and offer a variety of musical courses and ensembles designed to develop their students' differing interests, abilities and needs. They accept as commonsensical the differences in the musical abilities and aptitudes of their pupils. And given the multiplicities of their students and their particular instructional situations, the idea that music education must be approached in any one particular way is viewed by such teachers as silly and impractical; they have tested the idea in their own experience and found it wanting.

The analogies I have sketched above, each with its implications for developing musicianship and appreciation, complicate the theoretical and practical options for music education. Multiplicity and multiformity require developing ways to address things in tension or dialectic with one another, and working through the options in particular situations rather than specifying any one right way for all time. Such a position corresponds with the ways in which teachers act, as if musicianship is demonstrated in all sorts of ways–composers, improvisers, performers, listeners, dancers–and no one way is the only way through which the various qualities musicians possess can be expressed. Each focuses on a different aspect: composition and improvisation draw upon original musical ideas and their development; performance draws on interpretative prowess and showmanship; listening draws on imaginative conceptions of musical ideas as they are produced in sound; dance draws on the body's powers to convey in space what music sounds like. So musicianship, whatever it is, cannot be just one manifestation. Rather, it takes various forms across musical genres and practices. It is defined with respect to the particular musical tradition in which it is situated, but it can enable the musician to go beyond a particular tradition to join with musicians of other practices. As our fractile analogy suggests, knowing one musical tradition may provide a key to others, even if it is

to know or know that one does not know what others are up to when they make music.

Which musics ought to be the subject of one's study? Connecting with the past is particularly important in today's world in which pervasive technology emphasizes the present. Paying attention to the past raises questions such as: Is sufficient attention paid to the musics of the past, or to the classical tradition that is our heritage? Ought this classical tradition to be changed? If so, how? These big questions have to do essentially with the subject matter and values that underlie musical study, and music(s) teachers and our students sing, play instrumentally, compose, learn about historically, theoretically, and in relationship to society.

A knowledge of the musics of the past helps students begin to answer the question: Where have I come from? Knowing about the past requires drawing upon the resources unearthed by musicologists and theorists, studying scores to see what they contain, reconstructing performances from the growing evidence gleaned by students of performance practice, copying scores and learning to compose in the styles of earlier times by imitating compositions of masters in the past, "jamming" with more experienced players who have learned their craft firsthand from exponents of it, reading histories of artists, composers and their works, and studies of music in the context of times past. As students sing, play, and dance, they can tap intuitively into the culture of an earlier time. The musics in which they participate may have been performed by their foremothers and forefathers. Understanding and knowing about these musics of the past and present and how they were and are made can help bring the generations together–an especially important feature in our time. Used in these ways, technology can be employed not only in the service of the present by affording opportunities to experience music removed in place through such means as distance learning, but in bringing the past to life

through such means as film, sound recording, internet and other computer-driven means.

In a society in which materiality and technology are all-pervasive, the development and exercise of intellectual and spiritual powers can also point toward greater humanity and civility. The fact that music doesn't always accomplish this and that musicians (as with other artists) may be among the world's greatest rakes (as Schiller [1801/1967] observed) does not deter us from hoping that maybe it can benefit society. In all of these musical doings, makings, and hearings, teachers and students are engaged in an enterprise that is other-worldly in its nature and import. This enterprise has to do with a world beyond the phenomenal, a world that Susanne Langer (1942/1957) calls, for want of a better word, "feeling," Israel Scheffler (1991) and Iris Yob (1997) respectively call cognitive emotions and emotional cognitions–a world of imaginative constructions beyond the physical, meaning making beyond the propositional, and corporeality beyond intellection. Or, as Elizabeth Jolley (2001) quotes Thomas Mann's words from *Death in Venice* in the preface to her novel, *An Innocent Gentleman*: "[t]hought that can emerge completely into feeling, feeling that can emerge completely into thought–these are the artist's highest joy."

These spiritual aspects of music are difficult to talk about because they are so attached to the experience itself. If you weren't there, how can I tell you exactly what I felt, saw, and heard? It may have been a moment of pure joy, when the performers were so in tune and so together that they and we were captivated by the sound, mastery of technique, and the ease and fluidity in what was happening–a moment when we seemed apart from the mundane and the ordinary. It may have been when the performers struggled to perform at piece not to our or their liking, or perform it under circumstances that were frustrating or unnerving. It may have been

when the performance was merely workmanlike, comparatively ordinary, when all did their duty as musicians and the best under the circumstances but that is all. Or it may have been when the performers did not pull together well, and the flawed performance left us and them feeling dissatisfied or frustrated. These moments from the sublime to the sub-par constitute the stuff of making and taking music. And the same might be said of day-to-day classroom and studio instruction in music, sometimes inspired and sometimes not.

As music teachers, we are about the education of *people*. This reality necessitates that we attempt to improve our students' lives individually and collectively. We hope that our music making will enhance the lives of our students and its effects will spill over into the school and out into the community at large. We are gratified when we see our students doing well, carrying with them a love of music and the assurance that we believe in them, want the best for them, and care for them quite apart from the music. We need to think critically about our worlds of music, and the need for their transformation towards greater humanity and civility. Among evidences that present practices need critical engagement are the exclusion of girls and boys from various musical activities, the lot of the poor who cannot afford individual music lessons, the silence of our profession in the face of pervasive corporate greed and technological power over our lives, our individual and collective failure to engage sufficiently the musics of the disenfranchised and marginalized ones in our society while we go abroad to study exotic musics, our failure to deliver consistently strong primary and elementary music education to all the boys and girls in publicly supported schools, the flight of some of the best music teachers out of the profession or to more congenial teaching environments; and our inability or unwillingness to offer sufficiently compelling musical alternatives to the commercially produced musics of our time or to explore

sufficiently those musics not so readily accessible to today's students. These daunting ethical, political, spiritual, economic, and musical issues belong to our raison d'etre as music teachers.

*Applying Ideas to Practice: Some Practical Questions and Suggestions*

If musicianship, the host of musical beliefs and practices one can know about and do, is to be an end of music education, as a teacher, I need to know my subject matter intimately and I need to be a musician in order to teach music. What can be done, practically, to lift the standard of musical knowledge and practice among teachers of music, including specialists and classroom teachers? And how can music teachers ensure that all elementary and primary school students in every place have a more consistent and thorough musical education and opportunity to learn about and do music?

One of my greatest concerns regarding North American music education is the lack of articulation between kindergarten and doctoral study in music, and I ask, Where is the ongoing conversation between college professors and school teachers at all levels about what this articulation should be in all the objectives of singing, playing instruments, composing or improvising, learning about musical traditions historically and theoretically, and experiencing musics as part of wider culture? If there hasn't been such a conversation, how can we get it going? The differing perspectives of the Yale Seminar and Tanglewood Symposium (Choate, 1968) have yet to be addressed and reconciled. Participants in these symposia arrived at very different conclusions about the state of music education and its future. Ever since, music educators and music historians and theorists in the United States have been like ships sailing past each other in the night.

A central issue with which I grapple as a teacher is that of my curriculum–what I intend

to do and what happens in my rehearsal space, classroom, and all the other spaces I teach. The repertoire I choose is an expression of what I believe music to be. Curriculum is where theory meets practice. I need to spend considerable time reflecting on this aspect of my teaching because of its centrality in music education–it represents my best judgment about what these particular students should know and do. It is where general theories about what music is are realized in the music my students and I perform, listen to, watch, compose, improvise, produce and record. Nor do I consider just the music itself, but how these students can relate to this particular music. Feeding into my decision making about repertoire are such considerations as the interest I think this piece might hold for my students, how quickly I believe I can move to broaden and deepen their knowledge of music in order to stretch without discouraging them, how we can accomplish each move successfully, and which things need to come before other things in order to develop a broad scope and effective sequence of study.

Events can impact curriculum, so I need to be flexible in my planning. I cannot and probably should not pre-plan everything. Roland Allsup (In press) writes of how he and his music education students composed a requiem in their class in the wake of September 11, 2001. As members of the class wrote their own poems, set their own songs, listened to parts of composed requiems from the past, they expressed the connectedness between music and this tragedy. How better to relate music to the lived experience of students than to improvise this strategy! Some curriculum cannot be pre-planned. It needs to be improvised in response to events that contextualize it. Allsup's class may well have been one of the most meaningful in the lives of the teacher and his students as together, they confronted tragedy and gave voice to their feeling musically.

Are our standards regarding our repertoire selection sufficiently challenging? The Yale Seminar faulted North American music teachers for "failing" in regard to their repertoire choice for the following reasons (Seminar on Music Education: Yale University [1963], 1964, 11, 12):

1. It is of appalling quality, representing little of the heritage of significant music.

2. It is constricted in scope. Even the classics of Western music–the great works of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven–do not occupy a central place in singing , playing, and listening. Non-Western music, early Western music, and certain forms of jazz, popular, and folk music have been almost altogether neglected.

3. It is rarely sufficiently interesting to enchant or involve a child to whom it is presumed to be accessible. Children's potential is constantly underestimated.

4. It is corrupted by arrangements, touched-up editions, erroneous transcriptions, and tasteless parodies to such an extent that authentic work is rare...

5. Songs are chosen and graded more on the basis of the limited technical skills of classroom teachers than the needs of children or the ultimate goals of improving hearing and listening skills...

6. The repertory of vocal music is chosen for its appeal to the lowest-common denominator and for its capacity to offend the smallest possible number, More attention is often paid to the subject matter of the text, both in the choice and arrangement of material, than to the place of a song as music in the educational scheme. The texts are banal, and lacking in regional inflection.

7. A rich treasury of solo piano music and chamber music is altogether neglected.

8. The repertory is not properly coordinated with the development of theoretical and

historical insights.

9. No significant amount of music composed by children, particularly the children being taught, is included or treated seriously.

The seminar concludes with the statement that a "wholesale renewal of the repertory of school music, both for performing and listening, is badly needed."

How far have American music educators have come in meeting these objections or responding to them critically? Are school music teachers as seriously limited as musicians as Yale Seminar participants thought them forty years ago, and do these musical as opposed to pedagogical limitations get in the way of their teaching? No one likes to be criticized, and when a group of musicians (including some of the best school musicians) tells the music education profession that what it is doing is not "up to snuff," it is tempting to become defensive. Still, I wonder if enough is expected of school music students. For example, very few incoming freshmen (or first year) music education majors with whom I talk these days have had a course in ear training, sight singing, music history, or theory in their entire high school music programs.

This may be just a North American problem. Each country has its own roots, traditions, and particular educational challenges. Still, music educators in other countries and continents may not find things exactly to their liking either. There may be a sense in which teachers in other places may want to revise what has been taken for granted, to ask whether or not students are being sufficiently prepared with the sorts of musical literacy and orality, theoretical and historical knowledge, particularly, those that are their heritage and the basis of classical, vernacular, and popular culture?

Achieving musicianship and appreciation (or some version of comprehensive

musicianship) is unrealistic unless teachers can work together. Practicing teachers know that music is one of those subjects that must be done. Being able to do something often takes much longer than learning about it. You can tell me the theory of how I should play a clarinet but as a pianist who has struggled to learn to play the clarinet, there is a gulf between knowing this theory and being able to produce the sounds I wish to on the instrument. We all start as musicians with our particular instruments in our respective musical traditions, developing skills that we have spent sometimes decades perfecting, and we go on from there. I start as a pianist, you start as a clarinetist. Despite our best efforts to broaden our knowledge and skills as musicians, we necessarily go in different directions and end up in different places. What we know intuitively, and we have spent years developing musical intuition, is that we can't do everything, we have to be very selective in what we teach, and we need each other if we are to help fill in the gaps and bridge the fissures in our individual experiences.

How could we better work together as musicians? And how might this greater cooperation translate into an holistic and integrated curriculum for our students? Where teachers work together, a more comprehensive program can emerge that enables students to take advantage of the combined skills of their teachers. And if all our teachers were to envisage their objectives more broadly and interactively, it might be possible to begin to forge a reciprocity between aesthetic and artistic, musicianship and appreciation that the advocates of comprehensive musicianship desired to create. How could we collaborate better across schools, districts, and with university college music educators? Do we do enough talking together as colleagues, observing each other's rehearsals, and mentoring and being mentored? Do we consult sufficiently among each other about the challenges and possibilities we face? Maxine

Greene (1988) rightly observed that we may not be able to imagine how things might be better until we are in a community or a group working together. Musical competitions (and dare I say our competitiveness?) sometimes play against the willingness of music teachers to risk like this. How much better for us all if we were able to develop more collegial relationships among us as music teachers and a greater sense that we are professionals working together. To accomplish this means taking advantage of the skills and expertise we collectively represent. Some have spent their lives working with words and may have something to say that will help all of us think about the validity of what we are doing and the important issues in music education. Others have musical skills that would help us conduct, play, sing, and rehearse better. The general standard of music education could be raised as stronger or more experienced teachers help those who are weaker or less skilled. This being the case, bettering music education requires careful attention to the leadership of teachers, the ways in which communities of teachers can be fostered. And it requires some good discussion leaders to facilitate this conversation.

Working together as professionals translates especially into what is done in regard to the continuing education of music teachers. Watching the King's Singers work with prepared choirs at the MENC meeting in Nashville, TN, April 2002, I saw a master class in which the Singers worked with a few select teachers. How much better if there might be many more master classes in string class, band, choir, and general music, among other practical activities that would hone the skills of all teachers, not just a select few outstanding ones. Improving one's teaching lends itself to master classes, as one hones one's craft under the watchful eye of experts. Music education especially relates to master classes because it also relates to the doing of music. Whether it be discussion groups or master classes, or preferably both, our

professional meetings need to be occasions for teachers to get involved in practical ways in both talking about and doing music, not for clinicians to perform for teachers. It takes practice to be a good discussant and master class participant. When we are a community rather than isolated competitors, there is a sea-change of attitudes. Over the years, teachers have told me that they feel very alone and fearful. I have encountered too many music teachers afraid to say what they really think or work musically in front of their peers for fear of being judged inadequate or wrong. This culture needs to change in our profession. A way has to be found to genuinely listen to each other, and to take what our colleagues say seriously, criticize each other constructively, and exemplify professionalism in all our actions. So, as we talk together, as we watch our colleagues work as musicians, there is a sense of hearing and receiving the other, not rushing to judgment, but understanding where the other is coming from, and the thinking and experience that grounds ideas and practices different from one's own.

Who we are and what we do as teachers are more powerful than what we say. The greatest argument for a music program is that program itself. Demonstrations don't always work, and powerful people still close music programs. Still, if anything can sway public opinion, a good demonstration will, even if it requires private or state funding to carry off. Were music teachers to decide collectively that music education needs to be done differently, and better, and were they to mount public campaigns, even legal challenges, spear-headed by musical performances, music education could be improved. What happens in one place on behalf of music education could become a demonstration of a plan for revitalizing music education elsewhere. I think, for example, of the possibilities of Scandinavian music schools as models for delivering music instruction in other countries. It is the people and music that we are

all about as music teachers–simple, practical objectives of giving every child in every school, in every hamlet, village, town, and city, in every state and country around the world, the opportunity to engage immediately with music, the right to be led by competent and (sometimes) inspired teachers, and the provision of resources necessary to accomplish this task.

*Coda*

We are teachers because we hope that we can make things better. We need faith, hope, and love–faith in ourselves and our students, hope that we can positively impact these students and thereby make the world a better place, and love for music and for our students and colleagues without which our lives would be the poorer. Keeping the important things in mind requires our wide-awakeness to possibilities, to how things might be, and our commitment to improving things. Beyond the music(s) we love, the musicianship we hope to cultivate in our students, and their appreciation for the work of musicians is our devotion to the people we serve. We are, in the company of exponents of other fields, teachers of people.

In sum, this case illustrates the philosopher's crucial role in clarifying ideas and practices, interrogating commonplaces, and suggesting applications to practice. All along, the philosopher asks questions that help to unpack meaning and prompt reflection on the part of those engaged in the work of music education, interrogate the taken-for-granted, and think through the "might be"–the possibilities for better thought and practice in the future. The work of philosophy need not be undertaken by just a few. Rather, as askers of important and sometimes uncomfortable questions, music teachers can also participate in the work of philosophy in music education. And in so doing, all involved can contribute to the thought and work of music education.

References

ssible: Thoughts on the Writings of Maxine Greene and Paulo Freire. *Philosophy of Music Education Review.*

Alperson, P. (1993). What should one expect from a philosophy of music education? In *Philosopher, Teacher, Musician: Perspectives on Music Education*, ed., E. R. Jorgensen. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 215-242.

Booth, W. (1999). *For the Love of It: Amateuring and its Rivals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bowman, W. (2002). Educating musically. In *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning,* eds., R. Colwell & C. Richardson. New York: Oxford University Press, 63-84.

Bowman, W. D. (1998). *Philosophical Perspectives on Music.* Oxford University Press.

Buehl, W. (2002). The CMP model: its all about making connections. *Wisconsin School Musician*, 72 (3), 28.

Chanan, M. (1994) *Musica Practica: The Social Practice of Western Music from Gregorian Chant to Postmodernism.* London; New York: Verso. Choate, R. A., ed. (1968). *Documentary Report of the Tanglewood Symposium*. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.

Contemporary Music Project. (1971). *Comprehensive Musicianship: An Anthology of Evolving Thought.* Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.

Cox, G. (1993). *A History of Music Education in England, 1872-1928.* Aldershot, Hants.: Scolar Press.

Dewey, J. (1934/1980). *Art as Experience*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Dewey, J. (1938/1963). *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books.

Elliott, D. J. (2002). Philosophical perspectives on research. In *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning,* eds., R. Colwell & C. Richardson. New York: Oxford University Press, 85-102.

Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Greene, M. (1988). *The Dialectic of Freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Howard, V. A. (1982). *Artistry: The Work of Artists.* Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Jolley, E. (2001). *An Innocent Gentleman.* Camberwell, Victoria: Penguin Books Australia.

Jorgensen, E. R. (In press). The Seashore-Mursell debate on the psychology of music revisited. In *The Nature of Musicality: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, eds., D. Coffman, Kate Gfeller, David Nelson, & Carlos Rodriguez. Ames: University of Iowa Press.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2002a). *Transforming Music Education*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2002b). Philosophical issues in curriculum. In *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning,* eds., R. Colwell & C. Richardson. New York: Oxford University Press, 48-62.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2001a). The aims of music education: a preliminary excursion. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 36 (1) (Spring), 31-49.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2001b). What are the roles of philosophy in music education? *Research*

*Studies in Music Education*, no. 17 (December), 19-31.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2001c). A dialectical view of theory and practice. *Journal of Research in Music Education,* 49 (4) (Winter), 343-359.

Jorgensen, E. R. (1998). Musical multiculturalism revisited. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 32 (2) (Summer), 77-88.

Jorgensen, E. R. (1997). *In Search of Music Education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

*cted Writings of Zoltán Kodály.* Transl., Lili Halápy and Fred Macnicol. London: Boosey & Hawkes.

Langer, S. K. (1942/1957). *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*. 3rd. Ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Leonard, C. & House, R. W. (1959). *Foundations and Principles of Music Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Mark, M. L. (2000). MENC: from Tanglewood to the present. In *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education*, ed., C. K. Madsen. VA: MENC–The National Association for Music Education, 2000, 5-22.

Mark, M. L. & Gary, C. L.. (1992). *A History of American Music Education.* New York: Schirmer Books.

National Association of Schools of Music, *2002-2003 Handbook*. Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music.

*The New Harvard Dictionary of Music.* (1986). Ed., D. M. Randel. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Paynter, J. (1982). *Music in the Secondary School Curriculum: Trends and Developments in Class Music Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pitts, S. (2000). *A Century of Change in Music Education: Historical Perspectives on Contemporary Practice in British Secondary School Music.* Aldershot, Hampshire; Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.

w, B. (1967). *The Land Without Music: Musical Education in England 1800-1860 and its Continental Antecedents.* London: Novello.

Rainbow, B. (1989). *Music in Educational Thought and Practice: A Survey from 800 BC.* Aberystwyth, Wales: Boethius Press.

Reichling, Mary J. (1996). On the question of method in philosophical research. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 4 (2) (Fall), 117-127.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A Philosophy of Music Education: Advancing the Vision.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reimer, B. ed. (2000). *Performing with Understanding: The Challenge of the National Standards for Music Education.* (Reston, VA: MENC–The National Association for Music Education.

Reimer, B. (1992). Toward a philosophical foundation for music education research. In *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning,* ed., R. Colwell. New York: Schirmer Books, 21-37.

Reimer, B. (1989). *A Philosophy of Music Education.* 2nd. Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Reimer, B. (1970). *A Philosophy of Music Education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Scheffler, I. (1991). *In Praise of the Cognitive Emotions and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Education.* New York: Routledge.

Schiller, F. (1801/1967). *On the Aesthetic Education of Man in a Series of Letters*. Transl., E. M. Wilkinson & L. A. Willoughby. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Scholes, P. A. (1970). *The Oxford Companion to Music*, 10th edn. Ed., J. O. Ward. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwadron, A. (1967). *Aesthetics: Dimensions for Music Education*, Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.

Seminar on Music Education (1963: Yale University). (1964). *Music in our Schools, A Search for Improvement*. Report of the Yale Seminar on Music Education, prepared by Claude V. Palisca. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening.* Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, Published by University Press of New England.

Small, C. (1980). *Music-Society-Education.* London: John Calder.

Stubley, E. (1992). Philosophical Foundations. In *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning,* ed., R. Colwell. New York: Schirmer Books, 3-20.

Swanwick, K. (1999). *Teaching Music Musically.* London and New York: Routledge.

Yob, I. (1997). The cognitive emotions and emotional cognitions. In *Reason and Education: Essays in Honor of Israel Scheffler,* ed., Harvey Siegel. Dortrecht, Boston and London: Kleuwer Academic Publishers.

Notes

1. See her unpublished response to Estelle R. Jorgensen, "The Aims of Music Education," presented to the Philosophy Special Research Interest Group, Music Educators National Conference, Washington, D.C., 1998, available from the author at iyob@waldenu.edu.