

Questions for Music Education Research

By

Estelle R. Jorgensen

Indiana University Jacobs School of Music

October 2007



In a companion essay, “A Philosophical View of Research in Music Education,” I argue the need for a more broadly-based and robust conceptualization of music education that prompts and guides research as it also builds upon it.<sup>1</sup> Lamenting the lack of definitiveness of too many research studies in music education, due partly to ambiguous theoretical constructs and flawed reasoning, I posit that philosophers need to be centrally involved in the research enterprise since they are, the field’s architects and building inspectors.<sup>2</sup> Nor should this thinking be done by philosophers alone, but all those involved in quantitative and qualitative research of various sorts need to think more philosophically and critically about the significance and quality of the research that is undertaken. And philosophers along with those in other research specialties in music education are subject to the selfsame claims of scholarly rigor and relevance of scholarship to the theory and practice of music education.

Here, I ask: “What questions do music education researchers need to address?” In unpacking this question-set, I sketch several questions that warrant systematic examination: What are and should be the dimensions of music education? What are and should be the institutional agencies of music education? What are and should be the specifically educational dimensions of music education? What are and should be the musical interests of music education? What are and should be the purposive and/or incidental, and formal and/or informal attributes of music education? At what developmental stages are and should music education be cast? What disciplines and levels of generality do and should inform music education? What is the present status of music education and what should it be? How relevant is and should music education research be to practice? Notice that each question juxtaposes descriptive and normative matters in a dialectic between what is and what should be. Taken together, they

represent a sort of conceptual map of music education that is intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive and a means of opening rather than closing discussion about various ways of viewing music education and important questions that need to be addressed.<sup>3</sup> As such, this analysis illustrates the value of stepping back from the specific empirical investigations in which researchers may be engaged to think carefully about the bigger view of music education and its research. A critic may fault me for writing somewhat generally and posing further questions, and to these faults I plead guilty. Still, without painting these ideas in broad brush strokes and raising questions for future investigation, I cannot encompass something of the breadth and complexity of what passes for music education historically and internationally, and prompt an open-ended view of music education that embraces its commonalities and particularities. And I leave it to other subsequent investigations to fill in the gaps and finesse or alter the particulars in ways that I am unable to accomplish in this present writing.

*What are and should be the dimensions of music education?*

In previous writing, I laid out six aspects of particular interest to music educators, namely, music, teaching, learning, instruction, curriculum, and administration.<sup>4</sup> Seeing music education as an isolated or discrete area of inquiry may fail to view sufficiently the importance of the societal and cultural contexts in which music education takes place. Still, I see music education not as a closed system that is situated “in” a culture or society but as an open system that is shot through with cultural and societal influences.<sup>5</sup> There is a dialectic here, since thinking of music education as distinctive from other things presupposes that it is, at least conceptually, mutually exclusive of these other things; should it not be possible to place some

bounds on music education, there would never be an end of it. Also, regarding it as interrelated to the other things with which it interacts, be they societal, cultural, or whatever, requires an open-ended system that is also infused by or infuses these other things, at least practically speaking. This tension between the boundedness and unboundedness of music education is evident in other multi-disciplinary and social enterprises, and needs to be acknowledged at outset as a necessary characteristic of music education. While one admit the intersection of all of the activities of music education with other cultural and societal elements, one is nevertheless justified in attending to those elements that seem most characteristically music educational, even if one must also acknowledge that the ways in which they are studied need to take into account the interconnectedness of music education with these other elements.

In listing music, teaching, learning, instruction, curriculum, and administration, my focus is on how music education functions, an approach that constitutes a legitimate focus on the ways in which music education plays out practically. Music concerns the particular subject matter of education that distinguishes music education from education in other subject areas and this word is, itself, a special case since, in some societies, there is no word for what is thought of in European and Western societies as music.<sup>6</sup> Teaching focuses on the actions of those who are responsible for or transmit wisdom from one generation to the next; it is not necessarily or exclusively the prerogative of those who are designated as teachers, since students or other members of a musical community may also teach from time to time; and in informal education, teaching may take place in contexts that are not primarily pedagogical and may be accomplished by those who are most knowledgeable concerning a particular idea or practice.<sup>7</sup> Learning refers to the process of coming to know about and how to do the subject matter in question and

epistemological aspects of self, world, and whatever lies beyond. Its compass is necessarily broad and it, likewise, may be undertaken by teachers as well as students and formally as well as informally.<sup>8</sup> Instruction denotes the interaction between teachers and students in pedagogical situations.<sup>9</sup> Curriculum has to do with the engagement of the individual and the subject matter.<sup>10</sup> And administration relates to the organizational context in which instruction takes place.<sup>11</sup>

What is needed, now, is a more comprehensive and systematic understanding of all of these aspects both theoretically and empirically, descriptively and normatively across the entire field of music education. I fault music education research, particularly that in North America, for failing to attend sufficiently to the development of robust theories over all of these aspects of music education. As in other multi-disciplinary fields, researchers may have been too quick to uncritically import theories from foundational fields of cognitive science, philosophy, anthropology, psychology, history, and anthropology without doing sufficient theoretical work to develop theories that inform directly the theory and practice of music education. Rushing ahead to undertake empirical studies of music education in the absence of such specifically music educational theories means that what is observed is not always directly relevant to music education but contributes more to psychological, historical, philosophical, anthropological, sociological or other theories. It matters greatly which theories guide the work of music education. For example, my own efforts to understand administration dynamically and processually, in what sociologists might term symbolic-interactionist ways, limits as it also enhances my findings concerning aspects of the operation of musical ensembles just as the structural-functionalist or static analyses exemplified in my study of the tasks of Canadian school music supervisors provide yet other perspectives that are limited in other ways.<sup>12</sup> Also,

operationalizing theories in order to conduct empirical studies allows researchers to see only a part of their richness just as empirical results may implicate several theories rather than just one. The need for what Joseph Schwab calls “arts of eclectic” requires acknowledging the ambiguities between theory and practice.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, beyond the gathering of empirical evidence, important normative questions need to be systematically addressed. These questions include: “What musics ought to be the subject of music education?” “How shall the determination of which musics count in music education be made?” “How should music teachers teach music?” “How should learners come to know music?” “How should music teachers relate with students?” “How should people engage music in the process of coming to know it?” “How should music instruction be organized?” The answers to these questions sometimes vary greatly; while commonalities may be found among these different approaches, they are also nuanced, particularistic, and sometimes significantly different.<sup>14</sup> And juxtaposing these theoretical and empirical, and descriptive and normative aspects complicates notions of music, teaching, learning, instruction, curriculum, and administration.

In North America, at least, notwithstanding the influential work of those who have advocated a humane approach to education and the redemptive claims of such values as justice, freedom, inclusiveness, and equality, the community of music educators has yet to pay concerted attention to issues that have to do with race, gender, sexual identity and identities of various sorts, ethnicity, color, among a host of issues that constitute barriers between people.<sup>15</sup>

Notwithstanding efforts to raise these issues, notably, at the International Conference on Music Education, Equity, and Social Justice, held at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, October 6-8, 2006, the MAYDAY group through its symposia and e-journal *ACT*, the

Gender Research in Music Education Special Research Interest Group of MENC–The National Association for Music Education and the e-journal *GEMS*, and the international conference, *musica ficta / Lived Realities: A Conference on Exclusions and Engagements in Music, Education and the Arts*, held at the University of Toronto, January 24-27, 2008, in my view, much music education practice remains largely untouched by these matters. Addressing these among other matters requires pervasive, systemic, grass-roots, and top-down change.<sup>16</sup> And the values upon which such change is predicated need to be a first-order of importance in deciding what music education should become.

*What are and should be the institutional agencies of music education?*

Each of the societal institutions that are agents of music education, namely family, religion, politics, commerce, and the music profession, impose values on those involved in music education that affect its theory and practice.<sup>17</sup> Taking a cosmopolitan, global, and historical view of music education reveals these institutions at work in music education from antiquity and around the world. Viewed societally and culturally, they function in various ways from time to time and from place to place, reflecting and contributing to the societies and cultures of which they are a part. Rather than focusing only on formal school-age instruction, this broad approach encompasses formal and informal life-long learning from babyhood to old age.<sup>18</sup>

What do we know of the role of all of these institutions in music education, both descriptively and normatively? Since music is commonly a school subject in general education, it is understandable that the profession's focus is on elucidating the nature of state-operated schools as a part of compulsory schooling. Here, the role of politics is paramount (as is religion



where it is established in the United Kingdom). With notable exceptions, for example, studies of music conservatories by Bruno Nettl and Henry Kingsbury, less attention is paid to music education carried on in other institutions.<sup>19</sup> I think, for example, of Bernarr Rainbow's and Gordon Cox's history of music education that follows religious music education until the rise of secularism in the Renaissance, and with a brief nod to the rise of the modern conservatory, focuses mainly on the development of school music education.<sup>20</sup> The same is true, for example, of studies in the United Kingdom by Stephanie Pitts and Gordon Cox, and in the United States by Michael Mark and Charles Gary.<sup>21</sup> Studies of familial influence include Marie McCarthy's analysis of the transmission of Irish traditional music, and Lucy Green's study of garage bands.<sup>22</sup> Notwithstanding the important influence of the music profession evident in studies of musical ensembles, schools, conservatories, opera houses, concert halls, private studios, and community music schools operated by music professionals, these organizations are often outside the mainstream of music education research especially in countries such as the United States where well-established programs of school music instruction are in place.<sup>23</sup> Yet, studies of British amateur choral societies and private piano studios in London turn up evidence of thriving music education programs that are sometimes remote or distinct from school music and these instances also need to be thought of as central to music education.<sup>24</sup>

Beyond descriptive questions relating to these institutions are normative questions pertaining to which institutions ought to be charged with music education and under which circumstances, how these institutions should be coordinated, and by whom, and how discontinuities, dissonances, and dialectics should be resolved. Since values underlying music education are intimately interconnected with the institutions under whose auspices music

education is conducted, one would expect these values to play out in differing aims and methods that feature commonalities and differences across the spectrum of pictures studied.<sup>25</sup> Tackling these questions requires a dialogue across the various institutions involved in music education in order to ascertain common ground and resolve, at least practically speaking, the differences that exist between them. For example, it is not always easy to reconcile the purposes of the music industry that fosters music education in order to purvey its products and services and the music profession that values artistic merit over popular appeal and profitability, and whose interests in music education may be more esoteric and elitist.<sup>26</sup> Religious involvement in music education also varies in terms of the particular religious experiences that are fostered,<sup>27</sup> and may be synchronous or in conflict with a range of political and civic interests. Modeling these various institutional commitments and intersections elucidates the values that underlie music education and maps the ways in which these difficult axiological matters can be reconciled, practically speaking. In particular, the rise of rampant fundamentalisms in West and East, North and South, requires concerted thinking about how music education needs to respond to these phenomena and how it can foster liberality of thought and practice as educational ends.<sup>28</sup> There is also the question of whether certain underlying values need to be common to all music education, a point that I return to a little later. It suffices, here, to notice that institutions, as the building blocks of civil societies, affect not only the particular ways in which music education functions but the values, beliefs, attitudes, and practices that stem from and feed into, and constrain and enable those institutions. As such, they are vital to our consideration. And taking them all into account greatly broadens the work of music education beyond schooling that has been the focus especially since the nineteenth century.

*What are and should be the specifically educational dimensions of music education?*

To published conceptions of education, namely, training, schooling, education, socialization, and enculturation,<sup>29</sup> others could be added. Among them, are pedagogy, thought of, at least in North America, as a form of music education especially relevant to the teaching of music performance that relies especially on the teacher's leadership of the student in the manner of a parent, tutor, or guide; and apprenticeship, whereby the disciple gradually acquires the master's knowledge and skill. In pedagogy, teachers ask their students to follow them on journeys through territories unfamiliar to the student but of which teachers have sufficient knowledge to undertake; in apprenticeship, students gradually take over the practice of arts and crafts practiced by their teachers. Since this list is provisional rather than definitive, it is important to map conceptually the array of distinctive conceptions of education. There are many overlaps between metaphors and their related models, and the various educational aspects that play out in music education, although conceptually discrete, are also interrelated.<sup>30</sup> The philosophical and empirical challenges, here, are to describe these various aspects as comprehensively as possible while also distinguishing them rigorously and clearly. It is then possible to see the ground between these various educational dimensions in which especially interesting questions emerge.

Since each conception of education has practical consequences, normative questions arise concerning what ought to be the focus of music education in its various forms, whether on training, schooling, education, socialization, enculturation, or whatever. It is unlikely that no one picture of music education, taken alone, suffices, and music teachers and those interested in their

work are faced with deciding which aspects are of most importance and whether any might be combined. For example, John Dewey clarifies the inconsistency of justifying music instruction on the grounds of “their culture value” and teaching music “with chief emphasis upon forming technical modes of skill.”<sup>31</sup> Related to this question is the matter of whether music education should be focused on learning about music or developing the practical skills to practice it. Since the nineteenth century when music was introduced into publicly supported schools, the emphasis has sometimes been on music listening and other times it has been on performance, and in the United States, at least, one can trace a pendulum swing back and forth between them.<sup>32</sup> Dewey might respond to this dilemma by reminding music educators that in eschewing *either/or* thinking, they face the practical problem of balancing between extreme positions and synthesizing both.<sup>33</sup> Still, in today’s multicultural and globalized world, such solutions are sometimes difficult to arrive at. And conversations are needed about how these different educational interests are to be served and why.

*What are and should be the musical interests of music education?*

The preceding discussion brings us to the problem of how the various musical aspects of music education are to be viewed and included in music education. Much of the discussion by writers in the field concerning these aspects focuses on composition, performance, and listening. Keith Swanwick extends this trio to comprise a quintet in his C(L)A(S)P model that includes literature studies and skill acquisition.<sup>34</sup> Swanwick’s model does not move far from a quite traditional stance. Rather, the advent of computing and mediation has generated an array of other aspects that need to be included: the electronic manipulation of sound in live concerts,

production of sound and video recordings, packaging and marketing of these recordings, file sharing, and the like, and the rise of virtual communities that together constitute what Kurt Blaukopf aptly calls the “mediamorphosis” of music.<sup>35</sup> Simply viewing these aspects as part of the old notions of composing, performing, and listening cannot suffice because they suggest new forms of musical experience in what Randall Allsup observes is an evolutionary process that some wish to domesticate.<sup>36</sup> Likewise, since much modern music is written for the dance or recreational use, it is important to think systematically about these other forms of musical experience beyond the claims of what Peter Kivy thinks of as abstract symphonic music or “music alone.”<sup>37</sup>

Also, music educators need to think carefully about the musical images associated with these different activities. Beyond the musical images already suggested such as aesthetic object, symbol, practical activity, experience, and agency and that merit critical examination and extension are new forms of musical expression that create as they also flow from particular images of music, both old and new.<sup>38</sup> These musical images, each with its advantages and disadvantages, affect the particular purposes and methods in which the musical activities are undertaken and studied. For example, construing performance in terms of a sonic view of music is quite a different enterprise than thinking of it as a cultural expression, and this reality likewise impacts on the ways in which performers are and need to be prepared. Or thinking of music as integrally related to other arts, humanities, and aspects of culture and lived life or as an accompaniment for or incidental to other arts such as film and dance alters the purposes of music instruction and the ways in which it needs to be taught and learned.

Layered on these descriptive elements of music are normative questions concerning what music teachers ought to do in cultivating these various musical qualities. For practical purposes, decisions need to be made by music educational policy makers about what sorts of musical experiences need to be cultivated. Notice that this discussion is not framed in terms of particular musical genres or traditions but in broader terms that examine what music needs to accomplish and how it ought to be made and taken. Take, for example, the question of exactly how today's young people need to experience music, whether through performance of acoustic instruments or singing, or electronic and computer-generated production. Today's technologies open opportunities that Heidi Westerlund describes in regard to Sibelius Academy that offers courses for music teachers in the arts of popular musics, songwriting, and sound production.<sup>39</sup> Is something lost when students no longer take up traditional classical acoustic instruments and play, instead, and almost exclusively, amplified electronic instruments? What obligations do musicians and teachers have to the cultivation of the world's vernacular musics as opposed to its more esoteric traditions? What ought to be the defining characteristics of musically educated people in today's world? When music is experienced almost entirely through instrumental means, what is missed when music is not also experienced through singing? Aside from issues of relevance to students' lived experience, how shall this complicated terrain be negotiated? These are some of the sorts of normative questions that go well beyond issues of particular genres or musics to relate to the notions of music at the root of desirable musical experiences and that urgently need to be addressed across the spectrum of those involved in the work of music education broadly construed.

*What are and should be the purposive and/or incidental, formal and/or informal attributes of music education?*

Randall Allsup's and Lucy Green's suggestion that the garage band represents a way forward for music education contrasts with other views of music education proposed by such writers as Keith Swanwick, Bennett Reimer, David Elliott, Paul Woodford, and Frede Nielsen who emphasize purposive and formal music education.<sup>40</sup> Others who emphasize informal education include Maxine Greene, Jane Roland Martin, and in music education, June Boyce-Tillman and Julia Koza.<sup>41</sup> Allsup, Green, and their colleagues would not go so far as to argue that the only way forward for music education lies solely in informal and serendipitous music education any more than those who advocate more formal approaches to education would insist that music education be entirely formalized (for example, Elliott forwards jazz as an improvisatory model of music education akin to Reimer's writing on the importance of improvisation as a musical art).<sup>42</sup> Rather, Allsup and Green seem to be emphasizing a view of enculturation as a music educational end in which formal and purposive music education cannot suffice, and much hangs on informal and incidental music education. These differences in perspectives concern where the focus of music education ought to be and how these disparate elements can be properly combined. For example, it is likely that Boyce-Tillman would trust to improvisation and composition and to the serendipitous and incidental learning that flowers in the midst of informality much more so than the didactic and directive learning suggested in Nielsen's approach to music education. These differences reflect nuanced matters of temperament and style as well as substance regarding what teachers and their students do in music education. And while theoretical extremes or polarities invite a comparison and contrast

of these approaches, it is also important to map the ground between them in elaborating how they may be discriminated, combined, and to what extent.

Again, normative questions are parasitic on these evident descriptive matters. Thinking of music education incidentally rather than purposively would seem to be contradictory, since one might expect that intentionality lies at the heart of music education.<sup>43</sup> Still, music education is sometimes unintentional, picked up or unconsciously gleaned in the midst of activities in which music is a part and that are not always self-consciously instructional, and in informal rather than formal circumstances.<sup>44</sup> Such a view challenges the borders of music education and raises important definitional questions relating to the enterprise of music education. Moreover, once one allows the prospect of unintentionality, serendipity, and informality in music education, how far should this go? Under what circumstances should such music education be conducted? How shall these determinations be justified? Only as this nest of normative issues is addressed is it possible to avoid slipping from interpreting Green's proposition that informality constitutes *a* way forward for music education to say that it constitutes *the* way forward.

*At what developmental stages are and should music education be cast?*

Although music education is generally thought of as about and for children of school age, more-or-less between ages six and 18 years, attention is now also focused on early childhood music education, including that for infants and very young pre-school-age children.<sup>45</sup> The musical development literature focuses on the early rather than later stages of life, notwithstanding that adults likewise develop through youth, middle-age, senior, and senescence.<sup>46</sup> Regarding music education as lifelong suggests a broader and different focus than



that restricted to school-age young people, especially in the aging populations in some industrialized and post-industrial societies. Acknowledging the different ways in which people learn music among other things at different stages of life and development suggests the importance of becoming more sensitive to the claims of adult learning, dispositions, abilities, interests, and values, especially those later in life.<sup>47</sup> It means devising music programs that are tailored to and take advantage of these particulars and thinking of music education across the developmental stages, sometimes simultaneously. Teaching students at various developmental levels at once adds to the complexity of the teacher's work, especially where the subject of study is an aural phenomenon. Still, music teachers have done this since antiquity, and once one considers the possibilities of inter-generational music education, purposes and means can be devised to take advantage of these opportunities. For example, the eighteenth and early nineteenth century singing schools in the United States that were the forerunners of those in today's rural Appalachia, included children, youth, adults, and seniors who learned and sang together.<sup>48</sup>

Thinking about music education at all of the life stages raises normative questions about where the bulk of limited resources ought to go in the addressing the particular needs of students. The importance of early music instruction and the claims of the very young as a focus of music educational resources were well established by the mid-twentieth century, as the writings of Zoltán Kodály, Émile Jaques-Dalcroze, Shinichi Suzuki, and Mary Helen Richards attest.<sup>49</sup> In practice, however, at least in the United States, many of the resources in publicly funded music education are focused in adolescence and young adulthood in middle, junior high, senior high schools, colleges and universities. Some earlier musician-teachers such as Joseph Mainzer, John

Curwen, Lowell Mason, Frank and Walter Damrosch, and Percy Scholes also focused their music educational efforts on adults as well as children.<sup>50</sup> And following in their footsteps, today's amateur ensembles and music organizations and elder-organizations such as Elderhostel and New Horizons music programs are often organized by professional musicians and educators.<sup>51</sup> This being the case, it is important to ask whether sufficient attention is now paid to adult and senior music education and infant and pre-natal music education beyond the school years, whether, as a matter of public policy, more resources need to be devoted to music education in these other areas, and what the character of that music education ought to be.

*What disciplines and levels of generality do and should inform music education?*

The question, here, relates to descriptive matters concerning the various levels of generality at which music education is cast and the disciplines that are particularly appropriate ways of grasping its work and normative issues regarding which levels of integrative analysis are most advantageous for the study of music education and should prevail in the field. Once it is admitted that music education is a social activity, one moves beyond the physiological and psychological to the sociological, ethnographic, anthropological, historical, philosophical, and theological realms.<sup>52</sup> The complexity of the phenomena under investigation also require sophisticated research methods to examine appropriate to these various levels of generality.<sup>53</sup> At least in the United States, much of the published research in music education over the past half-century has been psychologically oriented and psychological norms prevail in research in the field.<sup>54</sup> Thinking broadly to encompass other higher levels of generality that are less amenable to scientific investigation and warrant investigation by sociological, ethnographic,

anthropological, historical, philosophical, theological, and other means requires the development of appropriate sophisticated research procedures that facilitate the examination of these complexities. Such investigations may require assumptions that run counter to those in such fields as physics, chemistry, and even psychology. Regarding a narrow band of research traditions, for example, psychological or physiological, as normative for the gamut of research approaches in music education is reductionistic. Since some of these fields of study, for example, theological and anthropological investigations of music education, are not as well developed as they need to be, it is important to cast music education at an array of levels of generality and ensure that the research enterprise reflects the gamut of appropriate investigations. I do not know of recent, extant, and full-blown theologies of music education in our own time although some are pertinent to the arts,<sup>55</sup> but these are needed as are robust investigations that have their roots in such fields as anthropology, sociology, and psychology.

These levels of generality and their differing disciplinary perspectives raise important questions about what ought to be the respective theological, philosophical, historical, sociological, psychological, physiological and physical manifestations of music education. The higher the levels of generality, the shorter the time scales and the more problematic the assertions of causality.<sup>56</sup> How should one construe music education at these various integrative levels? Given the interrelatedness and integrated quality of phenomena at various levels of generality, how should they be sorted out practically speaking? For example, if theological practices conflict with psychological propensities, which trumps the other in determining what to do? How can they be reconciled practically speaking in forging public music educational policy? Should one discover that a Muslim girl has the aptitude to become a singer of Euroclassical

opera, and her musical potential and gifts come in conflict with Muslim theology that views such music making as profane and decadent, ought theological prescription to trump psychological and physiological aptitudes? Or should theological dogma to be challenged at least in publicly supported music education? Music educators may be inclined to sidestep such questions and defer or even capitulate to Muslim theology. In so doing, of course, the student's musical potential may not be realized.<sup>57</sup> Dewey might say that such an approach could be mis-educative because it stunts and denies further musical development of girls as well as boys.<sup>58</sup> So this is clearly a knotty set of issues with which to deal.

*What is the present status of music education and what should it be?*

This nest of questions concerns the relationship of descriptive and normative questions concerning music education and related public policy matters. Linking these questions suggests that *Is/Ought* questions are interrelated practically speaking if not conceptually. Since music education takes place in the public sphere, and, in the United Kingdom, its "location in the school curriculum has been bitterly contested over the years," it is important to grasp where things are at the present.<sup>59</sup> Of course, where they are now may be closely interrelated to where they were in the past and where they are likely to be in the foreseeable future. Such a present-centeredness encompasses the ways in which, as Alfred North Whitehead puts it, "the present holds within itself the complete sum of existence, backwards and forwards, that whole amplitude of time which is eternity."<sup>60</sup> In a recent writing, I was surprised by the irony that notwithstanding concerted political and public pressures on music education, as education generally, I could find only two recently published status studies of music education in one state

in the United States that attempt to gauge what is ongoing in that state from a research perspective.<sup>61</sup> This is quite a different matter from the collection of data by various educational and other organizations with their own interests because researchers expect some level of objectivity in a research status study. Indeed, descriptive research seems to be quite out of fashion in our time, too often regarded as the poor sister of other research methodologies that attempt to explain rather than describe. In the absence of definitive data, the kinds of polemical discourse represented by Charles Fowler's *Strong Arts, Strong Schools: The Promising Potential and Shortsighted Disregard of the Arts in American Schooling*, the MENC-led report, *Growing Up Complete*, and earlier national reports on education such as *The Nation at Risk* can flourish since there is no substantial and objective research evidence of the state-of-affairs in music education in the United States.<sup>62</sup> Of course, I may be talking only about a situation in one country, and others such as the United Kingdom, may have a more concerted emphasis on objective and ongoing research status studies. Going beyond a focus on the present-centeredness of status studies, are important research questions relating to how the present situation developed and where the status quo is likely to lead in the future. Such studies would require a detailed analysis of the histories of the places studied that systematically examines the roots of the present situation, and speculative studies that extrapolate present trends into the future and examine where we are likely to be going. Future studies in music education are uncommon, yet, engaged as we are in matters of policy making, it is important to examine statistical, economic, social, cultural, political, technological, and other data with a view to determining what the future (at least in the near term) is likely to be if present trends continue.<sup>63</sup> Since music education does not go on in a vacuum, and one's country's policies are impacted by those in

others, these studies need to have an international and comparative flavor in order to situate the present circumstances in particular places in a broad and possibly international context.<sup>64</sup>

Once it is possible to say with some level of definitiveness how things are with respect to the past, present, and likely future (at least that which can be reasonably foreseen assuming that things continue as they are) and the relationship between the state of affairs in this place in respect to others, questions naturally arise about how they ought to be. Philosophical thinking about music education is situated and contextual, and it is natural to reflect on what we know about the phenomenal world. One can do better philosophy when the context about which one thinks and writes is clearly in view. Unfortunately, in the absence of definitive and substantial descriptions of music education, one may be off-the-mark. True, one may reflect on one's personal experience, and this is an important activity. Still, when one is speaking in the public sphere, it is useful to have compelling descriptive studies to bolster an argument. In writing *The Art of Music Teaching*, I did not always trust the evidence before me for all sorts of conceptual as well as empirical reasons.<sup>65</sup> Neither did some of my colleagues to whom I turned for counsel. And while one might wish that this was not the case, I suspect that my own experience may be more widely shared.

Friedrich Schiller wrote that we ought to think of how people might be when we seek to influence them, but we need to think of them as they are when we seek to act on their behalf.<sup>66</sup> Philosophers can write hopefully and appeal to people's better nature. Where one cannot find trustworthy evidence, like philosophers from antiquity, one can still refer to examples of the best of music teaching and learning that one has observed and one need not rely entirely on descriptive evidence. Still, policy makers and advocates for music education are in a different

and more difficult situation, since they must act on people's behalf. To do this effectively, Schiller observes, they must know how people actually are, and what faults and foibles they tend to exhibit. They cannot expect that people will always act humanely, disinterestedly, compassionately, rationally, unselfishly, tactfully, and thoughtfully. Assuming the best of people is likely to result in policy that does not fit the people it administers. To make policy effectively requires as much reliable descriptive information as possible about how people act on which to base decision-making. This being the case, descriptive and normative questions may intertwine but they inevitably diverge. The art of music education involves thoughtfully forging the sorts of ideas that inspire and guide while also creating policies that recognize that human nature is a "crooked timber."<sup>67</sup> One solution cannot necessarily fit everyone or suit every time and place, and it is important to reflect on and describe as well as explain (and if possible refute theories of) how things are and what can be done about them.

*How relevant is and should music education research be to practice?*

The pictures of music education need to relate to its practice. By pictures, I refers to the metaphors and models that guide one's conceptualizations of music education. Notwithstanding efforts of music education researchers to make research findings accessible to music teachers, many music teachers remain uninterested in music education research and are focused almost entirely on practical matters.<sup>68</sup> Assuming the importance of relevance to music education practice as a research value, then, raises the related question of how that relevance is to be assessed. What are the particular ways in which music education theory and practice are interrelated? In an earlier writing, I suggested dichotomy, polarity, fusion, and dialectic as means

whereby theory and practice may interrelate.<sup>69</sup> To these four, Ann Stokes and Randall Allsup add two more, namely, fugue and peaceful co-existence.<sup>70</sup> These models exemplify an array of possible interrelationships between theory and practice that are not necessarily or always resolved easily. For Joseph Schwab, the ambiguity between theory and practice requires the “arts of eclectic,” a careful negotiation between the abstract and phenomenal worlds.<sup>71</sup> Although Israel Scheffler allows that these discontinuities between theory and practice may not be as dramatic as Schwab infers,<sup>72</sup> still, reason and common sense provide ways of sorting out the relationships and applications of theories and practices. While there is not a one-to-one correspondence of theory and practice, and music teachers should not expect to be able to apply theories (and research findings) unthinkingly to their lived situations, nevertheless, imaginative and critical thought provide ways to interrelate them.<sup>73</sup>

These intersections between theory, research findings, and practical situations raise important normative issues concerning which theories have the most compelling claims, who decides which theories or research findings are to be applied, and which direction these applications should go, whether from practice to theory, from theory to practice, or in both directions. Music education researchers have tended to think in terms of theory-driven practice. Even praxialism as a theory of music education is intended to drive practice. Not enough attention has been given to thinking of theory as derived out of practice, or of theory and practice as interactive, that is, theory impacts practice as practice also impacts theory. This more dialogical or interactive conception of theory and practice is yet another model that might be added to the growing list of models of the relationship between theory and practice and would highlight yet another different way of seeing research and practice. Doing this would dignify



practice in ways that have not been as common in music education research as might be the case. Such research would need to be conceived in terms that are especially compatible with practical and lived situations and may need to be more phenomenological, naturalistic, existential, action-oriented, narrative, and descriptive than has been the fashion especially in North American empirical research. Still, it would have much in common with earlier educational research conducted in laboratory schools by John Dewey and his colleagues.<sup>74</sup> Indeed, my understanding of the “child-study movement” at the turn of the twentieth century suggests that it was conceived as a naturalistic and descriptive endeavor rather than scientific in the positivistic sense of conducting research under controlled conditions as in a chemical laboratory. And Dewey’s advocacy of science as an intellectual approach that needs to undergird education is best construed broadly in focusing on how practice informs theory as well as the other way round.<sup>75</sup>

### *Summary*

In sum, these paired descriptive and normative questions suggest possible lines of research that potentially expand, systematize, and re-direct scholarship in music education. They expand the scope of music education research to include an array of institutions, aspects of music education, functions, and activities designed for people at all stages of the life cycle beyond those that are traditionally the focus of scholarly interest in music education. They systematize the various elements of music education in ways that permit a more intensive investigation of aspects that have remained invisible or marginal to music education. Not only do they re-direct scholarly activity away from a narrow preoccupation with more limited array of research questions toward a broad engagement with music education of all sorts but they necessitate

developing and utilizing a broad array of methods that are of particular importance to music education practice as well as theory. By combining descriptive and empirical as well as normative and abstract matters, this approach acknowledges that music education by definition straddles theory and practice and since it is conducted as a social enterprise often in the public sphere, requires philosophical reflection along with empirical research. In focusing on the questions at the heart of the research enterprise, it opens rather than closes possibilities of ways in which music education is and needs to be conducted. It complicates the work of music education scholarship and offers a way of envisioning it that can be genuinely helpful to the practice of music education. And the significance and richness of these questions is a source of hope and encouragement that scholarship in the future can be better than that in the past.

## Notes

---

1. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "A Philosophical View of Research in Music Education," presented to the Society for Music Education Research Symposium I, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, July 2007, available from the author at [jorgense@indiana.edu](mailto:jorgense@indiana.edu).
2. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "What are the Roles of Philosophy in Music Education?" *Research Studies in Music Education* no. 17 (December 2001): 19-31.
3. My own theoretically-oriented map intersects with that provided by review of research over the past 25 years by the BERA Music Education Review Group, "Mapping Music Education Research in the UK," *Psychology of Music* 32 (3) (2004): 239-90. Authors who constitute the British Educational Research Association Music Education Review Group include Keith Swanwick, Alex Lamont, Susan Hallam, Lucy Green, Sarah Hennessy, Gordon Cox, Gerry Farrell, and the essay is edited by Graham Welch.
4. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "On the Development of a Theory of Musical Instruction," *Psychology of Music* 8 (1980): 25-30.
5. On the cultural embeddedness of music education, see Robert Walker, "Multiculturalism and Music Re-Attached to Music Education," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 8 (1) (Spring 2000): 31-39.
6. On music as a cultural phenomenon and the implications for music education, see Robert Walker, "Music Education Freed from Colonialism: A New Praxis," *International Journal of Music Education* no. 27 (1996): 2-15. On the role of musical spheres of validity in music education, see Estelle R. Jorgensen, *In Search of Music Education* (Urbana and Chicago IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997), chap. 2.
7. Aspects of music teaching are examined in Estelle R. Jorgensen, *Talks to Music Teachers* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2007), forthcoming. In the United Kingdom, Susan Hallam and Alexandra Lamont note that in contrast to research on music learning, "relatively little attention has been paid to the role of the teacher" (BERA Music Education Review Group, "Mapping Music Education Research in the UK," p. 245) and Gordon Cox and Sarah Hennessy observe that "there is little research concerning teachers" and "into the preparation of specialist music teachers for secondary and primary schools" (Ibid., pp. 262, 260).
8. Several types of formal and informal learning are unpacked in Estelle R. Jorgensen, *Transforming Music Education* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 101-108.
9. On four choice-based types of instruction, see Estelle R. Jorgensen, "On a Choice-based Instructional Typology in Music," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 29 (1981): 97-102; Estelle R. Jorgensen, "On Building Social Theories of Music Education," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, No. 116 (Spring 1993): 33-50; Estelle R. Jorgensen, "An Analysis of Aspects of Type IV Instruction in a Teacher-student Dyad," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 6 (1) (Spring 1995): 16-31; Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Modeling Aspects of Type IV Music Instructional Triads," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, no. 137 (Summer 1998): 43-56. This social construction of instruction differs from Vernon Howard's (*Learning By All Means: Lessons from the Arts*, chap. on Instruction) view of instruction as the knowledge that teachers transmit to students and prefers, instead, a social

---

process whereby the givers and receivers of musical wisdom, knowledge, and skill relate together personally and directly as well as impersonally and indirectly.

10. This dialogical view of curriculum views the subject matter as constructed by people rather than abstract and self-contained notions of the subject as if it were separate from those who make sense of it. For a discussion of the various images of curriculum that are evident in music education, see Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Philosophical Issues in Curriculum," *The New Handbook of Research in Music Teaching and Learning*, ed. Richard Colwell and Carol Richardson (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 48-62.

11. Taking a dynamic view of administration in my own writing, I explore aspects of Canadian school music administration and some of the social processes that play out in music education. Among my studies of music supervision in Canadian schools, see Estelle R. Jorgensen, "An Analysis of Selected Supervisor Tasks in Canada," *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 27 (2) (1981): 107-113; Selected indexes of the academic and professional preparation of music supervisors in Canada. *Journal of Research in Music Education* 28 (2) (1980): 92-102. Reprinted in *A Cross-Section of Research in Music Education*, edited by Stephen H. Barnes. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982, 128-145. On my studies of social processes in musical organizations, see Estelle R. Jorgensen, "On Resource Allocation in School Music," *Proceedings of the McGill Symposium in School Music Administration and Supervision, 1979*, edited by Estelle R. Jorgensen (Montreal: Faculty of Music, McGill University, 1980); Estelle R. Jorgensen, "On the Recruitment Process in Amateur Ensembles," *Canadian University Music Review* no. 6 (1985): 293-318; Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Developmental Phases in Selected British Choirs," *Canadian University Music Review* no. 7 (1986): 188-225.

12. See n. 11.

13. Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: Arts of Eclectic," *School Review* 79 (1971): 493-542.

14. This point is made in Estelle R. Jorgensen, "'Seeing Double': A Comparative Approach to Music Education," paper under review, available from the author, [jorgense@indiana.edu](mailto:jorgense@indiana.edu).

15. O'Neill and Green notice that, in the UK, gender is one of "the most widely researched of all social groups" relating to music education (BERA Music Education Review Group, "Mapping Music Education Research in the UK," p. 254).

16. Jorgensen, *Transforming Music Education*, chap. 2.

17. Jorgensen, *In Search of Music Education*, chap. 2.

18. On informal music education, see Lucy Green, *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education* (Aldershot, Hants.; Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2002).

19. Henry Kingsbury, *Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988); Bruno Nettl, *Heartland Excursions: Ethnomusicological Reflections on Schools of Music* (Urbana and Chicago IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

20. Bernarr Rainbow and Gordon Cox, *Music in Educational Thought and Practice : A Survey from 800 BC*, rev. ed. (Great Britain: Boydell Press, 2006).

- 
21. Gordon Cox, *A History of Music Education in England 1872-1928* (Aldershot Hants.: Scolar Press, 1993); Stephanie Pitts, *A Century of Change in Music Education : Historical Perspectives on Contemporary Practice in British Secondary School Music* (Aldershot, Hants.; Brookfield, VT: : Ashgate, 2000); Michael Mark and Charles Gary, *A History of American Music Education* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Reston VA: MENC, 1999).
22. Marie McCarthy, *Passing It On: The Transmission of Music in Irish Culture* (Cork, Ireland: Cork University Press, 1999); Green, *How Popular Musicians Learn*.
23. On the influence of the music profession in music education, see Jorgensen, *In Search of Music Education*, 56-9.
24. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Aspects of Private Piano Teacher Decision-making in London, England," *Psychology of Music* 14 (2) (1986): 111-129; Estelle R. Jorgensen, "On the Recruitment Process in Amateur Ensembles," *Canadian University Music Review* no. 6 (1985): 293-318; Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Developmental Phases in Selected British Choirs," *Canadian University Music Review* no. 7 (1986): 188-225.
25. Estelle R. Jorgensen, *Pictures of Music Education*, manuscript in preparation.
26. On the relationship between Disney and music education, see Julia Eklund Koza, *Stepping Across: Four Interdisciplinary Studies of Education and Cultural Politics* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), chap. 1.
27. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Religious Music in Education," *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 1 (2) (Fall 1993): 103-114.
28. On the fundamentalist imagination and music education, see Randall Everett Allsup, "Hard Times: Philosophy and the Fundamentalist Imagination," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13 (2) (Fall 2005): 139-42.
29. Jorgensen, *In Search of Music Education*, chap. 1.
30. See Estelle R. Jorgensen, *Pictures of Music Education*, chapter 1, in progress.
31. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* 9[1916]; repr., New York: Free Press, 1944; London: Collier-MacMillan, 1944), 258.
32. For example, in the school music of the United States, I see an oscillation between emphasizing music making and taking. There is an emphasis on vocal performance for the greater part of the nineteenth century, a focus on listening in the music appreciation movement in the 1920s and 1930s, an renewed focus on vocal and instrumental performance in the post World War II era, an emphasis on the listener's engagement with music in the music education as aesthetic education movement of the 1970s and 1980s (that also underscored the role of composition, improvisation, and performance), and a refocus on the central role of music making in the praxial position of the 1990s.
33. Contra either/or thinking, see John Dewey, *Experience and Education* ([1938]; repr., New York: Collier Books; London: Collier-MacMillan, 1963), 17.
34. Keith Swanwick, *A Basis for Music Education* ([1979]; repr., Windsor, Berks.: NFER-Nelson, 1981), 45.

- 
35. On musical mediamorphosis, see Kurt Blaukopf, *Musical Life in a Changing Society: Aspects of Music Sociology*, transl., David Marinelli (Portland OR: Amadeus Press, 1992), chap. 29.
36. Randall Everett Allsup, "Species Counterpoint: Darwin and the Evolution of Forms," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 14 (2) (Fall 2006):159-74.
37. Peter Kivy, *Music Alone: Philosophical Reflections on the Purely Musical Experience* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990).
38. See Jorgensen, *Transforming Music Education*, 80-92.
39. For a description of some of these possibilities, see Heidi Westerlund, "Garage Bands: A Future Model for Developing Musical Expertise?" *International Journal of Music Education* 24 (2) (2006): 119-25.
40. Randall Everett Allsup, "Mutual Learning and Democratic Action in Instrumental Music Education," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 51 (1) (Spring 2003): 24-37; Randall Everett Allsup, "Activating Self Transformation through Improvisation in Instrumental Music Teaching," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 5 (2) (Fall 1997): 80-85; Randall Everett Allsup, "Music Education as Liberatory Practice: Exploring the Ideas of Milan Kundera," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 9 (2) (Fall 2001): 3-10; Randall Everett Allsup, "Praxis and the Possible: Thoughts on the Writings of Maxine Greene and Paulo Freire," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 11 (2) (Fall 2003): 157-169; Lucy Green, *How Popular Musicians Learn*; Swanwick, *A Basis for Music Education*; Keith Swanwick, *Musical Knowledge: Intuition, Analysis and Music Education* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994); Keith Swanwick, *Teaching Music Musically* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999); David J. Elliott, *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Frede V. Nielsen, *Almen Musikdidaktik* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1998); Frede V. Nielsen, "Didactology as a Field of Theory and Research in Music Education," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13 (1) (Spring 2005): 5-19; Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education: Advancing the Vision*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2003); Paul G. Woodford, *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice* (Bloomington and Indianapolis IN: Indiana University Press, 2005).
41. Maxine Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1988); Maxine Greene, *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change* (San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass, 1995); Maxine Greene, *Variations on a Blue Guitar: The Lincoln Center Institute Lectures on Aesthetic Education* (New York and London: Teachers College Press, 2001); Jane Roland Martin, *Reclaiming a Conversation: The Ideal of the Educated Woman* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985); Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1992); Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation: In Search of a Democratic Solution* (New York and London: Teachers College Press, 2002); June Boyce-Tillman,

---

*Constructing Musical Healing: The Wounds that Sing* (London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley, 2000); June Boyce-Tillman, "Towards an Ecology of Music Education," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 12 (2) (Fall 2004): 102-25; Koza, *Stepping Across*; Julia Eklund Koza, "'Save the Music'? Toward Culturally Relevant, Joyful, and Sustainable School Music," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 14 (1) (Spring 2006): 23-38.

42. See, for example, Elliott, *Music Matters*, 168-170; Reimer, *Philosophy of Music Education*, 115-16, 223-24, 258-59, 284-85.

43. Peter Miksza, "Towards a Model of Deliberate Practice: Implications for Music Education Research," unpublished paper available from the author at [pmiksza@indiana.edu](mailto:pmiksza@indiana.edu).

44. On informal music education, see Jorgensen, *Transforming Music Education*, 101-08.

45. Principle 7 of the "Declaration of the Rights of the Child," United Nations General Assembly resolution 1386(XIV) of 20 November 1959 at <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/25.htm>,

accessed January 17, 2007, guarantees the right to be given an education that "will promote his [or her] general culture." For a review of the research literature concerning early childhood music education, see Joyce Jordan-DeCarbo and Jo Ann Nelson, "Music and Early Childhood Education," in *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, eds., Richard Colwell and Carol Richardson (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 210-42.

46. Erik H. Erikson, *Identity and the Life Cycle* ([1980]; repr., New York; London: W. W. Norton, 1994).

47. For a review of research on community music, see Kari Veblen and Bengt Olsson, "Community Music: Toward an International Overview," *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, eds., Richard Colwell and Carol Richardson (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 730-53. For research on music teacher preparation, studio instruction, and elder-music education respectively, see *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, eds., Richard Colwell and Carol Richardson (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), part 6; Richard Kennell, "Systematic Research in Studio Instruction in Music," in *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, eds., Richard Colwell and Carol Richardson (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 243-56; Don Coffman, "Adult Education," in *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, eds., Richard Colwell and Carol Richardson (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 199-209. At this time of writing, reflecting the growing interest in music education in lifelong music education and community music, a symposium entitled, "Music and Lifelong Learning Symposium," is to be co-hosted by the Ithaca College School of Music and the ACME SRIG (Adult and Community Music Education Special Research Interest Group of MENC), Ithaca NY, September 27-29, 2007.

48. Early singing schools were sometimes inter-generational, and those in the *Sacred Harp* tradition of southern Appalachia still remain so. See James A. Keene, *A History of Music Education in the United States* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1982), chap. 2; *Sweet is the Day: A Sacred Harp Family Portrait* (Montgomery AL: Alabama Folk Life Association, 2001) DVD.

49. See Zoltán Kodály, *The Selected Writings of Zoltán Kodály*, ed., Ferenc Bónis, transl., Lili Hapály and Fred Macnicol (London: Boosey and Hawkes, 1974), 127-51; Emile Jaques-



---

Dalcroze, *Rhythm, Music, and Education*, transl., Harold F. Rubinstein (New York: Arno Times, 1976), chap. 2; Shinichi Suzuki, *Nurtured by Love; A New Approach to Education*, transl, Waltraud Suzuki (New York: Exposition Press, 1969); Mary Helen Richards, *Threshold to Music* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).

50. Bernarr Rainbow, *The Land Without Music: Musical Education in England 1800-1860 and Its Continental Antecedents* (London: Novello, 1967), chaps. 7, 10; Carol A. Pemberton, *Lowell Mason: His Life and Work* (Ann Arbor MI: UMI Research Press, 1985); George Martin, *The Damrosch Dynasty: America's First Family of Music* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1983); Kenneth Simpson, *Some Great Music Educators: A Collection of Essays* (London: Novello, 1976), especially chaps. 3, 4, 7.

51. On the Elderhostel organization, see <http://www.elderhostel.org/>, accessed January 19, 2007; on the New Horizons International Music Association, see <http://www.newhorizonsmusic.org/>, accessed January 19, 2007.

52. Alastair Taylor, "Systems Approach to the Political Organization of Space," *Social Science Information*, International Social Science Council 14 (1975): 7-40, proposes the idea of "integrative levels of analysis" in order to situate disciplines at different levels of generality, each one of which integrates those beneath it

53. Susan O'Neill and Lucy Green observe that "many of the established methods we [music education researchers] have available to research are not sophisticated enough to deal with the complexity involved, leading to criticisms of reductionism" (BERA Music Education Review Group, "Mapping Music Education Research in the UK," p. 257. In particular, they believe, it is important to study the interrelationships between the various groups that are involved in music education.

54. Cornelia Yarbrough, "A Content Analysis of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 1953-1983," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 32 (4) (1984): 213-22; Cornelia Yarbrough, "The First 50 years of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*: A Content Analysis," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 50 (Winter 2002): 276-9.

55. See, for example, Frank Burch Brown, *Religious Aesthetics: A Theological Study of Making and Meaning* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989); Edward Farley, *Faith and Beauty: A Theological Aesthetic* Aldershot, Hants., and Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2001). I have begun to address some of these issues in "Religious Music in Education, *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 1 (2) (Fall 1993): 103-14.

56. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "A Case Study in Two Divergent Research Methodologies in Music Education. *CAUSM Journal* 8 (1) (1979): 33-72.

57. On reconstructions of human potential, especially the importance of factors that stand in a student's way and decisions and choices about what should be done, see Israel Scheffler, *In Praise of the Cognitive Emotions and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Education* New York: Routledge, 1991), chap. 2.

58. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* ([1938]; repr., New York: Collier Books, 1963), 25.

59. Gordon Cox and Sarah Hennessy writing in the BERA Music Education Review Group, "Mapping Music Education Research in the UK," 258.



- 
60. Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* ([1929]; repr., New York: Free Press, 1967), 14.
61. See Charles P. Schmidt, Rhonda Baker, Beth Hayes, and Eva Kwan, "A Descriptive Study of Public School Music Programs in Indiana," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* no. 169 (Summer 2006): 25-38 (I am indebted to Charles Schmidt for assisting me in locating this reference); Katherine Strand, "Survey of Indiana Music Teachers on Using Composition in the Classroom," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 54 (2) (2006): 154-67.
62. Charles Fowler, *Strong Arts, Strong Schools: The Promising Potential and Shortsighted Disregard of the Arts in American Schooling* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), National Commission on Music Education, *Growing Up Complete: The Imperative for Music Education* (Reston VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1991); The National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1983).
63. On music education futures, see, for example, David K. Lines, *Music Education for the New Millennium: Theory and Practice Futures for Music Teaching and Learning* Malden MA; Oxford UK; Carlton Australia: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
64. Comparative studies between countries are less evident. See, for example, Masafumi Ogawa, "Early Nineteenth Century American Influences on the Beginning of Japanese Public Music Education: An Analysis and Comparison of Selected Music Textbooks Published in Japan and the United States," Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 2000).
65. Estelle R. Jorgensen, *The Art of Teaching Music* (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2008), in press.
66. Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man in a Series of Letters*, ed. and transl., Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), ninth letter, pp. 60, 61.
67. Immanuel Kant, "Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht," *Kant's gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 8 (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1912), 23.
68. In the United States, for example, the circulation of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* is a small fraction of the membership of the MENC—The National Association for Music Education. Also, at its national meetings, attendance at research sessions sponsored by the various Special Research Interest Groups is typically much smaller than at performances and general sessions, and these research sessions attract mainly college and university teachers and students.
69. Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Four Philosophical Models of the Relation of Theory and Practice," *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 13 (1) (Spring 2005): 21-36
70. W. Ann Stokes, "Response to Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Four Philosophical Models of the Relationship between Theory and Practice," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13 (1) (Spring 2005): 102- 104; Randall Everett Allsup, "A Response to Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Four

---

Philosophical Models of the Relationship between Theory and Practice,” *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13 (1) (Spring 2005): 104-108.

71. Schwab, “The Practical: Arts of Eclectic.”

72. Israel Scheffler, *Reason and Teaching* ([1973]; repr., Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973), chap. 16.

73. Max van Manen, *The Tact of Teaching: The Meaning of Pedagogical Thoughtfulness* (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 1991), chap. 6, suggests that tact allows one to intuitively work out how to act in particular situations and in relation to specific ideas.

74. For a discussion on the child-study movement and its relationship to music education see James A. Keene, *A History of Music Education in the United States* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1982), chap. 12,

75. See John Dewey, *Experience and Education* ([1938]; repr., New York: Collier Books, 1963), chap. 7. Elsewhere, in *Art as Experience* ([1934]; repr., New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1980), Dewey also advocates approaches consonant with the nature of the arts that are experienced differently than the sciences.