MEND

Music Education National Debate

Frank Heneghan

Version: MEND09d.doc
Date: 16/04/02 11:40

The MEND Logo

The MEND Logo was designed by Raquel Keogh, College of Art and Design (Dublin Institute of Technology), Mountjoy Square, Dublin 1.

The symbolism in the logo is as follows:

The colour scheme is that of DIT, the main sponsor of MEND

The central motif synthesizes a 'Y' for Youth and the form of a harp, the emblem of Ireland and a symbol for Music

The radiating concentric circles represent communication and transmission in the educational process

The author wishes to thank the MEND Sponsors:

Dublin Institute of Technology
Siemens Ireland
Bank of Ireland
Institute of Education
SIPTU
Superquinn
Marks and Spencer

Thanks also to the following who agreed to be interviewed by the author in relation to the subject matter of the MEND Report:

Darius Brubeck (Freelance Musician met at 'Arts on the Edge' Conference, Perth, Western Australia, April 1998)
Dr Geoffrey Gibb (Director, Western Australia Academy of the Performing Arts, Edith Cowan University, Western Australia)
Mr Robert Houlihan (Irish Freelance Conductor)
Mr Oliver Hynes (Senior Inspector [Music] Dept of Education)
Mr Noel Kelly (Mary Immaculate College of Education, Limerick)
Professor Marie McCarthy (University of Maryland at College Park)
Dr Gary McPherson (University of New South Wales, Australia)
Professor Caroline van Niekerk (Dept of Music Education, University of Pretoria , South Africa)
Professor William Chapman Nyaho (University of Louisiana at Lafayette)
Mr Aidan O'Carroll (Artistic Director, Kerry School of Music)
Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)
Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell (University of Washington, Seattle)
Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Institute of Technology)

Abbreviations in use:

AMS	American National Standards
APA	The (National) Academy for the Performing Arts
DIT	Dublin Institute of Technology
ISME	International Society for Music Education
ITM	Irish Traditional Music
JC	Junior Certificate
LC	Leaving Certificate
MC	Multiculturalism
MEAE	Music Education as Aesthetic Education
MENC	The Music Educators' National Conference (US)
MEND	The Music Education National Debate
MM	Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education (D Elliott)
NCCA	National Council for Curriculum and Assessment
OTL	Opportunity to Learn (A US publication on Music Education)
PIANO	**P**rovision and **I**nstitutional **A**rrangements **N**ow for **O**rchestras and Ensembles
RIAM	Royal Irish Academy of Music
TCD	Trinity College Dublin
UL	The University of Limerick
VEC	Vocational Education Committee
WAM	Western Art Music
IWMC	The Irish World Music Centre (UL)

Report

A Review of Music Education in Ireland, Incorporating the Final Report of the Music Education National Debate (MEND - Phase III).

By

Frank Heneghan*

Dublin, Ireland. 17 September 2001

*** Enquiries and for further information: heneghan@indigo.ie**

MEND Phase III

Presidential Patronage

It should be noted that the MEND initiative engaged the interest of the President of Ireland, Mrs Mary Robinson, who not only graced the gala concert of Phase I with her presence but accepted an invitation to be sole patron of the culminating phase of the project.

President Mary Robinson

1 Table of Contents

1 Table of Contents 6
2 Foreword 10
3 Summary 13
3.1 Scope 13
3.2 General Considerations 13
3.3 Problems of Music Education 15
3.4 *Deaf Ears?* Report 16
3.5 MEND as Response to *Deaf Ears?* 16
3.6 MEND Agenda 17
3.6.1 Philosophical 17
3.6.2 The Current State of Music Education in Ireland 18
3.6.3 Continuum 19
3.6.4 Performance 19
3.6.5 Assessment 20
3.6.6 National Culture and Multiculturalism 20
3.6.7 Third-Level Music Education 22
3.6.8 A Forum for Music Education 23
3.7 MEND Findings 24
3.8 MEND Recommendations 24
4 Overview 25
4.1 Music and Music Education –an Inseparable Pair 25
4.2 The Commanding Concerns in Irish Music Education 27
4.2.1 Taste in Music 27
4.2.2 Which Music? Which Educational Strategy? 27
4.2.3 Music Education as Regenerative Cycle 28
4.2.4 Performance and the Dimension of Skill in Music-Making 28
4.2.5 Other Values as Drain on Musical Competence 29
4.2.6 A Contextual Philosophy of Music Education 29
5 Music in Irish Education - A Summary 34
5.1 Recent Provision 34
6 The Stimulus of the *Deaf Ears?* Report 36
6.1 European Year of Music 1985 36
7 The Music Education National Debate (MEND) as natural sequel to *Deaf Ears?* 38
7.1 Response to *Deaf Ears?* 38
7.2 Presidential Patronage for MEND 39
7.3 The Dublin Institute of Technology 40
8 Pre-MEND Perceptions 42
8.1 Towards an Agenda 42
9 Basic Premises of MEND 43
10 Methodology of MEND 44
10.1 General 44
10.2 Towards an Agenda for MEND 44
10.3 Towards a Time-Frame for MEND 45
10.3.1 General Considerations 45
10.3.2 MEND Heralding Debate – October 1994 46
10.3.3 MEND Phase I – April 1995 46
10.3.4 MEND National Music Seminar – May 1995 46
10.3.5 MEND Phase II – November 1995 46
10.3.6 The Establishment of the Music Education National Forum - November 1996 47
10.3.7 MEND Phase III- November 1996 47
10.3.8 Attendance 47
11 The Agenda for MEND 48

11.1.1 Philosophical....48
11.1.2 Current Irish Music Education Provision....49
11.1.3 Continuum....49
11.1.4 Performance....50
11.1.5 Assessment....50
11.1.6 The Rôle of National Culture in Music Education....51
11.1.7 Music Education at Third Level....51
11.1.8 National Forum for Music Education....52
11.1.9 Resourcing for Music Education in Ireland – A Collective Agenda Item?....52
12 The Enactment of MEND....53
12.1 Participation....53
13 Sequence and Quality of Conference Sessions....54
13.1 The Pairing of Lectures and Debates....54
14 A Single Interpreter?....55
14.1 The Route to Recommendations.....55
15 Logistical Details of MEND....56
15.1 Coding of MEND Sessions....56
15.2 Opening Addresses....56
15.3 Session Chairpersons....57
15.4 Presenters (Alphabetical List)....58
15.5 Presenters (Phases)....59
15.5.1 Phase I....59
15.5.2 Phase II....59
15.5.3 Phase III....60
15.6 Institutions Represented by Speakers, Chairpersons and Reporters....61
15.6.1 Ireland....61
15.6.2 Australia....62
15.6.3 Canada....62
15.6.4 Philippines....62
15.6.5 United Kingdom....62
15.6.6 United States of America....62
15.6.7 International....62
15.7 Chairpersons at the debate sessions....63
15.7.1 Phase I....63
15.7.2 Phase II....63
15.7.3 Phase III....64
15.8 Reporters at the Debate Sessions....65
15.8.1 Phase I....65
15.8.2 Phase II....65
15.8.3 Phase III....66
15.9 MEND Phase I Programme....67
15.9.1 Summary of Debate Sessions, Sat/Sun 29th/30th April 1995....67
15.9.2 Summary of Lectures/Presentations, Sat/Sun 29th/30th April 1995....69
15.10 MEND Phase I Timetable....70
15.10.1 Saturday 29 April 1995....70
15.10.2 Sunday, 30 April 1995....72
15.11 Represented Bodies and Apologies (MEND Phase I)....74
15.12 MEND Phase II Programme....75
15.12.1 Saturday 11 November and Sunday 12 November 1995. Summary of Open Forum Debate Sessions....75
15.12.2 Saturday 11 November and Sunday 12 November 1995. Summary of Lectures/Presentations....77
15.13 MEND Phase II Timetable....79
15.13.1 Saturday 11 November 1995....79
15.13.2 Sunday, 12 November 1995....81

15.14 MEND Phase III....83
15.15 MEND Phase III Keynote Address....84
15.16 MEND Phase III Timetable....85
15.16.1 Saturday 9 November 1996....85
15.16.2 Sunday, 10 November 1996....87
15.17 MEND Phase III Programme....89
15.17.1 Summary of Open Forum Debate Sessions....89
15.17.2 Summary of Lectures....90
16 Significance of Phase III....91
16.1 Input from Interim Report I....91
16.2 Input from Interim Report II....94
17 ANALYSIS (I)....96
17.1 Key Concepts....96
17.2 Introduction....98
17.3 Introduction to the Elliott/Reimer Case....100
17.4 Reimer's Universal Philosophy of Music Education (*Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music?*)....101
17.5 Commonly-held Values about Music Education (Reimer)....102
17.6 Four Philosophical Positions....103
17.7 Formalism....104
17.8 Praxialism....105
17.9 Referentialism....106
17.10 Contextualism....108
17.11 Functional/Utilitarian approaches to Music Education....109
17.12 Bennett Reimer in Ireland....110
17.13 The Irish Context....111
18 Analysis (II): Presentations, Debates and Related Materials....117
18.1 Philosophy of Music Education....117
18.1.1 Overview of Music Education Philosophy....117
18.1.2 Contextual Philosophy....154
18.1.3 Composing (Creativity: Buckley I P iii): Performing: Listening....222
18.1.4 Time Management....224
18.1.5 Dichotomy....224
18.2 State of Music Education in Ireland....227
18.2.1 General Provision....227
18.2.2 Music in the Community....236
18.2.3 Private Enterprise and Semi-State Provision....237
18.2.4 Materials for Music Education....239
18.3 Continuum in Music Education....240
18.4 Performance....251
18.4.1 Performance and Élitism....251
18.4.2 Specialization....254
18.4.3 Music Schools....257
18.4.4 Performance in Third Level....259
18.4.5 Professional Training in Performance (including a National Academy for the Performing Arts)....261
18.5 Assessment....262
18.5.1 General Comments on Assessment....262
18.5.2 Assessment in the National Curriculum (UK)....263
18.5.3 The Leaving Certificate Crisis....272
18.5.4 National Standards (USA)....279
18.6 National Culture, Biculturalism and Multiculturalism....286
18.6.1 A Note on Multiculturalism....286
18.6.2 National Culture: Biculturalism versus Multiculturalism....287
18.6.3 National Culture - Review of Presentations and Debates....289

18.7 Music Education at Third Level....316
18.7.1 Options....316
18.7.2 Professional Training....317
18.7.3 Teacher Training....319
18.7.4 The Conservatoire Aspiration (A National Academy for the Performing Arts?)....324
18.8 Forum for Music Education....333
19 Rationalization....339
19.1 Rationalization – Towards A Contextual Philosophy for Music Education in Ireland....339
19.2 The American Philosophical View on Music Education. Towards a reconciliation of the Reimer/Elliott Counterpositions....345
19.3 Music Education as Aesthetic Education....347
19.4 The American National Standards (1992-1994)....353
19.5 Multiculturalism (MC)....361
19.6 Residual Dissonances....366
19.7 The Irish Context....375
19.7.1 Some basic understandings about music and music education.....375
19.7.2 Involvements and Diversity in Music Education.....376
19.7.3 The Philosophical Stances on music education....377
19.7.4 Towards a Universal Philosophy of Music Education....378
19.7.5 Philosophy in action. Standards, Curriculum, Method....382
19.7.6 The Relevance of American Music Education Practice....385
19.7.7 Music as Art and in the Arts Programme....389
19.7.8 The Conceptual Confusion about Performance....391
19.7.9 Diversity. The Role of Popular Music and Multiculturalism in Music Education....393
19.7.10 The Current State of Music Education in Ireland....398
19.7.11 A Way Forward for Irish Music Education....418
19.7.12 National Forum for Music Education....418
19.7.13 Philosophical Issues. Balance, Relevance and Time Management in Implementing the Curriculum....419
19.7.14 The Elliott and Reimer Philosophies Revisited as Models for Irish Music Education....420
20 MEND Findings and Recommendations....426
20.1 Towards Recommendations from MEND....426
20.2 MEND Findings....427
20.3 MEND Recommendations....428
21 Appendix I. TOC for Debates and Lectures....434

2 Foreword

"Words leave no traces; they pass as breath; and mingle with the air: . . . But the pen is a witness on record."

Samuel Richardson
Clarissa, Letter CLXXXIII

"Well, whatever bit of a wise man's work is honestly and benevolently done, that bit is his book, or his piece of art. It is mixed always with evil fragments - ill-done, redundant, affected work. But if you read rightly, you will easily discover the true bits. And those are the book."

John Ruskin
'Of Kings and Treasuries'. Sesame and Lilies

The Music Education National Debate has been a professionally rewarding project and I am grateful to Dr Brendan Goldsmith, President of DIT, for the invitation to have been its co-ordinator. The period since the conclusion of its public phase has been, for me, a time of deep thought. I have wrestled with the copious material it generated, trying to extract some useful parameters to point a way forward in Irish music education. I have attempted, through the agency of the initiative, to define the Irish music education dilemma by comparing and contrasting it with the wider contexts of global concerns. I am simultaneously reaffirming some of the realities that, I believe, must be grasped before reform can be rewarded with lasting success.

The phenomenon of musical experience is uniquely human; its scope and development, mediated through education, are daunting to ponder. In its educational contexts it invokes problems of valuing, judgement, choice and taste in a truceless war between the affect of easy listening and the artistic cognition of high culture. But the processes of school music education are under siege by the learners who, unconsciously driven by the virtually invincible powers of the media and commercial self-interest, are confusing notions of democracy, as social freedom, with delusions as to the equality, loosely defined, of all musics. The problem is not a new one, but it is central to the search for an accommodation of its dissonances. Music educators in western societies, such as Ireland, tend to be supportive of the tenets of western art music, simply because these have been the enablers of their own education. They are now being manipulated into uncomfortably sham protestations of allegiance to this new and pressing idea of musical democracy, without testing its canons. If education is committed to the transmission of that which society values it has, of course, a responsibility to establish what those values are, not what they ought to be; but the responsibility is not betrayed if it essays to refine public taste in ways which are not prescriptive. And the community, as in other areas of education, must, in turn, trust the professionalism of its educators; it should be a true partnership. The acid test is whether post-formal-education learners remember their school experiences in music as having had relevance to their subsequent life. Regardless of how it is expressed, the sensitive balance of this accommodation is a currently commanding preoccupation in music education. Perusal of the documentation of MEND Phase III has unequivocally established this fact; it can also be seen to be at the heart of the ongoing vituperative conflict between philosophers of music education.

This MEND study was proposed as a response to the Arts Council 1985 Report - *Deaf Ears?* - which stated that 'The young Irish person has the worst of all European musical "worlds"' - an assertion which threw down the gauntlet to public and political conscience. Apart from the need to address and to solve, as a priority, the ongoing problem of the destabilization of music education by the high/mass culture dichotomy, MEND offers six fundamental findings before going on to make specific recommendations. It stresses the need for the underpinning of music education with some consensus on a contextual philosophy suited to the uniqueness of the Irish case; obviously such a philosophy must be communicated to music educators and be subject, by definition, to local modification in the light of prevailing circumstances. The evidence of lack of understanding and tolerance between music

educators of different specialisms is so striking that it should be addressed. Assuming a healthy school music curriculum to be the only safe and logical means of realizing the aspiration of 'music for all', this report cautions against indiscriminate overloading of the curriculum. Achievable targets must be set which correlate time spent with results expected. In this respect it is felt that performance as an achievement target in schools falls between the Scylla and Charybdis of derisive standards and emasculation of the other equally important targets of listening and composing. This highlights the need, not only to define performance in its expectations, but also to provide for it as a specialism for the sizeable minority who may wish to take up the option. Strategies to promote genuine pre-professional specialization are suggested. The importance of teacher training is emphasized, as is the need to keep it relevant to the curriculum and to its informing philosophy.

As perusal of the invitation lists will show, the attendance at MEND included representation from every constituency of music education in the state. This gives overwhelming validity to the mandate from the delegates themselves to set up the Music Education National Forum, which was established and held its first plenary meeting before the opening of Phase III of MEND. Overriding all the findings and recommendations arising from the initiative itself is the hope that this autonomous body or its successor(s) will take over the responsibility to pursue the ideals and concerns that brought MEND into existence.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who contributed to such success as MEND can boast. They include the sponsors, notably the DIT, Siemens Nixdorf Information Systems Ltd, the Bank of Ireland, the Institute of Education, SIPTU, the Suzuki Society of Ireland, Jury's Hotel and Towers, Marks and Spencer and Superquinn. To all my colleagues in the DIT, the presenters, chairpersons, reporters, performers, and the music-loving public at large I am deeply indebted for the privileges I have enjoyed. The report is as much yours as it is mine.

The salient findings of the MEND initiative were crystallizing long before its final phase, which was then used as a sounding board to test their durability and reliability. The indispensability of an informing philosophy of music education and of a route for that philosophy to filter effectively to the executives - the teachers; the relevance of teacher training to the demands of the curriculum; the lack of understanding and tolerance between the academic and practical constituencies of music education as an inhibitor; the need to appraise the pragmatic potential of music education viewed in its time constraints; the confusion over the nature of performance – all of these may now appear as simple, self-evident truths which should not have needed the gargantuan ministry of MEND and of this report to articulate. But enduring truths often have a way of seeming obvious in hindsight until awareness of the lack of action in relation to them proves otherwise or vindicates the act of repetition. In taking the bold step to metamorphose the findings into recommendations, the writer was driven by the need, not so much to state what ought to be done but, rather, why and, to the extent possible, how. This inevitably led to exhaustive enquiry and the sheer bulk that now confronts the reader. An attempt has been made, using the formatting wonders of technology, to aid accessibility and to provide a short-cut route to the irreducible essence of the report; it is hoped that this will greatly facilitate the reader with limitations of time or of range of interests.

This account of MEND does not claim to harbour a panacea for music education in Ireland; but it does claim to have painstakingly sifted, from the plethora of material generated, the collective wisdom of a truly representative gathering of Irish musicians, and of a distinguished international panel, intent on charting a better future for music in our island. It aims not only to stimulate further debate but to provide an authoritative backdrop and reference against which it can be enacted and lead to progress on a spectrum of burning issues. In trying to do full justice to this precious store of received wisdom I may have incurred the criticism of bombarding with 'impenetrable prose'. Resisting facile apology, let me rather express the hope that the assiduous reader of these pages may be rewarded, *inter alia*, with fulsome confirmation of stoutly-held views or with food for honest disagreement, whether publicly expressed at MEND or not. Finally, to borrow the title of Harry White's lecture - *'A book of manners in the wilderness'* (itself an evocative borrowing from Séamus Heaney) - may I dare to

suggest that MEND, unlike *Deaf Ears?*, is intoning positive intent and, therefore, a happier prophecy, enabling this aging pundit to retire with honour.

Frank Heneghan

Dublin, 17 September 2001

3 Summary

"The world may be divided into (1) those who neither know nor care; (2) those who do not know but care very much; (3) those who know and condemn; (4) those who know and approve; and (5) those who know and distinguish."

H.W. Fowler
Dictionary of Modern English Usage

3.1 Scope

This report provides a commentary on current Music Education in Ireland in addition to presenting a final analysis of the proceedings of The Music Education National Debate (MEND), an initiative sponsored by the Dublin Institute of Technology and held between February 1994 and November 1996.

3.2 General Considerations

Music and its enabler, music-making, may be conceptually classified as universal (pleasurable) experience and faculty. The scope of music in human discourse is so vast and multifarious that it is virtually indefinable in a comprehensive sense. 'The organization of sound' is one inadequate attempt (to define music) which fails to conjure up the magic of the experience at its most intense.

In ear, mind and affect music is uniquely human and value-laden

The transmission of a value system, again a uniquely human preoccupation, has resonances in the educational process.

The pleasure of educational engagement in music calls into play learning (composing, performing, listening, appraising) and transmission (teaching). Apart from the music itself, teachers are the prime resource in music education and must be recognized as such.

Music and musicology are inseparable in educational terms. Educational processes beget and employ scholarship.

Musical discourse has bewildering variety, which it is impossible fully to accommodate in general music education. Eclectic choices must be made. This is the core of disagreement in music education

Performance has a special place in musical discourse as conceptually the most immediate presence of music for the vast majority, though it is indivisibly linked with listening. The aspiration to perform and communicate is primevally the strongest musical urge.

Music as communication readily adapts to notions of art, another uniquely human concept. Art aims to be understood. 'All art aspires to the condition of music.'[1] As the writing of this report proceeded, the artistic connection between music and education assumed critical importance.

Music in education may be concerned with the transmission of basics (recognizing achievable targets within curricular time limits) or with professionalism, which subdivides into practical and academic streams, both streams producing teachers. The practical stream supports virtuosity in performance, which is sometimes necessary but never sufficient for artistic fulfilment. The pursuit of virtuosity *per*

[1]Walter Pater, "The School of Giorgione", in *Studies in the History of the Renaissance - Studies in Art and Poetry* (1873; reprint New York: Mentor Press, 1959), 140.

se is an underlying feature of much music-making and is regarded as a potentially corrupting influence.

Music as art, according to the tenets of Absolute Expressionism, one highly regarded and generally accepted theory of how music functions, involves mimesis (imitation and the [sometimes symbolic] communication of the sense of the thing being imitated), craft and feeling. These concepts can be manifest in all genres of music, giving rise to the currently fashionable perception that all musics are equal. But there is much confusion in naïve educational psychology between feeling and emotion. Exclusively emotive considerations give rise to taste, sometimes to the negation of valuing and judgement. Music's interaction with the rest of human discourse, and especially with the notion of music as social text, produces strong forces which do not readily adapt to narrow views of music education, giving rise to further troublesome dissonances.

The accelerated development of music in one notable stream has led to the virtually unchallenged resplendence of European/western art music, championing literacy and scholarship, *inter alia*, over the past 400 years. The cultural conquest of the world by western ideology has assisted its ascendancy. But the interaction of western with other cultures has exposed the hubris of western art. A sensitivity of conscience has developed in relation to the facile assertion of musical hierarchies. This has destabilized current music education thinking and has led to painful reappraisals.

western scholarship, through the agency of musicology and, especially, of ethnomusicology, has loosely classified music under the headings of primitive, folk, popular and art, each with a different significance as to mode of transmission.

Philosophical travail has yielded a multiplicity of conceptual approaches to deal with the educational challenge in formal settings, typically of the art tradition. These cover a spectrum, from music as product (an art/aesthetic concept) to music as process (the praxial or practical approach). The functions of music (typically as defined by Merriam and Fowler (See McCarthy – Ref. III P vii)) - another approach (the utilitarian and socio-cultural context) - empower a wide, adaptable and derestricting set of behaviours.

3.3 Problems of Music Education

The sheer plenitude of musical experience means that the process of music education is inherently prone to incompleteness in any given society and, for our purposes, in Ireland.

Harry White (MEND Phase I: Ref. I P viii)
The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland

The complex interactions implicit in the above attempt to describe the workings of music, as a manifestation of human behaviour, have led to the inevitable result that no system of music education is perfect in being universally adaptable or acceptable; all are notionally flawed. Furthermore they have produced the idiosyncratic problems of contemporary music education which, typically, are:

1. The comprehensive nature of music's infiltration of human affairs.

2. The need to incorporate music as a valued component in general education and as a priority concern.

3. The impossibility of accommodating the holism of music within specific educational targets. The nature of the eclectic choices that must be made (in formal education) - philosophical, curricular, pedagogical, methodological, and evaluatory – is daunting to confront.

4. The conceptual confusion in the process of democratization[2] of genres of music.

[2] In the current climate of overweening liberalism this has become a particularly troublesome threat to the application of valuing and judgement in standard -setting, by a clever yet specious tendency deliberately to confuse value with taste. It may be foolhardy to engage the problem here; but it did surface so frequently at MEND, involving many distinguished contributors in inconclusive foot-shifting and prevarication, that the intervention may not be irrelevant. It received magisterial treatment in Professor White's groundbreaking paper, *A book of manners in the wilderness*, the peroration at MEND Phase III (Ref. III P viii). It is, in the writer's view, a problem that must be grappled with if music education is not to linger in a permanent state of unnecessary confusion.
In listening to a recent lecture given by Professor White on *Mozart's Piano Concerti: The Virtuoso Imagination* the writer was struck by the fact that he felt no embarrassment in singling out the late concerti as most suitable for the purpose of illustrating the pinnacle of Mozart's achievement in this genre . . . in other words, he chose the *best* of Mozart. But, following commonly accepted critical practice, Professor White significantly omitted any reference to K 537, the third of the last four concerti. Within the coterie audience nobody took exception to the implication as to its being less profound than the other three. It seems that intra-Mozartean scholarship has no qualms about this very natural and helpful discrimination. Similarly, the writer would claim that, in Beethoven, there is a progression that would establish the artistic significance of the Appassionata (Op57) Sonata over the F major Sonatina, based even on the nature of Beethoven's intentionality, quite apart from scale. Taking the argument further the writer would fear no contradiction if he were to insist on the stature of Beethoven over Clementi. Charles Dickens is to be preferred to Monica Dickens, Shakespeare, Goethe and Dante over a multitude of lesser luminaries.
It has already been stated that emotion (vested interest) can invalidate the powers of detachment and judgement; the subject is authoritatively engaged in Immanuel Kant's monumental *Critique of Pure Reason (Critique of Judgement; First Book: Analytic of the Beautiful,* 1781). The question of taste and the undoubted power of the media, and commercial self-interest in controlling them, have further confused the issue. To pontificate on contemporary values in music education (as distinct from the quite decisive judgements that seem unexceptionable in intra-genre criticism of music of a bygone day) is unacceptable, it seems. In a true democracy where minority interests are given equal rights to 'fight their corner' and majority interests generally 'carry the vote', the battle lines are not drawn on the question of quality, which is a self-defeating criterion to invoke in such circumstances. But neither does it deny that quality is a force to be reckoned with, and one that can prevail in the institutions of civilized society. The writer suggests that the criteria of intentionality, function, craft, feeling and mutual respect (as to origin) are more democratically relevant than the spuriously levelling one of equal quality. The wealth of comparative criticism and developmental educational method which resides in

5. The special demands of performance in music, at amateur and professional levels.

6. Time constraints

3.4 *Deaf Ears?* Report

The 1985 Arts Council Report *Deaf Ears*? - A report on the provision of music education in Irish schools (D. Herron) asserted that 'the young Irish person has the worst of all European musical "worlds". This statement was challenging and demanded a response.

3.5 MEND as Response to *Deaf Ears?*

The response, stimulated by the *Deaf Ears?* Report came in the form of the MUSIC EDUCATION NATIONAL DEBATE (MEND) initiative, sponsored by the Dublin Institute of Technology

The public phase of the project lasted from February 1994 until November 1996.

MEND took the form of a one-day Heralding Conference (October 1994), three weekend-long Conferences (including a central fully international one) representing carefully phased inputs (Phase I - April 1995; Phase II - November 1995; Phase III - November 1996). A half-day special seminar dealing with Irish Traditional Music was held as a pendant to Phase I in May 1995. The Music Education National Forum was established during Phase III in November 1996. There were, in all, 34 invited scholarly presentations including 14 from abroad, and 33 debates.

The attendance at MEND (some 1500 recorded attendances over all the phases) was representative of the whole constituency of music education interests in Ireland.

---

the corpus of knowledge generated by western art is too valuable a resource to be squandered on the sacrificial altar of debilitating and spurious notions of democracy; the canons of judgement must intervene to validate every candidate for consideration as worthy of inclusion on the menu of music education. This may be to propose challenging material for further debate but the exercise, if unpromising as to eventual agreement or consensus, would surely be worthwhile and responsible.

3.6 MEND Agenda

The 8-point Agenda for MEND was first deliberated on and chosen by the delegates to the Heralding Conference (October 1994). In simplified form it was as follows:

1. Philosophies of Music Education
2. The Current State of Music Education in Ireland
3. Continuum in Music Education
4. Performance in Music Education
5. Assessment in Music Education
6. National Culture and Multiculturalism
7. Third-level Music Education. Teacher Training
8. Sequel to MEND - A Forum for Music Education

MEND generated an enormous amount of documentation, including transcripts of the presentations and interpretative materials from independent rapporteurs invited to attend the debates. All the proceedings were audio taped. There were two Interim Reports (September 1995 and September 1996) which were generally available to all delegates. In this final report all the sessions (papers and debates) are separately analysed. In the case of the earlier phases the analytical material was subjected to further scrutiny for final analysis. The analytical method should be clear from the documentation but it is stressed that this final report reviews all the material generated and, so, may stand alone, without further reference, as an account and analysis of the proceedings of the entire MEND initiative.

The outcomes from MEND are presented as the fruit of analysis, leading to FINDINGS (Section 3.7) which are seen as quintessential concerns of fundamental significance to the future course of music education in Ireland. It has been explained in the body of the report that it was not considered prudent to force the issue that specific recommendations should arise from each debate or lecture; but that is not to say that copious suitable material, from which to draw recommendations, was not generated. The putative RECOMMENDATIONS are therefore presented in a three-tiered hierarchy for ease of extraction. Only two of these three are mentioned in this summary (i.e. the Findings, in Section 3.7, and the explanation of the derivation of recommendations, in Section 3.8); the third, comprehensive, list forms part of the analytical section of the report (Section 20). Melodramatically, of course, it might be claimed that MEND PRODUCED ONLY ONE COMMANDING RECOMMENDATION by confirming the establishment of the Music Education National Forum, from which all other aspirations should derive their hope of successful enactment.

It has been a feature of MEND discovery that problems are less insoluble singly than in their interactive context, which is the problem in Irish music education. Taking this as the ineluctable starting position the following, taking the agenda point by point, sums up the complex nature of these interactions.

3.6.1 Philosophical

There was no shortage of philosophical advocacy, nor did a consistent view emerge, even amongst those which received special consideration at MEND. Thus Reimer (music as product and as aesthetic experience in the broadest sense); Elliott (music as process and ‘continuum as practicum’ or praxial

approach, stressing performance as prime enabler); Swanwick (an esoteric but logical approach to music as 'conversation'); Fowler and Merriam (the functions of music approach); Fletcher (the elitist approach) - all fail to measure up uniquely to the protean criterion of what it is we want music education to achieve, a putative mission which is itself intrinsically pluralistic and contextual. An attempt must be made to define, or at least to give a finer focus to this context for Ireland, taking our unique set of circumstances and interactions into account. The current global obsession with philosophical enquiry into the intimately related cleavages between high and mass culture, social and educational ideas of relevant music, taste and informed judgement - and how these should and do impinge on music education - is likely to continue without agreement or conclusive inputs to educational practice.

3.6.2 The Current State of Music Education in Ireland

Allowing for the widest implications of the conceptual failure adverted to by Harry White (Ref. I P viii) the following attempts to summarize the situation:

1. State provision through general education (primary and second-level) has been comprehensively revised in the past decade, mainly as a response to (1) the admitted failure of The New Curriculum (An Curaclam Nua of 1971); and (2) typically contemporary quasi-political pressures on the foot of uptake, standards (statistical norms) and university credits at Leaving Certificate level. The best features of these revisions must be given time to take effect, although new problems are predicted following MEND deliberations. The primary/second level continuum fracture (*Deaf Ears?)* seems to have been addressed but there are other discontinuities which demand special monitoring, notably that between second and third level. In the absence of a clear national policy on music education at second-level and its application countrywide (even allowing for the optional status of music which is unchallengeable at senior cycle) there is no conclusive evidence that availability, accessibility and continuity are being guaranteed.

2. The performance dilemma remains static as to resolution, though there are heartening developments afoot with the dawn of the new millennium. There is inequality of opportunity, and the dearth of institutional availability, as a reflection of lack of official subsidy, is further complicated by poor standards in deprived areas, (notably the West and North of the country). This general lacuna must be addressed. The conceptual failure (Harry White's concern, itself open to challenge as to its target) regarding a ministry to the true nature of the performance aspiration calls for relevantly focused and informed scholarly research. The performance content in general education, in rationale and now, much more significantly, in practice, does not, even minimally, come to terms with the problems of standard and an equal access (scrupulously dispensed) which banishes the pejorative appellation of élitism forever.

3. In relation to the typically low levels of participation in music in the lower strata, third level provision is healthy but could benefit from some rationalization. The recent (January 2000) announcement of the establishment of an Academy for the Performing Arts (including music) is to be welcomed with caution. This exciting and epochal project is still in its infancy. The interactive nature of its brief needs very sensitive treatment if it is not to destabilize current provision and if it is to maximize collaborative effort - two sides of the same coin.

4. Traditional music is a complex issue, which was given its fair share of the time available at MEND. It is copiously reported.

3.6.3 Continuum

The exposure, by the *Deaf Ears?* Report (1985), of the primary/second-level continuum fracture proved to be only the tip of an iceberg. MEND enquiry has isolated a number of other discontinuities, and failures in communication, which are potentially as serious, especially now that the *Deaf Ears?* concern at the primary/secondary interface has been confronted in syllabus revision.

They include:

1. The idiosyncratic discontinuity opened up by the Leaving Certificate syllabus revision, affecting third-level entry into music as a liberal/professional study

2. The endemic dichotomy between academic and practical musicians, especially as it affects educational prioritization.

3. Intra-constituency discontinuities such as those endemic in primary education owing to the class teacher/music specialist differences in input quality.

4. The continuum demanded in music teacher education, which demands a three-phase approach - pre-service, induction/probationary, in-service assisted professional maturation (see McCann – Ref. I P vi).

5. Dialogue between teachers and trainers across all educational interfaces. This was particularly adverted to in the context of teacher trainers being familiar, through dialogue, with the content and demands of current syllabus revision (again see McCann – Ref. I P vi, and McCarthy – Ref. III P vii).

6. Communication between groups interested in the promotion of traditional music in education generally (Ref. I D iiic). The groups identified were curators of resource bases, currently disparate university interests, potential researchers, Comhaltas Ceoltóiri Éireann, Maoin Cheoil an Chláir (as a facilitator for pilot schemes).

3.6.4 Performance

Performance is the most deprived (in Ireland), as it is the least understood, yet most sought-after and individually practised activity in music and music education. Again stressing the interactive character, because it is skill- and time-dependent at the levels generally aspired to in most (including amateur) concepts of performance, it is for the minority - but that is not to suggest a minuscule minority. Significantly, in the MEND deliberations, although performance was associated with many of the unearthed problems with music education in Ireland, there was absolute unanimity as to its importance in musical discourse and as to the need to encourage and promote it. This support extended even to academic courses at third-level as, indeed, performance has entered a new, if questionable, ascendancy in attitudes to its inclusion in school music at all levels. This latter raises the question as to ‘what counts as performance', and the associated worry that the promotion of so-called performance in school provision may be seen as relieving government of the obligation to promote it for its own sake. It is no exaggeration to claim that selectively-practised performance at recognizably proficient levels is quintessential to a healthy music education dispensation and this was confirmed copiously at MEND. It is equally valid to state that educational provision for performance in Ireland has been culpably neglected, the rural community having been left to the financially straitened efforts of private enterprise for such service as is available. The band movement and local youth orchestral activities were identified as making a significant contribution to the promotion of performance as a collective activity. There is an urgent need to address this neglect, as a government concern, if the school syllabus revision is not to become a travesty. The most progressive approach to

such a scheme would be to see and plan it as essentially an extension, over time, of collaborative effort between state provision and private enterprise.

3.6.5 Assessment

This topic was treated by Professor Keith Swanwick (Ref. III P iv) in its general context and by Seán MacLiam (Ref. I P xiii)[3] in its Leaving Certificate aspects. Formal assessment is not a feature of primary education and, provided the implementation of the new syllabus is conscientiously monitored it seems that it would be best to leave it that way. It seems that the assessment components of *diversity* and *range* (see Swanwick - Ref. II P iv) are prescriptively dealt with in second-level syllabus provision. The elusive and subjective criterion of *quality* is less threatened by the Leaving Certificate examination itself as by its multi-functional nature in trying to provide experiential music as a life value in addition to satisfying the demands of the university credit system, an approach which is inimical to any truly feelingful engagement with the subject. This is a major sticking point, the feared effects of which permeate much of the analysis of MEND (see reviews of Seán MacLiam's paper on The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision - Ref. I P xiii).

3.6.6 National Culture and Multiculturalism

The pre-MEND concern with the status of national (traditional) music within the general music curriculum expanded, during the initiative itself, into increasing awareness that the problem was but a subset of the currently almost obsessional transition, in global terms, to the multicultural conceptualization of music education. It happened that MEND and the establishment of the Irish World Music Centre at Limerick University were contemporaneous; the fact that a significant part of the work at UL is devoted to research in Irish traditional music nicely points up the affinities.

The topic was dealt with generously and comprehensively during MEND to extract the parameters or context of the Irish case. The identified protagonist in effecting balanced progress on the many problems identified is Dr Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin, Professor at UL. He is a distinguished researcher, composer and performer in the widest contexts of traditional music and its significance, in Ireland, within the world music approach to education; his input (received only in October 2000), as a guide to further progress, will form an indispensable part of future strategies. Multiculturalism still is a currently very fluid area of music education, even in so-called First World countries, and is capable of being viewed from many perspectives according to local circumstances. The following is a summary of the sometimes-conflicting ideas facing Professor Ó Súilleabháin.

1. Is the general music education system the appropriate and natural ambience in which to promote traditional music?

2. In an educational system hitherto dominated by the norms of method and repertoire derived mainly from western art music, how could already overloaded curricula be flexed to accommodate an enhanced presence of traditional music?

3. How do current methods of transmission in traditional music dovetail with understandings of achievement targets such as composition/performance and listening in formal educational settings?

4. Taking the broad (but disputed) ethnomusicological classifications of music into primitive, folk, popular and art, there needs to be some rationalization and consensus in educational terms as to

[3] See Heneghan *Revision of Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus (1993-1995) for Irish Schools*, a submission to the NCCA Course Committee, April 1994.

a. which category traditional music falls into and how a multi-classification would affect educational parameters?

b. what is the so-called first culture musical experience of Irish children? As an important side-issue to this, the status of western art music, even in its most rudimentary forms, and of traditional music has to be honestly appraised.

5. The relative sophistication and overwhelming research base associated with the norms of music education according to the western art music tradition have to be recognized and taken into account when proposing any modification to this method. In particular the mutual adaptability and compatibility of literate and non-literate approaches has to be researched.

6. The consequences to both musics of removing traditional music from its natural community settings and incorporating it in general (western-type) formal music education must be fully appreciated by strategists and eventually by the teaching cohort as trained.

7. The rationale for the inclusion of 'other' musics (multiculturalism) in education must be clearly defined and removed from romantic philosophizing.

8. The meaning and significance, in educational terms, and especially in pre-third-level contexts, of such classifications as traditional/folk, ethnic, 'musics of the world's cultures', multicultural, multi-ethnic, non-tonal, exotic etc. must be clearly understood in curriculum development and syllabus construction.

9. The nature, practicability and relevance of the contribution of music from very divergent cultures to the kind of rudimentary overall exposure to music that defines most school programmes has to be kept in perspective.

10. The particular problems of varying ethnic mixes in the school cohorts have confused much thinking on multicultural method. This has to proceed to more mature rationalization, especially as to its applicability in the Irish case.

11. The question as to how a multicultural approach (and its simplified subsets) can assist the performance aspiration must be confronted. The notions of virtuosity in non-western musics, the separation of performers from non-performers, the nature of the listening role and the definition of meaningful musical (as distinct from social) participation. . . . all of these have to be carefully defined in any appraisal of the relative merits of different approaches.

12. In the case of Irish traditional music, a plan should be sketched for the phased introduction of a more balanced mix of musical repertoire into the school experience of children. This should incorporate:

13. A statement of benefits accruing

14. Discrete phases in the transition

15. Timescale for introduction and completion

16. The nature of performance and listening within the scheme

17. The relative importance, in folk contexts, of music and movement.

18. Confrontation of the literate/non-literate method as to fruitful coexistence.

19. Uses of technology

20. The role of culture-bearing musicians in the scheme

21. The method of creating authentic musical settings for the whole scheme to flourish 'naturally'.

22. The potential within the scheme to bridge the gaps between formal education and community, and between so-called high and mass culture.

23. The use of pilot schemes.

24. Current status and future trends of relevant educational research in the Irish context

3.6.7 Third-Level Music Education

The recent growth in the Irish economy is mirrored by and, to an extent, has been the product of educational provision to sustain that growth. Third-level education, in opportunity and uptake, has spiralled in recent decades and was further augmented by the introduction of free education at under-graduate level. Although MEND argues that primary and second-level music education has been far from ideal in delivery, accessibility and resourcing (as distinct from its documented apparent availability) the situation in third-level is less threatened, once students get that far. There are genuine concerns that the current school programmes are failing to make adequate provision for those who may wish to proceed to third-level studies in music (see the review of Seán MacLiam's paper - Ref. I P xiii); the lack of a stable policy and adequate subvention of performance education outside the school system is also a major inhibiting factor in the uptake of music as a third level study.

Paradoxically there has been a proliferation of opportunity for third-level education in music and over a bewildering range of options - education, performance, musicology, music therapy and hybrids of these, but the standards achievable have a correlation to standards of entry, which have been and are influenced by the concerns at lower levels, as first publicly documented by the *Deaf Ears?* Report. There has been a tendency for third-level interests in music education to proceed independently of one another and arguably in competition which has not always been healthy. There is thus a need to rationalize, to consolidate and to optimize the option system to remove unnecessary conflict of interest. One of the characteristic features of Irish third level education in performance has been its nature as a healthy outgrowth of performance teaching in specialist schools at second-level. There are at least three institutions that have pioneered this method of ministering to the needs of budding professionalism in performance, in the absence of the more globally-familiar conservatory-type model. The recent (January 2000) announcement by government of the establishment of an Academy for the Performing Arts (APA) (including music) is, of course, a superimposition on a system already in existence. It is as yet too early to predict how this development will interrelate to, interpenetrate and collaborate with the established system. It appears from the documentation already issued with the ministerial announcement that there is every intention of creating a mosaic of educational opportunity which is not self-threatening. One of the promulgated policy intentions for the APA is that it will include teacher training in its brief with the aim of rationalizing and standardizing, and perhaps certifying, teacher training across a wide spectrum outside its own direct involvement with the training process. This objective will call for massive collaborative effort and input to achieve consensus on a way forward, but its pursuit is a most encouraging prospect for the future, if it is handled with sensitivity, democracy and impartiality.

3.6.8 A Forum for Music Education

It has been stated above that one overriding outcome from MEND has been the confirmation of the establishment of a National Forum for Music Education. The MEND initiative itself, being of fixed duration and therefore vulnerable to the fate of ephemerality, had an inbuilt strategy from its very inception, to perpetuate its work; this was enthusiastically taken up by the delegates, who merely endorsed, in enhanced numbers during MEND itself, their own agenda as developed from the outset.

The work of the Forum proceeded for one year along predictable lines. The decision to hold the fourth plenary meeting in a provincial setting and at what turned out (subsequently) to have been considered an unsociable time, led to difficulties in reconvening the forum itself, although all the substantial business of the group is fully documented and up-to-date. Although the forum is specifically seen as being an activity separate from and wholly independent of MEND, the convening group have decided that the issue of the MEND Final report, now scheduled for 2001, would be an opportune time to reconvene and pass on the findings of the MEND initiative to the Forum itself as a document contributing to its establishment, and pointing, in the absence of other comparable statements, to employable music education strategies that could bear examination by sub-committees of the Forum. The significance of MEND is emphasized as being an authentic collective voice of music educators in Ireland as to where music education stands in the country, in absolute and relative terms.

3.7 MEND Findings

1. Music education systems, while they may have similar aims, yet have intrinsic differences. They must be informed by a philosophy which is sufficiently adaptable to be capable of absorbing these differences in context.

2. There must be a route for the idealism of philosophy to penetrate effectively to music education strategists.

3. The holistic qualities of music and music education call for recognition that specialisms *will* and *must* develop and have developed. The simplest dichotomy is between academic and practical aspects. There must be mutual respect and recognition between these groups if they are to collaborate successfully in education.

4. Arising from these specializations and from an overview of philosophical advocacy, the realistic capability of any music education programme must be assessed in relation to time allocations and resources. Overloading has a stultifying effect which is anti-aesthetic (aesthetic being understood in the positive sense of artistic, musical, intrinsic).

5. The special place of performance or music-making within education should be recognized. Performance should be defined and delimited in educational terms and within particular systems. Without precise definition of its constraints it is open to misinterpretation within the understandings of certain philosophical stances.

6. The commanding resource in music education is teacher quality. Teacher training must be a priority. It must be *relevant* and it must be self- fertile in subsequent application so that a stream of suitable candidates for music teacher training is produced from the general music education system.

3.8 MEND Recommendations

The MEND recommendations appear in Section 20 at the end of this report. As has been stated, some of the presentations and debates produced group recommendations, which are listed in the appropriate place as addenda to the analysis of these topical sessions in Section 19. The main derived recommendations, taking these into account, are, however, listed under the various Agenda headings in Section 20.

4 Overview

". . . it is so intensely and deliberately didactic, and its subject is esteemed so dry, that I delight in throwing it at the heads of the wiseacres who repeat the parrot cry that art should never be didactic. It goes to prove my contention that great art can never be anything else."

George Bernard Shaw
Preface to Pygmalion

4.1 Music and Music Education –an Inseparable Pair

An investigation into music education (in Ireland) presupposes that there are inherent problems stimulating a corrective initiative in the first place. It therefore seems prudent, before embarking on a campaign (as ambitious and) so idealistically dedicated to reform as the acronymic title MEND suggests, to take pause. This would enable the promoters to establish a perspective: to attempt, in the abstract and in anticipation so to speak, a logically sequenced appraisal, if not fully to explain, at least to identify some of the reasons why music education might suffer from isolation, of varying degrees, in the curriculum, in Ireland as elsewhere.

Music is given only to man. The making and enjoyment of music, as active faculty or as vivid experience are so undeniably a part of human discourse as to be arguably universal. That we are human because we are musical is a challenging and interesting speculation. The concept and defence of music as art, and as so-called aesthetic experience, has been provocatively absorbed in the underlying mentality of much western music education philosophy, although the dialectic has general application. But music can have other more modest and less sophisticated roles to play[4] - roles that are not wanting in validity; lack of understanding, acceptance and management of this basic claim may very well constitute one of the root causes of music not being accorded universal validity as a core subject in education - that is, in actual practice (the delivered curriculum), rather than just in the lip service of stated policy.

Music may be made or listened to, the latter being the common thread which binds all those to whom music is a real presence - potentially the whole of humanity. But the most immediate sense of music is related to (and arises from) its performance, the central activity which concentrates the efforts of composer and listener alike; and there can also be absolute coalescence of the roles of composer, performer and listener. The idea of music as cultural heritage is also well appreciated. The process by which society passes on that which it values may serve as a definition of education. Music and (music) education may therefore be regarded as an inseparable pair, mutually indispensable if, as in other areas of human endeavour, music is to survive and progress from generation to generation. We thus have posited the proposal that music should be incorporated in the education process, which can be formal or informal, to name the generally accepted division in the perception of modes of transmission. If we further propose education as typically practised in so-called western society (the norm for Ireland, which is the target of this exercise), we must come to terms with the reality that what is not incorporated in formal schooling is vulnerable as a credibly universal dispensation. In this scenario music must therefore compete for time in the curriculum, and try to establish a satisfactory level of prioritization by cogent defence of its case. This has not always been accomplished with the same degree of conviction as has been possible with other branches (subjects) of the curriculum more comfortably related to policies of economic pragmatism, standards of living and employment. The myopic view of many musicians that their subject does not have to justified in education is a serious threat to its survival.

[4] See Heneghan, *Performance in Music Education* for expansion of this idea. *Music in Ireland 1848-1998*, Thomas Davis Lecture, RTÉ, (Cork, Mercier Press 1998) p.92

In education music may be seen as only a part of the wider subject of arts education; in this context its case may be helped by aligning itself with other subjects (such as drama, dance and the visual arts) to secure its place. In a fairly recent federal campaign in the US to redefine educational goals into the new millennium it is doubly significant, first that the arts were initially omitted as not being essential to core curriculum, secondly that government had to 'climb down' and instate them following a bruising campaign that culminated in a 'mega-showdown' on television.[5] There is much to be learned from this event in relation to public majority perceptions and misunderstandings of music education, which regrettably do not vary much from country to country in the western world.

So what then defines the malaise about music education, most particularly at this epochal time as a new millennium dawns, with all its hopes and enthusiasms; what are the realities of the problems (historical and typically current) faced by music educators, who, after all, are the culture bearers who must shoulder the responsibility for successful advocacy?

[5] See Professor Paul Lehman's Lecture at MEND (Ref. III P iii) *National Standards and the Realities of Achievement in Music Education* for a compelling account of this principle in action in the US, through the agency of the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC).

4.2 The Commanding Concerns in Irish Music Education

4.2.1 Taste[6] in Music

The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. From it flows all fine arts and science. . . . All composers and musicians must search deeply into mysterious ways.

Albert Einstein
quoted in John Buckley paper (Ref. I P iii)

The spectrum of music and musical activity is vast and bewildering. Most people respond favourably to some kind of music. It is no exaggeration to claim that the world is drenched with music. In some form or other it comfortably and obviously infiltrates the school, the home, the workplace and the social environment, and spills over naturally from one to the other; in this it differs radically from many other school-based subjects. A new *fin de siècle*, liberal and currently fashionable approach to education asserts the ultimate democracy of all musical genres; ostensibly there is no good or bad, better or worse. And so the private and personal world of subjective reality, where music resides, easily succumbs and validates the hubris of human taste - naïve or sophisticated. Taste is essentially value-free; there is no arguing with taste. Music, as a consequence, has become big business in this commercially-driven world. There is fierce and seductive competition for the attention and approval of the listening public. The nature of the campaign is not just honestly to establish what the public wants but actually, by subtle, seductive and powerful means unrelated to the quality of the music itself, to control popular taste; the strategy invokes the alluring democratic aspiration that the majority must be satisfied most of the time - but the majority are being manipulated by means extrinsic and arguably inimical to the more classical statements of the benefits of music. The conflict implicit in this scenario is probably the most threatening but also the most challenging of all to educational stability. Music as entertainment is largely oblivious to its dependence (for its comprehensive delivery) on formal educational structures and the professionalism that flows from them. The exposure or demystification of this interdependency is a task which conscientious educators might profitably set themselves to encourage balanced perspectives.

4.2.2 Which Music? Which Educational Strategy?

The basic task for music educators is to survey the pool of learners, accurately to determine their needs and to minister relevantly to those needs. Depending on the assumptions made, the strategies and outcomes will differ. The task becomes a dilemma when, in the choice of pedagogical materials, quality can be overruled by unschooled taste, or when educators lack the confidence to insist on an ascendancy based on well-tried principles of craft and expressiveness.[7] This is not to disavow any music but to ensure that taste as a criterion is in its proper place; it should not have absolute authority at its disposal.

The problem in general education is to establish a convincing relationship between school music and the perception of the learners as to how music matters to them in real life. It is a disturbing fact that the majority have difficulty in retrospectively correlating their school experience of music with its

[6] The question of musical taste sparked off the most controversial of all the topics discussed at the MEND Initiative. The reader is referred to the MEND paper *A book of manners in the wilderness* by Harry White, which in turn was taken up in an international context after its publication in the College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society Volume 39 (1998): pp 47-79, attracting responses from two of the most distinguished living contributors to music education philosophy - Bennett Reimer and David Elliott (with collaborator Kari Veblen) The reviews are discussed in this report (Section 18.1.1).

[7] See Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, PRENTICE-HALL,INC, 1970 13th Printing, rev. 1989) p.133

significance in their life, contemporaneous or subsequent. This is an important consideration with music, since it eventually is or becomes a part of real life. To the time-honoured methodology of presenting music as received product, based on the monuments and scholarship of the past, a counterposition is now commonly adopted which treats music as process and social text, stressing, *inter alia*, its value as entertainment. Advocacy of these approximately-stated approaches has all but locked philosophers of music education in a truceless war.[8] The proposals of the warring factions also correspond roughly to strategies championing music-making as a central activity, on the one hand, or a more eclectic dispensation, separating performing and listening strands along axes of time and levels of interest, on the other. Both are laudable solutions, internally consistent based on the assumed parameters, and worthy of scrutiny as models; neither is contextually suited to the Irish case, as will be argued in the analysis of the MEND documentation.

4.2.3 Music Education as Regenerative Cycle

Because western music (as one popularly-perceived paradigm)[9], with its norms and derivatives, is such a protean, often complex, highly developed and sophisticated field, the challenges to educators striving to make suitable provision and limiting choices in the curriculum are daunting. Since the object of general music education is clearly not to produce a nation of professional musicians, the aim should be, within the constraints of curricular time available, to give a balanced exposure to and experience of the activities broadly defined as composing, performing and listening (including appraising). Some assert that the resulting dilution of quality (a time-dependent parameter) from this levelling-out or sampling procedure is too high a price to pay for an all-but-bland result, and recommend streaming (quasi-specialization) to offset boredom in the talented and frustration in the less gifted. Overriding all these considerations should be the concern as to whether the process is self-sustaining and regenerative; in other words does it (or should it?) produce an effective career route for the small percentage of learners who may wish to proceed to study music at third level? If the spectrum of expectations from curricular outputs is too wide nobody will be well served in the end; surely, in this context, to attempt to meet the goals of amateurs and aspiring professionals in a single course specification is too ambitious. If, additionally, curricular time is limited, the claim that school music has the potential to be regenerative and self-replicating is unsustainable. There is a vast difference in aims between a course designed to give a balanced exposure to music and one which purports either to develop the more time-consuming physical skills (such as those demanded for adequate performance) or to encourage free composition or a musicological expertise at any level of pre-vocational competence. There continues to be much confusion, in global terms, in limiting curricular inputs to match time allocations and the delivered curriculum with credible results.

4.2.4 Performance and the Dimension of Skill in Music-Making

In appraising the feasibility of a music education package there is merit in identifying those components which yield a high index of results to effort, but it is pragmatic also to take into account levels of learner satisfaction. It is surely axiomatic that, in music, the attainment of performing skills, if they could be painlessly procured, would outstrip all other learner aspirations. But physical skills are known to be notoriously refractory to ready acquisition; inordinate inputs of time are demanded, even for the naturally gifted. It seems, therefore, that special provision should be made for those (a minority) who are prepared to make the appropriate investment of time and effort to perform either competently or proficiently.[10] Essentially, however, the nature of performance (including its

[8] The seemingly polar philosophical positions of Bennett Reimer and David Elliott (authors referred to in the above footnote) and presented by them at MEND Phase II led to important findings. The reader is referred to the relevant Proceedings and Analysis (Section 18.1.2 Contextual Philosophy).

[9] This is not to pre-empt the ascendancy of western culture. Other approaches to music education including the oral tradition and multiculturalism are also treated in this report.

[10] The terms competent, proficient and expert are used to define levels of attainment in music. These are relative terms and have not, to the writer's knowledge, been adequately defined as a usable criterion.

psychological dimensions) should be critically examined and defined in relation to the inevitably modest levels achievable as a direct result of inputs in general school ambiences. To deal effectively with the dominant position of performance as an aspiration must, however, remain an overriding preoccupation of all music educators. Performance or the lack of it has deleteriously dichotomized musical society for thousands of years. Non-performers might realistically, in the vast majority of cases, be construed as those who do not wish to invest time rather than those who lack the interest. Clearly, proficient performance is for the minority

4.2.5 Other Values as Drain on Musical Competence

Even considering western music alone, its resplendent development and levels of sophistication lend themselves to specialization in education. But the school is not the appropriate ambience in which this can be undertaken. That is not to say that what is accomplished in general education should not have a natural continuum and ready adaptability to subsequent specialization; in Ireland this is no longer a stated aim, but it is not outside the scope of school music should the subject be more imaginatively catered for by wider options and other incentives.[11] The mode of delivery of a school music programme will vary considerably according to how its function within the curriculum is perceived. If music is seen as a non-examination subject (an almost unattainable ideal at second-level) which may add something significant to the quality of life, there are attendant dangers of its not being taken seriously if it is imposed, or of its being abandoned (as an option) when hard choices of credit-bearing subjects have to be made. If, on the other hand, the subject is married to appraisal, assessment and examination techniques it can lose much of its charm and subjectivity. This is another problem for curriculum strategists in attempting to make the subject, whether mandatory or not, appealing to the learner. And an attractively constructed and articulated curriculum is valueless unless the quality of teaching is assured and teacher training is comprehensively relevant to the curriculum - as promulgated, as implemented and as delivered.

In Ireland we have had a national curriculum, recognizing the contribution and status of music, almost from the foundation of the modern state. There is copious evidence that its implementation has been flawed in terms of the results achieved.[12] We are now in a phase of testing a comprehensive revision (at both primary and second level); there is hope that it will have avoided many of the pitfalls alluded to above. A crucial consideration is that of continuity between all components - primary/secondary, junior/senior cycle and second/third level; already there is concern about the latter, where discontinuity has the most serious consequences as inhibiting if not thwarting, at source, the flow of candidates to professional music, and therefore threatening the regenerative cycle.

4.2.6 A Contextual Philosophy of Music Education

It has already been stated that there is a seeming chasm separating the two main schools of philosophical thought where the approach to music education in the general (school) curriculum is concerned. The rationales both originated in the North American Continent. {For the moment let the specializations [Performance, Teaching, and other academic pursuits including Composition and Musicology] be set apart as belonging to the vocational/professional streams, which are nevertheless very sensitive to decisions taken at the lower levels, which should act as their potential feeder system.} Although more than a quarter of a century separates the promulgation of these philosophies they did not spring into existence independently. The first (Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* 1970/rev. 1989) is an impressive and admirable reworking and drawing together, for the purposes of education, of the tenets of Absolute Expressionism, with attributable links to the earlier work of

[11] See Frank Heneghan *Revision of Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus (1993-1995) for Irish Schools*, a submission to the NCCA Course Committee, April 1994. Copies on request to the author.
[12] The *Deaf Ears?* Report (Arts Council 1985) is invoked many times in this report, and gives convincing evidence of the uneven availability of music education, in quality and quantity, to Irish children.

Dewey, Meyer, Langer and Leonhard, *inter alia*. In practice it has become associated with Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE). Ostensibly reacting against the interpreted principles on which MEAE is based, the praxial philosophy of music education (Elliott, *Music Matters*, 1995), admirable though it is as an elaborately if somewhat ponderously stated theory, is arguably derivative; this is because it aggressively (or so it is perceived) sets itself the task of deconstructing MEAE, in relation to which it would like to see itself in a somewhat polar position.

Superficially, then, the identified protagonists in music education philosophy seem currently to be in such total disagreement that it augurs badly in relation to any stable position being possible as a basis for music education, for détente seems improbable. This theme was copiously considered during MEND Phase III, with hope for positive results as to rationalization and even reconciliation. And it is significant that the core of their disagreement resides in their attitude to the role of performance; again this interpretation strongly emanates from the Elliott philosophy though it is perhaps overstated as a criticism of MEAE. This, of course, is not surprising. Performance[13], as has been stated, is obviously the central act and aspiration of music-making. And in the writer's view, all music education arguments which do not fully recognize the intimate relationship of skills to satisfactory and satisfying performance (and there are such arguments) are fundamentally flawed. And it is interesting that in the copious textual material defining the above-mentioned philosophical stances there is no specific attempt made to define performance in its psychologically satisfying dimension; this clears the path for a great deal of invective which misses its target, simply because the target is not precisely delimited. The psychomotor dimension in music cannot be underplayed in championing, rather, its cognitive and affective dimensions. This automatically highlights the element of time; skills are painfully time-dependent in their acquisition. And time can be the virtual enemy of curriculum builders; but it can also be a beneficial taskmaster in meeting the challenges of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, if achievable targets are defined.

The management of the performance issue is therefore a key dilemma in general music education. Because this basic truth is recognized, albeit only subconsciously at times, there is a great deal of posturing evident in proposals to give performance a central role in school music education. Ultimately the learners will decide what passes for a satisfying experience in performance; they will have their role models against which to measure themselves and they will unquestionably realize and experience the sometimes-painful realities of skill acquisition and its time-dependency. If skills and time are wanting the music programme becomes emasculated and vulnerable; it is only the ministries of highly motivated and expertly trained teachers who can satisfactorily redeem that situation. By definition this introduces another problem for music education strategists; the delivered curriculum is only as effective as the relevant skills of teachers can make it.

It is proposed, then, that for any music education system, if it is to work successfully, there must be, as an absolute priority, an underlying philosophy which suits the context. The purpose of the MEND initiative is, *inter alia*, to establish what that context is for the Irish case. There is a marked degree of consensus that music (of any genre) is culturally significant and can be accommodated within the broader ideals of aesthetics, in general, and Absolute Expressionism in particular. (This claim is defended, taking into account the counterpositions, in the section of this report dealing with the Irish Context [Rationalization – Towards A Contextual Philosophy for Music Education in Ireland]). It is, therefore, not a question of pillaging the many admirable works of music philosophy to yield a hotchpotch masquerading under the name of eclecticism. Ireland has been too long prey to this kind of approach. It is, rather, a call to a careful search for significant points of agreement and an attempt to explain or, better still, to reconcile the differences in received theorizing. It is hoped that the proceedings of MEND, as herein reported, will enable this fundamental task to be taken to a more

[13] For a thorough working of the topic of the significance of performance in music education the reader is referred to two (different) papers on the subject by the author - Heneghan, *Performance in Music Education* (Arts on the Edge Conference, Perth, Western Australia 1998; published proceedings), and Heneghan, *Music in Ireland; Performance in Music Education* (Thomas Davis Lecture, Radio Telefís Éireann 1998, published Mercier Press).

developed stage in the Irish context. For the purposes of the evolution of this contextual philosophy of music education the following checklist may prove useful.

1. The general (school) music education programme is the essential nexus on which the whole edifice of *universal* music education depends in western society. A general music education curriculum exists to celebrate and accommodate the notion that music is an important dimension in human discourse worthy of inclusion as an element in education. At worst, it may be no more than a minimal experiential exposure programme, but, even as such, it is a key element in the campaign to promote music activities of all kinds. It is as important to be clear on what it is *not* as on what it *is*.

2. The general music education programme exists to recognize music as a life force while simultaneously recognizing that only a small percentage of learners will have any further pedagogical contact with it after the school experience. It should seek to define and convey what ought to be minimally absorbed by all learners in pursuance of the ideal of 'music for all'. Typically it should not be geared to professionalism (in learners) but it should have recognizable awareness (conceptually, or strategically, through its liaisons with other music education agencies) of the need to regenerate - in other words to facilitate aspiring professionals. Above all it should not see quality (and even standard) as irreconcilable with mass participation.

3. Specializations in music have their place in education; these must also be appropriately provided for. Performance is the central act of musical experience. It is still ripe for continuing research, not so much as to its place in education (which ought to be axiomatic) as to the strategies and methodology to insinuate it honestly, sensibly and effectively into the general curriculum. Since performance (by whatever definition) is now fully embraced in the Irish music education curriculum as an important if not dominant element, the purveyors of practical expertise (by definition from outside the school ambience) should be recognized for their potential contribution, and should be invited to participate in the general programme in an atmosphere of mutual esteem between the professional dispensers of the programme.

4. The application of democratic principles in music education is not only laudable, when used skilfully and in a discerning way, but is also unusually adaptable. Thus the many ways in which music can be experienced should be accommodated and validated; it is not necessary to impose unchallengeable hierarchies. 'It is not surprising that several of the greatest composers who have established themselves among history's greatest wrote music that seems equally suitable for appreciation of its formal qualities or its sensuous qualities or its expressive power.[14] Aesthetic experience may seemingly represent the highest reaches and explore the most profound depths of musical experience. But music enjoyed for its formal qualities or for the intellectual pleasure afforded by analysis should not be disavowed. Nor should we outlaw music which unashamedly seeks merely to entertain without engaging the mind in lofty thoughts. Music's cathartic potential and its associative referential qualities do not invalidate it as music, nor can we ignore the thinly disguised uses of music-making as a measure of achievement in performance or other musical activity.[15] But neither should it be that 'anything goes', and this dictates another adaptation of the democratic principle. Rather then validating all genres of music indiscriminately, as essentially of equal merit, especially in the choice of educational materials, judgement, an indispensable guiding principle in education, must be invoked. Criteria for judgement must be established and applied; there is no other way if education itself is to live up to its reputation as developing discriminatory powers in the learners.

[14] Harold F. Abeles and Charles R. Hoffer, Foundations of Music Education (London: Collier Macmillan Publishers,1984), p. 62

[15] See Heneghan *Performance in Music Education*, (Music In Ireland, Mercier Press 1998) p.92.

Education principle should be virtually proof against the false moral pressure of being deemed élitist, and can succeed by defining quality in terms that are not essentially exclusive. The writer is impressed by Bennett Reimer's recommended approach to value judgements. " . . . 'excellence' has to do with the level of syntactical or structural refinement in the music. . . . but it is not sufficient for judging musical quality. A second aspect of value must be included. This . . . has to do with the level of profundity of the music's expressive content".[16]

5. A contextual philosophy of music education must be sensitive to the over-riding influence of real time, whether from the educational strategist's point of view, in fashioning curriculum and syllabus materials which can be delivered in the curricular time-slot available, or from the learner's perspective, in seeking to make study time available to meet the demands of the curriculum. Time becomes a crucial element when dealing with physical skills. Thus the performance option again becomes problematic. The MEAE programme in the US has been severely criticized for its pragmatism in catering primarily (or so it is alleged) for those (the majority) who voluntarily decide against a performing option. Its effects are variously described (and this has been observed in practice in the US by the author) as essentially dichotomizing - depriving performers of the opportunities adequately to acquire so-called musicianship skills while capitulating in relation to any possibility of providing hands-on experiences for non-performers. The foil philosophy of praxialism (characterized by insistence on the practice of the art being an integral and dominant part of the education process), while idealistically attractive (who can cavil at the idea of painlessly-acquired performing abilities and experiences), has to contend with the notion of a spectrum of performance experiences being possible with minimal inculcated physical skills, and demands a teaching cohort which boasts high-level comprehensive skills (both academic and practical); neither of these features boosts immediate confidence in its general feasibility.

6. A contextual philosophy of music education for universal dispensation must, by definition and above all, be feasible in practice when the constraints of the context are taken into account. Constraints may not invalidate the basic philosophical principles but may seriously impede their success in action. They may highlight difficulties with the accessibility and availability of the educational package itself, historical lacunae in the music education provision, relationships with and dependency on feeder and follow-on systems, resources both fiscal/physical and human, curricular time allocations in all aspects, the social and political milieu, priorities in education, the role of assessment and the criteria adopted, performance aspirations, general levels of cultural awareness and bias/preference in postulant learners.

The most critical parameter in securing the success of a philosophy in action is the availability and quality of the teaching resource itself. And it is not sufficient that teachers be relevantly trained in the pedagogical and methodological implications of the curriculum flowing from the philosophy. They must be familiar with the detail of the philosophy itself, if possible by involvement in the drafting of schemes of instruction or in ongoing reappraisals of the success of the philosophy in action. This involves the insinuation, for approval and acceptance (and even for modification in context), of the

[16] Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, PRENTICE-HALL, INC, 1970 13th Printing), p103.
'Two aspects of musical 'goodness' can be identified as the bases on which value-judgments can be made. . . . To the extent that the construction of a piece of music is marked by qualities of skillfulness, expertness, competence, aptness, consistency of style, clarity of basic intent, sufficient complexity and variety for its scope, adroitness, inventiveness, craftsmanship, the piece can reasonably be judged to be 'better' than one which is lacking in these qualities. . . . To the extent that the conditions of expressiveness in a particular piece are capable of producing deep, abiding insights into the nature of subjective reality that piece can be called 'great'. . . . The notion of musical excellence as one basis for choosing 'good music' can be of immediate use to the practicing music educator'

philosophy (or contending philosophies) at the earliest opportunity in the teacher training cycle. Professionalism in the purveyors of music education at all levels has never been so crucial.

5 Music in Irish Education - A Summary

"The sheer plenitude of musical experience means that the process of music education is inherently prone to incompleteness in any given society and, for our purposes, in Ireland."

Harry White (MEND Phase I: Ref. I P viii)
The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland

5.1 Recent Provision

The introduction of state-sponsored education in Ireland dates from 1831. The inclusion of music in the curriculum dates from 1840.[17] Until well into the twentieth century the vast majority had no more than primary education. The situation as we enter the new millennium is, however, one of educational excellence and copious opportunity. There is even a free scheme for third-level education for all those suitably qualified. But the subject of music cannot be claimed either to have been treated with the importance accorded to language, number and the sciences, or to have kept pace, by government fiat, with developments in those areas at any time.[18]

The mosaic of music education provision in Ireland is bedevilled by a flawed appreciation and understanding of what music education is or should be; it lacks consensus on a guiding philosophy. It is multi-dichotomous in revealing the same divisions - along the axes of product/process, academic/practical, music-making (composing/performing)/listening - that are characteristic of music education systems in the developed countries. The state-school system, which should be the ideal provider, has dealt very inadequately with the concept of 'music for all'. There is a National Curriculum which has had several revisions, prompted by dissatisfaction with its content, relevance and mode of delivery. The autonomous nature of both primary and secondary schooling has raised difficulties in the curricular planning of a comprehensively inter-related music programme. Because of serious breakdown between the intended, implemented and delivered curriculum in primary schools (An Curaclam Nua, 1971), the levels of musical competence attainable before the transition to secondary education have been grossly unpredictable, leading to further breakdown in the essential continuum. There are encouraging signs in the introduction of a new curriculum (1999) but much will depend on the professional backup to secure its success in practice. There are clearly definable problems with teacher training (and so, without teacher culpability, with quality and relevance of teaching), with free availability and distribution of music education, with time allocations (or overloading) within the curriculum - and the inevitable outcome of threatened or indifferent standards. Music in secondary schools seems to be examination-driven, and at Leaving Certificate level it tends to be valued more for its credit potential towards university entrance than for the intrinsic worth of the subject itself. Performance, at an acceptable level of competence, does not play a significant role in general education (compare, for example, the United States, where it has sparked off divisive philosophical controversy). Its availability in the private sector, at a price, has created a further dichotomy, *inter alia*, along socio-economic grounds, gratuitously dubbing the subject élitist. The question of the place of performance in general music education is currently a global issue which is tending towards solutions in favour of its inclusion, without enhancing its quality or without defining what it is that constitutes acceptable performance. Ireland is, coincidentally, caught up in the throes of this controversy, as is obvious from the latest curricular revisions (1990s, in secondary education at

[17] Marie McCarthy, *Passing It On: The Transmission of Music in Irish Culture* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1999 Chapter 3), 45 *et seq.*

[18] This is not atypical. It is necessary only to consider the Goals 2000 Education Act (March 1992) in the US to see how an aggressive campaign mounted by the National Coalition for Music Education succeeded in forcing the Federal Government to reverse its earlier decision (1989) to exclude the arts from the national goals for education.

Junior and Senior levels), which it is currently too soon to pronounce on as to their effectiveness, though they have attracted many ready critics.

Third-level music education opportunities have proliferated in recent years but the curriculum here has undergone considerable change (notably in improved recognition of performance skills and in the watering down of the traditional Oxbridge models which elevated musicianship, in the form of academic prowess, above all other accomplishments). There have been timely and encouraging developments in performance specialisms, teacher training (secondary) and post-graduate studies, but this system too is overripe for some form of rationalization. In particular the ongoing dialogue with Government in relation to the establishment of a National Academy for the Performing Arts (APA) (confirmed in January 2000) should take cognizance of the proliferation already present and in need of closer surveillance, optimization and integration. The act of establishment is, it is hoped, merely the first step in a process of consultation, which should safeguard the interests of all institutional contributors to professional training in performance and performance teaching.

As the new millennium dawns, the concerns which overarch the whole music education dispensation in Ireland, as indeed elsewhere, relate to the socio-educational phenomenon of conflict between high- and mass-culture. The cleavage is not new but it is aggravated by the currently insatiable cupidity of the mass media and the rampant self-interest of commercial music, each wielding a virtually invincible but still subtle power - on the one hand to seduce the majority into demanding of education the satisfaction of undiscriminating taste in music and, on the other, to force educators into reluctant compliance.

6 The Stimulus of the *Deaf Ears?*[19] Report

"For some the formal systems may be crucial points of access. For others though, the contribution of educational institutions to their personal music education will be negligible and could even be negative in effect."

Keith Swanwick
Problems and possibilities in assessing musical progression. p.1.
MEND Phase III (Ref. III P iv)

6.1 European Year of Music 1985

The fortuitous occurrence of the European Year of Music in 1985 prompted the Arts Council (of Ireland) to commission a report on the provision of music education in Irish schools. The document, published at the end of the year in question, had the provocative and reproachful title of *Deaf Ears?*; its message was far from what might have been expected or hoped for. "By any standards the state of music education is not a happy one in Ireland", commented Dr Ciarán Benson, the Chairman of the Steering Committee, in the Introduction. Significantly, in the context of contemporaneous global trends in music education, the report commented favourably, but only as exceptional initiatives, on progress being made, in Ireland, in instrumental training opportunities and in the relevance of third-level courses then in development. But these were seen as insufficient in the light of the need. The school system, which was the commissioned focus for the author, Donald Herron, was found to be seriously wanting in delivering the promise of the published/intended curriculum. If a single sentence could summarize the extent of the problem and simultaneously throw down the gauntlet both to the culprits (if identifiable) and to would-be reformers it was that " the young Irish person has the worst of all European musical 'worlds'".

There were no surprises for music educators, at any level, in this disturbing and melodramatic confirmation of their worst fears, but they were slow, as musicians often are, to galvanize themselves into united action, or to target the lack of resources, the political advocacy to provide them without discrimination, much less their own plight as the prior victims of that deprivation, as possible root causes. As Ciarán Benson also so pertinently observed: "we need to distinguish explanations that have to do with an inability to finance a comprehensive national programme of music education from explanations that have to do with an inability to establish the educational importance of music education"[20] - a very well-aimed comment which targeted politicians and music educators alike.[21] And, of course, recognition of music's educational importance is presumed to carry with it the responsibility for ensuring that it is dispensed with equality, economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

The history of education in Ireland, and the provision of music within it, could not have led to any other result. The provision of basic education in the three R's which had characterized the nineteenth century 'colonial' dispensation to a population largely definable as peasants and artisans had been fertilized with music, from 1840 onwards, through the good offices of the aesthetically aware Sir Thomas Wyse.[22] But this had been systematically swamped by an understandable mentality, which

---

[19] The *Deaf Ears?* Report was issued by the Arts Council in November 1985. Perusal of the *Deaf Ears?* Report is recommended for a full exposé of the unhappy state of music education in Ireland at that time. But, apart from encouraging signs for the future, could it now be claimed by those committed to the transmission of musical skills that the situation since 1985 has shown any marked improvement, its being as yet too soon to comment on the ultimate effects of the curricular revisions of the 90s?

[20] Ciarán Benson quoted in the Introduction to the *Deaf Ears?* Report, p. viii.

[21] See the text of Harold Abeles, *The Rôle of Philosophy in the Development of Professional Music Educators* (Ref. III P ii) and of Paul Lehman, *National Standards and the Realities of Achievement in Music Education* (Ref. III P iii)(MEND Phase III November 1996)

[22] See McCarthy, *Passing It On: The Transmission of Music in Irish Culture*, 45 *et seq.*

saw education in terms of its utilitarian potential for the workplace and emigration; music had little place in such a scenario. Instrumental music was too expensive for the majority and was available only at a very low level of competence - another feature that might have been expected in a poor and conquered European offshore island. As Ireland's political and economic fortunes developed in this century our preoccupations, at various times, with a variety of pressing educational issues - the promotion (if not the restoration) of the Irish language, the additional need for non-artistic proficiency in European languages and, finally, the demands for technological skills in the interests of the country's economy - all militated against and inevitably played down the importance of music as a school subject. It has always been the old story of the arts having to wait for an upturn in economic fortunes, which is never sufficiently impressive or stable to enable conditional promises to be taken seriously.[23] Hellenic ideals, aided by the liberal arts mentality of mediaeval universities, were upheld too in the imperial models passed on to Irish education. The universities controlled the curriculum imposed in secondary schools; this succeeded in entrenching the intellectual (theoretical) approach to music education. The training of teachers for primary education used the child-centred model; many candidates were chosen from rural areas where skills in the Irish language acted in their favour. Again music was not taken sufficiently seriously by general education strategists, and the music component in primary teacher training was derisory in terms of what it could achieve in practice. Teachers for second-level schools were academically oriented and therefore this approach became the norm, and had the effect of turning music for examination purposes (and there was time for little outside this provision) into an élitist subject which was perceived as being too difficult (or too dry) for ordinary students.[24] The anomaly of the importation of instrumental music into secondary schools from the private sector, as an assessed component in examinations, further dichotomized the music cohorts in a discriminatory and damaging way. All of this may be in a process of change but the accuracy of the assessment for the 1980s is largely unchallengeable.

Tout court, the school system of music education was seen in 1985 as a failure in terms of contemporary socio/philosophical thought. With few exceptions it engaged the sympathies of neither the educators nor the learners, making music an endangered subject; the gravity of this finding was to deepen over the ensuing decade There was insufficient concentration in the implemented curriculum; there were regional and socio/economic inequalities. Serious discontinuities between junior and senior cycles sometimes appeared as virtual deprivation; pedagogical approaches were seen as too academic and too formidably lacking in active music-making to hold the interest of the majority. There was encouraging evidence of a healthy dispensation in the private sector, which had always attempted to provide the exact positive equivalent to the perceived omissions in the school system. But this came at a price, and violated the cherished ideal of music freely dispensed and generally available through state-sponsored education - a classical dilemma only too familiar to music educators. The few public initiatives[25] over the past fifteen years, admirable as they were in themselves, were concerned with specific grievances and merely sharpened the instruments of a more thorough appraisal. **The situation seemed to call for a collective response to the grim assertions of the *Deaf Ears?* Report - one that would be far-reaching and comprehensive in its brief, systematic, impartial and distanced in its enactment, and capable of claiming the support of the entire music education lobby, public and professional. The Music Education National Debate (MEND), which was conceived as a logical, proactive sequence to the Arts Council Report aspired to the filling of that role.**

[23] The recent allocation of funding to establish an Academy of the Performing Arts and to develop the Cork School of Music (Cork Institute of Technology) may now be cited as welcome exceptions to this axiom.
[24] This chapter of the history of music education in secondary schools, in the quintessentially important context of the Leaving Certificate, is comprehensively dealt with in Oliver Hynes, *A Marketing Audit of Music as a Subject in the Leaving Certificate* (Dublin: University of Dublin, Trinity College, unpublished thesis). Mr Hynes is a current Department of Education Inspector of Music.
[25] Leaving Certificate Campaign; Music in the Classroom initiative (sponsored by the Irish Times in 1995); PIANO (Provision and Institutional Arrangements Now for Orchestras and Ensembles) - a report (published 1996) commissioned by the Minister for Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht.

7 The Music Education National Debate (MEND) as natural sequel to *Deaf Ears?*

"It has been a feature of MEND discovery that problems are more soluble singly than in their interactive context, which is the problem in Irish music education."

Frank Heneghan
MEND Final Report

7.1 Response to *Deaf Ears?*

The brief of the *Deaf Ears?* Report was to research the situation (music education in Irish schools) but not necessarily to offer suggestions as to how it might be mended (MENDed!). The enormity of such a task obviously had to look to the future for a suitable initiative. Although the report had not been responded to in any significant way by the early 1990s, it was potentially epochal. It has never been counter-claimed that its findings were biased or exaggerated. In relation to the most advanced systems of music education operating in Europe it could be accurately deduced that Ireland's performance did not even register on the scale. Even if an element of sensationalism had been a tempting strategy to make its point it would have been superfluous; the relativity factor was so overwhelmingly damning that it merely confirmed the melodramatic processes of incrimination. Worst of all was the fact that in its dedicated focus - that of the crucial school music programme - its message was one of unrelieved gloom. The report was factual and statistical; a summary of its main concerns was woven into the introduction by Dr Ciarán Benson. The Report called for the drafting of a national policy on music education.

> It is a matter of urgency that all concerned with education in Ireland, and especially the Curriculum and Examinations Board and the Department of Education, work towards the formulation of a comprehensive coherent national policy on music education. It is a separate, though obviously highly relevant, issue as to whether it is financially possible to implement such a plan in its entirety from the start. But the existence of such a coherent plan would lessen the possibility of ad hoc gestures and would increase the likelihood of implementing a genuinely comprehensive and educationally worthwhile music programme for Ireland.

It is scarcely premature to suggest that the preparation of such a draft would have to be a priority agenda item for any agency essaying to respond to the report; its very title (*Deaf Ears?)*was redolent of despair and, as the chairman of the steering committee feared, that title was to become a sad prophecy. But an embryo response had already taken root within months of the issue of the report. The chilling statement that "the young Irish person has the worst of all European musical 'worlds'" had galvanic power and found its target, albeit in a somewhat surprising context.

The challenge was eventually met when Dr Brendan Goldsmith, the newly-appointed President of the Dublin Institute of Technology, announced, in February 1994, that the Institute, as a culmination of its own programme of reform in music education, would facilitate and sponsor a thorough review of the Irish music education scene. The Music Education National Debate, with its provocatively relevant acronymic title - MEND - was born, with the implicit invitation to all interested in the welfare of music education in Ireland to participate. It had been nearly a decade in gestation, but its link with *Deaf Ears?* and its aspiration to respond positively to its scenario of gloom were clearly signposted. The ultimate goal was, through a wide-ranging programme of public debates on issues of music education, to suggest a model for the establishment of a permanent forum, which would organize, democratize and prioritize those issues, and then act as a pressure group to lead on to satisfactory outcomes.

Obviously time had moved on since the European Year of Music, and problems not adverted to in the report of that year had added further complexity to the situation. Apparently the DIT itself, which had been uniquely established by Act of the Oireachtas (1992), saw itself in a phase of growth in academic prowess, ultimately aspiring to university status, in which the full spectrum of its provision of music education was not perceived to fit comfortably.[26] In spite of the ministerial decision (1990) to consolidate the then DIT College of Music in the autonomous Institute and an amendment to the Act which specifically enfranchised the so-called apprenticeship category of education within its dispensation, the Governing Body of DIT was still having second thoughts, well orchestrated, which seemed selectively targeted at primary and second level music education for some form of relegation or sequestration. This, of course, had national significance since the DIT was the largest institutional dispenser of music education in the state. The other event which had a destabilizing effect on the whole fabric of music education was the crisis of standards and content in the Leaving Certificate programme. These two major concerns (one in general music education and potentially affecting all learners, the other in the specialized area of performance training) added to the litany of musical woes listed in the *Deaf Ears?* Report, and formed the background against which MEND took shape.

7.2 Presidential Patronage for MEND

The MEND initiative engaged the interest of the President of Ireland, Mary Robinson, who also agreed to become the patron of the culminating phase.

[26] The DIT typifies the end result of a mosaic of musical provision which makes Irish semi-state dispensation unique in a European context. All levels of practical training, from the most elementary to the highest post graduate levels, from amateur to professional, are catered for under a single management structure. The Institute itself, of which its College (now Conservatory) of Music is but a small component, has recently (1993) been established by legislation as a degree-awarding agency in its own right and within its own provision. It therefore has more than a passing interest in the confirmation of the unusual music education hybrid, ministering to all levels, as suitable for retention within its ambit. This has, in itself, become a major issue in Irish music education. The sequel to these concerns within the Institute, and the ramifications of the so-called *binary* system of third-level education in Ireland are commented on in a separate section dealing with the DIT (Section 7.3) in this Report.

7.3 The Dublin Institute of Technology

The Dublin Institute of Technology, a fast-growing educational mammoth, had evolved from the old Technical Institutes of that city and had been consolidating itself - as a huge six-college unit - under the control of the City of Dublin Vocational Education (CDVEC), as that body's enterprise in the area of third-level-related studies. It had come into being in 1978 as the Committee's reaction to a fear that its numerous and expanding degree programmes might be picked off individually in some further Government rationlization after the failure of CDVEC to prevail in the eventual and bitter settlement of 'the Ballymun project' which was the beginnings of the history of the establishment of Dublin City University (DCU). The educational pursuits of the Institute were well interpenetrated with the fabric of vocational education in a national sense. The Institute had an impressive array of courses and was historically committed, from the very earliest days of its colourful evolution, to music education. Its College of Music had kept pace with developments at third level within the Institute and by the early 1990s had an impressive array of third-level programmes, including a tripartite music education degree, operated jointly with TCD and the RIAM (and dedicated to second-level aspects), to which it had contributed handsomely in the planning stages. It also had an autonomous performance degree, validated by Trinity College, and was in the advanced stages of launching three-year wholetime diploma courses in instrumental/vocal teaching and drama (for the private sector).

The work of the College of Music was based and dependent on its long history of practical training in performance studies over the widest spectrum. In this it could be seen to be providing all those branches of music education which seemed typically outside the scope of school provision, this being the rationale which brought it into being in the first place.[27] It was gratuitously, and without any formal recognition, providing an array of services to the third level music education sector (not least in producing quality candidature, but also in bolstering the instrumental skills which third level students of music-related courses were expected to have) and to the state schools (and therefore the Dept of Education indirectly) in the case of many of the so-called Syllabus B candidates for Leaving Certificate. It could thus be seen to have, outside of its traditional activities, a very real connection into music education at all levels, but especially across the practico-academic divide. Its work had been favourably commented on in the Deaf Ears? Report. Because of its leading rôle in the development of music education at third level, responding to the realities of the demand, and in a relevant way unfettered by the many conventions that had been inhibiting this branch of music education over a long period, it seemed to be ideally equipped to lead a new campaign for a better overall provision.

The driving force for a new initiative came from the writer and his colleagues: the timing of the campaign was precipitated by higher management concerns, alluded to above, within the Institute itself in relation to its own contribution to Music Education in Ireland. This reappraisal of its rôle was itself the product of a systematic programme of development which was accelerating into uncharted regions signalled by DIT's having been, by compelling negotiation, the subject of separate legislation when third level education in the technological sector was being rationalized by law. The relevant Act of the Oireachtas handsomely recognized the Institute's long history of providing third-level education by allowing it, eventually, to make its own awards at degree and post-graduate level. There was thus a secondary set of circumstances to be taken into account which in no way detracted from the goodwill of the Institute's concern about the future of music education in a national context. In seeking to clarify its own position it was necessary that this should be seen first against the background of the significance of its contribution to music education within the national framework. It scarcely needs to be stated that the stimulus for this self-appraisal within the DIT came from concerned musicians, anxious to highlight, for Institute management, the essential integrity and interdependence of DIT's music education modules; but it was also necessary to stress the importance of the exercise to their own survival and to the national music education endeavour, not only in terms

[27] The history of music education in the DIT is comprehensively treated in the College of Music publication (1994) *Coláiste an Cheoil: College of Music - A Musical Journey 1890-1993* by the historian, Jim Cooke.

of the sheer quantity of DIT involvement but also of its flagship status, capable of influencing the whole music education enterprise at all levels.

Clearly an ambitious project was in the making which, by clarifying the whole DIT music dilemma, born of the Institute's sudden virtually obsessive preoccupation with its exclusively third-level interests, would have a complementary function in establishing how the national dispensation in music education impinged on the DIT and vice versa. The music protagonists were adamant that the interpenetrations between the two systems were obvious but that they should, in some aspects, also both involved and subtle, be subjected to informed interpretation as to their continuing implications.

As in the case of the *Deaf Ears?* Report, an anchoring concept had to be found, but in this case one which would view Music Education in its more comprehensive contexts. There was little doubt that to consider the general education system from its earliest levels, through secondary schooling and even into its more specialized applications at third level (now directly state-subsidized) was the route most likely to impress for its identification with or search for the enabling concept of continuum. However this was seen as uncomfortably isolating performance in its more proficient aspirations; and performance, it was felt, and as it turned out to be, was going to be one of the major sticking points as to how music education should be organized. It was therefore decided that, without over-emphasizing the performance bias, school music would be singled out as a fundamentally important desideratum, which could then be linked to any or all of the items that eventually crystallized in the agenda as significant. This also had the advantage of continuum with the *Deaf Ears?* preoccupations.

8 Pre-MEND Perceptions

8.1 Towards an Agenda

The author of this report (Frank Heneghan), then the Director of its College of Music, was deputed by DIT to lead the MEND Initiative and redesignated, at a personal level, Director of Cultural Affairs of the Institute. His brief, however, was primarily to organize, in a systematic way, the conduct of the investigation. The object of MEND was not (indeed it could not have been) to effect solutions but rather to re-identify, collectively, the manifold problems of Music Education in Ireland and to offer them to the whole music-loving community for open debate in an attempt to take the findings of *Deaf Ears?*, and other related concerns, to a stage where procedures for reform could be formulated and relevant strategies could evolve. The establishment of a forum for music education (keeping in mind Dr Benson's plea, for a national policy, in the Introduction to the *Deaf Ears?* Report) was prefigured from the outset. MEND was not to be a regurgitation of the Deaf Ears? published material but, rather, a quasi-public investigation into the pessimism behind its findings, something that had not happened up to that point. And it was (obviously) not to have an executive function but rather to lead towards it. The prime concern in the early stages of the initiative was to ensure that as wide a participation as possible should be achieved, and then to rekindle public awareness, in the first place, of what the problems were and the gravity of their consequences. To obviate any bias in the perception of what the critical areas might be, a plan was put in place to involve the music educators (and the music education lobby generally) themselves in an exercise of examining a possible agenda and prioritizing the most pressing concerns before the debates themselves were organized.

9 Basic Premises of MEND

"Music exalts the human spirit. It enhances the quality of life. Music is vitamin M. It's a chocolate chip in the cookie of life. . . .The only question . . . is whether we want to limit access to music to those who can afford it or whether we want to make it available to all of our citizens to enjoy. I think the answer is clear."

Paul Lehman
MEND Phase III Nov 1996

Since school music education had been the target of the *Deaf Ears?* Report it was, as stated above, re-adopted as a major focus of MEND. It was felt that without this basic building block all other provision would be contrived, discriminatory and élitist. Since the DIT was itself in the forefront of private (semi-state) enterprise in music education and educational reform, it was in a position to provide substantial intellectual advocacy in setting up the structures for the debates and in formulating the opening philosophical parameters. Thus a preliminary set of agenda items was assembled from the implications of the *Deaf Ears?* Report itself. This called for a detached and thorough search for what it is that music education in schools sets out to achieve. . . in other words, for what the context of Irish music education might be? This invitation to consider fundamentals might seem a fatuous and even simplistic suggestion, but subsequent events revealed how divided the world of music education could be on this basic issue. Other derivative concerns were the interrelationships (continuum) between curricula at primary and secondary level, the quality and relevance of teacher training, the negative burden and artificiality of the practico-academic divide, the effects (psychological and pragmatic) of assessment as a tool, the nature of performance and its place in general education, and the recognition of the work of the private sector. The time had come for musicians to be proactive, to realize that there is a demanding world outside of music and that they would have to come to terms with its constraints rather than expect that it would accommodate their partisan ideas without question.

10 Methodology of MEND

10.1 General

In the history of the state, although there had been campaigns for a better provision in music education before, there had never before been such an ambitious enterprise in relation to it. There was reason to suppose that those potentially interested might be ill-prepared for the searching nature of the proposed enquiry and its long-term implications; yet without their committed and meaningful input the credibility of the outcomes would be open to question. Even still it is difficult to predict how effective MEND has been in stimulating a lasting awareness of the need for entrepreneurial activity from those with leadership qualities within the lobby. In anticipation of encountering a certain ambivalence in garnering general support, a *modus operandi* was formulated with a view to the active involvement, in the debates themselves, of leaders in the field of music education across the broadest global spectrum of remit, to attract, by their very eminence, a participative and enthusiastic audience. This strategy proved effective; the underlying rationale was systematic, as the adopted sequence, described below, should illustrate.

10.2 Towards an Agenda for MEND

The agenda for the debates was an overriding consideration. It was necessary to demonstrate a convincing democratic spirit, from the very outset, in drafting it. It was therefore decided that a heralding one-day conference would be held to condition the prospective participants and to explain the intention behind the main events. This was conducted by the distinguished British music educator, Professor Keith Swanwick - no stranger to the Irish scene. During the course of the seminar the 130 participants (mostly professional music educators) were asked to consider a comprehensive list of possible issues in Irish music education and to prioritize them. The response to this questionnaire was encouraging and workable; there was a marked level of agreement as to what were the burning questions for debate. The only moderation applied to the results was to place the final rationalization, in eight headings, into a logical sequence, so that the conduct of the debates would have a visibly plausible continuity. In the event this agenda, although offered for modification, stood the test of time and proved to be a hardy irreducible which survived into post-MEND days as a statement of the commanding parameters of Irish music education.

10.3 Towards a Time-Frame for MEND

10.3.1 General Considerations

In deciding on the timescale of the initiative many arguably conflicting approaches had to be weighed. It was necessary to stress the intention to be comprehensive and thorough. There was the need, first, to allow time, even leisure, to re-identify, simultaneously, the whole spectrum of concern, to present scholarly deliberations in relation to it, issue by issue, and then to debate it in forum; on the other hand the programme should be 'telescoped' to obviate a feeling of chronic futile debate and passivity, a real danger in a country notorious for its prodigality with words. To engage and retain the interest of participants, individual events should be substantial and significant in content, especially since it was hoped to attract audience and speakers from the whole country, involving travel and personal expense over a period; thus the convenience of sociable timing became critical, to justify an expectation of engaging the music-loving community widely. Furthermore it was desirable to adopt a mechanism which could psychologically benchmark key stage progress and stimulate a real sense of expansiveness followed by convergence. In other words a metamorphosis from bald agenda items to solutions or, at least, to concentration into a simple list of 'deconstructable barriers to progress' was the aim. In the certain knowledge that budgetary provision would be severely stretched in the process, agreement was successfully negotiated beforehand with the sponsors to allow the involvement, by invitation, of the international community of music education scholarship. Ireland had suffered too long from the narrowness and vagaries of post-colonial thought and the futility of a time lag in adopting new ideas, often when the promoters themselves had already superannuated them. It seemed timely to hear what the global philosophical, administrative and executive experts had to say in both general and specific terms. This suggested another strategy for flagging progression in the debates; it was therefore proposed to subdivide the enterprise along yet another axis - that of indigenous and foreign input – at least in the early stages. An exclusively Irish team would first define, delimit and debate the areas of concern; this work would form the basis of an interim report which would then be submitted to a representative team of internationally recognized educator scholars. Responses in the form of focused papers in the context of the thematic dominance of each specialist enlisted would be elicited and would fuel the ensuing debates. This process would be repeated before Phase III with the difference that the 'faculty' would then comprise a complementary array of speakers and panel members, drawn from Ireland and abroad, who could, at that stage, comprehensively debate the agenda with the delegates in its more refined, convergent and proactive context. It was planned to issue interim reports between the phases to ensure that the subsequent invited contributions would be cognizant of and reflect the progress thus far and that delegates would have documentation with which to focus their intended participation more effectively. These reports were duly issued; copies are contained in the Appendices to this report.

The logistic structure of the initiative soon evolved. It would comprise three weekend-long conferences. Because the agenda was heavy with (potential) detail, it seemed desirable to encourage delegates to stream themselves towards their areas of prime interest; it proved plausible to segregate the topics into differentiated families and time-slots that would effectively concentrate the substance and usable outcomes of each debate session while offering delegates a choice. All sessions would have an invited chairman. In order to safeguard the authenticity of the contributions as reported, all sessions would be audio-recorded for subsequent reference. In addition each debate would have an independent rapporteur whose function it would be to submit an interpretative summary, for the Proceedings, by adding independent thought to collective wisdom while capturing the mood of each debate. The layout was carefully planned; in theory therefore it was promising.

The MEND, in the event, took the form of a series of strategically-spaced conferences and other events. There were thirty-four (34) formal presentations varying in length from 20 minutes to one hour. These were invariably conducted in plenary session. Thirty-three (33) debates took place, each timetabled for one hour, but these were streamed as mentioned above (trifurcation during Phases I and II; bifurcation at Phase III as the focus narrowed). The topics for formal responses were chosen (in

consultation with the invitees) fully to explore the challenge of the agenda; these sessions were timetabled, as far as was possible, to precede the debates to which they were intended to act as stimulants. The details are as follows: -

10.3.2 MEND Heralding Debate – October 1994

As its name implies this one-day conference (conducted by Professor Keith Swanwick of the London Institute of Education) was to give information, set the scene, and work, by consultation, towards a suitable agenda. Approximately 130 people attended

10.3.3 MEND Phase I – April 1995

During this intensive two-day conference, the agenda, ordered from the outcomes of the Heralding Debate, was spoken to by an invited team of Irish music educators of stature. The formal presentations, which were specifically limited to Irish speakers, were intended to stimulate and focus the ensuing debates. The object was to expose, virtually simultaneously, the full spectrum of concerns in Irish music education, with their interrelationships, and to further validate the agenda; this was facilitated by the presence of a representative assembly of music educators and other relevant commentators. Some 500 attendances were recorded at Phase I.

10.3.4 MEND National Music Seminar – May 1995

This half-day seminar, conducted by Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (University of Limerick) addressed the specific problems and realities of Ireland's bicultural (as distinct from multicultural) music tradition. It is worthy of special mention that the question of the inclusion of native music elements in formal education was a specific concern in MEND. It was publicly acknowledged, by Professor Ó Súilleabháin, that the invitation to the devotees of traditional Irish music to participate was a positive step in promoting mutual understandings and esteem, in educational terms, between general music educators and the currently coterie interests of national music (by whatever definition).

10.3.5 MEND Phase II – November 1995

This was the second of the three main two-day conferences. During Phase II the agenda and reported findings (Interim Report - Phase I) in relation to it were submitted (and had been in advance) to a team of international music education specialists, to achieve cross-fertilization with the global view. The intention was to keep the full spectrum of the agenda under review. All the invitees were personally briefed (in the US, the UK and the Philippines) well in advance of their participation. All presentations were in the form of formal papers, which are collected for perusal under Proceedings (a separate volume of this report). The participation of Professor Marie McCarthy, an American-based Irish national with copious experience of the Irish music education scene, was specifically invited to achieve a pivotal and informed linkage with the inputs of the other speakers.

It had been unambiguously established at MEND Phase I that shortcomings in the Irish music education dispensation could be traced, in part, to a paucity of philosophical underpinning in curricular policy and decision making. Phase II coincided almost exactly with the publication, in the US, of David Elliott's *Music Matters - A New Philosophy of Music Education*. Since this work had been heralded as, and proved to be, a stated counterposition to Bennett Reimer's celebrated *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, rev. 1989) it was not coincidental that these two protagonists were invited to Ireland to inform the situation in the most provocative and challenging way. The input of the eminent American music educator, Professor Richard Colwell (New England Conservatory, Boston, Mass.), who agreed to act as moderator for the whole conference, was particularly fortuitous

and added a valuable extra analytical dimension to the proceedings. It should be added that the topic of Performance (Agenda IV - see below), which was to become a key issue in the final analysis, was ably treated by Dr Janet Ritterman (Director of the Royal College of Music in London) during Phase II, which was distinguished throughout by closely matched relevance of the formal presentations to the evolving nuance of the agenda.

10.3.6 The Establishment of the Music Education National Forum - November 1996

It had always been understood by the promoters that MEND could do little more than begin the process of reform implicitly called for in the *Deaf Ears?* Report. The establishment of a forum for music education was therefore planned into the envisaged evolution of the MEND initiative, subject, of course, to a mandate being given (as it was), by the delegates, for this to happen. The inaugural meeting, held on 7 November 1996, was attended by Sir Frank Callaway, Honorary President of the International Society for Music Education (ISME, with links to UNESCO), by Professor Paul Lehman, a former president of the US-based Music Educators' National Conference MENC), the largest national music education forum in the world (with 70,000 members) and by Professors Marie McCarthy (University of Maryland at College Park) and Patricia Shehan Campbell (University of Washington at Seattle).

10.3.7 MEND Phase III- November 1996

The intention in Phase III was to submit the agenda in its enriched and converging stage to a team of music education experts drawn from the global community, including Ireland, with the widest spectrum of connections to what was emerging as the commanding issues in Irish music education. There was the hope that solutions to some of the identified problems might begin to crystallize at this stage. As will be seen from the analysis of this culminatory stage, the quality of the presentations was consistently high and arguably lived up to expectations. It is particularly to be noted that the highly controversial paper *A Book of manners in the wilderness* presented by Professor Harry White not only focused on the central nexus of the whole MEND initiative, viz. Philosophy of Music Education, but injected itself, on subsequent publication, into the international scene, eliciting responses from none other than Bennett Reimer and David Elliott/Kari Veblen. These are analysed in full in the body of this report, as indeed Professor White's paper is separately and independently reviewed by the writer.

10.3.8 Attendance

Phases II and III had approximately the same attendance patterns as Phase I. Roughly 500 attendances were recorded at each.

11 The Agenda for MEND

I The Philosophical Theories. The concept of the state-funded general education system as enabler in music education. The segregated educational needs of composers, performers, teachers and listeners.

II Appraisal of the music education network in Ireland as it currently exists.

III The fractured continuum in music education in Ireland.

IV The conflict between the concept of the centrality of performance and the élitism stigma. Towards a reconciliation

V The Leaving Certificate crisis as paradigmatic flashpoint.

VI The rôle of National Culture in the music education curriculum.

VII Music at third-level. The professional training of musicians. The Conservatoire Aspiration.

VIII The establishment of a permanent National Forum for Music Education.

11.1.1 Philosophical

While this agenda may seem unexceptionable, even typical in many respects, and adaptable too, the writer maintains that the national systems of music education with which he has even a passing acquaintance all embody nuances, at least, and sometimes significant differences, in the emphasis of their operating parameters, in comparison with others, that make each one unique; this, in fact, is one of the outcomes of MEND that has a message for all music educators, but especially for those who may lean lazily towards the adoption of ready-made solutions to their problems based on half-digested theories that may be divergent in the fundamental educational questions they seek to address. Ireland has only recently begun to make its mark in the field of educational research in music; in the area of non-derivative philosophical thought on the subject (one of the younger fields of enquiry) we are not leaders. But in following the theories of others, some of them very distinguished in their subject, there are grounds for concern that we have been too easily impressed and too superficial in our analysis. All philosophies have definable limits to the applicability of their idealism[28]; fitting a rationale to an existing system is therefore a hazardous business in the hands of the uninformed or gullible. The writer believes also that we have no monopoly of naïveté in Ireland, judging by the dissonances between the philosophical allegiances professed by many music educators around the world and the educational realities of the systems in which they work. Looking briefly at two lists of Irish concerns - those derived from our Deaf Ears? Report and the writer's own additional causes for anxiety - it can be seen how crucial it is that music education be guided by a philosophy that is sensitive to these issues in context.

From *Deaf Ears?*

1. There has been insufficient concentration in the implemented curriculum

2. There are regional and socio/economic inequalities

[28] It is sufficient to consider here the words of C.D. Burns (quoted in Susanne Langer's *Philosophy in a New Key*, p5), who states that 'philosophers in every age have attempted to give an account of as much experience as they could . . . . all great philosophers have allowed for more than they could explain, and have therefore, signed beforehand, if not dated, the death warrant of their philosophies'.

3. There are serious discontinuities between Junior and Senior Cycles

4. Pedagogical approaches have been lacking in active music-making

Additional Concerns

1. Interrelationships between curricula at primary and secondary level are compromised by differences in pedagogical approach as between child-centred and subject centred approaches, between mandatory and optional status.

2. The quality and relevance of teacher training.

3. The practico-academic divide.

4. The effects (psychological and pragmatic) of assessment as a tool.

5. The nature of performance and its place in general education

6. Recognition of the work of the private sector.

These issues needed to be addressed in seeking philosophical underpinning for curriculum as observed.

11.1.2 Current Irish Music Education Provision

It is unnecessary to stress that in any plan for amelioration of a flawed system it is, of course, crucial to understand the exact nature and gravity of the problems to be addressed. These are not defined by an undifferentiated collection of coterie wishes or grievances, but by their interrelationships and interactions. The salient features of Irish school music education already sketched are incompatible with any reasonable expectation of a satisfactory provision. The irreducible essence might be stated as a historically implanted practico-academic dichotomy, which is as old as the tenets of Greek philosophy. It is suspected that this may be a feature of many other systems and be very familiar to many. One pointed comment should be made here relating the first and second agenda items by suggesting that many philosophers have been somewhat misleading in overstressing the neatly closed system and indispensability of composer, performer and listener in the making of a musical experience, while ignoring or playing down the ministry of teachers to ensure its quality and its survival, as art and in other important functional ways.

It seems obvious that the Irish music education dispensation would have to be objectively appraised, first to search out the flaws in its structure, then to account for them satisfactorily and, finally, to suggest means of redress.

11.1.3 Continuum

The fractured continuum in school music education in Ireland is a direct result, *inter alia*, of differences between child-centred and subject-centred education - between a junior cycle teacher cohort inadequately prepared (because of time constraints in their training) for even the most rudimentary of music teaching tasks (and we do not have music specialists in the primary system) and an academically-oriented senior cycle force which, because it is generally inimical to performance as an unfamiliar tool, has little appeal, judging by the dwindling uptake[29]. But although this fractured

[29] This situation is changing according to the statistics since the end of the public phase of MEND, but there is mixed opinion, as to its effectiveness, of the new curriculum in terms of enhanced real standards. This is a controversial area which will be commented on in the appropriate place (See Assessment Section 18.5). On its

continuum was identified as the root cause of the malaise in Irish school music education it has many manifestations beyond the interface between primary and second-level education. Continuum and liaison - between philosophical thinkers and educational strategists, between second and third-level education for aspiring professional musicians, between general educators and music educators, teacher trainers and teachers in the workplace and, above all, between the interests and activities of practical and academic musicians - must be actively encouraged. And there are many parallels to the Irish dilemma in countries that ostensibly boast more music-friendly educational provision than ours.

11.1.4 Performance

The most crucial of all concerns in music education is, in the writer's view, the place of performance within it.[30] It is too wide a question to deal with at this point, but it is stimulating to consider the mystique surrounding performance in the human psyche. It is related, *inter alia*, to skill, virtuosity and a sense of sometimes-vainglorious achievement (to put it at its crudest); this idea is embodied in the functional theories of music education philosophy[31]. This is not to disavow the kind of rudimentary involvement in music-making that can and should be usefully encouraged by skilful teachers in general education. But the two are not the same (nor do they both generally answer to the same broad 'definition' of art, which is, after all, one of the valid criteria justifying music education) and it is dangerous to deceive ourselves into believing that they are. One is a specialization demanding a heavy personal commitment of time and energy which places it outside the scope of general education; the other is intrinsically limited in potential but is eminently suitable for incorporation in a general music programme in schools. The crucial factor is the relationship between skill and time and this points up the difference. There is much current confusion, which seems to ignore the limiting factors. If we are speaking about music performance as art (remembering Stavinsky's aphorism[32]) it is unrealistic to expect it to come as a response to unspecialized teaching.

The issue of performance in school education is at the heart of the differences in outlook between Bennett Reimer and David Elliott. It is of such overwhelming significance that it surfaces, too, as one of the three commanding questions hanging over music education at the turn of the millennium, as identified by Reimer in his response to Harry White's provocative paper, *A book of manners in the wilderness* (*qv*). The writer is convinced that the lack of a clear national policy on performance training is evidence of chronic misunderstandings and misconceptions in relation to it, particularly as to its spectrum and its demands at proficient and expert level. It is difficult to decide whether this blind spot is innocent or whether it conceals a reluctance to concede that serious performance studies must be encouraged even though they are resource-intensive. Ireland at last seems to have graduated to the national prosperity that ought to be capable of confronting this issue.

11.1.5 Assessment

The interface between second- and third-level education is a natural focal point of concern, for it is the stage at which most lose their contact with formal educational experiences in music. It invites not only summative assessment of what has been achieved in some 12 years of schooling, but appraisal too of how the aims of that formative period have been met, including the pertinence of assessment itself as a tool and the refinement of the curriculum which should follow from the outcomes of

---

face value, however, a reported increase in uptake of music as a subject in Second Level schooling, especially at Senior Cycle, is to be welcomed.

[30] This is a subject of two separate derivative papers, by the author, to which the reader is directed. They are *Performance in Music Education* (Arts on the Edge Conference, Perth, Western Australia, April 1998; published proceedings) and *Music in Ireland: Performance in Music Education* (Thomas Davis Lecture, Music in Ireland: 1848-1998, RTE, Mercier Press, 1998) 87-97

[31] This question (of function) is dealt with in the MEND papers delivered by Professor Marie McCarthy (Ref. III P vii) and Professor David Elliott (Ref. II P viii)

[32] "to the gifts of nature are added the benefits of artifice - such is the general significance of art" (Poetics, 29)

assessment. Concerns in Ireland have ranged from the relevance of the curriculum itself at senior cycle to the standards expected in other subjects, to the socio/musical needs of the majority being served by it (including management of the high/mass culture conflict), and to the minority interests of those who might expect their progression to third-level studies in music to be fully met by school provision. There has been some disingenuousness in this latter regard within current strategies to reform the curriculum with a view to increasing the popularity of music as a senior cycle subject (arguably diluting its content), and to establishing credible continuity with the feeder systems. There has, on the other hand, been a laudable attempt to effect a better correlation between time spent and expected achievement, but this inevitably attenuates standards and threatens or reduces the relevance of school music to those who aspire to the profession, sending them outside the school system to 'top up' their skills. There is a realism here, however, not necessarily to be decried, for it highlights the need to recognize the contribution that the private sector makes to the total enterprise. And it continues, if accurately appraised as a policy, usefully to draw attention to the fact that performance, for those who aspire to third-level studies of any kind in music, is unlikely to be served adequately by school provision.

11.1.6 The Rôle of National Culture in Music Education

Ireland has a rich heritage of traditional music, which has recently evolved dramatically to make a significant contribution within the ambit of the world commercial music market. At home, it is (inherently) community-based, popular, freely available but not generally taken up by the majority of the population as a serious pursuit in perceived educational terms. It is outside the experience of most school children. MEND attempted to focus on its importance and potential, and to examine how its intrinsically social character and informality might be adapted selectively to normalize aspects of it into the more formal setting of general school, to expose children to their natural cultural inheritance. There is a danger that this bicultural nature of the Irish music education dilemma may be overtaken and further diluted or confused by premature attempts to superimpose multicultural modes. This quandary may not be peculiar to Ireland; it needs sensitive, pragmatic and even-handed treatment in relation to progressive contemporary music education ideas.

11.1.7 Music Education at Third Level

Although school music education was the dominant enabler identified by MEND as the focus of the overall enterprise, there was still the problem, for the organizers, of where to access the system as a total regenerative cycle. It would therefore have been foolhardy to have ignored the sources of educational provision since it is to the training of professionals that the formative influences, good and suspect, can be traced. Again invoking relevance as a criterion, and including all third level education - since it is axiomatic that the vast majority of professional musicians teach at some time during their career - it is desirable that all musical expertise, right across the spectrum, wherever acquired and whether practical or academic, should have instructional access to general music education.[33] There has been a significant growth over the past two decades in third-level education in Ireland and in the number of institutions providing it; this drift has applied to the availability of music programmes, with the consequent buyer's market for those seeking them. There is arguably an over-provision (and dilution of core curriculum) which has affected the very nature of the courses on offer as a result of the options within them. Although changes in emphasis are plausibly defended, the reality is that practical institutions have become more academic, arguably for the right reasons, and traditionally academic colleges (typically the universities) have (sensibly, in their own interests) added practical modules, up to master's level, to attract the best talents, who almost invariably come from a practical

[33] This collaborative method of music education is referred to in Harold Abeles's MEND lecture (Ref. III P ii) on *Philosophy as Basis for Teacher Training.*

background anyway. This system is overdue for some kind of rationalization, as is its total relevance to educational goals at lower levels in a national context[34].

11.1.8 National Forum for Music Education

Finally, there was a need to signal a plan for continuity in concern for music education which would stretch out far beyond the culmination of MEND itself; pragmatism and the bitter experiences of the demise of previous initiatives demanded as much. It was obviously necessary to have this need for a national forum endorsed by the participants at MEND so that a comfortable transition from one to the other could be effected, if that was to be the mandate.

11.1.9 Resourcing for Music Education in Ireland – A Collective Agenda Item?

It is worthy of mention that the agenda items might have been cryptically regrouped as a single item - Resourcing for Music Education In Ireland, which, in turn, could have been subdivided into its human and fiscal elements. The first seven items clearly underline the rôle of teachers. The question of financial resources, for whatever purpose, may seem, both retrospectively and in the account of MEND as it was enacted, to have been underdeveloped. Item 8 (the setting up of a National Forum for Music Education), which was and is considered by the writer to be the single most crucial outcome of MEND, without which the initiative itself and its sequel would be still-born, implicitly signposts the campaign for resources which would become a prime concern of this body, if established and enthusiastically supported by the teaching profession and by other interested parties.

[34] Professor Harry White's paper, *"A book of manners in the wilderness"* (Ref. III P viii) deals dramatically with this topic. It is also considered in the section dealing with the recently (Jan 2000) announced funding to set up an Academy for the Performing Arts in Ireland, in three locations.

12 The Enactment of MEND

12.1 Participation

The conferences themselves were very well attended, particularly considering the minuscule size of the music education enterprise in Ireland where, for example, less than 2% of the school-going population learn an instrument institutionally. More than 1600 attendances were recorded and it is significant that not a single agency of music education in the state failed to support the deliberations. But it should also be stressed, in honesty, that the initiative was not just well publicized but that a great deal of effort was expended in personal contacts to ensure that musical conscience was touched in the matter of pressurizing the apathetic to attend. Almost every key educator in the state was asked to participate actively in such matters as chairing a debate session, making a prepared scholarly contribution or acting as an interpretative reporter. In particular, the fully international event (Phase II, November 1995), the centrepiece of the project, was an unqualified success; it was a matter of considerable gratification that all the invitees accepted with enthusiasm and participated in a very full schedule which not only demanded a personal presentation but found them acting as panel members in a variety of contexts to which their expertise seemed especially suited. We were honoured to have had the services of Professor Richard Colwell, from the New England Conservatory in Boston, as the moderator of that entire weekend session[35].

[35] The internationally distinguished faculty who contributed at Stages #2 and #3 comprised visitors from 4 continents as follows. Most are members if the International Society for Music Education (ISME):-
Prof. Harold Abeles (USA); Emeritus Prof. Sir Frank Callaway (Australia); Prof. Richard Colwell (USA); Prof. David Elliott (Canada); Prof. Paul Lehman (USA); Prof. Marie McCarthy (USA); Prof. Bennett Reimer (USA); Dr Janet Ritterman (UK and Australia); Prof. Ramon Santos (The Philippines); Prof. Patricia Shehan Campbell (USA) Ms Dorothy Straub (USA); Prof. Keith Swanwick (UK); Dr Kari Veblen (USA).
The Irish contributors included:-
Dr Ita Beausang (DIT); Dr Albert Bradshaw; Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat (Trinity College Dublin); USA/ Iran); Prof. Gerard Gillen (Maynooth University); Dr Mary Lennon (DIT); Prof. Mícheál O'Súilleabháin (The Irish World Music Centre, Limerick University and University College Cork)); Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Institute of Technology); Prof. Harry White (University College Dublin)

13 Sequence and Quality of Conference Sessions

13.1 The Pairing of Lectures and Debates

It proved generally feasible, by careful planning, to timetable a prepared presentation germane to each agenda topic immediately before it was further broken down into subheadings for debate; it was felt that this would provide the right kind of stimulus to sharpen the focus of the session inputs. Separate detailed agendas were provided for the guidance of each chairperson, from which a judicious free choice could be made. The drafting of these agendas alone soon confirmed, however, that the idea, of adequately debating the spectrum of issues likely to be suggested by the main agenda and the scholarly treatment of its topics, was over ambitious - another justification for the suggestion to inaugurate a forum which would continue to process the material proactively.

It was not surprising that the quality of the prepared presentations (which were commissioned well in advance to permit thoughtful and highly focused preparation) outshone the more spontaneous contributions at the debates themselves. The papers formed the nucleus, as indeed much of the bulk, of the received wisdom from the whole initiative, but it was always envisaged that both inputs would be processed as complementary essentials to the final result. The lectures tended to be more focused on their topic, general rather than over-concentrated on specific problems in Irish music education, and therefore admirably detached from emotional interests. The debates, on the other hand, were more antiphonal and often confrontational, sometimes engaging visiting panel specialists in defensive apologias. In spite of very careful preparation and selection of the topics for debate and the provision of exhaustive guidelines for the chairpersons, it proved difficult, if not impossible owing its very nature, to guide free discussion to yield the same level of reflective and discerning input.

14 A Single Interpreter?

"To be sure, music is a miracle. . . . What miracle wants of us is not that we, as thinking beings, shall capitulate to it, but rather that we shall do justice to it in our thinking. Precisely because music is a miracle, incomprehensible in the framework of the dominant mode of contemporary thinking, impossible to fit into the current conception of the world - a miracle not only in its greatest and most splendid, its most exceptional, manifestations, but in its plain fundamentals, precisely because of all this it is our duty to think about it. The purpose is not a rationalization, a setting aside of the miraculous. Thought that is true to its subject does not annul miracles. It penetrates the fog around them; it brings them out of darkness into the light."

Victor Zuckerkandl
Sound and Symbol p.6

14.1 The Route to Recommendations.

It was decided, for pragmatic reasons of attempting an appraisal of the extensive documentation which MEND was expected to generate (and did), that the comprehensive analysis would have to be undertaken by one person, namely the writer, who was the organizer of the whole initiative, and could therefore be expected professionally to keep a finger on the pulse of the proceedings. MEND did not seek to constrain each debating group into producing specific recommendations, discussion times being too short and the significance of many of the topics too weighty for facile or irrevocable decision-making. It was felt that the attempted drafting of formal outcomes would have inhibited flow, failed to reach agreement or even consensus, and achieved nothing that a faithful interpretation, drafted from the definitive audio-tapes, could not more convincingly suggest or convey. The nature of much of the final reporting is interpretative and is therefore open to challenge. But this aspect of MEND is considered to be healthy and to have vindicated in advance the establishment of the Music Education National Forum, for which the Final Report of MEND should be capable of being considered as a possible starting point in drafting, ordering and prioritizing a new working agenda.

15 Logistical Details of MEND

15.1 Coding of MEND Sessions

The coding for the MEND Proceedings is as follows:

I, II, III etc.	Chronological Phase of MEND
P	Presentation/Lecture
D	Debate
H	Heralding Conference
P/D N	Separate half-day seminar devoted to the topic of National Music
K	Keynote Address (Callaway – Ref. III K)
i, ii, iii etc.	Time sequencing of the sessions in each of the separate Phases
a, b, or c	Streaming of each group of simultaneous debates

Thus **II D iv b** refers to the fourth debate (second stream as printed on the timetable) held during Phase II of MEND

15.2 Opening Addresses

Phase I	Dr Brendan Goldsmith (President DIT)
Phase I	National Music Seminar Mr Frank Heneghan (Director of Cultural Affairs, DIT)
Phase II	Dr Brendan Goldsmith (President DIT)
Phase III	Music Education National Forum Dr David Gillingham (Director of Academic Affairs DIT)
Phase III	Keynote Address – Sir Frank Callaway Introduction - Alderman Pat Carey (Deputy Lord Mayor of Dublin) Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat (Trinity College, Dublin)
Phase III	Mr Frank Heneghan (Director of Cultural Affairs, DIT)

15.3 Session Chairpersons

Phase I
Mr Frank Brennan (Director of Engineering DIT)
Dr Martin Adams (Acting Professor of Music TCD)
Mr Simon Taylor (Radio Telefís Éireann)
Prof. Deirdre Doyle (Royal Irish Academy of Music)

Phase II
Prof. J Valentine Rice (Professor of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin
Dr Joseph Ryan (Army School of Music)
Prof. Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)
Prof. Harry White (Dept of Music, University College, Dublin)

Phase III
Prof. J Valentine Rice (Trinity College Dublin)
Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College, WIT)
DrThérèse Smith (University College Dublin)
Dr Ellen Hazelkorn (Director of Applied Arts, DIT)

15.4 Presenters (Alphabetical List)

A number in brackets signifies multiple presentations

1. Abeles, Professor Harold, *Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, USA*
2. Beausang, Dr Ita, *DIT*
3. Bradshaw, Dr Albert, *Mt Temple School*
4. Brennan, Mr Shane, *St Finian's Schola Cantorum*
5. Buckley, Mr John, *Freelance Composer*
6. Callaway, Emeritus Professor Sir Frank, *University of Western Australia; ISME, CIRCME*
7. Colwell, Professor Richard, *New England Conservatory, Boston, Mass, USA*
8. Elliott, Professor David, *University of Toronto, Canada; University of Northern Texas, USA*
9. Farhat, Emeritus Professor Hormoz, *Trinity College, Dublin*
10. Gillen, Professor Gerard, *St Patrick's College, Maynooth*
11. Halpin, Mr William, *DIT*
12. (3) Heneghan, Mr Frank, *DIT*
13. Lehman, Professor Paul, *University of Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA*
14. Lennon, Dr Mary, *DIT*
15. MacLiam, Seán Uasal, *NCCA and St Patrick's Training, College, Drumcondra*
16. McCann, Ms Gabrielle, *Dept of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin*
17. (2) MCarthy, Professor Marie, *University of Maryland at College Park, USA*
18. Mercier, Mr Mel, *University College, Cork*
19. O'Carroll, Mr Aidan, *Kerry School of Music*
20. (2) Ó Súilleabháin, Professor Mícheál, *Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick*
21. Reimer, Professor Bennett, *Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA*
22. Ritterman, Dr Janet, *Royal College of Music, London*
23. Santos, Professor Ramon, *University of the Philippines*
24. Shehan Campbell Professor Patricia, *University of Washington, USA*
25. Straub, Ms Dorothy, *Music Educators' National Conference, Reston, Virginia, USA*
26. (2) Swanwick, Professor Keith, *Institute of Education, University of London*
27. Sweeney, Dr Eric, *Waterford Regional Technical, College , WIT*
28. Veblen, Dr Kari, *Commission on Community Music, (ISME)*
29. (2) White, Professor Harry, *University College, Dublin*

Total of 34 Formal Presentations

15.5 Presenters (Phases)

15.5.1 Phase I

I P i	Mr Frank Heneghan (DIT Director of Cultural Affairs)
I P ii	Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple School)
I P iii	Mr John Buckley (Freelance Composer)
I P iv	withdrawn
I P v	Mr Aidan O'Carroll (Kerry School of Music)
I P vi	Ms Gabrielle McCann (Trinity College, Dublin)
I P vii	Mr Shane Brennan (St Finian's Schola Cantorum)
I P viii	Professor Harry White (University College, Dublin)
I P ix	Mr Mel Mercier (University College, Cork) (transferred to I P/D N)
I P x	Professor Hormoz Farhat (Trinity College, Dublin)
I P xi	Mr William Halpin (DIT)
I P xii	Dr Ita Beausang (DIT)
I P xiii	Mr Seán MacLiam (NCCA and St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
I P xiv	Ms Mary Lennon (DIT)
I P xv	Professor Gerard Gillen (St Patrick's College, Maynooth)
I P xvi	Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College, WIT)
I P/D N	Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)

15.5.2 Phase II

II P i	Mr Frank Heneghan (DIT Director of Cultural Affairs)
II P ii	Professor Marie McCarthy (University of Maryland at College Park, US)
II P iii	Professor Bennett Reimer (Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, US)
II P iv	Dr Janet Ritterman (Royal College of Music, London)
II P v	Dr Kari Veblen (Commission on Community Music [ISME])
II P vi	Professor Ramon Santos (University of the Philippines)
II P vii	Professor David Elliott (University of Toronto, Canada; University of Northern Texas, USA)
II P viii	Professor Richard Colwell (New England Conservatory, Boston, Mass, USA)
II P ix	Ms Dorothy Straub (Music Educators' National Conference, Reston, Virginia, USA)

15.5.3 Phase III

III P i	Mr Frank Heneghan (DIT Director of Cultural Affairs)
III P ii	Professor Harold Abeles (Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, USA)
III P iii	Professor Paul Lehman (University of Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA)
III P iv	Professor Keith Swanwick (Institute of Education, University of London)
III P v	Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell (University of Washington, USA)
III P vi	Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)
III P vii	Professor Marie McCarthy (University of Maryland at College Park, USA)
III P viii	Professor Harry White (University College, Dublin)

15.6 Institutions Represented by Speakers, Chairpersons and Reporters

15.6.1 Ireland

Army School Of Music

Department of Education

Dublin Institute of Technology

European Piano Teachers' Association

European String Teachers' Association

Kerry School of Music

Kodaly Society of Ireland

Mary Immaculate College of Education, Limerick

Mater Dei Institute

Midland Arts

Mt Temple School

Music Network

National Children's Choir

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment

Newpark Music Centre

Post -Primary Music Teachers' Association

Radio Telefís Éireann

Royal Irish Academy of Music

St Finian's Schola Cantorum

St Patrick's Training College, Drumcondra

St Patrick's College, Maynooth

Trinity College (University of Dublin), Dublin

University College, Cork

University College, Dublin

University of Limerick

Waterford Regional Technical College (Institute of Technology)

15.6.2 Australia

University of Western Australia, Perth (Western Australia)

15.6.3 Canada

University of Toronto (Canada)

15.6.4 Philippines

University of the Philippines

15.6.5 United Kingdom

The Institute of Education, London University (UK)

Royal College of Music, London (UK)

University of Hull

15.6.6 United States of America

Music Educators' National Conference

New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Mass

Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York

University of Ann Arbor, Michigan

University of Maryland at College Park

University of Northern Texas at Denton

University of Washington at Seattle

15.6.7 International

Callaway International Research Centre for Music Education (CIRCME), Nedlands (Western Australia)

Commission on Community Music (ISME)

International Society for Music Education (ISME)

15.7 Chairpersons at the debate sessions

15.7.1 Phase I

I D i a Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College of Education, Limerick)
I D i b Ms Ite O'Donovan (DIT)
I D i c Ms Cáit Cooper
I D ii a Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
I D ii b Mr Ian Fox (Freelance Broadcaster)
I D ii c Professor Pamela Flanagan (Royal Irish Academy of Music)
I D iii a Ms Brighid Mooney (DIT)
I D iii b Mr Niall Doyle (Music Network)
I D iii c Mr Seán Creamer (retired Dept of Education Inspector)
I D iv a Ms Louise O'Connell (Post Primary Music Teachers' Association)
I D iv b Professor Ronald Masin (DIT; European String Teachers' Association)
I D iv c Professor Paul Deegan (Royal Irish Academy of Music)

15.7.2 Phase II

II D i a Dr Ita Beausang (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
II D i b Ms Gabrielle McCann (Dept of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin)
II D i c Dr Patrick Devine (St Patrick's College, Maynooth)
II D ii a Ms Mary Lennon (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
II D ii b Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College, WIT)
II D ii c Colm Ó'Cléirigh (St Patrick's Training College, Drumcondra)
II D iii a Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)
II D iii b Seán MacLiam (NCCA and St Patrick's Training College, Drumcondra)
II D iii c Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat (Retired, Trinity College, Dublin)
II D iv a Mr Aidan O'Carroll (Kerry School of Music)
II D iv b Professor Pamela Flanagan (Royal Irish Academy of Music)
II D iv c Professor Gerard Gillen (St Patrick's College, Maynooth)

15.7.3 Phase III

III D i a	Dr Ita Beausang (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
III D i b	Ms Ite ODonovan (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
III D ii a	Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College of Education, Limerick)
III D ii b	Seán MacLiam (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra; Chairman NCCA Review Group [music])
III D iii a	Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)
III D iii b	Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
III D iv a	Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple Comprehensive School)
III D iv b	Dr Mary Lennon (DIT [Adelaide Rd])

15.8 Reporters at the Debate Sessions

15.8.1 Phase I

I D i a:	Mr Philip Carty (DIT and St Patrick's College, Maynooth)
I D i b	Ms Bernie Sherlock (DIT)
I D i c	Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin (DIT)
I D ii a	Ms Eithne Donnelly (Mater Dei Institute)
I D ii b	Ms Bernadette Cleary (Midland Arts)
I D ii c	Ms Sinéad Collins (DIT Wholetime Student)
I D iii a	Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association)
I D iii b	Ms Elizabeth Fuller (Newpark Music Centre)
I D iii c	Ms Siobhán Kilkelly (DIT)
I D iv a	Ms Anne Leahy (DIT)
I D iv b	Ms Bríd Grant (DIT)
I D iv c	Mr Martin Barrett (University of Limerick; Royal Irish Academy of Music; University of Hull)

15.8.2 Phase II

II D i a	Sr Barbara McHugh (DIT)
II D i b	Mr Christopher Kinder (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association)
II D i c	Mr Mel Mercier (University College, Cork)
II D ii a	Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin (DIT)
II D ii b	Mr John O'Flynn (Kodaly Society of Ireland)
II D ii c	Ms Blánaid Murphy (DIT)
II D iii a	Mr Odhrán Ó'Casaide (DIT)
II D iii b	Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association)
II D iii c	Professor Ronald Masin (DIT)
II D iv a	Ms Siobhán Kilkelly (DIT)
II D iv b	Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College of Education, Limerick)
II D iv c	Mr David Brophy (DIT)

15.8.3 Phase III

III D i a Mr David Mooney (DIT, Adelaide Rd)

III D i b Mr Martin Barrett (University of Limerick and Royal Irish Academy of Music)

III D ii a Professor Deirdre Doyle (Royal Irish Academy of Music)

III D ii b Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association; Second-Level Teacher)

III D iii a Ms Kathleen Hegarty (DIT)

III D iii b Mr Pádhraic O'Cuinneagáin (Course Tutor [Performance] DIT [Adelaide Rd])

III D iv a Ms Gabrielle McCann (Dept of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin)

III D iv b Professor Pamela Flanagan (Senior Academic, Royal Irish Academy of Music)

15.9 MEND Phase I Programme

15.9.1 Summary of Debate Sessions, Sat/Sun 29th/30th April 1995

1	I D i a	The Identification and the Encouragement of Creativity in Music. Towards a Non-Threatening Definition Chair: Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College of Ed, Limerick) Reporter: Mr Philip Carty (DIT and St Patrick's College, Maynooth)
2	I D i b	The Listening Process. The Core Curriculum for the Inculcation of Basic Awareness, Appreciation and Literacy. Chair: Ms Ite O'Donovan (DIT) Reporter: Ms Bernie Sherlock (DIT)
3	I D i c	The Fractured Continuum in Music Education Chair: Ms Cáit Cooper Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin (DIT)
4	I D ii a	An Appraisal of Current Primary and Pre-School Provision as Music Education Strategy in Ireland Chair: Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra) Reporter: Ms Eithne Donnelly (Mater Dei Institute)
5	I D ii b	The 'Non-State' Sector. Private Enterprise and Community Activity in the Promotion of Music as Educational Process. Chair: Mr Ian Fox (Freelance Broadcaster) Reporter: Ms Bernadette Cleary (Midland Arts)
6	I D ii c	Third-Level Training in Music; its Spectrum and its Possibilities. The Professional Dimension in Teacher Training. Chair: Professor Pamela Flanagan (RIAM) Reporter: Ms Sinéad Collins (DIT Wholetime Student)
7	I D iii a	Second-Level Music Education. The Feasibility of Senior Cycle Music Uptake as Long-Term Target. Chair: Ms Brighid Mooney (DIT) Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association)
8	I D iii b	The Centrality of Performance and the Élitism Stigma. Towards a Reconciliation Chair: Mr Niall Doyle (Music Network) Reporter: Ms Elizabeth Fuller (Newpark Music Centre)
9	I D iii c	The Rôle of National Music and its Potential Multicultural Extensions. Chair: Mr Seán Creamer (formerly Dept of Education Inspector) Reporter: Ms Siobhán Kilkelly (DIT)
10	I D iv a	The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision Chair: Ms Louise O'Connell (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association) Reporter: Ms Anne Leahy (DIT)
11	I D iv b	The National Conservatoire Aspiration Chair: Professor Ronald Masin (DIT; European String Teachers' Assn) Reporter: Ms Bríd Grant (DIT)

12	I D iv c	A National Forum for Music Education in Ireland Chair: Professor Paul Deegan (RIAM) Reporter: Mr Martin Barrett (Limerick U; RIAM; University of Hull)

15.9.2 Summary of Lectures/Presentations, Sat/Sun 29th/30th April 1995

1	I P i	Towards a New Dispensation in Irish Music Education. Mr Frank Heneghan (DIT Director of Cultural Affairs)
2	I P ii	Listening as Quintessential Key to Musicianship. Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple School)
3	I P iii	The 'Composer' in the Classroom. The Demystification of the Concept of Creativity. Mr John Buckley (Freelance Composer)
4		Withdrawn
5	I P v	Private and Community Initiatives in Music Education. Mr Aidan O'Carroll (Kerry School of Music)
6	I P vi	Teacher Training as a Priority in a National Campaign for a Better Provision in Music Education. Ms Gabrielle McCann (Trinity College, Dublin)
7	I P vii	Specialization in Music Education. Mr Shane Brennan (St Finian's Schola Cantorum)
8	I P viii	The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland. Professor Harry White (University College, Dublin)
9	I P ix	Looking at the Music of the World: A View from Ireland. Mr Mel Mercier (University College, Cork)
10	I P x	Multiculturalism as an Approach to Music Education. Professor Hormoz Farhat (Trinity College, Dublin)
11	I P xi	The Growing Ascendancy of Performance in Music Education Contexts. Mr William Halpin (DIT)
12	I P xii	The Rôle of the Music School. Dr Ita Beausang (DIT)
13	I P xiii	The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision as Ongoing Vehicle for Change in Attitudes to Music Education in Ireland Mr Seán MacLiam (NCCA and St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
14	I P xiv	Music Teacher Education: Understanding Teacher Knowledge Ms Mary Lennon (DIT)
15	I P xv	Performance in Context as a Component in Balanced Third-Level Education Professor Gerard Gillen (St Patrick's College, Maynooth)
16	I P xvi	Mandatory Performance in Third-Level as Enabler in Music Education at Lower Levels Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College)

15.10 MEND Phase I Timetable

15.10.1 Saturday 29 April 1995

09.30		Registration
10.00		Opening Address of Welcome Dr Brendan Goldsmith (President DIT) Chair: Mr Frank Brennan (Director DIT Kevin St)
10.10	I P i	Towards a New Dispensation in Irish Music Education Mr Frank Heneghan
10.50	I P ii	Listening as Quintessential Key to Musicianship Dr Albert Bradshaw
11.10	I P iii	The 'Composer' in the Classroom. The Demystification of the Concept of Creativity Mr John Buckley
11.30		Coffee
12.00		Open Forum Debates
	I D i a I	The Identification and the Encouragement of Creativity in Music. Towards a Non-Threatening Definition Chair: Dr Gareth Cox Reporter: Mr Philip Carty
	I D i b II	The Listening Process. The Core Curriculum for the Inculcation of Basic Awareness, Appreciation and Literacy. Chair: Ms Ite O'Donovan Reporter: Ms Bernie Sherlock
	I D i c III	The Fractured Continuum in Music Education Chair: Ms Cáit Cooper Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin
13.00		Lunch
14.00		Chair: Dr Martin Adams (School of Music, TCD)
14.10	I P v	Private and Community Initiatives in Music Education Mr Aidan O'Carroll
14.40	I P vi	Teacher Training as a Priority in a National Campaign for a Better Provision in Music Education Ms Gabrielle McCann
15.00	I P vii	Specialization in Music Education Mr Shane Brennan
15.20	I P viii	The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland

		Professor Harry White
15.40		Coffee
16.10		Open Forum Debates
	I D ii a I	An Appraisal of Current Primary and Pre-School Provision as Music Education Strategy in Ireland Chair: Ms Marian Doherty Reporter: Ms Eithne Donnelly
	I D ii b II	The 'Non-State' Sector. Private Enterprise and Community Activity in the Promotion of Music as Educational Process Chair: Mr Ian Fox Reporter: Ms Bernadette Cleary
	I D ii c III	Third-Level Training in Music; its Spectrum and its Possibilities. The Professional Dimension in Teacher Training Chair: Professor Pamela Flanagan Reporter: Ms Sinéad Collins

15.10.2 Sunday, 30 April 1995

10.00		Chair: Mr Simon Taylor (RTE)
	I P ix	Looking at the Music of the World; A View from Ireland Mr Mel Mercier - Postponed until 25 May 1995 Ref. I P/D N (*qv*)
10.20	I P x	Multiculturalism as an Approach to Music Education Professor Hormoz Farhat
10.40	I P xi	The Growing Ascendancy of Performance in Music Education Contexts Mr William Halpin
11.00	I P xii	The Rôle of the Music School Dr Ita Beausang
11.20		Coffee
11.50		Open Forum Debates
	I D iii a I	Second-Level Music Education. The Feasibility of Senior Cycle Music Uptake as Long-Term Target. Chair: Ms Brighid Mooney Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin
	I D iii b II	The Centrality of Performance and the Élitism Stigma. Towards a Reconciliation Chair: Mr Niall Doyle Reporter: Ms Elizabeth Fuller
	I D iii c III	The Rôle of National Music and its Potential Multicultural Extensions Chair: Mr Seán Creamer Reporter: Ms Siobhán Kilkelly
13.00		Lunch
14.00		Chair: Professor Deirdre Doyle (RIAM)
	I P xiii	The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision as Ongoing Vehicle for Change in Attitudes to Music Education in Ireland Mr Seán MacLiam
14.30	I P xiv	Music Teacher Training: Understanding Teacher Knowledge Ms Mary Lennon
14.50	I P xv	Performance In Context as a Component in Balanced Third-Level Education Professor Gerard Gillen
15.10	I P xvi	Mandatory Performance in Third-Level as Enabler in Music Education at Lower Levels Dr Eric Sweeney
15.30		Coffee

16.00		Open Forum Debates
	I D iv a I	The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision Chair: Ms Louise O'Connell Reporter: Ms Anne Leahy
	I D iv b II	The National Conservatoire Aspiration Chair: Professor Ronald Masin Reporter: Ms Bríd Grant
	I D iv c III	A National Forum for Music Education in Ireland Chair: Professor Paul Deegan Reporter: Mr Martin Barrett
17.00		Closing Session

15.11 Represented Bodies and Apologies (MEND Phase I)

The following were represented at the Music Education National Debate Phase I:

Department of Education
Dublin Institute of Technology
European Piano Teachers' Association
European String Teachers' Association
Feis Ceoil
Kerry School of Music
Limerick City University
Mary Immaculate Teacher Training College, Limerick
Mater Dei Institute
Mt Temple Comprehensive School
Music Network
National Children's Choir
National Council for Curriculum and Assessment
Newpark Music Centre
Post Primary Music Teachers' Association
Radio Telefís Eireann
Royal Irish Academy of Music
Schola Cantorum
St Patrick's Teacher Training College, Drumcondra
St Patrick's College, Maynooth
Trinity College, Dublin
University College, Cork
University College, Dublin
Waterford Regional Technical College

Apologies were received from the following invitees who were unable to attend:

Ms Jane Carty (Radio Telefís Éireann)
Ms Daphne Clifford (EPTA Ireland)
Professor David Cox (UCC)
Dr Marian Deasy (DIT)
Ms Kathleen Hegarty (DIT)
Ms Barbara Heas (Cumann Náisiunta na gCór)
Ms Eileen Herlihy (Wexford School of Music)
Mr Noel Kelly (Mary Immaculate College, Limerick)
Mr John Kinsella (P.I.A.N.O.)
Séamus MacMathúna (Comhaltas Ceoltóiri Éireann)
Sr Barbara McHugh (DIT)
Mr David Mooney (DIT)
Mr Colm Ó'Cléirigh (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
Dr John O'Conor (RIAM)
Mr Mícheál O'hEidhin(Dept of Education)
Dr Jane O'Leary (Concord)
Labhrás Ó'Mhurchú (Comhaltas Ceoltóiri Éireann)
Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, Limerick University)
Ms Anne-Marie O'Sullivan (DIT)
Ms Una Russell (DIT)
Dr Geoffrey Spratt (Cork School of Music)
Mr Michael Taylor (TCD)
Dr Simon Tresize (TCD)

15.12 MEND Phase II Programme

15.12.1 Summary of Open Forum Debate Sessions. Sat/Sun 11th/12th November 1995

1	II D ia	Philosophies of Music Education and the Great Divide Chair: Dr Ita Beausang Reporter: Sr Barbara McHugh
2	II D ib	Pre-School and Primary Education. The First and Critical Testing Ground for Philosophy of Music Education in Action Chair: Ms Gabrielle McCann Reporter: Mr Christopher Kinder
3	II D ic	Performance: Definitions and Strategies to Empower a Universal Faculty Chair: Dr Patrick Devine Reporter: Mr Mel Mercier
4	II D iia	The Conservatoire Aspiration. Educational Contexts of Music in Process of Transmission Chair: Ms Mary Lennon Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin
5	II D iib	A National Forum for Music Education; A Strategy for MEND Continuity Chair: Dr Eric Sweeney Reporter: Mr John O'Flynn
6	II D iic	Second Level Music Education in Ireland: Towards a True Continuum Chair: Colm Ó'Cléirigh Reporter: Ms Blánaid Murphy
7	II D iiia	Traditional Music and Formal Education Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin Reporter: Odhrán Ó'Casaide
8	II D iiib	The Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus Dilemma: Assessment with Multiple Aims Chair: Seán MacLiam Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin
9	II D iiic	Third-Level Music Education in Ireland: Vocation, Choices and Philosophies in Conflict. Chair: Professor Hormoz Farhat Reporter: Professor Ronald Masin
10	II D iva	Continuum in Music Education Curriculum: A Sine qua Non Chair: Mr Aidan O'Carroll Reporter: Ms Siobhán Kilkelly
11	II D ivb	Teacher Training: The Transition to Professionalism and a New Crisis for Philosophy in Action Chair: Professor Pamela Flanagan Reporter: Dr Gareth Cox
12	II D ivc	Specialization in Music Education: The Illusion of Real Choices

		Chair: Professor Gerard Gillen Reporter: Mr David Brophy

15.12.2 Saturday 11 November and Sunday 12 November 1995. Summary of Lectures/Presentations

1	II P i	Convergence in MEND Deliberations Mr Frank Heneghan (DIT, Director of Cultural Affairs)
2	II P ii	Irish Music Education and Irish Identity: A Concept Revisited Dr Marie Mc Carthy (Associate Professor, Dept of Music Education, The University Of Maryland at College Park)
3	II P iii	Aesthetic Education: Past, Present, and Potential for the Future Dr Bennett Reimer (Professor of Music Education at Northwestern University, Evanston, Chicago, Illinois)
4	II P iv	Performing Music, Knowing Music. Dr Janet Ritterman (Director, Royal College of Music, London)
5	II P v	The Rôle of the Music Educators' National Conference (M.E.N.C.) in American Music Education: Current Changes and Challenges Ms Dorothy Straub (M.E.N.C.)
6	II P vi	Children of Ireland, Children of the World: Appropriate Music Curriculum for Ireland in the 21st Century Dr Kari Veblen (Commission on Community Music, International Society for Music Education)
7	II P vii	Perspectives on Music(s), Culture, and Tradition with Special Reference to Contemporary Music Education. Dr Ramon Santos (Professor of Composition, Theory and Musicology at the University of the Philippines)
8	II P viii	Music Education, Music Performance, and the Irish Music Educator Dr David Elliott (Professor of Music and Music Education, University of Toronto; currently visiting Professor at the University of North Texas)
9	II P ix	Issues in Progress about Changes in Music Education in Ireland. Professor Richard Colwell (Chair of Music Education at the New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Massachusetts)

The organizers of MEND wish to thank the following:

- The President, Dr Brendan Goldsmith, for encouragement throughout
- The Directors of D.IT. (Bolton St and Kevin St), Mr Michael Murphy and Mr Frank Brennan (Engineering) and their staff for the use of premises and facilities.
- Bernadette Bridgman, Sally-Ann Fisher, Deborah Kelleher, Celine Kelly (DIT) and Adrian Murphy.
- Mrs Carol Briscoe, Mr Thomas Duff, Ms Claire Flynn, Ms Mary Lennon, Mrs Clare O'Halloran, Mrs Maureen Porter.
- All Lecturers, Chairpersons, Reporters and Participants
- The National Children's Choir, Na Casaidigh and all DIT teachers and performers involved in the Gala Concert at the National Concert Hall.

15.13 MEND Phase II Timetable

15.13.1 Saturday 11 November 1995

09.00		Registration
09.10		Chair: Professor J Valentine Rice (Chair of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin)
		Opening Address of Welcome Dr Brendan Goldsmith (President DIT)
09.20	II P i	Convergence in MEND Deliberations Mr Frank Heneghan
09.50	II P ii	Irish Music Education and Irish Identity: A Concept Revisited Professor Marie McCarthy
10.50		Coffee
11.15	II P iii	Aesthetic Education: Past, Present, and Potential for the Future Professor Bennett Reimer
12.15		Open Forum Debates
	II D i a I	Philosophies of Music Education and the Great Divide Chair: Dr Ita Beausang (Acting Director, DIT, Adelaide Rd) Reporter: Sr Barbara McHugh (DIT, Adelaide Rd) Panel: Dr Richard Colwell; Dr Bennett Reimer; Dr Ramon Santos
	II D i b II	Pre-School and Primary Education. The First and Critical Testing Ground for Philosophy of Music Education in Action Chair: Ms Gabrielle McCann (Dept of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College) Reporter: Mr Christopher Kinder (Post Primary Music Teachers' Association) Panel: Dr Marie McCarthy; Dr Dorothy Straub; Dr Kari Veblen
	II D i c III	Performance: Definitions and Strategies to Empower a Universal Faculty Chair: Dr Patrick Devine (Dept of Music, St Patrick's College, Maynooth) Reporter: Mr Mel Mercier (Dept of Music, University College, Cork) Panel: Dr David Elliott; Dr Janet Ritterman; Dr Terri Sundberg
13.15		Lunch
14.00		Chair: Dr Joseph Ryan (Army School of Music)
	II P iv	Performing Music, Knowing Music Dr Janet Ritterman
15 00	II P v	The Rôle of the Music Educators' National Conference (M.E.N.C.) in American Music Education: Current Changes and Challenges.

		Ms Dorothy Straub
16 00		Coffee
16.30		Open Forum Debates
	II D ii a I	The Conservatoire Aspiration. Educational Contexts of Music in Process of Transmission Chair: Ms Mary Lennon (Head of School of Keyboard Studies, DIT Adelaide Rd) Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin (Course Tutor, BMus Ed, DIT Adelaide Rd) Panel: Dr Richard Colwell; Dr Janet Ritterman; Dr Terri Sundberg
	II D ii b II	A National Forum for Music Education; A Strategy for MEND Continuity Chair: Dr Eric Sweeney (Head of Music, Waterford Regional Technical College) Reporter: Mr John O'Flynn (Kodaly Society of Ireland) Panel: Dr Bennett Reimer; Dr Dorothy Straub; Dr Ramon Santos
	II D ii c III	Second Level Music Education in Ireland: Towards a True Continuum Chair: Colm Ó'Cléirigh (St Patrick's College of Education, Drumcondra) Reporter: Ms Blánaid Murphy (Conductor, DIT College of Music Choral Society) Panel: Dr David Elliott; Dr Marie McCarthy; Dr Kari Veblen

15.13.2 Sunday, 12 November 1995

09.30		Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Chair of Music, University of Limerick)
	II P vi	Children of Ireland, Children of the World: Appropriate Music Curriculum for Ireland in the 21st Century. Dr Kari Veblen
10.30	II P vii	Perspectives on Music(s), Culture, and Tradition with Special Reference to Contemporary Music Education. Professor Ramon Santos
11.30		Coffee
12.00		Open Forum Debates
	II D iii a I	Traditional Music and Formal Education Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin Reporter: Odhrán Ó'Casaide Panel: Dr Ramon Santos; Dr Kari Veblen
	II D iii b II	The Leaving Certificate Music Dilemma; Assessment with Multiple Aims. Chair: Seán MacLiam (Chairman, Music Syllabus Sub-Committee, National Council for Curriculum and Assessment) Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association; Second-Level Teacher) Panel: Dr David Elliott; Dr Marie McCarthy; Dr Dorothy Straub
	II D iii c III	Third-Level Music Education in Ireland: Vocation, Choices and Philosophies in Conflict. Chair: Professor Hormoz Farhat (Emeritus Professor of Music, Trinity College, Dublin) Reporter: Professor Ronald Masin (European String Teachers' Association; Teacher of Strings, DIT, Adelaide Rd) Panel: Dr Richard Colwell; Dr Bennett Reimer; Dr Terri Sundberg
13.00		Lunch
14.00		Chair: Professor Harry White (Professor of Music, University College, Dublin)
	II P viii	Music Education, Music Performance, and the Irish Music Educator Professor David Elliott
15.00	II P ix	Issues in Progress about Changes in Music Education in Ireland Professor Richard Colwell
16.00		Coffee
16.30		Open Forum Debates
	II D iv a I	Continuum in Music Education Curriculum: A Sine qua Non Chair: Mr Aidan O'Carroll (Artistic Director, Kerry School of Music)

		Reporter: Ms Siobhán Kilkelly (School of Keyboard, DIT, Adelaide Rd) Panel: Dr Richard Colwell; Dr Ramon Santos
	II D iv b II	Teacher Training: The Transition to Professionalism and a New Crisis for Philosophy in Action Chair: Professor Pamela Flanagan (Senior Academic, Royal Irish Academy of Music) Reporter: Dr Gareth Cox (Specialist - Twentieth Century Music, Mary Immaculate College of Teacher Education, Limerick) Panel: Dr Marie McCarthy; Dr Bennett Reimer; Dr Kari Veblen
	II D iv c III	Specialisation in Music Education: The Illusion of Real Choices Chair: Professor Gerard Gillen (Professor of Music, St Patrick's College, Maynooth) Reporter: Mr David Brophy (Recent Graduate in Performance, DIT, Adelaide Rd) Panel: Dr David Elliott; Dr Dorothy Straub; Dr Terri Sundberg
17:30		Close of Conference Phase II

15.14 MEND Phase III

Keynote Address: Friday 8 November 1996 at 19.30

Conference: Saturday 9 November 09.00 to 17.30
Sunday10 November 09.30 to 17.30

The Conference will be formally opened by

Alderman Pat Carey, Deputy Lord Mayor of Dublin

at 7.30 p.m. on Friday, 7 November 1996

The organizers of MEND wish to thank the following:

The President of DIT, Dr Brendan Goldsmith, for his encouragement

The following Directors of D.I.T. for unfailing courtesy and help
Mr Frank Brennan (Engineering)
Dr David Gillingham (Academic Affairs)
Dr Ellen Hazelkorn (Applied Arts)
Mr Robert Lawlor (Secretary)
Mr Michael Mulvey (Tourism and Food)
Mr Paul Sullivan (Business Studies)
Mr Ray Wills (Finance)

Bernadette Bridgman, Sally-Anne Fisher, Celine Kelly, Gráinne O Boyle

All Lecturers, Chairpersons, Reporters and Participants

The Palestrina Choir, The Orchestra of St Cecilia, John Feeley, Louise Thomas, Peter Sweeney, Anne-Marie OSullivan, William Halpin and all DIT teachers and performers involved in the Gala Concert at the NCH.

The Co-Sponsors with DIT of this MEND Event
Siemens Nixdorf
The Bank of Ireland
The Institute of Education
S.I.P.T.U.
The Suzuki Society of Ireland
Jury's Hotel and Towers
Marks and Spencer
Superquinn

15.15 MEND Phase III Keynote Address

Dublin Institute of Technology

presents

Music Education National Debate

MEND

PHASE III

DIT (Bolton St)

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

‘the common sense of all music’

(Remembering Percy Grainger)

Emeritus Professor Sir Frank Callaway

Honorary President of the International Society for Music Education

Callaway International Research Centre for Music Education

The University of Western Australia

Sir Frank Callaway’s lecture will be introduced by Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat

15.16 MEND Phase III Timetable

15.16.1 Saturday 9 November 1996

08.45		Registration
09.10		Chair: Professor J Valentine Rice (Chair of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin) Opening Address of Welcome: Mr Frank Heneghan (Cultural Affairs, DIT)
09.15	III P i	The End of MENDor Just a Beginning? Mr Frank Heneghan
10.15	III P ii	Philosophies of Music as a Basis for Teacher Training Professor Harold Abeles
11:15		Coffee
11.45		Open Forum Debates
	III D i a	I Who Needs a Philosophy of Music Education? Reflections on an Irish Context Dr Ita Beausang (DIT, Adelaide Rd) Mr David Mooney (DIT, Adelaide Rd) Professor Harold Abeles, Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Professor Harry White.
	III D ib	II Time Constraints in Music Education. Politics and Strategies for Acceptance and Implementation of an Effective Music Curriculum Chair: Ms Ite O'Donovan (DIT, Adelaide Rd) Reporter: Mr Martin Barrett (University of Limerick and RIAM)) Panel: Sir Frank Callaway; Professor Paul Lehman; Professor Marie McCarthy; Professor Keith Swanwick.
12.45		Lunch
13.45		Chair: Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College)
	III P iii	National Standards and the Realities of Achievement in Music Education Professor Paul Lehman
14 45	III P iv	The Questionable Value of Assessment and Evaluation as Tools of Progress in the Implementation of the National Curriculum in the UK. Professor Keith Swanwick
15.45		Coffee
16.15		Open Forum Debates
	III D ii a	I The American National Standards as Aspiration. An Appraisal of their General Applicability Chair: Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick)

		Reporter: Professor Deirdre Doyle (RIAM) Panel: Professor Harold Abeles; Sir Frank Callaway; Professor Paul Lehman; Professor Marie McCarthy
	III D ii b	II Towards a Balanced Perspective on Assessment in Music Education. The Compatibility of Music with Other Standard-Setting Subjects. The True Aims of Assessment and Evaluation. Chair: Seán MacLiam (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra; Chairman NCCA Review Group [music]) Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association; Second-Level Teacher) Panel: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Professor Keith Swanwick; Professor Harry White

15.16.2 Sunday, 10 November 1996

09.30		Chair: Dr Thérèse Smith (UCD)
	III P v	Music as Universal Language! A Multicultural Music Educator's View. Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell
10.30	III P vi	A Strategy for the Promotion of Traditional Music in Formal Music Education Contexts in Ireland. Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin
11.30		Coffee
12.00		Open Forum Debates
	III D iii a	I Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in Music Education: Attainable Ideals, or a New Threat to an Overloaded Curriculum? Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin Reporter: Ms Kathleen Hegarty Panel: Professor Marie McCarthy; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Dr Kari Veblen
	III D iii b	II Making Music. Performance as Dominating Element in Music Education. A Realistic Approach to the Definition and Challenge of Performance at Competent, Proficient and Artistic Levels. Chair: Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra) Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin (Course Tutor [Performance] DIT [Adelaide Rd]) Panel: Professor Harold Abeles; Sir Frank Callaway; Professor Paul Lehman; Professor Harry White
13.00		LUNCH
14.00		Chair: Dr Ellen Hazelkorn, (Director of the Faculty of Applied Arts, DIT)
	III P vii	The Establishment of a Primary-Secondary Continuum in School Music Education in Ireland. Professor Marie McCarthy
15.00	III P viii	'A Book of Manners in the Wilderness': The Relevance of the University Model of Music Education as Enabler in General Education in Ireland Professor Harry White
16.00		Dr Ellen Hazelkorn
16.15		Coffee
16.30		Open Forum Debates
	III D iv a	I The Continuum in Music Education: Satisfying Basic Principles in Irish Schools. The Search for Suitable Teaching Materials Chair: Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple Comprehensive School, Dublin) Reporter: Ms Gabrielle McGann (Dept of Higher Education and Research

		Trinity College, Dublin) Panel: Professor Harold Abeles; Professor Marie McCarthy; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Dr Kari Veblen
	III D iv b	II To Triumph or Perish on the Rock of Relevance. Evolution or Revolution in Third-Level Music Education in Ireland Chair: Dr Mary Lennon (Head of School of Keyboard Studies, DIT [Adelaide Rd]) Reporter: Professor Pamela Flanagan (Senior Academic, RIAM) Panel: Sir Frank Callaway; Professor Paul Lehman; Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin; Professor Harry White.
17.30		Close of Conference

15.17 MEND Phase III Programme

15.17.1 Summary of Open Forum Debate Sessions, Sat/Sun 9th/10th November 1996.

1	III D ia	Who Needs a Philosophy of Music Education? Reflections on an Irish Context Chair: Dr Ita Beausang (DIT, Adelaide Rd) Reporter: Mr David Mooney (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
2	III D ib	Time Constraints in Music Education. Politics and Strategies for Acceptance and Implementation of an Effective Music Curriculum Chair: Ms Ite O'Donovan (DIT, Adelaide Rd) Reporter: Mr Martin Barrett (University of Limerick and RIAM)
3	III D iia	The American National Standards as Aspiration. An Appraisal of their General Applicability Chair: Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick) Reporter: Professor Deirdre Doyle (RIAM)
4	III D iib	Towards a Balanced Perspective on Assessment in Music Education. The Compatibility of Music with Other Standard-Setting Subjects. The True Aims of Assessment and Evaluation. Chair: Seán MacLiam (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra; Chairman NCCA Review Group [music]) Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association; Second-Level Teacher)
5	III D iiia	Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in Music Education: Attainable Ideals, or a New Threat to an Overloaded Curriculum? Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin Reporter: Ms Kathleen Hegarty
6	III D iiib	Making Music. Performance as Dominating Element in Music Education. A Realistic Approach to the Definition and Challenge of Performance at Competent, Proficient and Artistic Levels. Chair: Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra) Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó'Cuinneagáin (Course Tutor [Performance] DIT [Adelaide Rd])
7	III D iva	The Continuum in Music Education: Satisfying Basic Principles in Irish Schools. The Search for Suitable Teaching Materials Chair: Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple Comprehensive School, Dublin) Reporter: Ms Gabrielle McCann (Dept of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin)
8	III D ivb	To Triumph or Perish on the Rock of Relevance. Evolution or Revolution in Third-Level Music Education in Ireland Chair: Dr Mary Lennon (Head of School of Keyboard Studies, DIT [Adelaide Rd]) Reporter: Professor Pamela Flanagan (Senior Academic, RIAM)

15.17.2 Summary of Lectures, Sat/Sun 9th/10th November 1996

III P i	The End of MEND or Just a Beginning? Mr Frank Heneghan
III P ii	Philosophies of Music as a Basis for Teacher Training Professor Harold Abeles
III P iii	National Standards and the Realities of Achievement in Music Education Professor Paul Lehman
III P iv	The Questionable Value of Assessment and Evaluation as Tools of Progress in the Implementation of the National Curriculum in the UK. Professor Keith Swanwick
III P v	Music as Universal Language! A Multicultural Music Educator's View. Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell
III P vi	A Strategy for the Promotion of Traditional Music in Formal Music Education Contexts in Ireland. Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin
III P vii	The Establishment of a Primary-Secondary Continuum in School Music Education in Ireland. Professor Marie McCarthy
III P viii	'A book of manners in the wilderness': The Relevance of the University Model of Music Education as Enabler in General Education in Ireland. Professor Harry White

16 Significance of Phase III

16.1 Input from Interim Report I

A sense of progression and growth was built into the MEND initiative from the outset. Phase I was envisaged as being exploratory, attempting not only to quantify the spread of Irish music education activities but also to identify and comment on the range of perceived problems within it. This accounted for the fact that the invited speakers were all from the Irish music education lobby. The pre-ordained agenda, reflecting the views of Irish music educators attending the Heralding Conference in October 1994, was already, in a sense, a prognostication of areas of concern. The agenda, as primary source, was therefore expanded into a matrix of complementary lectures and debates to explore its nuance and to bring topics of abiding concern into focus for further treatment at the subsequent phases of MEND. This methodology, if it was to become a pattern for the overall conduct of the initiative, encapsulated an understanding that an interim report would be issued. How else could the progression be maintained creatively in the sense of fully briefing the participants in the later stages? An interim report became mandatory in the case of invited speakers from abroad whose subject-centred expertise could, obviously, not be assumed to include an intimate knowledge of the Irish context.

The entire documentation generated by Phase I was carefully studied and analysed in drafting the first Interim Report. It should also be confirmed that at this, the final (post-MEND III) stage of reporting, the documentation has again been scrupulously reviewed and fully reported on in the body of this report. The Interim Report Phase I (*qv*) offers an analysis which seeks to highlight material for further exploration, on the basis of the frequency of recurring statements of the same concern. Since all the agenda items were fertile in this respect it may be taken as an endorsement of the agenda itself. In regrouping the material in line with the agenda sequence, patterns emerged which suggested a matching format for the Phase II sessions. It will be remembered that Phase II was to be limited to inputs from abroad (formal presentations) by way of focused responses to the Irish context.

It was not expected that Phase I would yield authoritative articulation of philosophies of music education, an area of scholarship in which Ireland has not been productive; it did, however, produce copious reference to the need for philosophical underpinning of music education strategy. Since MEND coincided exactly with the publication of David Elliott's *Music Matters - A New Philosophy of Music Education*, which was generally understood to be a direct challenge to the well-established authority of Bennett Reimer's *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, rev 1989) it was particularly exciting that these two distinguished scholars accepted invitations to present their ideas at Phase II. The state of music education in Ireland (the second Agenda item), which, of course, permeated the whole of the MEND debates, had evinced a plethora of comment at Phase I. This, and the continuum issue in particular, seemed a difficult brief for any invitee not versed in the Irish scene. For this reason a slightly different approach had to be taken, and we were particularly fortunate that the services of Dr Marie McCarthy were secured; she is a highly respected scholar in the international scene of music education, but her Irish nationality and early professional training here came as a bonus in ensuring that she could tackle the double brief of taking a global stance on an intrinsically Irish concern.[36] Her rôle was truly a pivotal one as she had worked significantly with no less than five of the seven other visiting experts who presented papers at MEND Phase II; and there was no breach in the principle of confining the formal inputs to music educators from abroad. Performance, the fourth Agenda item, had been well debated at MEND Phase I in a variety of aspects; this brief was entrusted to Dr Ritterman, Director of the Royal College of Music in London, who was to mould it sensitively to include a substantial confrontation of the Conservatoire issue and its obvious relevance to third-level training. The question of Assessment, in relation to its principles, was reserved for Professor Swanwick (Phase III) but its immediate problems, copiously aired at Phase I in the context

[36] Professor McCarthy's treatment of the Continuum topic did not, however, take place until MEND Phase III.

of the Leaving Certificate crisis, were felt to be so specifically Irish in detail that they could not be adequately engaged by an educator from abroad with little feeling for their interpenetrations within the system; it seemed prudent, therefore, to deal with this topic in debate by engaging with the panel of visitors. National culture and its inescapable connections to the wider field of ethnomusicology and 'musics of the world's cultures' was considered to be a topic that needed special MEND advocacy to keep it vibrantly on the agenda. A fortuitous opportunity was seized in inviting Dr Veblen (an American scholar whose PhD research was in Irish traditional music) and Professor Ramon Santos, an extraordinarily committed multi-talented scholar who could provide, from a classical stance, a view on the hybrid multiculturalism of the Philippines, a post-colonial scenario which has innate relevance to both biculturalism (in a politico-nationalist sense) and to multiculturalism in its indigenous ethnic variety; the relevance to Ireland could not have been more persuasively invoked. The 'national forum for music education' issue, although it had, as reported, only received tentative treatment, at MEND Phase I, as a specific debate issue, had, nevertheless, been sufficiently defined, and was additionally invoked frequently throughout the other events. It was felt that a major presentation to explain the workings of such a forum would be a useful input at this time; that brief was offered to Dorothy Straub, as former president of the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC) in the United States. The participation of Professor Richard Colwell from the New England Conservatory, a prestigious research scholar and trouble-shooter extraordinary in matters of music education, completed the picture; he graciously accepted the unenviable task of acting as moderator for the international event. Perusal of the programme of Lectures and Debates for Phase II will confirm a complementary characteristic which would ensure diversity of treatment of the subject matter identified as having continuing key significance. The analysis of the material generated by Phase I of MEND was, therefore, used constructively to set the scene for its sequel to be compatible with the progressive plan.

The burning issues, drawn from the post-MEND III review of Phase I, and on which there was general agreement, identified themselves as:

1. The need in Ireland for a statement and promotion of a clear philosophy and rationale for music education.

2. The need for an inspired and inspiring teaching force at all levels. Enhanced professional training for teachers to be available in a three-stranded package covering pre-service, induction and in-service. The 1995 White Paper position in this respect was welcomed.

3. The endorsement of traditional (classical) models in the inculcation of literacy skills.

4. The need for suitable materials for teaching, promoting an Irish ethos. The work of Dr Albert Bradshaw was cited as typical and worthy of general adoption.

5. The promotion of peripatetic teaching as a short-term solution to regional inequality of access, especially to performance.

6. Engagement with the performance concept to define its parameters in practical terms.

7. The nurture of talent.

8. The development of a regionally well-distributed performance programme readily available to all, even if not a free scheme.

9. Continuing reappraisal of the Leaving Certificate complex of problems.

10. The encouragement of pedagogical interaction between the traditional and formal systems of education.

11. Continuing advocacy of a research basis for the enhancement of Irish traditional music modules in formal education.

12. The implementation, in the context of music, of the progressive educational ideas promulgated in the1995 White Paper on Education.

13. Solidarity (self-rationalization) in the approach to third-level education in music by all the participating agencies, especially in the matter of issuing composite course availability information.

14. Continuing vigilance in relation to any discontinuities in the music education system - between levels or between otherwise discrete groups of educators.

15. The conservatoire issue.

16. A forum for music education in Ireland, inter alia, to boost communication and to create an ambience in which the interactions of various interest groups could be identified, defined, discussed, refined and co-ordinated.

16.2 Input from Interim Report II

It can easily be ascertained, from the MEND Interim Report from Phase II, that the international event provided saturating exposure to philosophical dialectic, which had been divined at Phase I as being indispensable to the progress of thoughtful and well informed initiative. The question of the Ireland's supposed biculturalism and its relationship to total multiculturalism, within educational strategy, was also massively engaged. These two main thrusts – the philosophical and the cultural – were suffused with and additionally supported by coverage of the performance issue and that of balance in the curriculum; this naturally led on to professional considerations concerning teacher training, third level education and the conservatoire aspiration.

It was anticipated that the philosophical presentations would be provocative, but as muted in confrontation as the 'proximity only' strategy of scheduling the Reimer and Elliott participation could achieve. But Ireland was not ready for the apparent degree of polarity that came to light. This spilled over, usefully, into the philosophical aspects of Phase III but neither Professor Abeles nor Professor Lehman attempted to arbitrate in the disagreement. The battleground was nevertheless prepared; it was left to Professor White to step into the breach. In the event his paper at Phase III (*A book of manners in the wilderness*) was destined to take the philosophical argument onto the world stage, to attract responses from Reimer and Elliott and, in the process, to lead the MEND analysis into uncharted areas and a gruelling rationalization exercise in trying to reconcile the opposing views; this, of course, was of inestimable value to the outcome. It was always expected that the fundamental importance of music education philosophy would eventually dominate the culmination of the MEND initiative, and this proved to be the case. The post-MEND White/Reimer/Elliott debate was to reopen the whole spectrum of concerns encapsulated in the MEND agenda. But there was no way of knowing that this was going to happen. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the complementarity between the inputs to MEND Phases II and III (and the subsequent analysis) so effectively sensed the true hierarchy of music education concerns in global (universal) terms, and as eventually applicable and applied to the Irish context. They were, only subsequently, articulated by Bennett Reimer, in his response to Harry White, as 1) the high culture/ popular dichotomy as a sociological as well as a purely educational phenomenon, 2) the multicultural movement, and 3) the nature and management of performance in music education. Thus the whole agenda was reconfirmed as having been relevant and was effectively engaged, from purely national as well as from international perspectives, during the composite Phase II as III sessions

Specifically, the following were the concerns passed on for further treatment to Phase III, and to the analysis stage, as the full impact of the Reimer/Elliott debate (and, intuitively, its extra-MEND sequels) was felt: -

1. The search for a contextual philosophy for Ireland. This was then advanced by the presentations of all the speakers at Phase III.

2. The relevance of the pedagogical (as, indeed, the philosphical) content in teacher training.

3. The nature of performance and its realistic accommodation within the total music education dispensation in Ireland.

4. The effective use of time management in bringing a realistic general music curriculum to schools.

5. The availability, accessibility and affordability of appropriate specialist (especially instrumental) training in Ireland.

6. Serious appraisal of the bicultural/multicultural issue and its implications for the expansion and management of the school curriculum.

7. Continuing examination of the aims, in music education, of assessment, in general, and of senior cycle music in secondary schools, in particualr.

8. Continuum in all its aspects, as between discrete phases of general music education in schools, at the interface with third level, between school and community.

9. Third-level music education in all its aspects, including the impact of the hoped-for establishment of a conservatoire.

17 ANALYSIS (I)

It has been a feature of MEND discovery that problems are more soluble singly than in their interactive context, which is the problem in Irish music education.

Frank Heneghan (MEND Final Report)

17.1 Key Concepts

Because of the streaming of the MEND debates it would not have been possible for anyone to have participated in the entire proceedings. With a small number of exceptions[37] hard copies of all the material generated by MEND were made available to the writer. In attempting to analyse this wealth of documentation in a manner that would be accessible to a reader with specific interests, the topics treated were segregated into categories. These were made to correspond with the Agenda under its 8 headings. Each heading was then subdivided to embody a number of evocative key concepts drawn generally from the titles of the formal presentations and the debates themselves. Each of these key concepts is considered separately and any implicit or overt recommendations resulting from the proceedings is added at the end of its analytical treatment. For those wishing to trace the derivation of the extracted essence, the code numbers (see tables above) for the relevant debates and papers are given and there is an elaborate immediate cross-referencing cueing system incorporated in the text further to facilitate the reader. The topics reported on are as follows; they are treatred separately in Section 18 (Analysis II):

18.1 Agenda I. Philosophy of Music Education

- 18.1.1 Overview of Music Education Philosophy
- 18.1.2 Contextual Philosophy
- 18.1.3 Composing (Creativity): Performing: Listening
- 18.1.4 Time Management
- 18.1.5 Dichotomy

18.2 Agenda II. State of Music Education in Ireland

- 18.2.1 General Provision
- 18.2.2 Music in the Community
- 18.2.3 Private Enterprise and Semi-State Provision
- 18 2 4 Materials for Music Education

[37] In the case of a small number of debates, for which the gathering subdivided into interest groups relocated away from the main auditorium, the recording facilities are known to have failed to produce audible tapes. This was particularly troublesome during Phase III. However, the material available, exclusive of these lacunas, is considered to be generally adequate for the analysis. It should be remembered that the formal presentations and the debates were very closely related in thematic relevance.

18.3 Agenda III. Continuum in Music Education

18.4 Agenda IV. Performance

18.4.1 Performance and Élitism

18.4.2 Specialization

18.4.3 Music Schools

18.4.4 Performance in Third Level

18.4.5 Professional Training in Performance (APA)

18.5 Agenda V. Assessment

18.5.1 General Comments on Assessment

18.5.2 Assessment in the National Curriculum

18.5.3 The Leaving Certificate Crisis

18.5.4 National Standards (US)

18.6 Agenda VI. National Culture Biculturalism versus Multiculturalism

18.7 Agenda VII. Music Education at Third Level

18.7.1 Options

18.7 2 Professional Training

18.7.3 Teacher Training

18.7.4 The Conservatoire Aspiration (APA)

18.8 Agenda VIII. Forum for Music Education

17.2 Introduction

No serious music educator will disavow the value of philosophical underpinning in the optimization and professionalization of the teaching function, as being in itself quintessential to the success of music education strategy. It was anticipated, by the organizers of MEND, that if the initiative was well attended by the teaching profession (as it was hoped it would be and as, indeed, it was) their day-to-day concerns would dominate the discussions at Phase I; the proceedings were tailored to allow this to happen. In other words, the exclusively Ireland-based presenters were expected to give an exposé of how it *is* with music education in this country, and this was intended to stimulate a characteristic response. It was predicted that there would, however, be many philosophical resonances in expressed wishes eventually to confront the fundamental parameters underlying difficulties rather than to be satisfied just with identifying them or with proposing random short-term solutions.

Thus, as it turned out, the field of philosophical thought, and the insecurity of Irish educators in relation to it, was invoked and loomed large in the collective mentality as it was articulated at Phase I. But it is all too easy for practitioners to be suspicious or even dismissive of scholarly pursuits which they perceive to be remote from the cutting-edge of the class situation or the individual lesson. The claim that music was there before musicology, and that music education existed long before its multifarious possibilities were charted and exhaustively analysed by philosophers keen to pronounce on the subject, can easily lead to the spurious assumption that music and music education can exist and survive well enough without such scholarly inputs. We find Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin, however unintentionally, encouraging this view in his stout defence of the non-literate mode of music education. 'Music and musicology are not of equal significance. Music can exist without musicology. Musicology cannot exist without music. . . . Musicologists do not always serve music well. The powers of verbal articulation and language literacy, which are at the heart of the discipline, can be abused at the expense of music'.[38] Can the same be said of music education philosophy? Paul Lehman, perhaps the most admirably down-to-earth scholar (and practitioner) to address MEND (Phase III. Ref. III P iii) had this to say, touching upon the crucial performance issue, but in tones of some weariness, and even impatience, with the vituperative philosophical debate then current (1996):

'Philosophy and practice are mutually reinforcing because philosophy provides a basis for practice and practice provides an opportunity to test and validate philosophy. . . . If it hadn't been for that emphasis on performance [in the US] we wouldn't be in the strong position we're in today. The challenge now is to expand that emphasis to include analysis, music of other cultures, and so forth. The truth is that we need a *balance* [writer's italics] between the so called "arts approach", which emphasizes performance and creation, and the so-called "humanities approach", which emphasizes analysis, criticism, and history. In any case, the precise nature of the balance is subject to honest disagreement. . . . you can try to answer the specific, practical questions one must answer in designing a curriculum. The answers you reach may help you to clarify your philosophy by indirect means. The discussion engendered by Bennett Reimer and David Elliott is enormously stimulating and helpful, but music education was firmly entrenched across our nation [US] generations before we began to examine these issues closely. . . . don't wait until you have all the answers before you move forward.'

Sound valedictory advice, but it does not play down the value of philosophical debate and travail or the need to engage in it. And this view was anticipated or mirrored by many of the speakers at MEND. By the end of Phase I it was clear that the delegates too were already reaching out and demanding access to this inadequately tapped resource to explore its potential in shedding light on the many issues raised. As it transpired, the issue of philosophy in general, and performance in particular, transmuted the MEND *mise-en-scène* into a battleground where the first skirmishes of a much more global encounter were engaged in; two titans - Bennett Reimer, the reigning champion, so to speak, and David Elliott, the pretender - mounted the stage. Nor was this a coincidence. Elliott's iconoclastic book, *Music Matters; A New Philosophy of Music Education* had just been published,

[38] Mícheál Ó'Súilleabháin, Ref. I P/D N (Half-day seminar on National Music, May 1995)

following a series of well-aired ‘trailers’ indicating that it was going to throw down the gauntlet to the revered wisdom, of Reimer, which had dominated the scene, virtually without challenge, for exactly a quarter of a century. But it was not merely the eminence of the participants that aroused interest. It was rather that performance was such a burning issue in Irish music education on a variety of aspects - availability, accessibility, continuity and affordability in education; its presence or otherwise in schools; the notion of élitism in relation to it; standard; assessment . . . . and so forth - that the idea of its new claims to dominance as a topic on the first-world stage was intriguing. Although the high profile publicity given to this struggle was played down by several of the visiting specialists (notably Swanwick, Abeles and Lehman), its significance for Ireland, in focusing on philosophy and performance, each *per se*, should not, in the writers’ view, be underestimated. When this proximity debate (for the two never did engage in face to face disputation) was enlivened by Harry White’s melodramatic intervention at Stage III - *A book of manners in the wilderness* (Ref III P viii), it had already produced a corpus of literature and this was further expanded in a way which now offers valuable scope to probe these two issues (philosophy and performance) and others in their Irish context. And the contribution of Richard Colwell in acting as the moderator of the whole international conference (MEND Phase II), quite apart from offering his own deeply penetrating paper, which was also a fund of philosophical wisdom, should not be gainsaid.

17.3 Introduction to the Elliott/Reimer Case

Before engaging, again, with the Reimer/Elliott material in this post MEND III review it is timely to answer the question as to why it might be helpful to analyse rationales which are known to be so publicly polarized. Who can arbitrate between them? How can they be made to converge in a way which is worthwhile for Ireland (or, indeed, any other searching system) to consider. These questions would acquire more urgency if it were hinted that one more than another is now, arguably, a preferred approach to general education in Ireland, albeit in its own characteristic guise. Have we made the right choices? Does it really matter; there are many roads to Parnassus? Are these the only choices available to us? What are the possibilities for eclecticism? The International Society for Music Education engaged this same problem when it invited Bennett Reimer to give a paper entitled *Should there be a universal philosophy of music education?* at its biennial conference held in Amsterdam in 1996, only months after MEND Phase II. 'No such universal philosophy of music has been articulated and has been recognized by the world's music educators to be universally acceptable. . . . Lacking such a philosophy, claims for the universality of music have no firm foundation. Yet the intuition that there is, indeed, a universal dimension of music education remains persuasive or at least attractive'.[39] Already the notion of flexibility is being predicated; in other words, if the strategies of music education could be adaptable to their contextual demands, areas of disagreement might be reconciled, and universals could be applied without being threatened or invalidated by circumstances. In Ireland, to name but two burning questions, the place of performance in music education and the degree or definition of multiculturalism that we apply to our endeavours are two areas that need to engage flexibly with philosophies that address these areas, as most philosophies will and must in the current climate, if they are not to appear bland and diffident in the face of these supremely challenging issues.

[39] Abstract of paper by Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a universal philosophy of music?*, delivered in Amsterdam in July 1996 (International Journal of Music Education Conference Edition No 29 1997) 4-20.

17.4 Reimer's Universal Philosophy of Music Education (*Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music?*)

In this epochal paper[40], *Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music*, Reimer, not without celebrating his own idea that philosophy is itself an ever-changing discipline, constantly responding to fertile ideas and renewing itself, laid out a most compelling contemporary vision of the many ways in which philosophy of music can work, the options that are available within the wider matrix of possibilities, and their interrelational (in)compatibilities. This, of course, coming from the acknowledged doyen in the field, has profound implications for all thinkers about music and music education. In spite of some sophisticated and logically insinuated name-calling (in the context of *his* interpretation of what David Elliott's praxialism entails), without which bias its impact must surely have been even more telling, the theorizing in this paper is admirably succinct and provocatively innovative. In brief, Reimer notes four philosophical approaches, condensing the traditional triptych of Formalism, Referentialism and Expressionism into the first two of these, and adding Praxialism and Contextualism; this last, almost by its very name, suggests the sought-after multi-adaptable model, if its fructifying interconnection with the other three in a balanced way (the *gestalt*, so to speak) is also accepted and respected.

The writer would go so far as to say that this paper from Reimer's pen should be essential reading for all musicians, but especially for those who have any involvement in the pedagogical field. It is, almost impeccably, an impressively craftsmanlike assembly of the facts of music education that need to be correlated to make any sense of such a seemingly incompatible array of stances, all of which lead to specific but diverse practices within the global community. There is all the familiar bouquet of old wine in a new decanter as he deftly mobilizes his players into new and challenging relationships. And even when Reimer constrains his still unrefined model of a universal philosophy (based on a co-existing relationship between the non-extremist norms of yet potentially dogmatic positions) to search for 'what is common at the level of our deepest values and fundamental beliefs', he does not lose contact with the reader, though his reasoning demands painstaking appraisal which for the casual reader might place it beyond the bounds of immediate absorption. Yet his espousal of the existential theories, related in turn to theories of art, of Robert Plant Armstrong is a personal journey that is as plausible in its invitation to follow as anything from Reimer's pen; while arcane and Epicurean in flavour, it makes a compelling case for understanding that ultimate involvement in the mystery of music which underlines its universality, and reconciles its differences whether it is experienced as 'light-hearted and momentary entertainment of modest proportions or understood to offer the deepest, most profound satisfactions and meanings available to *homo sapiens*'.

[40] Note that much of this précis draws verbatim from Bennett Reimer's ISME paper, *Should there be a Universal Philsophy of Music*, read in Amsterdam in 1996.

17.5 Commonly-held Values about Music Education (Reimer)

Reimer has a three-tiered approach. The first is to suggest a range of commonly-held values about music. These are:

1. That music is a positive force in life

2. That music and musical learning are worthy of support

3. That there should be access, typically by the young, to music through education

4. That comprehensiveness in music education (as for example the inclusion of offerings from a range of cultures) is a desirable goal; this is perhaps the most controversial of Reimer's claims (see 15.1.12.2 below)

5. That support for music education should come from the culture

6. That music education should be continuous and systematic

7. That talent must be selectively nurtured without negating the aspiration of 'music for all'

Note that 2. and 5. (above) are not the same.

This list of values, even allowing for differences of opinion in some areas, leads to the question as to 'Why, exactly, is music positive for people, or essential for people?' This is the point at which philosophical stances become important. The most difficult challenge to philosophy is in attempting to understand and provide principles for how humans can lead more fulfilling lives. It is tied into valuing, and must explain in relation to music and music education, what their nature and most significant values are. The idea that a universal philosophy - in an age when difference is cherished and celebrated as much as, if not more than, similarity - may be a questionable ideal is not, in Reimer's view, persuasive enough to cause philosophers to retreat from trying to define its commanding parameters. 'We want to make . . . a coherent whole, because we ourselves rejoice in the contemplation of a unity. Man loves unities'.[41]

[41] Carlos Chavez, *Musical Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), 28

17.6 Four Philosophical Positions

Reimer's second tier comprises a treatment of, minimally, four philosophical positions that must be accommodated and reconciled within a *Gesamtphilosophie* before testing its canons in the crucible of human experience. This last challenge, as engaged by Reimer, is a highly cerebral one; it is attractive as a potential study in conceptual philosophy but, in the writer's view, is too esoteric, a tendency towards existentialism being perhaps too controversial . . . . and therefore, in itself, almost a measure of the problem of articulating a philosophy of universal *understanding and acceptance* in the first place. However, Reimer's insights into the differences and possible interactions between the component stances of the *gestalt* philosophy are, at a pragmatic level, most valuable as outstandingly user-friendly guidelines for bilateral testing of embryo strategies and practices against the spectrum of possible philosophical underpinnings. This is where the paper has so much to offer in appraising the Irish situation. The philosophical stances explored are Formalism, Praxialism, Referentialism and Contextualism.

17.7 Formalism

Formalism, Reimer explains, emphasizes the *products* of musical creativity as being the key component in understanding what music is and does, and why it should be valued. Music is the making of particular kinds of events different from all other events because they exist to do the particular thing music does - to create, with sounds, significant or intrinsically meaningful *forms*, embodying sets of interrelations capable of yielding musical responses by those able to be engaged appropriately with them. Pure Formalism insists that the experience of art is essentially unconnected to *all* other life experiences. These *aesthetic* experiences are dependent for their occurrence and enjoyment on inherent talent and/or concentrated education. It is this approach to aesthetics which is so vulnerable to attack from more liberal philosophies. Formalism may be associated with a focus on the great works of art as exemplars of artistic form suitable for study; it supports talent education, attempting to elevate, but not without pejorative insinuations, the taste of the masses for better listening; it recognizes and condones the high/mass dichotomy as an irreconcilable reality. Reimer mitigates extreme Formalism by suggesting that intrinsically significant forms *musically* created, albeit explainable as to their total meaning by other philosophical approaches, can still be construed as supporting Formalism. Clearly, however, Formalism is implacable in its judgements and exclusivist too, and establishes hierarchies in which *optimal experiences* are reserved for the few. Its tenets, emphasizing the craft of music-making, must nevertheless be included as a force in the *Gestalt*.

17.8 Praxialism

Praxialism, in contrast to Formalism, emphasizes the doing, the acting, the creating involved in music as being the essence of music. The products of the process are decidedly secondary. Music should be construed as a verb - 'musicing' if you will. Reimer warns, as he does in relation to Formalism, against fundamentalist tendencies. His interpretation of the approach to Praxialism espoused by David Elliott in his book - *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* - is that it is too extreme and doctrinaire, too radical in its overwhelming focus on process. The process is paramount, and he believes that Elliott concentrates exclusively on performance as the major goal, purpose and value of music and music education. This unrelieved judgement is, of course, hotly challenged by Elliott (and must be further analysed in this document as to its plausibility), but if justified, it could arguably vindicate the kind of rhetoric used to condemn such a far-reaching version of the centrality of performance.

Although eminently clear in the specifics of its interpretation and in the pungency of its condemnation, the overall impression left by this treatment of Praxialism is that the deletion of the anti-Elliott tirade would have left the section without much substance[42]. In fact it is not really clear from the attack on Elliott's perceived obsession with *performance* (*sic* and note also the fine distinction implied in Seán MacLiam's paper [Ref I P xiii] between performing [the activity or process] and performance [presumably the product]) whether he (Elliott) is concerned with product or with process - or with both (as he himself would probably claim). And Reimer establishes such a case for the inseparability of product and process that it might have been more prudent not to have attempted to isolate them in the first place. 'Formalism, when understood as calling attention to the products created by musical processes and how these products can be experienced, and praxialism, when understood as calling attention to the processes by which musical products come into being and are shared, are not, except in their extremist versions, incompatible. Indeed, music cannot exist without products and processes as completely interdependent.' It seems that praxialism, thus emaciated by dependence, would have been better served as an adjunct to product or as being seen as a functional *context* of 'musicing'. But Reimer's classification is not without plausibility, particularly as he eventually includes praxialism, however conceptualized, as a necessary though insufficient component of the *Gestalt* .

[42]In this respect Reimer is arguably hoist with his own petard in attempting to separate product from process in definition; admittedly he eventually reaches the conclusion, by a kind of null hypothesis, that the two are inseparable. 'Products are the outcomes of the doing; . . . Music should primarily be construed as a verb - "muscling if you will". To music is to do a certain kind of thing - to make [writer's insertion: not to imagine, compose or listen to] sounds . . .' This seems to be suggesting that Reimer himself is subconsciously construing process as situated primarily in performance. In instancing the Eroica Symphony is he therefore presenting us with a unique case of processual composing - that of Beethoven himself? And the idea of the listening (and therefore also the performance) process without the product is, as Reimer says, problematical, to say the least. Conducting is equally without a referent. Arranging and improvising (to complete Elliott's list of parenthetical activities) are left to their own devices as to full treatment of their vitality as process - arbitrarily by Reimer, more culpably by Elliott. The holistic and empowering concept of listening as conceptual performance and performance as vicarious composition, is destabilized and threatened, if not negated, by this artificial separation of product from process.

17.9 Referentialism

It is surely an interesting observation on Bennett Reimer's thesis about a universal philosophy of music education, and indeed a tribute to the author himself too, that it cannot be easily construed as propaganda for his own philosophical position as expounded between 1970 and 1989, the dates of publication and revision of his own book - *A Philosophy of Music Education*. Treatment of the aesthetic idea, with which his name has been associated as being a staunch proponent, if not the architect, of the so-called Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) Movement in the US, appears only in the section dealing with fundamentalist Formalism - an unlikely ambience for Reimer philosophy. And its greatly mollified and much more adaptable version, known generally as Absolute Expressionism,[43] is nowhere to be found, except by implication, but is seemingly concealed in the section dealing with *Referentialism*.[44] It is here that Reimer is, in the writer's view, at his most subtle and brilliant; and his detachment is singularly effective in enabling him, with consummate clarity, to classify a considerable array of stances under one species. This is peerless philosophizing. He begins with the innocuous claim that 'under the heading of Referentialism I mean to include a variety of positions about the essential nature and value of music and music education different from those focusing on either music as product or as process'.

Again, borrowing copiously from Reimer's succinctness of exposition[45], 'in Referentialism the values of music are gained less from conceiving music as significant form or significant action than from conceiving it as a powerful instrumentality for achieving values to which music can lead us. The referentialist listener attends to the sounds being heard (the product) and to the sounds as they are made (the process) with the assumption that those sounds contain a message or messages not unlike those communicated by the sounds of language. Musical sounds, like words, refer. They point outside themselves to meanings, images, ideas, emotions [note that Reimer uses the word emotion, which is an-aesthetic, and not feeling], descriptions of places, things, people and so forth. [In] (m)usic without words more imagination has to be exerted to locate and identify the meanings, . . . the listener must 'interpret' its meaning by seeking a variety of clues, inside the music. Referentialism proposes that musical experience be conceived as the recognition of such meanings and their incorporation as an essential ingredient in one's experience. Music is a particular way in which 'communication' occurs, the language model of communication being the paradigm.'

Since Reimer, in first and correctly defining philosophy as a search for nature, meaning and value (*inter alia)*, is subsequently attempting to evolve to a universal philosophy, he scrupulously decides that extrinsic values cannot be ignored. There is a curious but distinct feeling here and later, of a slightly motley collection of values (well defined, it may be added, in educational advocacy literature) in search of philosophical sanction. The validity of such a search may pose many questions, not the

[43] This interpretation of the most natural placing of Reimer's own stance is purely authorial and doesn't in any way affect the line of reasoning adopted in the universal philosophy essay. It is hoped that Bennett Reimer may concede that this reading is possible. In relation to formalism he claims that '[at] one end of the continuum the focus on formed products can be so narrow as to exclude many important dimensions of music not entirely attributable to the form of musical works. At the other end of the continuum formed sounds continue to be understood to be an essential component of music, but additional dimensions, such as represented by the three other positions I will explain [Praxialism, Referentialism and Contextualism], are seen to be important in establishing the nature of music as a way of bringing a particular kind of meaning into being through intrinsically significant forms musically created'. The writer sees this as a suggestion that the symbolic nature of music, especially in relation to the 'forms of feeling', to use a Langerian phrase, is a relevant value which, nevertheless, fits better in a referential than in a formal sense (p. 12 of the essay). As Reimer says (p. 18 of the essay): 'Musical sounds, like words, refer. They point outside of themselves to meanings, images, *ideas, emotions* [writer's italics] descriptions of places, things, people, events, and so forth'

[44] Reimer's reference on p 23 of the Universality essay could, however, lead to a different view. Here he refers back to Formalism: 'Musical products, and their intrinsically *expressed* (writer's italics)or significant forms, on which formalism focuses, always exist in the context of particular cultures and times, so they are contextualized by necessity'

[45] As already acknowledged, much of this précis is drawn verbatim form Reimer's Amsterdam paper.

least of which is whether Reimer is himself not amongst the intrepid 'few [who] would be so boldly politically incorrect as to publicly proclaim their position'.[46] Reimer articulates his awareness and concern that by recognizing a plethora of non-musical results (such as growth in self-discipline and self-esteem, optimal experience and 'flow') from musical activities as referential values he is rendering music vulnerable to being rivalled or supplanted by other occupations offering the same extrinsic benefits, thus partially disabling a purer philosophy from pursuing if not insisting on the more refined ideals of *sui generis* worth. But, it seems that political correctness does enjoin caution, prudence and inclusiveness. So music's instrumental utility is, rather uncomfortably, included under a referentialist view of its value.[47]

[46] This apt and candid quotation is from Reimer, in commenting on the high/mass, art/utilitarian cleavage, in the way music is experienced. See Harry White, *A book of manners in the wilderness.* (MEND Phase III) which was subsequently published, together with responses (from David Elliott and Bennett Reimer) in the College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society, Volume 38 (1998), p 77.

[47] The range of inclusions, under the heading of Referentialism, resembles a *Gestalt* rather than a continuum. The highly aesthetic concept of Absolute Expressionism, with its subtle interplay of the artistic, craft, feelingful, mimetic, expressive and symbolic significance of human perception (the referent), on the one hand, is set side by side with such utilitarian considerations as the attainment of discipline, social skills . . . self-growth, enjoyment, self-esteem and optimal experience on the other.

17.10 Contextualism

The boldest step in Reimer's exposé of a fully adaptable philosophy is to construct the backdrop against which the three approaches (Formalism, Praxialism and Referentialism) can engage, individually, interdependently and collectively with the essentially human milieu they purport to empower and explain. It was not a simple matter to envision the binding force of *context*, in which a *Gestalt* psychology creates, from the interactions between the components themselves and with their contexts, a new dimension in which the result is greater than the sum of the parts; the interesting correlation established between the workings of the philosophy of music education and those of music itself is elegantly conceived.

17.11 Functional/Utilitarian approaches to Music Education

It has been noted elsewhere in this report (See McCarthy Ref III P vii) that imaginative approaches to music education theory representing significant departures from the currently controversial ones of Elliott and Reimer are extant, notably and typically those of Merriam and Fowler, stressing the *functions* of music. Although these may stray at times from the purer motives that might be more appropriately attributed to the modified versions of Formalism, they are concerned (very much so) with that vital link between music and life as lived, from its most mundane and prosaic manifestations, through its pragmatism/utilitarianism and eventually to the upper reaches of optimal experience and to those all-too-rare instances of complete identification with the *sui generis* qualities of music. These approaches tie in very comfortably with the notion of context.

Contextualism stresses that the sociocultural functions of music are the focus of attention. What makes it a 'position' is the particular dimension it emphasizes in explaining music. Music is, first and foremost, a playing out of, or manifestation of, or aural portrayal of, the psychological, emotional, political and social forces of the human context in which it exists; . . . it is the function music plays in cultural participation which most explains its nature and value. Music must be issues-orientated, value centred, sociologically and politically involved in the culture's ongoing life. Reimer's ideas on Contextualism dovetail very well with his statement elsewhere (see his response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness*), that the three commanding issues in current music education dialectic – multiculturalism, the high/mass culture dichotomy and performance training – are, precisely, both sociologically and politically involved in our culture's ongoing life.

In conclusion Reimer argues against the extremist rejection of the aesthetic ideal, a scenario in which 'music is whatever a culture's institutional policy-makers decide to call music'. He proposes, rather, that a carefully constructed *Gestalt* philosophy, typically as he has attempted to construct one within the aspiration of universality, can guide us to a secure position where 'we can recognize the essentiality of context in our construals of what music is and does, while at the same time recognizing that what music is and does has to do with something identifiably musical.' And Reimer, in relinquishing his claim to have the last word, so to speak, quotes Roger Scruton, the British aesthetician, in a passage of provocative relevance. ' . . . the work of art is designed as the object of a certain response . . . Responses depend upon prevailing psychological and social conditions. And if a response is to be significant to the person who feels it, it must bear some relation to his life as a whole: it must be part not only of his enjoyment, but also of his *concern*.[48] This all-embracing *aesthetic*, simply as a response to things perceived and intentionally value-free as enfranchising no particular stance to the exclusion of another, is a helpful way of rescuing the art work response from the realms of esotericism, and firmly establishing it as an almost domestic experience and resonance. In his *Universality* essay Reimer takes a giant step in seeking to accommodate the widest spectrum of musical experiences as worthy of consideration in the music education menu. There may be an implicit admission that the purely aesthetic (in the formal sense) fails to validate the desired criterion of universality; on the other hand the compromise opens up a plethora of new problems, giving considerations of relevance, time management, balance and judgements of quality an ever-increased significance and sense of urgency.

[48] Roger Scruton, *Musical Understanding and Musical Culture* (in *What is Music?*, ed. Philip Alperson [New York; Haven])

17.12 Bennett Reimer in Ireland

In a different forum[49] Bennett Reimer had this to say:

'I feel more than just academically interested in the dilemmas facing Irish music education . . . having found myself deeply immersed . . . on Irish turf (an unlikely but welcome occurrence) but also, I admit, [with] a certain sense of frustration. This stems from the assumption on the part of the organizers of the (MEND) debate that voices from the U.S. could add something meaningful to it. . . . Surely the glaring gaps between the two cultures were at least equally a limitation to what we could offer as our seeming similarities enabled us to be of some help'.

In the face of this polite self-effacement, the decision to invite Bennett Reimer to Ireland should now be explained and defended. It is scarcely a matter of dispute to claim that Reimer has probably influenced more music educators than any other living music-orientated philosopher. It is true that his paper dealing with the notion of a universal philosophy of music education had still not been delivered in November 1995 (although he did kindly make a private copy available to the MEND organizers before its publication); the full significance of its impact could not have been anticipated, but its possibilities could certainly have been predicted. So it may be suggested that his lecture in Dublin was, for many, a revealing introduction to one very sophisticated theory as to how music works as a human endeavour. The engagement with David Elliott, suitably distanced and, so, muted by the logistics of the MEND timetable, added a fascinating if confusing dimension to the ongoing debate. The exposé in Amsterdam represented a giant step forward in significance for MEND outcomes. Reimer was already the richer for the Elliott challenge; his gift for clarity had an even sharper focus. He had moved on from his 1989 and MEND positions and was forging a new matrix of ideas in which he both questioned his own position and simultaneously reaffirmed it in a progressive way; the consequences for MEND analysis were spectacular in the introduction, or at least the clarification, of the contextual approach. It may be claimed by rivals that there was nothing new in the ideas propounded in Amsterdam but it is in the synthesis that Reimer has scored his triumph, not for the corpus of his own evolving philosophy, it might be added, but in the comprehensive philosophical formula advanced, a yardstick against which local strategies could be effectively measured, and validated or rejected, on their contextual applicability.

In further defence of the MEND strategy to involve the American philosophical lobby in the debate, let it be said that Ireland was ready for the novelty of personal inputs and further fertilization from the English-speaking world but from a pool not just defined by her British neighbours, whose thinking, with which we were familiar, had dominated Irish music education from its inception in the nineteenth century and through both the colonial and post-colonial eras. As a cursory reference to the International Directory of Music and Music Education Institutions will reveal, 40% of all third-level activity in music education in the world takes place in the North American continent, and certainly a much greater percentage of the relevant literature in English comes from that source. Bennett Reimer should not have been mystified by our interest in the nature or maturing problems of the world's most progressive democracy. That Ireland was not planning the flattery of imitation but seeking instead the benefits of vicarious hindsight should have suggested itself; contrast is perhaps a more potent model than similarity for critical analysis, as proved also to be the case.

[49] Bennett Reimer, *Through Irish Eyes* (College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society, Volume 38, 1998), p. 74.

17.13 The Irish Context

1. Ireland has a colonial, post-colonial and modern democratic history. In none of these epochs, for reasons that are subject to understandable dispute, was a liberal attitude to arts education a feature. That 'music is a positive force in life' would certainly resonate in the Irish subconscious mentality as a commonly-held value. But, curiously, Reimer's sanguine list (15.1.4. above) of these values does not, otherwise, fare particularly well as a checklist for testing Irish socio-political attitudes leading up to the dawn of the new millennium, whatever about the hopeful signs that the booming economy of the turn of the century portends; and we must not gainsay these. That music and music learning are worthy of support; that the support should come from the culture; that there should be access, typically by the young, to music through education; that it should be continuous and systematic - all of these are embraced in Ireland more in theory than in practice, arising from deep socio-economic and politico-economic forces. Here is quasi-virgin soil for the application of contextual philosophy to music education provision.

2. Comprehensiveness in music education as a desirable goal is perhaps the most controversial of Reimer's *values* and is certainly a significant context in Irish strategy, especially as influenced by MEND. The topic is confronted systematically under the National Culture Sections (Agenda Item VI) throughout this report; it is a complex and ongoing question which is not helped or particularly clarified by the plethora of options and variants by which the global scene of music education in developed societies is currently being bombarded. Ireland may be located on the ethnomusicological continuum as responding to ethnic, popular and art cultures, with certain hybrids also contributing to patterns of general consumption in music. But this classification is not entirely typical nor are the details of its internal composition uniform or predictable. Because of the familiar norms of educational practice, the music and the so-called aesthetic ideals of western culture maintain dominance, though much-threatened, in educational thinking; this is being diluted by responses (to sometimes polar philosophical stances) that have, arguably, not been fully-informed as to their consequences. Ireland is in the throes of the high/mass culture dilemma and is no nearer to a solution of its devastating dichotomization of the school/community relationship than any other known system battling with the same dissonance. The ethnic/traditional seam is a healthy subculture of oral/aural/non-literate community-based activity; its classification as a subculture may seem pejorative but is factual since the music has not yet been fully normalized within the formal education system. Since judicious infusion of educational practice with values drawn from the traditional subculture is a desideratum, because of its scale and its cultural significance, a genuine contextual problem arises. Should the implied biculturalism, however defined (trad/pop, trad/art, non-literate/literate and there are other versions), be allowed temporarily to arrest mainstream philosophical persuasions while Ireland comes to terms with its characteristic mix of cultures? In particular, can all the plausible advocacy for music of the world's cultures prevail in the teeth of such a major indigenous concern, and sweep aside its claim to prior solution? To invoke the Reimer treatment of contextual philosophy the 'psychological, emotional, political and social forces of the human context in which music exists' find here a challenging subject for serious consideration, simply because it is 'issues-orientated, value centred, sociologically and politically involved in the culture's ongoing life'. As will be seen in the denouement, discussions at MEND and the subsequent analysis of the Proceedings were inconclusive in suggesting an immediate way forward on this issue of the choice between biculturalism and multiculturalism.

3. Talent Education, even in its more narrowly-construed sense of specialization in performance, which is the more usual instance of the need in young musicians, is another of Reimer's *commonly-held values* which must be confronted and accommodated in music education philosophy. It is, like the world-culture issue discussed above, highly controversial in the sense that it is invaginated in the whole performance issue which, although it is apparently too fundamental and intrinsic a concept in relation to music, and therefore might even be deemed to transcend the need for consideration as a commonly held value (that music should be performed!), is nevertheless and surprisingly a major sticking point in inhibiting agreement in philosophical terms. This is yet another issue on which there is undoubtedly an Irish context. The claims of American talent educators, as to provision in the US, may incite envy, but we can learn much from the widespread confusion within American practice in relation to performance. Reimer boasts, with irrefutable justification, that 'at present, estimates of the number of students in middle schools and high schools taking advantage of our [US] unmatched generosity in this regard [performance training] range from 9-15%. I regard that as an achievement of which the profession deserves to be very proud. And the quality achieved by many young performance groups approaches the astonishingly good, especially given that most participants have no intention of pursuing performance as a career after high school.'[50] This sense of ownership of an idea must be viewed, initially, against Reimer's claim that Elliott is now insisting that *all* learners should perform, which is at the core of the Elliott/Reimer dispute, as indeed it isolates the whole problem with performance as a skill-based activity. And, around the same time, Reimer is recorded as saying that 'there seems to be, around the world, a growing recognition that we have served students poorly by being so narrowly focused on performing'.[51] It will emerge from the MEND analysis that Reimer is *not* hinting here that there has been over-provision of performance training in the US, but rather that the internal detail and quality of the performance programme, and indeed of the whole music education provision in the US, need radical refinement. Paul Lehman (Ref III P iii), speaking of performance in American *schools* puts it pragmatically: 'vocal music gained universal acceptance in the 19th century because kids enjoyed singing. Instrumental music became a fixture in the early 20th century because kids enjoyed playing instruments. If it hadn't been for that emphasis on performance we wouldn't be in the strong position we're in today'. Both claims are couched, and are further commented on in context by the authors, in terms that recommend a cautious attitude to claims for the manifold benefits of performance-rich programmes in schools. The contrast with Ireland could not be more provoking; but the enunciation of the problems of America, especially as to recent attempts to address them (National Standards), clearly define the underlying principles, which are of universal application.

Here we are being asked at last to confront and demystify the realities of what music in education means in terms of product and process when construed in their performance/performing context. The context invites clarification in terms of the nature of the skills demanded and the critically significant timescale of their acquisition, between rudimentary, competent, proficient and advanced achievement outcomes *inter alia*. In North America we are notionally presented, depending on the dominant viewpoint of the argument, with the 9-15 % of school-going students with free access to performance and performance training, guaranteeing, at best, 'astonishingly good quality'. The cohort is typically and euphemistically portrayed as mounting 'the challenge to expand that emphasis into analysis [see Lehman, Ref III P iii], music of other cultures and so on' implying that the empowering musicianship (Elliott's admirable aspiration) is, somehow, currently being neglected. This 'privileged' minority is offset by the approximately 90% majority who have, voluntarily it seems, relegated themselves to the mercies of the Music Education as Aesthetic Education Movement, where their low prioritization of music in their stated interests is being rewarded with dry-as-dust acquisitions of literacy and passive listening skills; or so it is implied selectively. The two models of music education are sketched

[50] Bennett Reimer, *Through Irish Eyes*, Response to Harry White, *A book of manners in the wilderness*, p. 78.
[51] Bennett Reimer, *Universal Philosophy* (ISME; Proceedings from Amsterdam 1996), p 12

provocatively here but are, in the American system, juxtaposed as positive or negative options in general music education (for details see the review of Dorothy Straub's paper dealing with national forum [MENC] issues [Ref II P v]). The significant point is that the majority have volitionally declared their non-performing option with the naïve but accurately-divined wisdom (that should not be ignored by educators) in observing that to perform satisfactorily takes time and effort; they are reluctant performers only in their mature sense of prioritization and time management. A philosophy of music education which essays to change those biases significantly faces a daunting challenge, not least in defining performance potential in terms of time spent and skills required.

No such options approaching the American dream have been available to the typical Irish school child. Solo possibilities as a freely accessible school facility have been and are virtually non-existent - ensemble insignificant. Other offerings, where they have been available, have been literacy-based rather than listening-intensive; performance has played virtually no part in them. The teaching force has mirrored that bias; in fact it might even be claimed that they have been mutually determining. In primary education the child-centred model, as distinct from the specialist system widely in operation in America, has failed the system – and for reasons that cannot be laid at the door of the music teachers or *their* trainers. This aspect is being addressed in the latest revisions, if we are to trust the intentions declared in the 1995 White Paper. In secondary cycle the subject is largely examination-oriented, further consolidating the information (objective) base over the subjective. Talent education is not a desideratum, if that is taken to imply that the official support system of the culture recognizes its claims in free education through a school network.

The American and Irish systems of school music education are not indeed, as Reimer and White confirm from different stances, directly comparable; it really is more a question of contrast. And they are both in agreement that one is not a paradigm for the other. That the American system, for all its attractive championing of performance and its impressive results in that area, dichotomized school music education cohorts in the past there can be little doubt; but there is still room for grave doubts as to whether the homogenized stream now mooted will serve the united cohorts with the benefits of universally satisfying challenges (such is the diversity of music). There is also, as may be inferred from Reimer, the paradoxical realization that, in the historical context, it was performers (the high interest group) who were being marginalized by inattention to their wider musicianship needs; but the admirable aspiration of the new National Standards (if they succeed) seems to be redressing the balance in widening the scope and the prescription of desirable musical experiences across the board. Nevertheless, side-by-side with all this putative progress, it is almost certain that the mechanisms for identifying and nurturing talent of all kinds, and the particular case of the talented performer, will still be securely in place in the US. The sheer weight of scholarly input to the National Standards defines a system which is unlikely to countenance mandatory imposition of particular philosophical stances advancing curricular, pedagogical or methodological statements as to how general aims are to be achieved, especially should they attempt simultaneously to sweep away or supplant the celebrated achievements of past method. It is thus irrelevant to conjecture as to how the application of a praxial philosophy, such as that advocated by Elliott, would empower the comprehensive system, even if it were possible to arrive at agreement as to what exactly he is proposing in terms of what is pragmatically achievable.[52] As far as talent education is concerned it is thus also irrelevant, unless someone undertakes to metamorphose its strictly philosophical approach into a suitable rationale for specialist applications. There is encouraging evidence that the American National Standards have been accepted, within the complex notions of state-autonomy that obtain. If their aims are achieved with the flexibility to enrich the so-called musicianship experiences of performers while attending to the purely musical experiential involvement of the volitional non-performers they must be counted as an outstandingly significant advance on previous efforts. It is to be hoped that the application of

[52] The plethora of statement and counterstatement in relation to Elliott is confusing. But it is on the question of the pragmatic applicability of his philosophy that most questions arise. The ongoing prolix exchanges are as much evidence of Elliott's importunity as they are proof that reigning philosophies have been dealt a body blow, demanding that both sides continue to clarify their position and reach détente for the benefit of the profession. This continuing dialectic is enthusiastically supported by Elliott in his writings.

standards of such intentional flexibility will not produce a dull homogeneity but will continue to accommodate a range of options that can still selectively minister to the comprehensive needs of students and the collective requirements of the total socio-cultural music endeavour which it hopes to serve. As far as the United States are concerned, the now magisterial presence of the National Standards and the favourable, and not just sanguine, reports as to their general acceptance and implementation leave the impression that

1. There will continue to be two distinct categories of music learners to be serviced - performers (or generically doers – activity-biased musicians), with high motivation - and non-performers with correspondingly more modest aspirations in music studies. This is a broad categorization which covers the majority. For further details of the realities of this extraordinary but selectively highly effective system see the review of Dorothy Straub's paper dealing with national forum (MENC) issues (Ref II P v)

2. Using the criterion of the 'product of numbers and motivation' as democratically compelling the above are, thus, two equally important cohorts.

3. The philosophy of music as 'product' (a version of Formalism) is still persuasive for the performing stream but the notion of performance as process, a totally different approach (Praxialism) should not be ruled out as capable of informing all other musical endeavours in general education, including the broadening in outlook of committed performers. There has, however, been insufficient time since the publication of Elliott's book to develop a convincing statistic that his particular version of Praxialism is gaining ground.

Defined thus it can be seen that there is potentially complete agreement, derivable from analysis, between the ideals of the American and Irish music education systems; and it is a simple matter to appraise our overall implemented curriculum and to search for its shortcomings. It appears that, in general music education in Ireland, from primary up to senior cycle secondary, there is a sincere effort being made, as a result of syllabus revision in the nineties, not only to meet the demands of a so-called well-rounded musical education, giving appropriate weighting to composing, performing and listening, but also to enshrine continuity of that education as a desideratum. The system stubbornly denies any leanings towards particular methodologies, but the underpinning philosophical stance evident in the syllabus literature can easily be aligned to a hybrid of Praxialism and Referentialism; music as product (in the sense outlined by Formalism) is conceptually outside its brief, as it is also outside its capability, and there is already concrete evidence of a levelling out to lower overall standards. The system therefore still falls down, in ignoring the committed performing stream and in effectively banishing it to the realms of private enterprise. This is culpably discriminatory as it is to create and perpetuate the notion of élitism and, furthermore, accurately to trace, and now to consolidate, its origin as being not totally in prevailing socio-economic perceptions but in the mentality of official Irish music education itself and of general education strategists, too, who are creating this sharply-etched dichotomy in the first place. Once this crucially important cohort is removed, as it truly is, from consideration in general education, it raises important questions, truths and considerations, some of which should be patently obvious.

1. Is serious performing so time-consuming that it has no place either in the school ambience or aspiration; must its status as a component in examination-driven syllabi be questioned?

2. If the answer to this question is yes, is it still accepted that it is an important component in overall education (typically for a significant minority), and where should the responsibility for its promotion lie?

3. Is the cost of suitable practical training an inhibitor in politico-economic terms and how can this cost be met?

MEND deliberations unequivocally and unanimously confirmed that performance (and not even confining it to definitions of talent education) is quintessential to the whole music and music education endeavour. There is thus no doubt hanging over its indispensability. If it is culpably ignored in general education provision, then undesirable tensions are set up, not least owing to the separation of the school subject, music, from its most natural manifestation, performance; this cannot be healthy. The fall-back position is that other agencies must be found equitably to minister to the need, especially if that need is a matter of public concern, a fact which the efforts of such agencies, where they exist, have succeeded in bringing into sharp relief. Here MEND reinforced the many previous statements that provincial Ireland is particularly deprived. A questionable standard has always been the norm and this is, to a large extent, self perpetuating because a professional cadre of teachers cannot accrue from such an indifferent base. Availability, accessibility, quality and continuity of performance training are problematic in rural Ireland. It may be claimed that we did not have the resources in Ireland to provide for quality music performance in state schools[53] (yet this did not apply to other branches of education) but it is high time (and now both opportune and propitious) that the distribution of resources to essential educational endeavour be critically examined to draw attention to state neglect of music and to seek positive mitigation of its devastating effects. There needs to be no further ambiguity or philosophical nicety as to what performance entails. Music has its professional side; performance looms large within it, and without this outcome- and product-centred dimension music in the popular perception, as something of quality, to be engaged in or listened to, is impoverished to the point of blandness or of mere academic definition. It is a feature of the art that, as for example with sport, its professional stream evolves naturally from a mass involvement at amateur level in the sheer craft of music-making as a conscious involvement, *inter alia*, in its skill-based dimension. But this is a far cry from the now openly observable token level of rudimentary participation that passes for performance in the examined modules of even senior cycle music (Leaving Certificate level). These two notions of performance simply cannot be equated at conceptual level - not even in terms of basic aims.

If potential success in music education endeavours in Ireland is measured on the possibilities enshrined in the 'common denominator' nature of current syllabus revision, responding as it does to a contextual agenda not fully aligned to the *intrinsic* value of the subject (i.e. it is skewed towards examination routines and third-level credit potential); if the establishment of an Academy for the Performing Arts (APA) is to be taken as a positive step towards professionalism, without calling into question the many logistical problems that still need to be addressed; if these two ends of the spectrum are seen to have been addressed sincerely there is but one, albeit a critical, area that remains the Cinderella in the piece. If performance (in the nature of specialist) education is not now taken seriously as an area that cries out for development on a nation-wide and equitable basis, it will continue to act as a reproach to the otherwise worthy efforts of school music education strategists and will make a mockery of the ambitious plans to develop a super-structure (APA) on a diminishing or virtually non-existent base. There simply must now be a regional development scheme to ensure that the performance infrastructure is securely in place and that its services are generally available, even at a price to the consumer.

The above summary of Irish attitudes to Reimer's list of commonly held values of music education, if accepted, may help to explain why there are continuing problems about a healthy, caring and democratic response to established needs in Ireland. Apart from a history of patchy provision (its underlying cause an indifference rooted in political and sociological expedients which established other priorities but are now outdated) music education in Ireland, in attempting to outgrow the recognized and much publicized shortfall in current school-based music, has a variety of contexts within which to engage the traditional philosophical approaches. There is a distinctive character about the diversity issue which first begs for strategies to incorporate it meaningfully in the school

[53] There can be no doubt that there is an economic dimension here. It appears that in the US the state system traditionally values performance to the extent of absorbing its costs in general education on the basis that the subject is a core option and not sufficiently 'minority' in uptake to warrant its separation from mainstream education. At least in this respect the American system is ideal.

experience in a phased programme which moves from the urgency of biculturalism to a more modestly-paced multiculturalism availing of the hindsight benefits of the more successful projects and methods. The bifurcated (general/specialist) question of performance studies needs to be addressed in the contexts of urgently-needed provision of product-centred (specialist) performance (in schools or suitably subsidized in the private sector), in some cases *ab initio* - and careful monitoring of the process-centred provision, especially as it arises in secondary school experience. And all of these concerns need to take into account the time constraints so that curricula are not overloaded and that achievable goals are being set which will maximize experiences and the artistic growth which accrues from them.

It scarcely needs to be added that there should be complementarity between the needs of the system as contextually defined and the expertise of the teaching resource provided to attend to those needs. There is still a troublesome mismatch to be faced in this regard. And additionally, as will be seen, however inconclusively for the moment, from the deliberations of the National Culture constituency within MEND (Agenda Item VI, *q.v.*), we have still to confront the delicate mission of infusing general education with much more than a token presence of national musical culture and in a way which will not unduly destabilize the curriculum either as to time or to methodology. The preparation of a proposal on this issue was sought from Professor Ó Súilleabháin (Ref III P vi), but high in his priorities must have been the need for relevantly trained bicultural music teachers, backed by the discoveries of research, who can lead a timely campaign in a thoroughly professional way.

The relevance of teacher training is just as critical in the ministry to performance. At school levels the political interventions promised in the 1995 White Paper on Education must be followed through so that, typically and ideally, the tri-partite package for teacher training is implemented to ensure that new contexts of educational provision in music are not only understood but are supported towards their safe delivery in all aspects. As will become clear from the review of the Elliott philosophy, there are differences between the 'music as process' envisaged in the new secondary school syllabi and the holistic approach in Elliott which, *inter alia*, and on the personal confirmation of David Elliott himself to the writer, calls for a kind of highly sophisticated multi-dimensional specialist level of teaching expertise; this is just not available in Ireland. The most cursory glance at the Elliott literature, of which there is a plethora (including a great deal from himself over and above the provenance of *Music Matters*, his ultimate source material) brings to light the mind of an original thinker essaying the development of a universal, adaptable and multi-cultural music education philosophy, but one that is couched in terms that are not user-friendly; it is thus still suffering from the drawback of abstruseness, which has yet to be mediated, but which has been cited as an obstacle in the way of its possible implementation. But the Elliott philosophy is thoroughly reviewed in this report in an attempt to demystify it and to compare and contrast it with other respected approaches to music education.

In the case of traditional (specialist) performance studies, should the system be boosted as outlined above, the most likely philosophical positions may very well outgrow current perceptions and begin to respond to universal criteria with linkages to Formalism, Praxialism and Absolute Expressionism (a form of Referentialism as expounded by Reimer), and subconsciously also to the deeper implications of a humanistic universality engaged at philosophical levels by both Reimer and Elliott (the MEND invited positions) and by a host of other luminaries to whose work (as referred to throughout the MEND Report) a careful search of their writings will provide access for the interested reader.

18 Analysis (II): Presentations, Debates and Related Materials

" . . . the distinction between 'serious' and 'popular' music is a false distinction - certainly not to be equated with the distinction between 'good' and 'bad'. And I repeat: we must teach understanding."

Gerald Abraham
1961 ISME Keynote Address
Quoted in Sir Frank Callaway's Keynote Address at MEND Phase III

"To the degree that we succeed in attaining . . . a balance of learnings including but surpassing those available from performance, we will have better fulfilled our professional mission, and will serve as a better model from which other countries can gain useful insights."

Bennett Reimer
Response to Harry White's 'A book of manners in the wilderness.'
College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society,
Volume 38 (1998): pp 47-97

18.1 Philosophy of Music Education

"'Tis with our judgements as our watches, none
Go just alike, yet each believes his own"

Alexander Pope
Essay on Criticism, II.9-10

"Philosophy and practice are mutually reinforcing because philosophy provides the basis for practice and practice provides an opportunity to test and validate philosophy."

Paul Lehman
Phase III MEND Nov 1996 - Ref. III P iii

18.1.1 Overview of Music Education Philosophy

Ref. I P viii See Document 108 in Proceedings

The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland
Professor Harry White (University College, Dublin)

Professor White, as might be expected of him, is never content, in his own sphere of influence, just to offer neutral comment on a troublesome situation as he finds it; the account of his analytical search for underlying causality as an exercise in returning to basics is refreshing and makes for engaging reading. His condemnation of certain practices or omissions in Irish music education, as he perceives it, was in two parts, since he also contributed significantly to Phase III of MEND. And his ability, by the use of lucid and unambiguous phraseology, to be provocative and to invite counterpositions, as in this 'conceptual failure' topic, is eclipsed only by the power, drama and passion of the sequel (III P viii) when he launched a frontal attack on the notion of the American model of music education as suitable for Ireland. Professor White should be stoutly reassured that his interventions are by no means unwelcome. There is much stark and depressing truth in what he has to say, but the logic and coherence in his arguments, impressive as they are, should not be allowed to go entirely unchallenged;

the magisterial grandeur of his style may carry the reader forward on an illusory wave of conviction but his rhetoric is not without a hint of sophistry. As he says himself, he would settle for knowing that he is wrong, though it might be more prudent to compromise and concede, or suggest, that he is merely half-right!

Professor White has all the authority of a well-versed and experienced historian behind him; in this sense his definition of 'conceptual failure' - as historical evidence of 'a decisive obstacle to a better understanding of music' - is plausible. On the other hand, the reality is that there had always been more than a hint of poverty of conceptual thought and vibrant policy in educational management where music in Ireland was concerned - that is until the onset of very recent efforts, which are as yet unquantifiable as to their ultimately influencing the situation for the better. There was a curriculum and an agenda in the school system almost from the beginnings of the nation state, the putative influence of which Professor White does not sufficiently take into account in his historical trouble-shooting. The 'piano in the parlour' - that inherited nineteenth century token of an almost exclusively feminine pursuit - was, at worst, a symbol of a quasi-colonial idea of respectability, at best a community reaction to an unarticulated feeling that the state system was not providing appropriately for music and its enlightening effect; it scarcely merits consideration as a conceptual mentality about education, even if it has its echoes in current mediocre performance, which is not a uniquely Irish preoccupation anyway. The more recent history of music education in Ireland, as symbolized by school music between the promulgation of the New Curriculum (an Curaclam Nua) in 1971 and the ultimate exposure of its flaws (in conceptual approach and implementation) by the *Deaf Ears?* Report in 1985, reveals no special advocacy of the performance tradition that is targeted by Professor White, unless he is referring to evidence of its survival in the minuscule Leaving Certificate (LC) participation. In fact the introduction of the so-called Syllabus A option, which increased numbers dramatically but precipitated other disastrous effects, represented a *non*-performing elective, accounting for the majority of LC candidates. The disabled condition of music in Ireland, as accurately signposted by the delivered curriculum in schools (and not to blame private enterprise for its limited powers of reacting to that failure), must be attributed to government apathy and lack of resources. An Curaclam Nua (1971) and the second level curricula in operation until the 1990s were, if not ideal, at least conceptually benign in terms of Professor White's academic and listening priorities. Their failure must be attributed to a combination of a typically post-colonial disinterest in humanistic over employment-generating subjects, and the fact that availability and accessibility of music were inequitable in demographic and socio-economic terms.

As to the quotations chosen by Professor White to make his point, the first (*Hibernia* 1882) is merely a statement about lack of musical sensibility which would have been as applicable to Britain as to Ireland at the time. Dr Larchet's plea of 1921 is a revealing comment on the disproportionate distribution of wealth which was, for that time, a 'not so naieve declaration that the skills of musical discourse, [of a kind now aspired to by Harry White] may have been seen as the province forever of the very few'. Arnold Bax's sympathetic comment disguises the fact that productions of the grand operas of Wagner would have been financially impossible in Ireland in his early Dublin days, quite apart from the interest they might have engendered. Denis Donoghue's rhetoric, in relation to the dearth of appreciative listeners in the mid-fifties, while it excites sympathy as to its honest frustration, is seriously misdirected in failing to realize that the amateur pianists and piano-dabblers, whom he despised, probably, in fact, made up the bulk of the appreciative audiences such as they existed at the time. This brings us to the heart of the matter and Professor White has provided clarification, if not a partial solution, in his proposals.

Harry White's own words seem to compromise his stance if not actually to contradict the whole thrust of his dialectic. 'Of course Donoghue is being rhetorical: speaking for myself I would be slow to disavow the importance of instrumental and vocal tuition, given its vital force in music education in Ireland as in many other European countries. . . . As a scholar of baroque music, I find performance to be an essential part of a process by which I come to think and write . . . . (T)he practice of making music with my students is an indispensable and reciprocal experience. . . .' There is incontrovertible support for this view in all the other professional contributions to Phase I of MEND (see Beausang,

Brennan, Gillen, Halpin, Sweeney). But this is ill at ease with Professor White's own words: ' . . . the question of musical understanding and reception . . . cannot be contained or satisfactorily answered unless we are prepared to acknowledge that music education remains in Ireland to be liberated from the model of individual instruction'. This juxtaposition is confusing. But Dr White goes on to say that' we would do better to divide this vast pursuit [music] into its constituent parts, partly in order to widen its assimilation and partly so as to intensify our cultivation of its substantive plurality'. He is pleading here for more time in the Leaving Certificate curriculum for those interested in music to pursue a specialism. And he goes on to make the proposal (a double credit music provision), which had engaged him and the writer in relation to the revision of the syllabus, and which is reported more fully in the review of Sean MacLiam's paper (I P xiii).

Dr White is preoccupied (and he must be respected for nailing his colours to the mast) with the plight, if not also even the survival, of *art* music at a reasonable level of public acceptance. If 'the absence of art music from the Irish mind', as the target of his concern and assertion, is merely evidence of a certain philistinism amongst the highly educated it is, of course, regrettable. If, on the other hand, it is seen as significantly symptomatic of a deprivation, rather than an attitude, of the population at large then other questions must be asked. "If it is art, it is not for all: if it is for all it is not art", an aphorism attributed to Arnold Schönberg, is one part of the answer. Another consideration is that of public *taste* so discreetly referred to in Dr Larchet's plea for music, even before the foundation of the modern state. One can take the horse to the water . . . ! There is no current shortage of conceptual philosophy but it would be to anticipate the thrust of Professor White's monumental peroration during MEND Phase III to engage the subject prematurely. Suffice it to say that the shibboleth of the centrality of performance, which virtually dominates thinking on the revised syllabus for the Leaving Certificate, casts the shadow of lower all-round standards resulting from the school experience of music education; and Harry White is right to be concerned about the effects of this rationalization. It is a matter of vital concern that the conundrum of uptake, taste, value, judgement, progression, time and balance, to name but a few of the interpenetrated parameters affecting music in education, be confronted anew before further irreparable damage is done to the ill-fated subject's prospects in education, as in the community at large. Professor White's reasoning may be an over-simplification of the causes of the malaise in Irish music education, but his target is accurately in his sights, his sense of direction is true, and his heart is in the right place where the future of music in Ireland is concerned. It is to be hoped that his proffered wisdom will be heeded.

Ref. III K See Document 300 in Proceedings

Phase III Keynote Address
'the common sense of all music'. Remembering Percy Grainger
Emeritus Professor Sir Frank Callaway
Honorary President of the International Society for Music Education
Callaway International Research Centre for Music Education
(CIRCME) The University of Western Australia.

Sir Frank Callaway is truly the 'grand old man' of music education. His achievements in the field have been accorded copious recognition, a knighthood and honorary life presidency of the International Society for Music Education (ISME) being arguably amongst the most prestigious. Clearly his accepting an invitation to take part in the MEND proceedings was a boost to the status of the initiative. He participated actively at the inaugural meeting of the Irish Forum for Music Education and has maintained a lively interest in it ever since. He agreed to present a keynote address in the form of a paper on a topic of his choice, the content of which was, in addition to being germane, to have been 'general, seminal and idealistic'. The thrice-tested title - *A Common Sense View of All Music* - subtitled *Remembering Percy Grainger,*[54] was cleverly used to highlight the uncanny

[54] The Title *A Commonsense View of All Music* was the title of Grainger's 12-part lecture series delivered on Australian National Radio in 1934. It was taken up again in John Blacking's book of the same name in the

relevance to present day problems of the accomplishments and visionary insights of a single highly gifted musician. The achievements of the Australian, Percy Grainger, who died in 1961 (long before the currently characteristic problems of music education had begun to mature), were summed up in distinguished conductor Simon Rattle's tribute when he said that "In music he [Grainger] got to places long before other people".

Since most of the findings (*qv*) of MEND were already taking shape before Phase III took place, it can be argued that the content of Professor Callaway's keynote address handsomely validated, rather than forged, them. Some of the correlations should be documented as they are significant.

Percy Grainger was described by the American music critic Henry Finck, as early as 1915, as *A Musical Genius from Australia*; yet it is arguable that Percy Grainger's genius, and his hubris too, resided in the sheer scope of and output from his multi-talented versatility. It is hazardous (even potentially misleading) to arrange the aspects of his giftedness hierarchically. As a scholar he was a philologist, philosopher, editor of early music, pioneer ethnomusicologist and prolific writer; he was a composer of always attractive music (across the widest spectrum which included choral works and, significantly, much functional educational material for wind bands, and his so-called 'elastically-scored' arrangements for a bewildering variety of instrumental resources), most of which was distinguished by imaginative and original colouring; he was a world-ranking pianist with 'impeccable credentials' (having been a pupil of Busoni), a conductor, a substantial collector, transcriber, arranger and orchestrator of folk material. With so many superbly-developed capabilities vested in one person, it is not surprising that he was also a visionary and, almost by definition (because of the breadth of his experience), the prototype of the idealistic music educator. The documented outcomes of his kaleidoscopic career can therefore be beneficially and fruitfully combed through for educational wisdom, particularly of the utopian variety, which has, notwithstanding, proved to be prophetic and timeless, if occasionally eccentric and provocative. Sir Frank Callaway deftly guided us through this record of panoramic creativity in a way which subtly drew parallels between Grainger's highly original and pioneering thoughts and those expressed by the one-time President of ISME, Gerald Abraham, in his opening speech at the ISME Conference in 1961 (the year of Grainger's death), and later still by the late John Blacking (based at the time in Northern Ireland). Sir Frank's keynote address is brimming with such useful references, a handful of the most noteworthy being given here for their unerring relevance to turn-of the-century problems. Professor Callaway seems obviously to be synthesizing the idealism of these three fine thinkers in a natural way which shows both *their* consensus and *himself* as their worthy successor in the higher reaches of music education thinking. As to whether their laudable meliorism is readily adaptable to manifold implementation is another question. The principles are nevertheless honestly stated and amount collectively to a possible embryo philosophy of music education

From this writer's perspective the strengths of the rationale are in its basic democracy - the broader global view of 'approaching all the world's available music with an open mind' and reaching out to all humanity in an effort, through music education, to involve it in the experience. But this is a guarded endorsement. The details as to how this is to be accomplished are not always specific; the resultant and obvious lacuna can stand proxy for the manifold problems of implementation that still confront us today. During MEND the dilemma was redefined as the need for a contextual philosophy - one which could temper idealism with the pragmatism of ministering to prevailing circumstances; the concept has been developed copiously in this report. Thus it is claimed (by Blacking), unexceptionably, at the outset, that human beings are inherently musical; that musical ability is part of our shared humanity[55]; that music is an important means of communication across cultural boundaries. Nor is there anything exceptionable either in its being taken for granted that, in the general case, performance is the central, pivotal and immediate act of music-making and must be promoted in education. Blacking, taking up

---

1960s but with the subtitle *Reflections on Percy Grainger's contribution to ethnomusicology and music education.* Sir Frank Callaway's revisitation pays generous homage to both scholars.

[55] These first two claims are comprehensively developed in Heneghan *Interpretation in Music - A Study in Perception, Expression and Symbol* (Dublin, University of Dublin, Trinity College, 1990, unpublished thesis)

Grainger's point, emphasized that 'the goal of musical progress in a country should not be more education for a special class of musicians but the musical education of participation in music by the majority of citizens'. It should be borne in mind, however, that this does not disavow, nor should it, the specialized training for some, which is the lifeblood of ensuing generations of teachers, another important reservation within the MEND support for the absolute ascendancy of general (non-specialized) music education as a priority issue.

Grainger's belief was that music, however chosen for educational purposes, should be 'made available' rather than have its virtues extolled in mere words. Thus he promoted the idea of 'a more hospitable attitude towards inexperienced music-makers by making it possible for those without technical skills to participate in performance'. He could, with authority, claim that, for the majority, the 'pursuit of soloistic skill must always remain aesthetically barren and unsatisfying'; this is, of course, partly challengeable and is belied by the countless numbers who indulge this aspiration, as Harry White bemoaned (Refs. I P viii and III P viii). But Grainger handsomely advocated his alternative by making thrilling musical experiences available to the multitude through his adaptable arrangements, which he produced with indefatigable energy. (We must draw a distinction here between those genuinely *without* technical skills and those with the modest but serviceable ability targeted by Grainger.) Here again Grainger can be seen to have endorsed a key finding of MEND in relation to contextual philosophy in action. While the relativity of the term 'performance without technical skills' must be borne in mind with some scepticism, the pragmatism of Grainger's praxial philosophy has a pivotal and conciliatory relationship to the 'apparently' polar stances of Reimer and Elliott (*qv*), in that he honours the idea of aesthetic education by making real music available 'for performance' in a way that obviates the need for an inherently damaging dichotomy based on skill acquisition. He is thus, in this, the paradigm of the inspired and inspiring educator/teacher in having matched the need to perform in ensemble with suitable materials - yet another of the stated concerns of teacher delegates at MEND. Without gainsaying the fine line between the potentially barren pursuit of soloistic skills and the satisfaction of minimal involvement in communal performance, it is surely all reducible to the skills plied by expert teachers. And, of course, we cannot compare the potential for satisfactory listening experiences (the key to familiarity with the repertoire which Grainger had in mind) as between the earlier part of the twentieth century and its close; again the context is critical to the case. And Sir Frank Callaway's inspirational endorsement of another MEND outcome unerringly identifies the link which solves part of the philosophical conundrum posed by Reimer and Elliott. It relates to the current controversy in Ireland surrounding the establishment of an academy for the performing arts. Quoting John Blacking in his 1963 study, he observes "that the new Academies of Performing Arts . . . could have profound effects on the social and economic development of their countries, provided that they manage to maintain a balance between the extremes of cultivating professional élites of artists of high standard, and training dedicated teachers who will be able to promote the performing arts in colleges, schools and community centres.[56] The need for basic learner skills in performance (if it is to be satisfying and central in general music education), the relevant training and resourcing of highly motivated and imaginative teachers and, especially, the provision of suitable and ample materials to enable them to perform their task - these are clearly the quintessential components in Grainger's aspiration towards shared music and shared values; they surfaced time and time again as priority issues in the MEND debates.

Idealism, as typified, for example, in a philosophy of music education, is a fundamental building block for whatever it seeks to serve. But the pursuit of the ideal inevitably, it seems, comes into conflict with the dictates of realism and of pragmatism and must yield to or come to terms with them. The idealism of Grainger is excitingly inspirational but it is untempered and, so, vulnerable at times. And it is easy to detect grounds for levelling the charge of some inconsistency and confusion in its rationality; in this it prefigures many current controversies. These surround such interrelated topics as the unbridled democracy in the choice of educational materials, the ineluctable and cautionary criteria of valuing and judgement, and, most fashionable of all, the move to enfranchise all musics as of equal

[56] See Heneghan *Reflections on a Programme for the Establishment of an Academy for the Performing Arts* (Recommendation 6, p 2)

value, and the dangers from the indiscriminate imposition of the admittedly sometimes exquisite fruits of ethnomusicological research on already overloaded music curricula. To give one example from Grainger, it is interesting to analyse his own words - " I cannot admit any conception of musical progress that sees music passing gradually from worse to better, and which therefore belittles primitive music or the earliest traceable beginnings of art-music" and " music should belong to the people, and we can best bring them to an understanding and enjoyment of the greatest [*sic*] music through folk music, the musical expression of the people." The juxtaposition is perhaps a carping one but does it perhaps reveal a slightly patronizing aestheticism, and unmask the epicure who has the analytical sophistication to value folk music in a context which should not have to concern itself with making easily misinterpretable and unnecessary claims as to its ranking in a musical hierarchy? Yet Grainger can be credited with having made the idealistically Aristotelian, impeccable and controlling choices of work material himself in his own arrangements, which covered a spectrum from the conversion of folk material into modern art forms . . . to the reconversion of art music - back to its more primitive origins.[57]

It would be to anticipate the analysis of the closely related papers given at MEND Phase III by Professors Patricia Shehan Campbell and Harry White to dwell further on Grainger's prophetic exposé of the current problems of virtually infinite potential accessibility to music of the world's cultures and of reaching consensus on musical hierarchy. Certainly we are scarcely nearer to the realization, in musical terms, of his 'hope that people would become aware of the beauties of the musical achievements of all races and cultures of the world, thus helping to engender human understanding'.

Before leaving Percy Grainger it should be helpful (and indeed Sir Frank Callaway found it so) to refer to a possible clarification of Grainger's manifesto given by Gerald Abraham in 1961; his address to the 1961 ISME Conference may be pillaged for wisdom and pragmatism which could well be applied to keep in practical focus the commanding priorities in music education today: -

> We Occidentals realize now that it was a comically narrow view that our music was the only music that mattered; today at least we recognize the validity of other great musical cultures. . . . But in addition to these old, familiar divisions, we have many new ones. In western music alone there are the divisions between 'serious' and 'popular', the division between 'classical' and 'contemporary', . . . and the division between music that the normally gifted musician can hope to play or sing and that which he can only listen to. . . . We should try to appreciate the masterpieces of each other's musical cultures, learn from them if we can, but not try to imitate them or assimilate them. . . . We should control our experiments to what the normal intelligent ear can take in.…What we teachers, in particular, can hope to do, is to understand each other. Musical education must begin at home 'with the familiar classics which are our common heritage', but it mustn't end at home. . . . show those whom we teach that the world of music contains many treasures besides familiar classics. We cannot know all of these treasures ourselves but we can assure ourselves and indicate to our pupils that these things exist and that any of them which specially attracts us will be infinitely worth study. . . . We can show them that the distinction between 'serious' and 'popular' music is a false distinction - certainly not to be equated with the distinction between 'good' and 'bad'. And I repeat: we must teach understanding.

Sir Frank Callaway's presentation of the ideas of Percy Grainger included a variety of primary and secondary source quotations and proved to be remarkably germane to the contextual problems of Irish music education and comfortably congruent with the general thrust of the MEND findings.

---

[57] Professor Callaway quotes Edvard Grieg as having said that Grainger had "given a significant indication of how the English folk-song . . . should be lifted up into the sphere of art, thereby emancipating English Art Music". He also describes Grainger's highly successful experiment in arranging *Pagodes* (*Estampes* No 1), the highly sophisticated piano piece by Debussy for instrumental ensemble thereby "merely giving it back to the sound-type (Javanese Gamelan) from which it had originally emerged".

Ref. III P ii See Document 302 in Proceedings

The Role of Philosophy in the Development of Professional Music Educators
(The title of this presentation was modified from 'Philosophies of Music as a Basis for Teacher Training')
Professor Harold Abeles - Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York City.

The choice of Professor Abeles was a happy one in achieving a synthesis of considerations raised by two of MEND's agenda items, viz. Philosophy of Music Education and Third-level Education for Music Teachers. Author of an impressive range of germane material, he came highly recommended by distinguished American colleagues (notably Richard Colwell). Much of what he contributed corroborated the general thrust of MEND findings, which were already crystallizing as Phase III was in preparation. His long experience as a teacher trainer shines through in his common-sense approach to progression in and speed of acquisition of essential skills by trainee music educators in a changing world, and to the desirability of fruitful collaborations between practitioners in curriculum development and implementation. The strategy he adopts in his lecture is one of taking the key words of the title and working through them, but, consciously, not in order; notably, according to Abeles, philosophy as an acquired mentality only takes shape as a by-product, so to speak, and not as an absolute priority and overt component in the early training of teachers. Obviously Professor Abeles believes that while philosophy of music education must inform music teacher training, these typically highly pressurized undergraduate courses are not just about philosophy. It is assumed that he is referring here to music education and not to music as a component in a general education course. In other words, he is considering specialist music teacher training rather than the training of the general practitioner – the classroom teacher in an Irish context. He has a relaxed approach to the need for early absorption of philosophical principles by aspiring teachers and favours, rather, the long-term evolution of personal teaching styles (compare McCann - Ref. I P vi) coloured by eclectic choices but not driven by or slave to any particular philosophical stance. This ambivalence is somewhat unnerving and begs questions of feasibility and effectiveness. Professor Abeles calls for an underlying philosophy to inform teacher training (and a *consistent* one at that . . . consistency above all), but insinuated by suffusion into all course components, particularly and typically into methods classes. How this is possible without the prior policy imposition of a guiding philosophical rationale as to curricular activities and outcomes, in the first place, is difficult to imagine (the notionally polar views of Reimer and Elliott could well provide an interesting challenge to this strategy).

Dr Abeles is, above all, a serious-minded pragmatist; flamboyance is not his style. Distinguished music educator that he is recognized to be, his strength seems to be in an ability to work effectively within the constraints of an imposed system without confrontation - no mean achievement; alternatively he could be seen as being capable of manipulating the perceived prescriptive *liberality* of the American education system by circumventing controversial areas. The current battlefield of music education philosophy is just such an area, as we know from the lively proceedings of MEND Phase II. He specifically views the training period for music teachers as extending well beyond the college years (again see also McCann - Ref. I P vi). "[S]easoning is a critical aspect of developing the music education professional. . . . The four years of undergraduate school are just not long enough to develop the breadth of musicianship needed to teach the diverse repertory of music". He sees this lengthened apprenticeship as facilitating the evolution of a philosophical mentality in *career* teachers, fostered by the accumulation of professional experience. This, of course, begs another immediate question as to how the so-called classroom teacher (that is, the non-specialist) can be expected to cope with anything but the barest fundamentals of a subject so holistically demanding on aspirant trainee teachers. He stresses that college formal education should focus on preparing educators from a broad background that provides a basis for further development and a foundation for education in the future - this rather than training for specific skills; in other words general principles are preferred over techniques with a narrow focus. The inculcation of a leadership role is also highlighted as an objective for professional music teachers. Yet he is fully in sympathy with the implications of the subject matter he was specifically invited to address - philosophy as a tool of development. In this regard he states that "philosophically, music educators must understand why music is indispensable to

the development of children. They must be able to express this conviction". Furthermore he considers that a broad education in the liberal arts and sciences should be pursued during the undergraduate years, leading to communication skills that enable the graduates to organize their thoughts, write about their subject and present their ideas effectively to relevant groups (and not always presumed to be sympathetic audiences) - in other words, to philosophize about and be advocates for music education. It is not to disavow a defence of generally accepted principles of music education philosophy that Dr Abeles prioritizes knowledge of musical content, pedagogical strategies and verbal skills as pre-essential for successful teaching. In fact that is how he defines the needs of professional music educators, synonymous, for him, with teacher/leaders and career teachers. And he is in agreement with Harry White (Ref. III P viii) in making a distinction between 'education' and 'instruction'. He touches here on a familiar phenomenon in third-level music education in that most candidates present themselves with a biased view of the central importance of performance; experiences in Ireland and the USA are, however, causally very different. Harold Abeles believes that through exposure to well integrated courses in theory (including method), history and composition, this bias can be softened (into relevance to general music education) while important philosophical principles are reflected without being overtly articulated.

Dr Abeles goes on to define a spectrum of desirable capabilities that should accrue to the professional teacher in the course of maturation over the undergraduate and subsequent years:

1. Familiarity with the basics of child development, the skills and understandings that comprise a music curriculum and the strategies to transmit those understandings.

2. An intimate knowledge of music, which can only be obtained through immersion in the art form *through performance*. Careful as to definition, Dr Abeles must be understood here as referring to performance *in music*, nailing his colours to the mast, so to speak, and implying that the natural stream from which teachers are recruited is the performance one. In this he touches a nerve-centre of Irish music education in calling into question how our second-level school music curricula (and certainly as they are currently organized) can yield candidature for careers in music teaching unaided. The implications of this instance of the fractured continuum, which is so insidiously devastating, are considered under Assessment (*qv* - Agenda Item V). He refers in passing to the performance/aesthetic education controversy (Reimer/Elliott) but wisely circumnavigates it, although it is difficult to see how he might reconcile them as approaches of comparable merit. First he employs a neutral statement "One can organize method classes emphasizing the performance outcomes of music education or the aesthetic outcomes"; he then amplifies these notionally prescriptive approaches by invoking the influential thoughts of the late Charles Fowler (1996) in suggesting other ways of thinking about the objectives of music education. Thus, there is merit in such strategies as "thinking receptively . . . aesthetically . . . creatively . . . communicatively . . . and culturally". (Compare Professor McCarthy's treatment of *Continuum* for further clarification of these approaches. Ref. III P vii.) These are healthy and less confrontational ways of validating particular types of access to musical experiences which make up a comprehensive mosaic, avoiding exclusions. It is interesting that Dr Abeles himself comes through as a traditionalist and pragmatist. Taking the basic assumption that most postulant teachers have a performing bias, he aims 'to break that bias, to develop a more eclectic view of the goal's of music education . . . to develop a musically literate populace (by including) opportunities for students to compose, improvise and analyze music'. It seems that teacher training, and music education in turn, is still typically anchored in these skills. Professor Abeles punctuates his specification with constant references to the inculcation of strategies that are not merely responding to prescriptive guidance, but are 'tailored to fit the teacher's "teaching style"'; this championing of adaptability and flexibility in suiting 'the needs of the students they are working with' invokes and parallels the idea of *contextual philosophy* which is recommended in the MEND findings.

3. Perhaps it is to misinterpret Professor Abeles's preferences to say that he merely pays lip service to the idea that undergraduate experiences include a variety of "kinds" of music which, untypically, he leaves undefined except by relating them to 'diverse cultural interests' and relegating them to the status of 'music other than western art music', which teachers *beyond undergraduate school* have to explore. Harry White identifies his *bête noire* in rock and 'pop', but there are many other kinds (as, for example, folk and ethnic) clamouring, on the basis of social relevance, for a place in the curriculum. Dr Abeles, understandably in the context of his brief, had no need to join battle in this confrontational scene, in which the Irish and American contexts are markedly dissimilar anyway, most particularly in an ethnic or multicultural sense. His observations are politically correct but it is obvious that he is well aware of the time management implications (see MEND Findings – Section 20.2) in overcrowded curricula and the impossibility of equipping young inexperienced teachers with the repertoire and the skills to respond to the daunting challenge of manifold diversity in a truly effective way. It remains one of the most pressing but unresolved problems of contemporary music education (See Patricia Shehan Campbell's paper for the multiculturalist's view. Ref. III P v).

Returning to the timing of philosophical maturity in teachers, Dr Abeles again brings forward a common sense prediction. 'It is during the time of developing as a professional, that a philosophy of music education should begin to develop'. This is an important point which ties in well with Abeles's original definition of the career teacher as being a leader and an articulate spokesperson for the profession; in other words he is predicating the essential continuum of learning experiences by which a teacher supplements his undergraduate experiences and reaches maturity (a postgraduate period of up to seven years is recommended). Dr Abeles suggests, with inexorable logic, that it is only during this period, for those who have truly professional quality, that a personal philosophy of music education should be embraced, drawn from the many options available for perusal and, presumably, not necessarily bound exclusively to any one. This is a seminal conclusion, accounting in part for the general insecurity and diffidence to be found amongst teachers in responding convincingly to the simple question: "Why and what should I be teaching". There is a crucial connection here to an earlier paper read at MEND by Mary Lennon (Ref. I P xiv) in which she stresses that the professionalism, and the career prospects, of teachers are tied more to their consciously developed skills in thinking about what they are teaching rather than in following prescriptive methodology which may not always fit the case. There is, thus, no denial here of the need for a guiding philosophy of music education and for its ease of conveyance to its implementers (the music educators at all levels). But if it is left to the ministries of personal development, individually undertaken, it is given, in most cases, as doomed hostage to the doctrine of laissez faire. So well might this dilemma be confronted by the music education forum, the establishment and continuity of which is the commanding recommendation of the MEND initiative.

Professor Abeles concludes his treatment of the philosophy issue with an interesting exploration of a contextual, so-styled, application, redolent of the Irish scenario, which has long been in the grips of the specialist/class teacher and child-centred/subject-centred argument in relation to music education. While he favours, as Dr Marie McCarthy does, the idea of the professional music specialist for the systematic introduction of children to music, he responds to the reality that 'the general classroom teacher may have to assume the responsibility for developing music skills and understandings'. He sees this need, under the right circumstances, as having very positive potential in encouraging the professionalization of teachers; this is achieved by providing opportunities for decision-making and for partnership in curriculum development through participation in in-service educational experiences. He cites examples of collaborations in the United States which have taken the form of liaisons between classroom teachers, music education specialists and community-based artists (solo or collective) in which schools and cultural institutions have taken the sponsoring initiative. Such cross-community projects can only be successful if guided by a clear underlying philosophy. Since the cases he describes are based on very different philosophical perspectives, he makes the point that such projects not only benefit the teachers and their students, but expose teachers to a variety of

philosophical approaches, familiarity with which can accelerate their maturation. He stresses that all participants must retain their vocational individuality while participating fully in the management of the curricular idiosyncrasies. Although the funding of such initiatives can sometimes be scant, if not precarious, they are nevertheless paradigmatic as contextual philosophy in action.

Professor Abeles's thoughtful presentation, while avoiding confrontational philosophical issues, is nevertheless valuable in pinpointing the difficulty in situating the exposure of trainee music teachers to Socratic philosophical dialectic. The corollary of his conclusion is that there is a danger that many teachers may never experience a meaningful engagement with the fundamental tenets of their profession as articulated, for their edification and consideration, in sometimes-conflicting philosophical statements.

Ref. III P viii See Document 308 in Proceedings

'A book of manners in the wilderness': The Model of University Music Education and its Relevance as Enabler in General Music Education in Ireland
Harry White, Professor of Music, University College, Dublin, Ireland

It should be stated from the outset that Professor White's peroration was a fitting epilogue to the public phases of the MEND initiative. Without detracting from the sustained excellence and collective value of the other prepared presentations, this paper, by the current incumbent of the chair of the late John F Larchet, is predictably as decisive and provocative as could be expected in its overarching perspective of the Irish music education dilemma. Its impact on the capacity audience attending the final afternoon of the MEND proceedings was electrifying. And its publication has launched it in the global forum too, attracting responses from both Bennett Reimer and David Elliott. If the MEND research effort evolves as the delegates ordained, the value of Harry White's contribution will be more fully appreciated at every re-reading. This paper is essential preparation for anyone who wishes to immerse himself in the conundrum of Irish music education and its perilous choices; its polished phrases are a literary delight, where style is not offered as a substitute for substance

Professor White is unapologetic in painting his own portrait as a music educator. He sees himself as a musicologist, which he undeniably is *par excellence*, and his proposed personal input to the pool of musical discourse naturally stems from this. Curiously, he distances himself from the discipline of music education philosophy, especially from the trendy, reactionary and posturing variety which *he* identifies unambiguously in his lecture; he therefore gives himself hostage to his would-be critics by rejecting the feigned democracy of an egalitarianism which seems to be claiming that all musics are of equal value - an interpretation which may, however, be an over-presumption on his part, as analysis will seek to clarify.

The paper itself, which would be seamless except for Dr White's own decision to subdivide it, has three main themes. He first takes up the contextual argument and rejects the perceived American model of music education (and what he sees as its dominating informing philosophies) as a paradigm for Ireland - now or in the foreseeable future. He grounds his scepticism in his reading of how the Americans have countered Eurocentricity in dealing with their characteristically multi-cultural dimension. "Eurocenticity", claims Harry White, "is, or should be, an American problem. Being European, I fail to see how we can be *other* than Eurocentric". The American phenomenon is not, of course, as simple as that, nor is Eurocentricity in music monopolized by Europeans. Unlike Herbert Gans (see Keith Swanwick's paper, Ref III P iv, p.3) he leans towards the view of simple cleavage between 'mass' and 'high' cultures and deplores the strategies that seek to accommodate one by reducing the other to a common denominator which belittles its potential in education. He targets the performance issue by sketching the equally unacceptable manifestations of American high-school polished (ensemble) performance (to the virtual exclusion of all other musical discourse), and "mediocre performance . . . of any kind of music and at virtually any standard of competence - as an

immanent form of student-centred discovery [which] looms large over the process of music education in general. . . . Meanwhile the music itself begins to disappear". Secondly, Professor White analyses two carefully selected tracts from American music literature and uses them to reach a compelling if deceptively simple outcome: "if the 'grand tradition ' of music is 'receding into history' . . . ***the blame lies with the education system*** [writer's italics]. Even the economic self-interest of popular music, together with its virtual omnipresence, is not enough to destroy an idea. And music, at the last, is fundamentally an idea about sound. Roehmann is right: change (his or mine) begins with the educators". Thirdly, in a powerfully logical sequel, Professor White tells us of one of his own innovative options as a university model, devoted to *listenership*, which seeks to redress the totally disrupted balance in current music education trends.

> What most distresses me about this high-handed repudiation of art music is the assumption that one generation is free to dispense with its obligations to the generation that follows. . . . The university model of music education must . . . redeem it from our wilful obscurity**. In plain terms, it must teach people how to listen.** We have ostracized the listener. We have left her [*sic*] to the solitary pleasures of the compact disc. We have no need of deconstructive criticism in music education: we have already dispensed with the central authority of the text"

Is it any wonder that Reimer and Elliott responded, predictably differently, to this passionate defence of art music, the plea for its continuing strong presence in music education, primarily through the commanding vehicle of committed listenership, which should be cultivated rather than played down or even disavowed?

Dr White shows himself, throughout his paper, to be thoroughly conversant with the proceedings of MEND. And he identifies so completely, by numerous references, with the layout of its agenda (as an attempt to sketch the matrix and scope of music education concerns in Ireland), and argues so compellingly in its favour as an accurate set of implied challenges, that it is virtually impossible not to be swayed, most of the time, by his passion and eloquence; it has, thus, proved difficult for the writer to maintain detachment in reviewing his paper. But all is not fully convincing; nor could it be expected in a subject of such complexity? The central concern of music education - *inter alia*, passing on that which society values - is daunting enough when it confronts the reality of music and music-making as a universal human experience and faculty; but the idealistic shibboleth of 'music for all' is an impossible aspiration, certainly if it is expanded in scope to read '*all musics* for all'. Arnold Schönberg is credited with the aphorism: "If it is art it is not for all: if it is for all it is not art". Harry White's noble defence of western art music is ill-at-ease in affording any reconciliation between these two maxims, although it must be conceded that he is merely pleading for a rightful share of the educational cake. The truth is, as Dr White himself recognizes, that the scope of music is so bewilderingly comprehensive that its management in education, at any level, is first and foremost a question of time management, and secondly a question of choice - the scarcely controllable gamble of either/or, which so distresses him, or the simple capitulation to the "incessant pressure of 'Me' and Mine' and the present tense of American popular culture"; and the insidious spread of that force, from the 1960s, in First World countries, is with us to stay and must somehow be managed too. Is it not possible that post-sputnik America, where it all started, took the brunt of it, and that (apart from its ethnic and multicultural problems, which must not be confused with those related to the universal dilemma of high/mass cleavage) certain of its education strategists sought to stem the tide in a variety of accommodations. So it is not always merely a question of a chauvinistic reaction against Eurocentricity; after all the second generation Diaspora in America have a perfectly valid claim to the resplendent art heritage of Europe and to identify comfortably with it and its indigenous derivatives. The failed exercise of establishing a credible continuum between music in education and the social experience of music, definable across a wide functional spectrum not fully recognized as educationally relevant, is the real and ongoing dilemma. But pandering to popular taste as the answer seems to have been proved a failure if, as Dr White laments, there appears to be a danger that the baby is being thrown out with the bathwater.

It will be fascinating to scan the Reimer/Elliott responses to White's paper but, in the interests of the impartiality aspired to by the writer, it will not be undertaken until this review is complete. They are included as sequels to this review as recognition of the seminal importance of Professor White's lecture as a masterful treatment and exposition of the Irish problem, in spite of its occasional imprudent oversimplifications. It is suspected that Harry White will be accused of not understanding the situation that he criticises so fulsomely. As far as the 'music as product or process' debate is concerned he is affronted by the implications of the 'fundamental tenet of Elliott's philosophy that all music is a human activity rather than a *product* of that activity . . . a philosophy of music which insists upon the equivalent condition of all musics, irrespective of their origins or purpose' (It is significant that Professor White takes up this point, as does David Aspen in *his* review of Elliott's *MM* [q.v.]); he seems to see this as unconditionally enfranchising 'the pop and rock forms of the present day, those which press down with ubiquitous insistence on the musical imagination' and as 'a retreat into the abyss of desolation' These are strong words. And the corollary is his acceptance of or concentration on music (and not necessarily or always western art music) as product, owing much to the punctuation of history with geniuses whose masterworks define the ideals of their expressive world (White's unstinting praise of Mozart and Mozart scholarship is a case in point). But the argument must be taken further. Professor White is to be respected for a gutsy defence of his professional commitment to the university model of 'music education which clears a vital space for art music and the study of music in culture which otherwise is overcome by the deafening roar of popular forms'. His revulsion (by an insidiousness that is not new) may, however, be somewhat overstated. The author takes it that he, like Reimer and even Elliott (to an extent, and by his constant invocation of artistic norms [see the rationalization of the Reimer/Elliott confrontation]), would embrace the Absolute Expressionist view of music (as art, which, after all, is a uniquely human cross-cultural phenomenon which transcends any coterie interpretations based on western ideals) as being a mimetic expression of feeling rather than a vehicle for the indiscriminate discharge of emotion. The functionalists (see references to Fowler and Merriam [and Elliott] in Professor McCarthy's paper on Continuum, Ref. III P vii) might demur but this is, nevertheless, the sense which emerges from White's paper. And since human feeling (as indeed the committed and informed listenership which Harry White so vehemently recommends) is a function or an outcome of thought, we are led to the Epicurean approach which suggests entrapment in an élitist idea. And this is a measure of the contemporary problem with music education - the desirability of a healthy interface with the ordinary person - which may account for the American dilemma which Harry White analyses with such different conclusions.

Before quitting the question of the place of western art music (including that area of current sensitivity - American music of the European Diaspora and its derivatives) in the general educational curriculum, rather than in specialized education, one other point arises from Professor White's paper. If music is, as he plausibly suggests, 'fundamentally an idea about sound', it is essentially then, by definition, a thing of the mind. 'The musical tradition of post-Renaissance Europe and her offshoots is one of the most brilliant and astonishing cultural phenomena of human history'[58]; the insatiable scholarship which has intentionally fed upon it with such resplendent outputs can surely lay claim to due recognition in terms of human achievement and hierarchy. It is also true that there are many genres of music, some of which, also intentionally, are much more modest in their aspirations, and more extrinsically functional. Professor White does 'not subscribe to the current egalitarianism which so loudly dictates musical choice . . . [and he] deplores the arrogant equation of Schubert with Simon and Garfunkel. . . . As to whether the European tradition deserves its hitherto sovereign claim on the educated imagination . . .[his] answer to that question is: in Europe, yes it does'. He advances 'Ireland's right to access to the European tradition over and above the interests of cultural egalitarianism in North America'. Without quibbling over the nicety of what precisely is included under the European tradition (a hopelessly ambiguous and diffuse definition) all of this is asserted while he, surprisingly, draws back from the brink without claiming that his sophisticated preferences in music simply *are* superior, although that is, to the writer, obviously what is implied from the rhetoric of the whole paper and, more importantly, what will be generally attributed to him (and not

[58] Christopher Small, Music: Society: Education (London, John Calder [Publishers] Ltd, 1977; Second Revised Edition 1980' Second Impression, 1984)p1

without the admiration of the many whose honesty outweighs other considerations of current political propriety). It may be argued that 'historians of music are not much concerned with implausible theories of musical superiority' . . . . simply because they take them for granted! It seems evasive to state that 'abstract notions of musical superiority are self-evidently reprehensible, but the notion of musical difference is not". May it not be inferred from this half-hearted semantic distinction that it could very logically and validly support the idea of the egalitarianism which is anathema to Professor White? And it doesn't help his stance one whit to observe that nowhere (to the writer's knowledge) in the publications of Elliott, or, for that matter, of Reimer, is there a statement, unambiguous in intent, that all musics are specifically, *without qualification*, of equal value. So the evasion on all accounts avails nothing. Professor White's apologia, nevertheless, stands as a compelling defence of the evidence of quality, genius, feeling and craft, quite apart from its seemingly magisterial unawareness of the pressing need to find ways of insinuating it into the popular mentality or otherwise of successfully accommodating the claims of the culturally naive in a congenial way.

Harry White is really too obviously well-informed to be accused of having misjudged the American music education scene as he seems, on the surface, to have done; nor is he so insecure in his convictions as to be made so fearful for Irish music education by what seems to emerge, for him, from his appraisal of Heartz, Roehmann and Bernstein. Any peg will do to hang one's hat on, and Professor White's hypothetical reconstruction of American music education and its underlying philosophical advocacy is surely just a grandiose intentional exaggeration to illustrate what he does *not* want for Ireland; contrast as a device is wholly permissible if he gets his point across. As he says, he is 'not primarily concerned with music education outside Ireland'. If music education in the United States is a mishmash, this is a characteristic of the federal system, the virtues of which are so jealously guarded by the American polity; the blame (if, indeed, there is culpability) cannot be laid at the door of music educators. The federal authority exerts no control over state-to-state dispensation in education; there is no national curriculum, so anything goes provided it can operate within local constraints. The system comfortably supports views as diverse as those of Heartz and Roehmann referred to above; it is entrepreneurship that must win the day in deciding eventually what children are to be exposed to in their musical discoveries. There are no authoritative statistics which illustrate, for example, how the philosophies of Reimer and Elliott are taken up, and implemented, much less how they have performed in reaching their putative and tendentious targets. There is no evidence as to how they may have seduced 'misguided' educators away from their prized 'polished ensemble performance', which is as typical of American music education as it is untypical in Irish schools. Is Professor White not heartened to observe the signs that music educators in the United States are as concerned about the fate of their subject as we are (or should be) in Ireland, and for the same reasons as he has so perceptively divined; is he not impressed by the admirable work of the 70,000-strong Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in drafting American National Standards for the consideration of music education agencies nation-wide? Can he fail to be bemused by the fact that MENC is massively supported in its manifesto on standards by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS) which includes, *inter alia*, 'all of the pop singers and instrumentalists' (see Paul Lehman's paper. Ref. III P iii, p3). Finally would he not find in the text of the (American) National Standards, to which, we are told, the vast majority of American music educators now subscribe and aspire, a well nigh perfect template for what he has in mind in relation to Irish music education at all levels. The Standards include such entries as 'Listening to, analyzing and describing music; evaluating music and music performance; understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts; understanding music in relation to history and culture' - all balm to his soul. The American National Standards, which are as near to a statement of curriculum (activities and outcomes) as that system could ever attempt to propose for general adoption, are not prescriptive as to methodology, much less as to underlying philosophies of music education, new or otherwise (these must compete with one another in the rough and tumble of American free enterprise); in this conscious omission they are mirrored in the statements of Irish education policy-makers. But there is little that is exceptionable in the politically respectable middle ground of American music education. The prescribed 'varied repertoire of music' may not define a western art music monopoly; but neither does it unequivocally confirm Harry White's fear that 'no longer do

popular forms simply rival the classical repertoire; they now supplant it'. Perhaps, after all, there is much to be learned from American idealism in relation to general music education.

Harry White seems disinclined to attack the tenets of music education philosophy as expounded by Bennett Reimer although he essays to play devil's advocate in relation to the philosophies discussed during MEND Phase II. Perhaps he feels, like Swanwick, that the admirable Reimer paradigm of 1970 has served its purpose and can now be superannuated. On the other hand, since its wisdom has already endured for more than a quarter of a century, perhaps he finds it more interesting or comfortable to challenge the challenger, David Elliott, who, because of the 'newness' of his rationale, is much more controversial. But, if the putative equality of all musics is to be taken seriously, . . . if the siege by unacceptable genres of popular musics is a real threat and not just a tiresome reality which we have lived with and tolerated for half a century or more, . . . if the 'boy with the electric guitar' is lurking in the implementation strategies behind the National Standards, it is Reimer who, with consummate elegance, provides the yardstick to settle the arguments surrounding materials and choice. It has been stated elsewhere in this report that the processes of valuing and judgement are ineluctable in the dialogue of transmission; and there is a certain ethical morality governing the process as it operates in education. The universally acceptable criterion that the musical materials used for educational purposes must be the 'best' available may beg many questions, but it is indubitably not value-free. It is worth quoting Reimer at length to reassure Professor White of the unbending integrity that informs American music education practices at their most eclectic:

> It is impossible to avoid making value judgements about music when one deals with music as a professional. And while any overt imposition of musical values would be distasteful to most educators and most students, the entire music education enterprise is built on the assumption that musical tastes can be improved, that musical experiences can be deepened, that musical enjoyment can be refined, that musical significance can be made more available to all people. These assumptions, all of which are very healthy and beyond criticism, do imply a movement toward "better" musical experiences of "better" music. The question is, what makes music "better".
>
> To the extent that the construction of a piece of music . . . is marked by qualities of skillfulness, expertness, competence, aptness, consistency of style, clarity of basic intent, sufficient complexity and variety for its scope, adroitness, inventiveness, craftsmanship, the piece can be judged to be "better' than one which is lacking in these qualities. . . . The notion of musical excellence as one basis for choosing "good music" can be of immediate use to the practicing music educator.
>
> But important as syntactical excellence is as a component of good music it is not sufficient for judging musical quality. A second aspect of value must be included. This, which can be termed "greatness", has to do with the level of profundity of the music's expressive content. To the extent that the conditions of expressiveness in a particular piece are capable of producing deep, abiding insights into the nature of subjective reality that piece can be called "great". . . . Greatness occurs when the sense of feelingfulness is so striking, so "true", so revealing of the nature of the subjective human condition, that one who experiences the work's impact feels changed in the direction of a deeper understanding of what it is like to be human. . . . The major objective of music education is to develop, to whatever extent is possible, every person's capacity to share the deepest levels of musical greatness. For the more of the qualities of greatness that a person can experience the more can his sense of "humanness" be refined.[59]

The exercise of judgement carries with it responsibility for choices at every juncture. If Presley's Teddy Bear or Ellington's Cotton Tail is to rub shoulders with a Mozart Piano Concerto or a

[59] Bennett Reimer, A Philosophy of Music Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970) p102-104 (see also p 133-138 of the revised 1989 edition)

Beethoven Symphony on an equal footing, that place must be earned; can we not trust to the integrity of well-trained teachers to get it right. There is no weapon against mindless taste; neither should the need for contextual or functional propriety be summarily disavowed in the interests of overweening aestheticism. The mechanisms are there for pragmatic and acceptable balance if the trainers of the trainers are sensitive to the dictates of their professionalism and fully informed in making *their* choices. Harry White is right. **If change is called for, it begins with the educators**.

Had the principal findings of MEND (*q.v.*) not already been crystallizing prior to Phase III, Harry White's paper would have substantially formulated them, as indeed they now endorse them. That is why this paper is of such incomparable value. Thus, he reviews, at the very outset, 'prevailing ideologies of music education insofar as these have been expounded in all three [only two, surely, at that juncture!] phases of MEND' and finds them wanting, if not as to their internal consistency, certainly as to their indiscriminate applicability to or possible implementation in Irish music education curricula. Clearly he is arguing that the context in which a philosophy operates has a bearing on the case, and simply that the context of American music education reveals as many differences from as similarities to that which applies in Ireland. And since he concludes that attitudinal 'change begins with the educators' he is predicating that music education theorists should look to *relevant* models of thought and filter these through to the educators, at source. If Professor White is concerned that, within the more obviously learned reaches of professionalism in music 'the Beethoven scholar provides a necessary equilibrium for the philosophers of music education, even if the two can sometimes seem to exist in a relationship of mutual incomprehension' how much more should his concern be that dialogue be instituted between academics and practitioners, where dichotomy is rampant and misunderstandings have been more mutually isolating and damaging. In dealing with the breakdown (which he welcomes) of the Oxbridge-influenced universal model in university education in favour of the astonishing variety of options that are almost self-threatening to their own credibility in terms of their failure to define a recognizable model at all, Harry White makes the vital connection which links third-level courses with subsequent employment of graduates in the teaching profession. He warns, presumably in relation to the proliferation of other models, which, he feels, are responsible for over-dilution of what remains of the old university paradigm, that *it* should retain its close connections with the 'European tradition [which] becomes a permanent educational resource - in performance, in composition, in research. . . . If university music is to *enable* music education at large . . . our sense of a university model of music education ought to be more informed than it is'. This can only mean that he is fully aware of, and treats with due urgency, the responsibility to provide relevant training for teachers, as the irreducible resource in music education. And it is left to the reader to compare Professor White's treatment, point-by-point, with the MEND agenda itself to discover his carefully-woven interconnections, which, although laced with constructive criticism, respect its comprehensiveness while adding valuable comment on and clarification of its significance.

Finally, it is in relation to *performance* that Harry White's paper gratuitously throws down the gauntlet to music educators in identifying, with unerring accuracy, the hubris, as it is the blind spot, within the whole enterprise. In so doing he eloquently verbalizes on the notion, which he holds responsible for many of the ills by which his ideas for a balanced and efficient music education system, at any level, are beset. It is not by accident that his named musicians of popular culture - Presley, Cash, Ellington - all belong within the performer category. But it is especially notable too, in the writer's opinion, that, as a self-styled non-performer, Professor White's detachment magnificently outshines in effect any academic prejudice which might be attributed to him.

Performance is at the heart of music. The wish to perform is so strong in many that it can eclipse all other musical drives. It feeds vanity and massively begets self-deception; it is admirable too and deserving of encouragement, but it can disrupt and skew the whole music education process, especially in its general context. It can challenge time management to its ultimate. It is a vital component of music considered as product or as process. Performance, not surprisingly, is at the core of much music education philosophy. It features as a dimension of music in Reimer and Swanwick as it does in the rationale of the functionalists (typically, Merriam and Fowler); it seems totally to usurp Elliott's thought processes as a perennial preoccupation. It is the most aspired-to prize - the jewel in

the crown - of music education as much as it is the *bête noire* of academics in education who must fight a constantly losing battle for time against its allurement. Performance in music, especially at the early stages of training, and at any satisfactory artistic level, is largely dominated by the need for psychomotor skills; although this is often challenged in philosophical terms it remains true as an immanent problem in much music education. The truth is that preparation for performance in music, as it is understood by most learners, takes time; without the necessary investment of time it can degenerate into an amateurism that is self-conscious to the point of disablement. In real terms it is for a minority, but it has become a fashionable *sine qua non* of late, in response to the niceties of philosophies which define musical attainment targets, in general music education, in terms of composing, *performing* and appraising. So well might Harry White vent his frustration: 'the cult of performance has so overtaken our sense of music (from the regiments of Suzuki to the peaks of the international competition) that our conception of music has narrowed accordingly'. And this is undoubtedly true, nor are we compensated in Ireland by any evidence of the polished performance 'problem' that actually, we are told, spawned the 'Music Education as Aesthetic Education' movement in the United States, and dichotomized the cohorts of school music learners in the process. Harry White develops his theme by claiming (and there is no reason to doubt his sincerity) that the trend in Ireland towards the North American model of the ascendency of performance as a vehicle for music education has led to the 'conservative complaint from university teachers that standards are already down, that school leavers know less and less as the years go by'. This would be logical if it were not for the paradoxical reality, based on reliable information, that the standard of performance is also down. But the numbers are up! This educational nexus is more fully treated under the heading of Assessment (Item V of the MEND Agenda [*q.v.*]). Harry White, in pinpointing performance, without undue prejudice, as a problem area in music education, usefully exposes a whole spectrum of related concern, without, it might be added, offering any solution to the performance dilemma itself. And, after all, why should we expect it of him; the fact that he has confirmed its dissonance within the management of general music education is itself a collective invitation to music educators of all shades to search for resolution. As long ago as 1993 the writer consulted with, and was greatly encouraged by Professor White about an idea to seek specialisms (in performance and listening [musicology]) within the Senior Cycle Second-level Syllabus for music, as a method of coming to terms with the impossible time constraints in a subject so overtly demanding of excellence. While this idea was echoed in the subsequent PIANO report commissioned by the Ministry for Arts and the Gaeltacht, the only response from the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) seems to have been to level down standards in the Leaving Certificate examination to deliver the statistical norm in terms of results when compared with other subjects. It thus seems that we are doomed (at least for the moment) to treat, as is the norm in North America, first year university students of music as remedial (or have no students at all!). Harry White believes that the immanent problem with performance in general education is due to a basic confusion between instruction and education (see Abeles above Ref. II P ii); the resultant destabilization of the subject in schools will ensure its minority status. Be that as it may (and the logic is not clear in the light of reports about increasing uptake) it is nevertheless crucial that the question of performance in music education (which is still the parameter on which philosophies of music education most diverge) continues to be addressed in Ireland in a way which does not endanger the regenerative cycle by which music as a social grace is enabled to survive and grow. If there is a recognizable drift here towards the notion of performance, in real terms, as a specialization (of a kind demanding more time than can comfortably be accommodated in school curricula) and as therefore élitist - if the embryo professional stream (e.g. music teaching) is not to be nurtured by school music as defined in curricular statements, these lacunas must be separately addressed; and it is probably better that way. It is essential that these problems be recognized for what they are and that bridges be built, or barriers be deconstructed, to preserve continuum across crucial interfaces in the macrostructure of music education (as, for example, between second- and third-level music education). In the absence of a teaching cohort with the transcendental skills to incorporate performance meaningfully into school education (the Elliott ideal which has its own validity in context and as an ideal), the honest reappraisal of sham notions of performance and the restoration, or establishment, of a true balance in the menus of school music education may yet clear that vital space for listenership, without its pejorative connotations, that Harry White so compellingly argues for.

'A book of manners in the wilderness' is a touching, yet disturbing, apologia. Its finger is sensitively on the living pulse of Irish music education - today . . . now. If it feels threatened or even overwhelmed by current trends its stance is still not an arrogant, if futile, refusal to surrender; rather is it concerned. It pleads not so much for a return to basics as for a search for refinement and for a relegitimization of the disappearing art of listening which, after all, is the irreducibly basic faculty which validates the whole spectrum of musical activity. 'The music, you might say, comes first'. If it paints a scenario of gloom it is still more positive when perceived as a book of manners rather than as a lonely voice in the wilderness. One might echo the words of the *Deaf Ears?* Report and hope that it will not become a sad prophecy.

The Reimer/Elliott Reviews of Harry White's Paper - *A book of manners in the wilderness*.

Harry White's paper, which has been exhaustively reviewed for MEND in this report, was perhaps the most remarkable, as it certainly was the most provocative, presentation at the MEND proceedings. And when the promoters of MEND offered presenters the facility to publish their writings further, beyond the MEND boundaries, it proved (and certainly in this case) to have been inspirational. Professor White took up this offer and, in submitting his controversial paper to the **College Music Symposium** (Journal of the College Music Society) in the United States, was guaranteed significant responses, which in turn could be added to the MEND analysis.[60] Little was it suspected that the respondents would themselves have been active participants in the MEND process itself. So it has proved to be a particularly valuable outcome of MEND that the triumvirate of Harry White, Bennett Reimer and David Elliott[61] should have been drawn into a fruitful philosophical dialogue which has yielded a rich harvest in terms of reidentifying most if not all of the key issues of MEND, offering comment as to their hierarchical importance in the *denouement* of the Irish music education dilemma. But Harry White's assumed role as Devil's Advocate, perhaps legitimizing for himself a degree of freedom in baiting his critics with diminished prudence, and a line of questioning that challenged North America to vindicate or explain its alleged growing influence in Irish music education affairs, elicited two characteristic if profoundly dissimilar responses. Reimer's offering, apart from some mild name-calling when he deals with Elliott's philosophical stance, is a fine specimen of his style, arch at times but gallantly flattering to White's point of view; it handsomely supplements, in the most succinct manner (but here in the Irish context) his own substantial bibliography, which has entered and influenced the MEND proceedings. David Elliott's response is also typical of his writing when he feels he has a case to answer; he gives the impression throughout that he considers his philosophy to be under direct siege from White over a wide spectrum of issues.

Bennett Reimer's Response

Reimer's response is elegantly written and consciously affable; he makes his points without aggression and they are all the more palatable on that account, quite apart from their persuasive logic. He begins by voicing some doubt as to whether the organizers of MEND were justified in assuming that American philosophers could contribute useful ideas in an Irish music education context; and he believes that White rejects that assumption. Perhaps Reimer is being too self-deprecatory here - of himself and on behalf of his colleagues. There is a vast middle ground between White's

[60] Permission has been sought and granted to print Professor White's paper and the responses in the Appendices of MEND (*qv*).

[61] It is not immediately clear as to why Dr Veblen's name was added as co-author with David Elliott of his response. The material is drawn exclusively from Elliott's writings and the style is unmistakably his, as comparison with his rebuttal of Reimer's review of *Music Matters* would confirm. Equally, the commentary is not recognizable as emanating form Dr Veblen's paper at MEND. With due respect to Dr Veblen , it is assumed, for the purposes of this analysis that only the triumvirate referred to in the text above needs to be considered as providing the material for the analysis. Dr Veblen's contribution to MEND is reviewed under the appropriate heading (Ref. II P vi; Section 18.6))

disenchantment with the patterns of music *consumption* in North America (and its assumed connection to processes of music education in schools and at higher levels) and the possible levels of frustration amongst American music educators that their model is flawed as currently dispensed - a situation with which, by implication, he would sympathize. Deliberations at MEND (with the connivance of the promoters, it is true) had to confront the current debacle in the field of music education philosophy in North America with, it is to be hoped, beneficial results from the attempt to analyse and rationalize it. And this is precisely the context in which Reimer *is* very helpful. In a presentation of outstanding honesty and self-examination he allows White's concerns to boomerang back into US music education philosophy. This clever strategy has the enhanced potential to benefit both camps. And Reimer's observations are deceptively simple and disarmingly lucid. In addressing three commanding issues, he confirms MEND findings in placing these same issues high in any agenda for the amelioration of the Irish situation. They are: -

1. How does a local/national culture (a subset of the multicultural issue) influence what music education should be?

2. How can the 'pop music versus art music' issue be handled?

3. What are the appropriate roles of performing and of listening as educational objectives?

It can be confirmed that only in the first of these questions is there a significant difference between Ireland and North America. Cultural issues are pressing in Ireland, of course, but in both countries there is a need to define cultural pluralism, whether truly multicultural or some modified form in which only a limited number of cultures is competing for the aural, mental and social space of learners/consumers. In the Irish context this issue has also been discussed under the National Music section of MEND (Agenda Item 6). Broadly speaking there needs to be absolute clarity as to whether the general Irish response to music accommodates only three genres - art, popular and traditional music - and in what proportion. For comparative purposes American, or indeed any multi-ethnic, society should also be clear as to how its music education needs are being served. In other words, is multi-ethnic synonymous with multicultural and what, if any, are the truly *widely* practised strategies to include offerings from many musics in the music education curriculum. There is little doubt that these basic issues are in a confused state in both systems and are far from resolution, as Reimer freely admits in the case of the American context. He takes up the issue and makes the following points, before agreeing that 'White cannot be faulted for characterizing American multiculturalism as being "amorphous". We have a long way to go to get our own house in order, let alone being a model for Ireland with its very different cultural identity'.

1. Only Irish music educators can resolve, for Ireland, the issue of (multi)-culturalism, based on their own culture and history. This may be construed as a reference to the Reimer idea of contextualism in arriving at a workable philosophy for any system of education. And note, significantly, that this is also confirmed by Elliott (Ref. II P viii).

2. Multiculturalism is a supposed remedy for any failure to resolve the effects of cultural differences.

3. The extent of multiculturalism in education may, a) just reflect the number of cultures present and needing to be reconciled or, b) may take on the universalist brief of being open potentially to all cultures. This is a vexed question, which contributes to the confusion in the US, especially over materials for multicultural education.

4. Heightened political consciousness may dictate, or be influenced to dictate, a policy of bridging the gap between traditional models of school music education and the socio-musical diversity outside the school walls. This has enormous relevance in Ireland, as elsewhere, in attempting to take cognizance of the endemic dissonances between these two streams.

5. The ‘new’ National Standards for music education in the US ‘rigorously promote diversity in the music to be encountered at all levels . . . [but] choice of specific music is scrupulously left unstipulated’. It must be observed here that perusal of the American National Standards (Music Content Standards) would uncover sufficient ambiguity to allow the demand for diversity to be channelled away from cultural diversity. And the jealously-guarded criterion of state and even local autonomy in education would facilitate widespread ‘dodging’ of the multicultural issue, with impunity. And it is another question as to how truly widespread the acceptance and implementation of the National Standards is, in a federal sense.

6. Few if any counter arguments to multiculturalism have appeared up to now in the US, but this situation is changing. Questions are being asked, such as “Why do it?”, “Should political/social ends be permitted to drive music education into multiculturalism to the possible detriment of intrinsically musical benefits?” (a burning question), “Can music foreign to one’s own culture be understood authentically rather than superficially or inappropriately?”, “Are we slipping into a chaos where judgement and value are no longer cherished criteria and relativism reigns supreme?”, “How can any uniformity in the approach to multiculturalism be achieved if communities, and therefore their needs, are so diverse?”. “Can repertoire be left to local discretion?”, “How can teachers be enthusiastic about music of which they have little or no experience and with which they therefore cannot identify?”, “ Could such teachers be entrusted with a leadership role in a multicultural programme?”, and so on.

7. It is confirmed that there is an overwhelming dominance, at college and university level, of western classical music in American music education. This could be encouraging news (or cold comfort) for Professor White in seeking to explain his conviction that pop music continues systematically and inexorably to replace western art music and folk music in American attitudes to listening. How can teachers accustomed to and trained in this [western art] tradition have possibly internalized musics outside of it - sufficiently to help their students to become more musically broadminded than they are likely to be themselves?

Reimer pragmatically raises a plethora of questions here. He believes that multiculturalism, certainly of the multi-ethnic variety, may be ripe for reappraisal as to its agenda and potential and as to the accuracy of its documented success. In this regard he is undoubtedly correct in counselling caution in Irish strategies, context being the only safe criterion.

Reimer on the 'popular' versus 'classical' dilemma

On the assumption that what the reader takes as meaning is of greater significance, in analysis, than what the author may have intended as the meaning in the first place, it emerges that White, in spite of his perfunctory protests to the contrary, leaves no doubt that he considers art music as superior to 'the pop and rock forms of the present day'. There is no other plausible interpretation of his arguments, nor are they invalidated on that account, since his defence is formidable. And it proves to be helpful that Reimer relies on this muted assertion as an opening premise for his response. Again the honesty of his remarks is striking: -

1. It is probable that a great many American music educators would be in sympathy with White, regarding pop music as a vast wasteland of musical mindlessness. 'But while many might agree, few would be so boldly politically incorrect as to publicly proclaim their position (let alone with White's pungent style)'. This is a significant point, highlighted by White, as to the way art music has been backed into a corner where it must almost apologize for itself; such is the force of commercialism and the people power, fomented by it, which can even threaten educational stability.

2. Popular music is seldom represented in school music, in the US, with anything like the presence and seriousness of western classical music. Its dominance in the musical life of students outside of school is quite another matter. Reimer believes that most teachers are unfamiliar with the specific 'chart' pop music that their students enjoy, and while they themselves may have been involved in some aspects of recent pop, as consumers and even performers, they are not equipped with a *methodology* to teach it. This latter is a very significant point; it is a self-evident historical fact, on the contrary, that the methodology of teaching art music is highly developed, and dies hard.

Surprisingly, Reimer (again with commendable candour), having listed some of the parameters that define the pop dilemma, relinquishes it without offering any solutions. Yet his having raised the issue (which, of course, really is at the centre of White's concerns) is sufficient to highlight it as one of fundamental importance to music educators and music education. It may be that the cult mentality, in both its reactionary and milder manifestations, is inevitably pitted against the educational system as a social phenomenon, and that the best that Harry White can hope for is a stemming of the tide and the emergence of strategies to achieve some acceptable balance. Many concerns and many shades of opinion were expressed at MEND in relation to benign bridge-building which would achieve *rapprochement* in what is undoubtedly a deteriorating situation in the prospects for art music in schools. Marie McCarthy (Ref. III P vii) and Patricia Shehan Campbell (Ref. III P v) are probably the most eloquent in proposing that the community and the school must be linked more closely so that the traditional musical tastes characteristic of both can be brought into better alignment. Twentieth century music educators have largely deplored, but also ignored, the issue of this troublesome dissonance, but they cannot be said to have succeeded in establishing music education in schools which is universally admired, availed of, and guaranteed as natural a place in educational priorities as so-called employment-orientated subjects. In a dawning millennium which is likely to elevate leisure activities to new heights of desirability, without the traditional 'conscience' of a work-ethic to inhibit an openly-stated commitment to it, it is surely high time that the issue be given more serious attention as to how the attitudinal chasm can be bridged. We should be indebted to Harry White for his frankness in eschewing political correctness by raising the matter in its most controversial manifestation, and to Bennett Reimer for his ingenuousness, and courage too, in admitting that solutions are still refractory and are eluding efforts (even by the massive 'think-tank' that America is bringing to bear on the subject) to secure educational control over its vagaries.

Who [*sic*] is music education for?

We are on very familiar ground when the question is raised as to the appropriate prioritization of performance *vis-à-vis* listening in general music education. White, ignoring for his purposes the holistic nature of the best in performance teaching, prefers to point the distinction as between instruction (performing) and education (listening). The issue is ineluctable and merits Reimer's classification as 'perhaps the central question now facing music education in the US as well as in Ireland'. Apathy towards the status of performance and lack of understanding and appreciation of its centrality (rather than its dominance) in music education are listed amongst the substantive findings of the MEND initiative. Performance also, of course, marks the battle line of the wider Reimer/Elliott debate, accounting, with the addition of White, for the significance of this tripartite engagement. And here Reimer wisely warns against what he interprets (presumably from White's paper) as a current Irish tendency to promote performance as a dominant strategy finally to banish the vestiges of the imperial models which, at their worst, can be held accountable for the barren academicism typical of much Irish music education in the past. Here Reimer and White are of one mind. While the latter couples an outcome of the 'current climate of self-expression', through performance, with a magisterial cry that "we have ostracized the listener", Reimer still gallantly and directly expresses the same concern in a way which has invited the obloquy which Elliott would heap upon his head. It is strange that education seems no longer to be charged with the traditional duty of training listeners in the sense of ensuring that performers have appreciative audiences - currently deemed an opprobrious suggestion, requiring the ministry of euphemism to disguise its perceived discriminatory intent. But Reimer has this to say: -

> America's problem in regard to the health of its musical culture is certainly not a lack of excellent performers - quite the reverse! Its major problem is its marginal level of audience support for those musics outside of the popular genres. Surely a wholesale neglect by the music profession of the development of a discerning, enthusiastic audience has made the profession largely irrelevant to the actual musical lives of the vast majority of our population, which has no interest in becoming performers. Yet practically 100% of people are consumers of music, often with a great deal of ardor. The profession's disinterest in - often its disparagement of - the consumer of music remains among our major shortcomings. . . . To the degree that we succeed in attaining . . . a balance of learnings including but surpassing those available from performance, we will have better fulfilled our professional mission, and will serve as a better model from which other countries can gain useful insights.

While it would be foolhardy to accept Elliott's arguably distorted image of *Music Education as Aesthetic Education* (MEAE) (*q.v.* in the various reviews, within this report, of his stance) it would be equally unsafe to lay its reputed failures at Reimer's door, just because his philosophy, first promulgated comprehensively in 1970, happens to lay out the case for an aesthetic view. Reimer is but one voice in the American chorus of philosophers and he could not be credited with the power, of words only, to change a whole tradition in performance, of more than a century in the making, and of which he is himself openly very proud. Without undue exaggeration, the American system could be described, at its best and most beneficent, as freely offering performance to those who wish to take it up. And this performance module seems to have succeeded, generally, in siphoning away the talented and interested, often short-changing them on other more academic, but necessary, pursuits in music education, leaving (we are told) a complement of some 85-90% of all students, who opt out of performance. Is it this latter group, almost by definition the apathetic, who have been targeted for the benign intent of the MEAE programme (?); this is not clear. In fact, we are told, statistically, that only 2% of this cohort actually take music as teenagers (post-elementary). These figures simply don't add up to an unambiguous statement of what the American situation has been, nor do they reveal who, in fact, are the students who are suffering from the imputed ravages of the MEAE programme. Staying with numbers, it seems logical to suggest that listeners to music produced from the 15% of performing students, many of whom take their interest right through to high-school (but few of whom go on to be

professional musicians), could number almost 40 million nation-wide, a figure, providing stable audience participation, that would be greeted ecstatically by music educators as a massive achievement. But this is simply not the case, while the population at large (almost 100%) are consumers of music, or so it is claimed. It is not that the others (85%) do not matter but that they have opted out voluntarily and have been facilitated by the system in that decision. This really did reduce music to an optional, not a mandatory, subject – an important distinction. And the sensitivity in the US about imposing educational standards federally is a further inhibitor to changing this situation, which in America produces too many performers, too few listeners and a vast population which is in neither category from an educational standpoint; the parallels with Ireland are exact as far as the latter two are concerned. According to Reimer, White's 'critique of the imbalance in Irish music education in favor of performance instruction over audience education is dead-on accurate to describe music education in the US'; but neither he nor White is correct if this is assumed to be typical of school music education in Ireland. Reimer places great faith in the potential of the new National Standards to turn this situation around (see Lehman [Ref. III P iii] for a thorough exposé of the history and progress of this recent phase in American music education). Most significant in this regard is the fact that the music education lobby succeeded in shaming Government (no other description will suffice) into including music in the US Goals 2000 legislation for education. This is as near as it is possible to get, within the American system, to ensuring that music is on the agenda for adoption state by state as an important component in education, and equates approximately to the aspiration of our national curriculum, the most recent revision of which is currently being implemented. Reimer goes on to praise the intent behind the long battle for the recognition of music. 'This represents a major event in our [US] history toward finally recognizing that an authentic musical education must be wider than what performance can encompass, and must be made available to the vast majority of people who are not performers. . . . With the guidance of the national standards we can now hope for a more balanced, more comprehensive conception of music education to take hold, relevant to the musical needs of all rather than only of a small minority'.

Reimer, still deservedly regarded by many as the doyen of American music education, has several times revised the philosophical views he held in 1970. Far from detracting from confidence in the plausibility of such a protean stance, it is refreshing to find him so open to revision as propitious, especially in vindicating changes as timely and contextual; after all we live in a rapidly changing world which must accommodate the dramatic sociological upheavals we have witnessed in recent years. It should not be surprising that Reimer and White are predictably close in their views of the three commanding issues raised by Reimer as defining the world, as the Irish, dilemma irreducibly. Caution about the place of multiculturalism in education, urgency in tackling the "popular" versus "classical" dilemma', and balance (in general music education) between performance and a host of other involvements (including listening): these are priority guidelines for a millennium agenda.

David J. Elliott and Kari Veblen: Response to Harry White's paper - *A book of manners in the wilderness.*

The differences between Reimer's view and those represented in this response could not be more sharply etched. The Elliott rebuttal (for that is what it is) is awkwardly poised with regard to the use of the first person pronoun and virtually dispenses with Dr Veblen's view, for it cannot be assumed that they agree on everything; at least that is the sense of its impact. And the unfortunate recurrence of invective (all too prevalent in Elliott's defences of his philosophy) which resorts to such words as prejudice, and worse still, ignorance and arrogance in referring to the basis of Professor White's views, is ill-advised, offensive and unacceptable. This tendency has been seriously criticized before by respondents to Elliott's writings (as, for example, by David Aspin when reviewing *MM* for ISME) but it seems that he is unheeding, in the process rendering his own views susceptible to unnecessary hostility. This is regrettable, as Elliott is passionately sincere and has much to contribute that is worthy of sympathetic and discerning perusal . . . if only it could be purged of the worst excesses of his aggressive attitude towards those whom *he* regards as his critics and detractors, however constructively they offer their comments. And here, in this paper, we are again confronted, after a

perfunctory opening gambit, with yet another defence of his praxial philosophy, almost as if Professor White had no other thought but to demolish it; this is to misunderstand the subtlety of White's enquiry, if not to dismiss the brief he held, which was to define a university model of music education as an enabler in general education (music) in Ireland. But, in many ways, the commentary also provides further material, in the guise of clarification, to focus more effectively on the essential claims of the praxial philosophy, which are nonetheless still controversial, hotly disputed and very far from consensus acceptance, if we are to measure this by its minuscule influence as enabler in the adoption and implementation of the American National Standards.

Before attempting to engage Elliott's apparent massive misunderstanding of the thrust of Professor White's appeal, the writer has reread (yet again) the primary source, namely *A book of manners in the wilderness*. He finds it so compelling, earnest and unimpeachable (in spite of its dismissal of the 'wasteland of rock and pop' as the euphemism to launch an uncharacteristically reticent claim for the superiority of European art music) that he is relieved, before reading Elliott, to find Professor Reimer so much in agreement with what White has to offer. And the number of references (in White) to Elliott and his philosophy are so few (three, to be precise, all calling his multicultural ideas into question) that they could hardly be interpreted as a personal diatribe sufficient to warrant Elliott's defensive response. Let us look again at a paraphrase of Harry White's concerns:

1. He was asked to sketch a model for university music education. He could not do this in a vacuum.

2. It was necessary for White to anchor his arguments in causal relationships; he did this by identifying the system to which a university model might respond and by which, in turn, it would be influenced. It was natural that music education (especially in schools) and music preferences in the community would have come in for scrutiny.

3. He deplores the equation in educational ambiences of western art music and (scarcely without making any attempt to conceal his view) *inferior* music, which he identifies within the syllabi for Irish schools. He finds no justification for the lengths to which egalitarianism has progressed. It must be remembered that, chronologically, Professor White's paper was being written when Elliott's book - *Music Matters* - was barely in publication. It may not be assumed, then, that he was familiar with the totality of Elliott's philosophy (why should he have been, beyond what he interpreted from the paper read by Elliott at Mend II, and even then in a version which Elliott himself revised drastically prior to publication?). It must therefore be assumed that Elliott was mistaken in believing that White was attacking the philosophy promulgated in *Music Matters*.

4. Professor White is at pains to address the *context* of Irish music education, which he sees as 'so far behind the rest of Europe, to say nothing of North America, that apparently useful comparisons break down under the stress of near primitive conditions'. He is impatient of the 'cultural imperialism which prescribes that we abandon or drastically relegate that which we have not yet properly attained'. There are many lacunas in Irish music education provision listed by White as in need of redress. In confronting these he is unnerved, for example (and here he quotes an instance from Elliott's writing), by the incongruity in juxtaposing Beethoven's Eroica Symphony and Duke Ellington's 'Cotton Tail' as material for *comparative analysis*, seen by him as a case of reductio *ad absurdum* which the (relatively) highly endowed and reputedly advanced state of music education in North America presents for our consideration. Is this what we are attempting to emulate, White wonders.

5. Professor White raises issues, accurately understood by Reimer, as to whether the total multiculturalism (advocated [ideally] by Elliott) now so fashionable in American philosophical provenance (whatever about its applicability, or the progress of its implementation) is appropriate for Ireland; as to the current imbalance between popular

and art forms which is tending to obliterate the latter in Ireland - by implication as a result of the insidious nature of the American pop scene and its conquests in the education field; as to the autonomous nature of the listening process (education) - and without the mediation of performance (instruction) - which can offer real musical experience and benefit to those who engage in it for its own sake. The issue of the balance between performance and listening in education is one which touches the very nerve centre of the American dilemma and brings into the foreground yet another aspect of the extraordinary conflict between Reimer and Elliott. And it must be emphasized that both seem to be saying that performance *and* listening are quintessential components in the definition of what good music education should be. Reimer relies on the truism that without listening there is virtually no music; that in music there are music makers (or, as Elliott would put it, - performers, improvisers, composers, arrangers, and conductors) and listeners; that the listening function is totally separable as an activity in its own right, as evidenced by the ineluctable fact that 'practically 100%of people are consumers of music', while the majority are not performers. And no matter how Elliott tempers his rejection of the right, within education, often (or even exclusively) to choose this option of listening without linking it inseparably with one of the so-called active phases of music-making (by his definition), it is his obvious intent virtually to outlaw consistent listening for its own sake as the valid, inspiring, demanding, 'action-packed', enjoyable and satisfying activity that it is, whether considered as vicarious performance (composing, conducting etc.) - an attractive notion - or not. Nor does it redeem the situation that he validates independent listening perfunctorily, as he grudgingly does, especially as an option to be taken up later on, which is time enough! Elliott frequently covers his tracks by leaving an opening to counterbalance his more iconoclastic statements (the product/process issue, performance/listening relationship and depth over breadth in multicultural engagements are examples) but these do not occlude, much less cancel out, the main thrusts of his arguments. As Aspin says, he cannot have it both ways, so it is necessary in assessing his philosophy to appraise the viability of his *preferred* methodology, if it can be accurately divined, as the writer thinks it can.

6. White is aware that the so-called universal model of university education, a relic (in the professional sense) of an outmoded imperial model, has been superannuated, and he is attempting to define a new dispensation, at first by stating what it should *not* be. This focuses on the American system and its truck with indiscriminate (and as yet unstable) multiculturalism, and the legitimized wholesale infiltration of the university model there with popular music, on an equal footing with western art music, but with its grossly less sophisticated didacticism. It is, however, perhaps an overstatement by White to refer to a resentment of Eurocentricity by American music educators as being responsible for the flight to egalitarianism which he abhors. After all, North America cannot easily be depicted as or accused of having dispensed with its European roots; and the élitism of western art music is certainly prior to and therefore currently more natural than the adoption of a mishmash of other cultures as yet insufficiently processed for educational purposes. As has been seen, Reimer comments pertinently on this misconception.

7. White cannot be faulted for observing (p 54 of the College Music Symposium document)) that the 'fundamental tenet of Elliott's philosophy is that all music is a human activity rather than a *product* of that activity". After all, that is the interpretation (drawn from readings of Elliott) on which many of his reviewers (themselves engaged in music education philosophy) rely. Not the least distinguished of these is Reimer himself, who is not slow to take or make a point, as will be seen in the review of the documented Reimer/Elliott confrontation on the merits and demerits of *Music Matters* (*q.v.*). White repudiates the egalitarianism and relativism which he sees as authorized by this 'music as process' approach. And let it be said that White gives a magisterial account of the worthiness of western art (including music) to establish why it is *different* (surprisingly he stops short of claiming superiority for it, but his apotheosis of Mozart scholarship, a

safe if élitist argument, is compelling if tendentious). He is concerned that Ireland has embraced the commercialism of American pop music as a social reality, but that this has not been balanced by the respect, however attenuated by the current philosophical shift which deprioritizes it, for the 'imaginary museum of musical works' which *he* sees as an essential part of the university repertoire, if it is to 'enable' music education at large. Although it is only implicit in Professor White's apologia, it must surely be a strong argument that demands that executive scholarship (across the full spectrum of activities attaching to the long-term development of music cultures - which varies considerably while inevitably contributing proportionately to their levels of sophistication) be taken into account in working towards a theory of a hierarchy, which in turn ought to be put forward when making a case for the adoption of these cultures as priority components in education.

8. White believes that whatever the condition of music in a society happens to be, it is ultimately in the hands of educators to influence. 'Change begins with the educators'. If it is axiomatic to consider music education as, in the first place, guided and influenced by philosophy, it is hardly surprising that his cry of pain should also throw down the gauntlet to the philosophical lobby. In this sense it is, of course, appropriate that Elliott should respond, but his rejoinder is really too defensive and solipsistic, not to mention its being rudely dismissive, to engage the reader as an example of unprejudiced dialectic, a canon in the adoption of which he finds White so apparently lacking.

9. Perhaps it is taking the aversion to total multiculturalism too far when White 'advances Ireland's right of access to the European tradition (after centuries of denial and neglect) over and above the interests of egalitarianism in North America', as if the latter had no claim in cherishing the traditions of Europe to speak of. It is less an aversion to western art music than a capitulation to the undermining and overwhelming forces of commercialism that defines the American dilemma. We in Ireland would therefore do well to examine the measures which are being taken in America to counterbalance the malaise rather than to assume that the majority of music educators in America subscribe to it. At this point White nails his colours to the mast by providing (and not for the first time) his own theory as to the underlying cause of what he considers to be the lamentable condition of music education in Ireland; and he sees this as a continuing reflection of global trends, exemplified in Britain and America as the precedence which performance - 'any kind of music and at any standard of competence - takes over understanding and reception. . . . The deliberate eradication of this form [listening] in the interests of pragmatic self-advancement seems to me an irresponsible abnegation of the past. What most distresses me [claims White] about this high-handed repudiation of art music is the assumption that one generation is free to dispense with its obligations to the generation that follows'. Let it be said that White, in other fora, has defended, as he should, the indispensable involvement in performance necessary to complete a well-rounded education in music. What he objects to (and he is 'dead-on accurate to describe music education' so, in Ireland as in the US), is the imbalance which robs young learners of an eclectic exposure to *all* the elements of music, consistent with the amount of time they have to devote to it. In particular his aphorism 'we have ostracized the listener' (and he means the perfectly normal activity of receiving music performed by *others*) catches the tragedy of what has been allowed to happen in music education, and indeed what now seems to be acquiring second breath in a renewed obsession with performance (again 'at virtually any standard of competence') which threatens to destabilize school music for examination purposes, rather than to balance the various components. His claim that 'a programme of second-level music education which neglects the vital relationship between music, history and *listenership* [writer's italics] is doomed to mediocrity, . . . The crowning irony of this state of affairs is that music as a school subject will remain an elitist activity: another generation will pass in which the confusion between instruction and education will ensure the minority status of the subject' . . . is sufficiently plausible

to merit further investigation. And it is borne out by Reimer's undisputed statistic that 85% of American schoolgoing children, who have the option to take performance, decline it, in turn confirming the elitist tag.

10. Harry White adverts to the fact that, in University College Dublin, a course in exclusive listenership is now available and offers this as a token contribution to begin the process of rescuing this activity from virtual or threatened extinction as a quintessential and, of course, primeval form of educational engagement in music.

11. White's last point, that the ministry of even a contextual philosophy of music education, the development of which is seen, in MEND terms, as *sine qua non*, is in the nature of 'too much theory *before* the fact of our deprivations', may well be a Parthian shaft to focus rather on the lack of material resources (library and performance facilities) for the support of effective third level education in music in Ireland. But the imbalance which he deplores in the components of school music must surely have its origins in the philosophical underpinnings which dictate the curriculum. Since he believes that the model for a relevant university music education must engage in a continuum with and be influenced by the model being dispensed at second-level, he might be persuaded to reappraise his priorities, since without a stable all-embracing philosophical rationale chaos must result at all levels, both internally and at interfaces.

It might be expected that Professor White's ideas, *inter alia*, about the roles of performance and listening in music education would place him on a collision course with David Elliott. And his pejorative (and arguably plausible and factual) view of most performance as scarcely meeting the criterion of competence, not to mention proficiency or expertise, is undoubtedly at variance with what Elliot would like us to accept as an outcome of his praxial philosophy. Elliott's response to White can now be more effectively analysed.

Harry White's concerns may be linked essentially to three of the most dominant parameters in education - time, judgement (and value) and the philosophies that inform those judgements. In an ambience of limited time he fears that the inevitable dilution of the hitherto cherished norm, in music education methodology, of western art music, by potentially innumerable other musics, is becoming so disproportionate that so-called high culture music is threatened with redundancy. He calls into question the judgements that sanction such an indiscriminate and relativist valuing system and by implication, philosophies that coincide with this view. In particular, and again in an obvious context of the use of time (a scarce resource), he identifies the cult of amateurish performance as contributing additionally and significantly to the neglect, if not the total eclipse, of listenership as a musical goal or autonomous activity. He is not necessarily saying that performance should be eschewed but he is asserting the primacy of the art work to empower a much wider range of activities, all leading to more holistic experience. In stating his case, which he does with considerable eloquence and passion, he is not so unsubtle as to claim that the praxial philosophy is invalid (as Elliott's sensitivity so baldly interprets him) but allows his case to stand as an invitation to the reader to reach his own conclusions. He criticizes what he sees as the prevailing American mentality in musical preferences and agrees with Roehmann (though from a vastly different stance - see p. 59) that only education can change this mentality. What he does not do is rush to judgement on whether the situation in America is due to the power of commercialism, capitulation by educators, or a flawed philosophy. Professor White must be credited with the knowledge that there are many rival philosophies, that the defederalized nature of education in America is such as to accommodate them selectively, and that not all of them are inimical to his point of view. The philosophies that were formally presented at MEND were two - namely that of Bennett Reimer (still, presumably to be considered *prevailing* if his involvement with the drafting of the 1993 National Standards is to carry any weight), and of David Elliott, both paraphrased from their published works.[62] It cannot be assumed that Elliott's *new* philosophy of 1995 has supplanted

[62] Bennett Reimer *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970; rev 1989) and David J Elliott *Music Matters* (1995). The presentations by Professors Abeles, Colwell, Lehman and Swanwick, while they touched on philosophy,

the earlier work. Since Elliott's philosophy, quite apart from the arguably parenthetical material, is generally committed to music as activity, it seems unexceptionable for White to assume that he is more process- than product-orientated - but no more. If the openness of *Music Matters* favours total multiculturalism and a methodology that elevates performance to a superdominant position; if it refuses in general to legitimize listening as an autonomous and separate activity of value commensurate with that of performance; if it inevitably gravitates, by playing down product against process and stressing music as a human practice or activity, towards a statement of the equality of all these practices . . . then it is easy to deduce that he and Professor White are mutually in counterpositions. And we have ample material by way of documented understandings, to show that White's claim that 'the fundamental tenet of Elliott's philosophy is that music is a human activity rather than a product of the activity' is reasonable. If David Elliott now refutes that claim it offers a revised understanding which goes part of the way towards reconciling his with other stances. This reconciliation will be attempted in the Reimer/Elliott rationalization based on the review, of *Music Matters*, and its subsequent rebuttal.

David Elliott seems to be presenting *The Facts of the Praxial Philosophy* as if all "past approaches [have] failed' and he is credited as 'taking dead aim at the distinctly western notion of art objects having value in themselves'. It is, of course, absurd to make such claims. Much of Elliott's philosophizing in this section of his response is totally unexceptionable, and has been in circulation for some time, but he is mistaken to call into question, or rather to expose an imagined fallacy about, the aesthetics of western art, *inter alia*, which has always insisted that art is not centred in the art object but in the response to it. Reimer, amongst many others, in his perception/response theory is very clear about that. It appears, however, that Elliott's idea of product, which he defends as being fundamental to his thinking, is considerably different from and more flexible than White's. Yet it is generous too; he wishes music to be relevant to the widest spectrum of participation and this is a worthy aim of any music education philosophy. But his insistence that 'MUSIC is a diverse human *practice*' leading to *activities* and the efforts of musical *practitioners* who '*make music*' [writer's italics] is palpably to elevate process above its results - namely 'products works or listenables'; and this is the thrust of his phraseology, however he wishes to temper it for his purposes. And he *has* 'ostracized the listener', simply because he never recognizes listening alone as making music - a negation of the aspirations of the 100% who indulge it. One may tolerate his rejection of Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) on *his* evaluation as valid 'scholarly difference of opinion' but it is not acceptable that the listener who, after all, creates the music in his response, should be so summarily excluded from music making except when he doubles his role by being a performer (improviser composer, arranger, or conductor). While not everyone would agree that music should be aligned with the social sciences, thereby sacrificing something of its intrinsicality, Elliott's praxial philosophy is attractive (and this has been dealt with in the review of his paper, in the context of his attempt to fashion a universal philosophy of music education) in having pillaged the literature, for our benefit, to highlight the socio-cultural dimension of music. There is a need, not so much to repudiate the aesthetic approach to music (a rationale which dovetails very well with the supremacy theory of western art, it is true) as to expand it to fit other contexts and functions. But Elliott, unfortunately, seems intent on purging music education of the very notion of aesthetic response - or so it reads superficially from the pungency of his rhetoric whenever he focuses on it. The writer believes that there is sufficient in the quieter backwaters of Elliott's opus to bring about reconciliation on this issue also. And it is surely interesting to point out that, in considering the Reimer/Elliott hybrid statement (MEND Phase II) that philosphy is itself protean, Elliott is aiming at a moving object when he levels his criticisms at Reimer, who has gone through many acceptable and courageous metamorphoses since the publication of his 1970 book or even its 1989 revision. And the multi-cultural case is by no means cut-and-dried; but neither is it the intellectual property of David Elliott. There are indeed several senses of music that must be urgently considered and reviewed. The writer doubts if either Reimer or White would have any problems in accepting the reality that music may be considered in the contexts of human intent, artistic-social process/event, artistic/social product and social-cultural communities of action, achievement and evaluation. Nor is there an argument against Elliott's statement that

---

were not specifically focused on it.

'musical works and the musicianship required to interpret, listen to [this being an ambiguous activity in Elliott's definition] and make musical works originates in the contexts of identifiable music cultures. In this view, MUSIC (writ large) is multicultural in essence'. It is his proposal (which is a *non sequitur*) that, *therefore*, 'music education ought to be centrally concerned with inducting students into a *reasonable* diversity of music cultures during students' educational careers' that is open to challenge, and especially so in the context of time. The idea may be attractive to some and a logical outcome of following the praxial philosophy, but is it practical? Much depends on what *reasonable* diversity means. In the context of Harry White's fears about the dilution if not the annihilation of the primary and, for many, the music-fostering culture, this proposal has to be treated with circumspection.

On the question of *Musical Diversity and Music Education* (Elliott's next heading), we are again confronted by a mixture of well rehearsed wisdom which has been current for a long time and which Elliott cannot, and presumably would not, claim as his intellectual property. But, in the first place, the opening paragraph is an unfair exaggeration of White's point. As has already been commented on, White stops short, within his text, of claiming the absolute superiority of western art music; however, one might be forgiven for taking this meaning from what he says. He speaks of *difference* and it is true that he also speaks of *privilege*, but surely in the sense that western art music has now been reduced to articulating its claim to the privilege of survival; it is the threat to western art music (coupled, for the reader, with his [White's] magisterial defence of the riches that are at stake) that is his concern and not necessarily the rejection of other music cultures. And it is interesting that Elliott even extols, in context, the virtues of 'belonging to and living deeply in a particular [monocultural] way of musical life [as] something to be cherished'.

Elliott's comparison between language and music is not convincing as he gravitates towards his theory that 'no Music is innately superior to any other'. While one can give guarded support to this claim while the qualifier, *innately*, is included, that is not the condition of Musics that is being compared. We are not considering Musics *ab initio*, but in their developed states. And there are philosophical principles which command respect in making judgements, notably in Immanuel Kant's *Analytic of the Beautiful*, which stipulate, *inter alia*, that the judges should be recognized experts in the field [or multiple field]; that they should be free from emotional involvement with any of the subjects being judged; and that some criterion should be agreed or accepted in claiming universal validity from a consensus that approaches unanimity (otherwise the exercise is condemned to futility). These seem to be pragmatic criteria which *are* attainable. Thus, few would deny that the dozen or so most dominant spoken languages are also the most developed, for reasons of the richness of their vocabulary and/or their literature (works or products). There may be genuine differences of opinion as to their relative excellence (Elliott makes the point), state of development or whatever else we choose to call the criterion. But it may be taken that nobody will deny that a hierarchy of some kind will emerge. And precisely because of this fact, in the case of musics, the cult of ethnomusicology stoutly defends the rights of the minority to parity of esteem; after all, that is a natural outcome of working in that branch of the art. We see an example of this same principle at work in the European Community's policy on language, but it does not mean that the business of the Community is carried out in Irish! Multiculturalism is a noble aspiration but if it seeks to enhance the esteem of all Musics collectively by a process of levelling down rather than setting challenges to develop on an upward trend it invites serious losses in the total achievement of the combined enterprise. When Harry White says, "Historians of music are not much concerned with implausible theories of musical superiority. Nor should they be; they are a waste of time and intellect. . . . Abstract notions of musical superiority are self-evidently reprehensible", he may be suspected of disingenuousness, but the fact remains that David Elliott's stance as to the equality of all musical practices, based partly on the supporting quotation from Slobin and Titon ('it would be foolish to say that any one music-culture was "better" than another') can be challenged and solved by the Kantian method. If Elliott's dream of a multicultural musical world of education were to be even minimally achieved there would be a sufficient number of true multiculturalists who could pronounce authoritatively on such questions. The answers will not and should not amount to a dismissal of the lesser; there are always contextual reasons why all cultures should be cherished in the appropriate setting. Deciding on what that setting

should be, and the factors that confer privilege upon it, is one of the challenges that faces music educators both globally and locally; it is at the heart of White's rhetoric. And David Elliott corroborates the pragmatic approach; there is nothing surprising or *new* about much of this reiterated wisdom, but Elliott does introduce some useful concepts in addition to a raft of controversial, conjectural, unproved and therefore challengeable material. The idea of the equality of all musical practices, a foundational principle of the Elliott philosophy, may not, however, be taken as indisputable; and it appears, from Elliott's placatory words (see below) that he does not wish to impose his views. The following is a summary of what might be inferred from his rhetoric:

1. If the socio-cultural and multicultural approaches to music education are desired (a controversial stance) then they should proceed in the belief 'that fundamentally all musics are good, and we should compare them . . . by what message they bring from their society' (Bruno Nettl). 'Each music-culture is a particular adaptation to particular circumstances. . . . Ethnocentrism has no place in the study of world music. (Slobin and Titon).

2. Some musical practices may be educationally more appropriate than others (Elliott). There is room here for scholarly difference and, more importantly, for rapprochement between White and Elliott. 'Teachers and students work in relation to a variety of constraints - practical, curricular, moral, social, cultural, ideological, political.' Here Elliott, in recognizing the non-uniform nature of the challenge, is refreshingly non-prescriptive

3. 'It is essential for musical self-growth that novices achieve a match between their nascent levels of musicianship and the first challenges they meet in music education curricula. . . . teachers should take account of a student's immediate musical contexts.' (Elliott) This useful principle is generally applicable to all musical challenges and is clearly enunciated and developed by Elliott in Chapter 5 of Music Matters, with illustrations on pp122 and 132.

4. ' . . . musical diversity should not be sought at the expense of musical depth'. This eminently practical piece of advice is, of course, a double-edged tool which could lead to Elliott being hoist with his own petard. As Elliott proceeds along this common-sense path (and he is to be commended for it) it is difficult to reconcile his suggestions with the wider aspirations of his praxial philosphy. The passage on pp 68-69 should be read in its entirety for some sound rationality and real wisdom. The following are selected extracts to capture its pertinence and general applicability

When curricular time and resources are limited, the praxial philosophy supports an emphasis on musical depth over breadth. Teachers' central responsibility is to deepen students' musicianship. . . . Thus, and in addition to the obvious criteria of students' interests, the availability of authentic repertoire, and a teacher's knowledge and/or disposition to learn new Musics over time, it makes perfect sense to emphasize the musical practices of one's local culture as a basis for music teaching and learning'

This, of course, raises many questions, in the Irish context, which dictate a departure from the full-blown praxial rationale, leaving some doubt as to how many variations are possible in applying the praxial philosophy. If it is too loose in its essentials it begins to disintegrate in favour of a liberal contextuality tending towards relativism. This is what Elliott has to say:-

> The praxial philosophy supports the comprehensive study of people's most familiar and treasured musical traditions. At the same time, however, there are four basic reasons why the long- term scope of music curricula ought to include a wider diversity of music cultures: (a) MUSIC is a diverse human practice; (b) induction into unfamiliar Musics links the values of music education with the values of humanistic education (Elliott,

> 1995, p.209); (c) the self-identity of individuals in a music class *may* [writer's italics] benefit from affirming individual music-culture identities (pp. 211-212); and (d) the development of musical creativity can advance significantly when students realize how music is made and valued in other cultures.
>
> Clearly the praxial philosophy does not advocate musical diversity at the expense of teaching a people's indigenous musics. Also, in my presentation of these views in Dublin I emphasized that I was not interested in imposing any views on my Irish colleagues. To do so would be contrary to the themes of curriculum making I advocate, including the praxial emphasis on *local* decision making by *reflective* music practitioners. Whereas conventional approaches to music curricula (e.g., aesthetic education) oblige music teachers to implement a standard set of inflexible, step-by-step, procedures, I propose that teachers look to themselves and their own teaching circumstances to decide issues of repertoire, teaching strategies and so on. The reason is plain. As Joseph Schwab suggests, decisions in matters of curriculum, like decisions in matters of job choice and spouse choice, involve a variety of factors related to particular people, places and things (*cf*. Elliott,1995, pp 253-255). These decisions call for back-and-forth reflection and deliberation, not linear theories of curriculum determination; these decisions call for reflective music educators teaching in critically reflective ways.

It is difficult, in dealing with this kind of language, not to suspect Elliott of disingenuousness here, in spite of a feeling that he is simultaneously passionate and sincere in trying to get his views across. But, as Aspin (*qv)* comments, he cannot have it both ways. While there is no doubt about his intention to be universalistic and prescriptive, in turn, about aspects of his own philosophy, and why no other will do (the Reimer/Elliott reviews below show this at white heat), it is fatuous to suppose that his dismissive attitude to counterpositions lies well with such statements as not being 'interested in imposing any views on [his] Irish colleagues' and 'I advocate . . . local decision making by reflective music teachers. . . . I propose that teachers decide issues of repertoire, teaching strategies and so on; . . . these decisions call for music educators teaching in critically reflective ways'. Surely critical reflection suggests the exercise of judgement, valuing and choice; and teaching strategies are the natural outcomes of an informing philosophy towards which eclecticism is a plausible approach? As Elliott himself said in his revised presentation at MEND: 'The application of a theory to practice is the bringing to bear of critical intelligence upon practical tasks rather than the implementation of good advice' (Ref. II P viii, p.1); that presumably allows for disagreement with the theory and advice in the first place. It would be reassuring to know that Elliott has a liberal attitude to possible outcomes of what he is apparently sanctioning - a contextual philosophy. There is sufficient in what he is saying here to identify an accommodation of Harry White's aspiration and plea for the protection of the aesthetic, although he rejects White's notion of the 'privileged position of art music' on the basis of an equally, if not more, challengeable assertion about 'the equality of all music practices'. And it is also worth noting that not one of his four reasons, given above, for diversifying into multicultural music education, has general acceptance, two of them being purely speculative. For example, the use of language and medicine are both diverse, indeed universal, human practices, but in neither case is their diversity rammed down the throats of learners, even at professional levels. Why? Because in both cases there are understandings about a hierarchy and there are pragmatic limitations as to prioritization, both in turn a reflection of the relationship between the time factor and feasibility. And the linking of the values of music education with those of humanistic education is surely achievable even within a single culture; and it is questionable as to whether this criterion should take precedence, in any case, over aims based on imparting music's intrinsic benefits. Clearly there is a need for rationalization to establish what, exactly, Elliott means, and to purge his offering of ambiguity.

It is in the final section, *Musicing, Listening and Music Education*, that Elliott reveals himself most palpably, by proposing and claiming in relation to '*all* forms of music making . . .[that] music education should enable all music students to achieve the values of music by developing their musicianship and listenership in direct relation to: performing-and-listening, improvising-and-listening, composing-and-listening, arranging-and-listening and conducting-and-listening. I propose

that "*all* music students (including so-called general music students) ought to be taught in essentially the same way: as reflective musical practitioners engaged in music making generally and musical performing particularly. Artistic music listening ought to be taught and learned in conjunction with artistic music making."'

The intent of this statement is, of course, in direct conflict with his apparently liberal sanction that 'teachers . . . decide issues of repertoire, teaching strategies and so on' offered on the previous page. And it is not just prescriptive: it is also exclusive. Seen in the light of White's defence of listening as an art in itself (for that is surely what he is saying and justifying) Elliott's curriculum-as-practicum is arguably as narrow as any of the philosophically-based strategies that he attacks, notably MEAE. Three astounding dicta emerge unambiguously from this single statement, with the intended force of precept. Their effect is that:

1. Listening as an activity in its own right is not just ostracized as a form of music making; it is excluded, albeit revalidated, in a narrow definition and in a typical Elliott backtracking disclaimer, in the next paragraph. And this is a constantly exasperating outcome of Elliott readings. He could be respected, even admired, for the courage of his iconoclastic outbursts, but when he attempts to cover his tracks in the fear of giving hostage to his critics he emasculates the impact of his views.

2. While occasionally Elliott omits to add the parenthetical (composing, improvising, arranging and conducting) to his basic concern with performing as dominant activity, he clearly states here that while these other forms of music making are valid (as they are), 'students ought to be taught . . . as reflective musical practitioners . . . engaged in musical performance particularly'. He is clearly championing performance; the case for the other activities is only flimsily developed, by comparison, but here they are finally deprioritized.

3. There is no room for choice or specialization. 'All music students (including so-called general music students) ought to be taught in essentially the same way'

Elliott's obvious obsession with distancing himself from his chosen interpretation of how MEAE operates has resulted in a very inconclusive, incomplete and woolly definition of listening, especially of listening *per se*. That he has a vested interest in being *different* is clear from the very title of his book, which purports to be a *new* philosophy. But it is axiomatic that listening be taught and practised within all the activities that he lists. Listening is cognitive by definition and they do not exist in a vacuum of pure sensation; indeed they scarcely function at all in the absence of listening. So there is nothing *new* in Elliott's philosophy from this standpoint. But to suggest that listening to recorded music (which after all stands proxy, and very effectively too, thanks to the miracle of digital reproduction, for live music) cannot be regarded as the fullest kind of music listening is an affront to the countless millions whose only music making it is, and to the professional efforts of the teachers who teach it professionally, musically and comprehensively. It is even arguable that listening without the added distraction of having to make the music physically oneself is a highly concentrated and beneficial mode of learning how to perform (and the writer has a lifetime of experience in seeing this principle in action at its most effective. As in, for example, separate hand practice in keyboard instruments, fingerboard or bow arm only practice for bowed instruments, the purpose is not just technical; it is to remove physical complexity so as to devote the mind more fully to a smaller number of problems, listening effectively and creatively being one of them. By logical extension, to remove the muscularly physical activity progressively is to establish the value of listening *per se* (by definition to the performances of others). Of course the exercise is also necessary in reverse; the physical must be re-imposed progressively but the two methods, in all their permutations are indispensable for performers and especially for artistic performance, which is Elliott's admirable objective. Nor is there an appreciable difference from the pronouncements of Reimer when Elliott, by a gradual slippage, first advocates listening to recorded music as an allowable option (though only at first in conjunction with his five practices (performing, composing etc., and specifically in relation to

the works they are dealing with), then praises the use of verbal and graphic descriptions, which he vilifies elsewhere, and finally moves on 'to recordings of related works and, then, [to] listening more widely inside and outside the musical practices students are learning in class'. This comprehensive routine is time-intensive and well beyond the capability of the general music programme (as we understand its time constraints) to deliver. But, that aside, if we are generous enough (as Elliott should be since he is constantly recommending that teachers be trusted to do their job professionally and effectively) to credit so-called MEAE teachers (if they exist as such) with teaching to listen *for* (outside of performance) critically, reflectively and artistically (assuming also that they are not anti-performance) we must surely be making it well nigh impossible to detect that finest of distinctions between what Elliott recommends and what he abhors.

Not to interpret Elliott's stance, on listening, unfairly or selectively, it might be claimed that he *plays down* the importance of listening *per se*; in this he is in direct conflict with White and, not surprisingly, never reaches rapprochement with White's views. But to play down listening of the kind White yearns for is to deny its integrity, as for example when he (Elliott) proposes that listening be '*deliberately* and *systematically* taught in the context of authentic music making because four of the five kinds of cognition involved in music listening are situated forms of knowing.' (See Chapter 3 of *Music Matters* for details). Without going into lengthy explanations of what these forms of knowing are, the writer (having studied them carefully), and believing that listening is itself a form of authentic music making (perhaps even the prime, as it is the universal, form in the sense of music as communication residing ultimately, not in the composition or in the performance, but in the ear of the listener, who may also, but not typically, be the composer and/or performer), suggests that Elliott's five forms of knowing, some of which border philosophically on the metaphysical (procedural, formal, informal, impressionistic and supervisory) are as easily and perfectly applicable to the process of listening as they are to his five hybrid pairs (performance-and-listening, and so on). His omission of listening as a holistic activity in itself, and as worthy of addition to his five-fold list of co-dependent pairs (e.g. composing-and-listening) is in itself a significant statement that he must account for - and not merely by insisting that it is in his plan after all, as a kind of benign afterthought - a placebo, so to speak. And it is significant too that the majority of his critics see this as his stance. And it ought to be emphasized again that a reader must be able to extract from any philosophy, but especially from one as daunting, in the reading, and as complex and multi-faceted as Elliott's, a commanding, mainstream, line of thought, divested of its panoply of minor options. Even the most diligent reader may be mistaken but the responsibility for the misunderstanding must largely rest with the author. As Elliott says: - 'Music students can achieve competent, proficient and expert levels of music-listening.' But to teach and learn this kind of thinking effectively requires that its development be embedded in efforts to develop musicianship through performing, improvising, etc. (*Music Matters*, p. 106). Could anything be more clear or devoid of the possibility of misinterpretation? The writer, while readily accepting that these hybrid activities are, of course, though not universally, a part of the paraphernalia of teaching and learning to listen, doubts that they fully or individually meet the criterion of being either necessary or sufficient; the educational matrix is incomplete and therefore calls into serious question the plausibility and reliability of this aspect of Elliott's methodological claims. We can take on its face value Elliott's claim that 'in reality, then, my concern for music listening as praxis - the nature, values, teaching and learning of music listening - outweighs the attention I give to any other topic'. If, in relation to this claim, we assume Elliott's irreducible ideas of praxis as proceeding from music as a diverse human practice to mandatory multiculturalism, which is ill-at-ease with the predominantly western idea of listening *per se* (the pejorative notion of developing 'passive' listeners) - to music as predominantly and functionally a process rather than product-generated; if we are to arrive at and sincerely reject the seriously restricted and therefore arguably flawed definition of listening that proceeds from Elliott's line of argument, it must be cold comfort to him that his efforts have been so lavish but so futile in failing to convince universally. Nor does Humphreys's (*qv*) gratuitous compliment that Elliott's 'philosophy is far more comprehensive and, yes, probably superior to MEAE as a general guiding principle for the music education profession' do much more than set it up as a paradigm and a sounding board for the testing and equally possible repudiation of philosophical theses, including his.

As to answering White's concerns, as clearly articulated and responded to by Reimer, Elliott is, to employ an oxymoron, defensively aggressive to the end. He side-steps the issue of the established ascendancy of pop as a threat to the stability of traditional music education as much as being a phenomenon that must be reconciled within it. He is unapologetic about the validity of multiculturalism as a tool of music education, but inconclusive (as indeed Reimer was, but by admission) as to how it can be invaginated within the time constraints of the subject in schools. His polar position on listening, as needing the mediation of an active phase (in his view) of music making to validate it, ensured that he would not concede that White has a point to make. But his valedictory statements reveal conclusively that it is not White, but Reimer (whom he identifies with MEAE) who is his real *bête noire*. In a characteristic and unmerited piece of invective, he concludes that 'White's concerns . . . about music education's lack of attention to . . .the development of "informed listenership" can be traced in large part to the theoretical and practical weaknesses of the aesthetic philosophy in which listening to recorded music for structural elements takes precedence in general music and performing is reduced to an activity of mere sound-producing". The writer just does not find this interpretation to be the case, based on readings of Reimer, whatever about the realities of American music education curricula, the delivery of which could, however, very well be at considerable variance with their published intent. But Elliott's attack does not merit a response. There is little difference in essence between White's focus on poor performance programmes (a reality in the Irish system) without crediting the work of a small cadre of teachers who excel - and Elliott's singling out of this excellence while ignoring the more typical situation; but White, in pinpointing the majority case, is nearer to the truth that must be addressed, in philosophical pronouncements as much as in the classroom. The same applies to his rejection of White's observation that university courses in Canada are now, typically, being forced into remedial action for freshmen who are poorly equipped for third level studies because of performance programmes in schools that deprive them of the ancillary essentials of a rounded education in musicianship. White is an astute observer and a scholar of renown; he is not given to making statements which have little basis in fact. White is not disavowing the 'work of hundreds of excellent music educators leading comprehensive programs that send well-educated young musicians to study the diversity of musics we teach at the University of Toronto . . . ." He is merely trying to highlight the incompatibility between the sometimes extreme 'performance only' mentality in North America (which at least emphasizes performance for those who have chosen it) and the university model which must restore a balance. In this context David Elliott's Parthian shaft, in summing up Professor White's concerns and his articulation of them, is extremely distasteful and, in detracting from his own credibility and status as a scholar bound by the conventions of seemly critical behaviour, does little to advance his own cause or to entice music educators to study his theories.

Conclusion - White/Reimer/Elliott

In the introduction to his *Music: Society: Education*,[63] described as 'an important stunningly original book certain to provoke debate, for it is an unflattering mirror of our time', the New Zealander Christopher Small pens these obviously cautionary words:

> It is generally acknowledged that the musical tradition of post -Renaissance Europe and her offshoots is one of the most brilliant and astonishing cultural phenomena of human history. . . . It is understandable, therefore, for those of us who are its heirs (which includes not only the Americas and many late and present colonies of Europe but also by now a large portion of the non-western world as well) are inclined to find in the European musical tradition the norm and ideal for all musical experience, just as they find in the attitudes of western science the paradigm for the acquisition of all knowledge, and to view all other musical cultures as at best exotic and odd. It is precisely this inbuilt certainty of the superiority of European culture to all others that has given Europeans, and lately their American heirs, the confidence to undertake the cultural colonization of the world and the imposition of European values and habits of thought on the whole human race.

This is a pre-1977 view of great perception, predating the obsession with multiculturalism which has swept the world of music education in the quarter of a century which has followed it. Small, in a brilliant account, could easily be aligned with David Elliott in his plea for reappraisal and a new order. Writing for the average reader he describes the function and social role (key ideas) of music in radically new terms for its time, including a defence of 'music as process', and inveighs against the perceived excesses of the 'music as product' lobby. But he carefully prefaces his provocative stance with that reference to the paradigm of western art music as 'one of the most brilliant and astonishing cultural phenomena of human history'.

This exhaustive review of the kaleidoscopic philosophical engagement between Harry White, Bennett Reimer and David Elliott will take its cue from Small's prefatory words. There is an obligation on the world of music education to preserve its rich legacy of western art music, quite apart from its attentions to other forms. Reimer has analysed its aesthetic significance impressively, and from his fundamental wisdom an order may be seen to have developed, for it has remained virtually unchallenged for more than a quarter of a century. Harry White has gallantly and idealistically formulated a plea for its survival, which he sees as seriously threatened by current trends. There is much of value in his arguably, but perhaps consciously blinkered, approach to stemming the encroaching tide of cultural and ethnomusicological offerings that competes for the impossibly straitened time allocations for music in general education. The writer sees White's urgent plea as stimulated by the spirit of conservation - less by a desire to banish other worthwhile musics from the places of learning; he does not suggest easy options. David Elliott is the evangelist of the new order prefigured to an extent in Small's prophetic writings. The writer's conclusion is that all three must be taken seriously. Reimer has certainly moved away from the somewhat dated paradigm of the1970 aesthetic dictum contained in his book - *A Philosophy of Music Education* - and it is greatly to his credit that he has had the flexibility and the philosophical honesty to do so. As Keith Swanwick has so elegantly and flatteringly phrased his euphemism: - 'There may have been some underlying conceptual confusion and perhaps the paradigm has done its main work and could be laid aside'. Times have changed, and with it the social order. The aesthetic theory, with its wealth of philosophical support from a distinguished array of commentators - from Schopenhauer to Hegel, from Collingwood to Dewey, from Meyer to Langer - is no longer in phase with the wider and fashionable concepts of the nature and significance of music in human discourse; it needs, not to be abandoned, but to expand its understandings to admit other aspects of the functions of music without

[63] Christopher Small, *Music: Society: Education*. London: John Calder Ltd, 1977 and 1980, p. 1.

doing irreparable violence to its cherished principles. David Elliott, though he might not see himself quite in that role, has essayed this flexure in the potential of music education by a serious and at times brilliant reappraisal of many of the fundamentals of music and music education. He has done this, for this writer at least, in spite of some serious reservations arrived at in this analysis. He may have overshot the target in his enthusiasm, as he has certainly antagonized many of his colleagues unnecessarily by the carelessly dismissive aggression with which he rejects *some* of his direct philosophical forebears and *all* of those who, in paying him the considerable compliment of examining his theories seriously, find them wanting in some aspect or other. Harry White, as having, through the helpful mediation of Reimer, brought the real issues - multiculturalism, pop music versus western art music, the nature of performance and listening - clearly under the lens of philosophical scrutiny but also close to the bone of staunchly held philosophical difference, has been the provocative catalyst in stimulating a further survey of the ground between the perceived polar positions of Reimer and Elliott, where some rationalization, better mutual understandings and compromise may lead to solutions that could be near at hand.

Ref. III D ia See Document 351 in Proceedings

Who Needs a Philosophy of Music Education? Reflections on an Irish Context

Chair: Dr Ita Beausang (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
Reporter: Mr David Mooney (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
Panel: Professor Harold Abeles; Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Professor Harry White.

It should be noted that the debates (and indeed the presentations) at Phase III of MEND were expected to demonstrate a higher level of convergence than earlier ones and to produce a notional set of recommendations that could act as workable agenda items for subsequent forum sessions. The question of philosophy of music education was exhaustively treated, as a pre-identified need, at Phase II of MEND and, as Professor Colwell remarked, excellent philosophers were indeed invited to that gathering. The Reimer/Elliott debate, a separate, closely observed and highly publicized confrontation on fundamental philosophical issues, was partly enacted on Irish soil but its mutually vituperative tendencies, quite apart from its positive side - the genuine conviction evinced and strongly defended by each protagonist, both here and in other for a - might have left a feeling of confusion in its wake, as indeed seems to have been sensed by the reporter of this debate session. It was therefore refreshing to return to more sober considerations of philosophy *in action*. The panellists in this debate were chosen for and succeeded in representing a very wide spectrum of involvement in music education. Areas of specialism from child education to post-graduate studies, and from teacher training to purely academic pursuits ensured an interesting mix which was capable of defining an eclectic mosaic of participation at the philosophical table. It is notable that the report, as the debate probably also was, is dominated by the panellists, indicating that Irish music educators (the rank and file delegates in this case) typically feel uncomfortable with philosophical pronouncements (which can often be prescriptive and dogmatic) and are disinclined to challenge them at this stage. Notwithstanding the importance of philosophical underpinning, which seems to be inherited wisdom from MEND Phase II, clearly our music educators have a great deal of food for independent thought. The spread of opinion voiced at this debate demonstrates variety rather that convergence. The four panellists spoke in turn, a novel and productive way of adding substance to the outcomes from the debate.

Professor White, in disavowing the procedure of blindly respecting the principle of *a priori* philosophy in the absence of a clear definition of the ambience in which it might be applied, actually succeeded in defining a version of a currently very fashionable approach to philosophy, namely that of contextualization, and he is to be applauded for making this point, whether intentionally or not. And he proceeded masterfully to outline, in the limited time available to him, the *context* of Irish music education. He makes a distinction between the types of music education that are needed and the

current dispensation which *he* has always regarded as dominated by a public perception that the study of music presupposes instrumental or vocal instruction only. He is accurate, of course, in drawing attention to the impoverished state of music education in the country (a prime concern of MEND), as reflected in the general lack of resources, and calls for in-depth appraisal of the situation in matters of provision and underlying culture before consensus on an informing philosophy is attempted.

Professor Shehan Campbell, perhaps borrowing from her expertise in multicultural music education or her professional position as a music educator, and therefore as teacher trainer, took an approach based on means of access to the workings of children's instinctive or natural music-making and the maxim of 'music for all' - a safe philosophical position which is nonetheless difficult to apply to the real world of education. Her contribution, which might well accommodate both multicultural aspects and, in a somewhat narrower context, the painless importation of traditional music into Irish schools at the most rudimentary stages, champions the idea of learning without notation. But she goes on to stress that such method, appropriate to the teaching of the young, should be seen as a means of engaging the interest of the students at that psychological phase in their development, but should then be capable of progressing to more sophisticated learning procedures as they mature. Method, while it is not philosophy, is related to the implementation of the curriculum, which, in turn, is the product of philosophy in action. Professor Shehan Campbell's contribution, personally endorsed as to its success in action, was therefore germane to the topic under discussion.

It is difficult to assess the usable value of Professor Ó Súilleabháin's contribution. Always provocative, he chose on this occasion to concentrate on some of the less often stressed dimensions of music education - its social significance, the contribution of *people* to success or failure in the implementation of curriculum, the importance of the less formal aspects of music learning such as those deriving from play and from the exercise of natural ability and community input, the teacher's role as listener in effective applications of teacher/pupil relationship strategies, the juxtaposition of academics and performers in the same working ambience as a psychological exercise in tolerance building, the potential of community outreach programmes to boost educational awareness, the input of visiting artists to the appreciation and understanding of performance practices and (it is suspected) multicultural music applications. As most of these comments have a basis in conjecture or empiricism it is impossible to quantify their effectiveness in contributing to educational effort in music. Unlike Professor Shehan Campbell, who always backs up her arguments, when they are empirically based, with copious examples of their success in action if not even with practical demonstrations, the lack of substantiation in Professor Ó Súilleabháin's suggestions leaves a sense of incompleteness and nebulousness, although his fertile imagination, originality and natural gift for oratory are always compelling in stimulating thought. The theories of Howard Gardner with regard to multiple intelligences (also mentioned by Professor Ó Súilleabháin), while they are favourable to music and a boost in its advocacy (they are also praised and used by David Elliott as a major contributor to his development of the procedural essence of musicianship), are by no means universally accepted or convincingly demonstrable as scientific fact (see Colwell - Ref. II P ix). Regrettably it has to be stated that Professor Ó Súilleabháin's contribution is too lacking in serviceable substance to act as a defining factor in a contextual philosophy of music for the Irish case, the development of which was the intent of the debate.

Professor Abeles's input to the debate was brief in statement but significant in impact, if bordering on negativism. He suggests that the accepted classic - Bennett Reimer's *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, rev 1989) - serves well enough as an introduction to the subject. Professor Abeles (see also Abeles – Ref. III P ii) does not involve himself in the cut and thrust of the Reimer/Elliott conflict. Rather his experience as a distinguished music educator, and author on the subject, carries conviction in suggesting that a source which gained global recognition and remained unchallenged for a quarter of a century could be viewed, in its originally non-controversial aspects, as a standard from which to deviate, bearing in mind Reimer's own statements in this regard, that a philosophy is not fixed but demands an ongoing process of refinement. Abeles warns, and this is sound advice, that philosophies must be tested in practice and that the theory, no matter how convincing or attractive, can collapse under the pressure of inimical circumstances outside the scope of the philosophy; again we

are made aware of the contextual nature of the demand for a workable philosophy. He therefore prefers to rely on the constant testing of theory against practice and on the application of reflective techniques by teachers, rather than blind compliance with pronouncements that may be spurious or irrelevant. His contribution is very consistent with the thrust of his own presentation (Ref. II P ii).

The most important contribution from the floor (related to the substance of Professor Abeles's admonitions) was the suggestion that many teachers of practical subjects (instrument/voice), who would not necessarily see themselves as having a cerebral approach to teaching, are actually subconsciously applying a philosophy of music education when they teach. The validity of this unarticulated rationale was questioned. While the meeting did not reach a conclusion on the issue the point seemed to arise from a paper read by Ms Mary Lennon at Phase I of MEND where she critically examined the notion of the professionalism of instrumental music teachers and concluded that a case book of the thoughts and strategies used by the most successful practical teachers could be progressively amassed and amount to a significant guide to more effective teaching; in metamorphosing into overt statement (rather than remaining as a covert method not fully analysed even by the teacher in question) it would define a contextual philosophy of practical method which would not only be valuable as a resource, but would progressively affirm the professionalism of the teachers involved in the exercise and be eventually applicable to professional training of all practical teachers.

The weakness in philosophical underpinning evidenced by many of the practices in Irish music education are testimony that we have not thought sufficiently about the nature and value of both music and music education. That we are not alone in our omissions is cold comfort. Wayne Bowman sums up the essence of philosophy this way:

Philosophy works to render the implicit explicit, with the ultimate intent of enriching both understanding and perception. Among its greatest allies is a persistent curiosity. Its enemies are the habitual, the stereotypical, the unexamined, the acritical, the "common sense" assumption or assertion. The philosophical mind critically challenges and explores received doctrine, renounces the security of dogma, exposes inconsistencies, weighs and evaluates alternatives. It explores, probes, and questions, taking very little for granted[64]

In an area of such crucial importance to the future of music education in Ireland it would be fatuous to expect that the outcome of a short discussion such as this debate comprised, could provide definitive solutions to a problem that has been more than a century in the making. What can be said of this session, however, is that, although it can hardly be claimed to have been convergent, it reinforces the need for a sharper and more informed critical analysis of every situation, within efficient constraints of time, before irrevocable decisions are taken. Philosophy of music education, itself subjected to the kind of regime suggested by Bowman above, must certainly remain on the agenda for Irish music education.

Recommendations

1. There is a need for a philosophy of music education contextualized to match the circumstances obtaining in Ireland. The contextual search should include an appraisal of the resources available and the implications of the country's history and cultural idiosyncrasies. Philosophy should always be seen as a means to an end.

2. The methodology of teaching without reliance on notation should be carefully appraised as an introductory technique at the rudimentary stage of music education, especially in applications to younger children.

3. Philosophies/theories should be tested in practice before adoption

[64] Quoted in David Elliott, *Music Matters*, p7

4. Teachers and trainee teachers should b encouraged in the application of reflective practices to their work so that the philosophies which are guiding their actions may become overt and respond to further analytical appraisal.

For additional material under this heading see also:

Ms Gabrielle McCann (Ref. I P vi)
Ms Mary Lennon (Ref. I P xi)
Professor Harold Abeles (Ref. III P ii)

18.1.2 Contextual Philosophy

Ref. II P iii See Document 203 in Proceedings

Aesthetic Education: Past, Present, and Potential for the Future
Dr Bennett Reimer (Professor of Music Education at Northwestern University, Evanston, Chicago, Illinois)

Professor Reimer's paper was reviewed very favourably in the Interim Report of MEND Phase II (*q.v.*). It is fascinating to recall its detail in the light of the subsequent exchanges between himself and David Elliott and their responses to Harry White's paper *A book of manners in the wilderness*, given at MEND Phase III. And it is interesting, too, to compare this 1995 statement with Reimer's considerably expanded palette when he addressed the aspiration of a universal philosophy of music education at the 1996 ISME Conference in Amsterdam. Although there is change it is generally negotiated without inconsistency.

It is very significant that Reimer's *Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, rev. 1989), which masterfully correlated and significantly added to the ideas of distinguished philosophical thinkers who were active in the three decades or so before the publication of his book, not only informed the influential Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) Movement in the US but remained a unique and virtually unchallenged statement for a quarter of a century[65]. It has been enormously influential and must be credited with the tacit approval of more than a full generation of scholars - a notable achievement in a field so currently active as the philosophical lobby in the United States. One should feel confident therefore that it encapsulates wisdom of an enduring kind, while mustering the forces of a sharp intellect in examining a challenge. Reimer must be acknowledged for the gifts of simplicity in presentation, clarity, lucidity, easy logic, accessibility and applicability which suffuse his writings, making them acceptable as seminal statements in their time. And there is little substantive evidence that, although they have been challenged, they have been superannuated in American music education practice.

When Reimer clears a way for the exposition of an evolving philosophy of aesthetic music education, his pragmatism is evident in sometimes quite subtle shifts of emphasis which reflect the concurrent evolution of socio-cultural and politico-cultural values. Thus we find rejection of the extrinsic values of music in education being replaced by cautious inclusion; the transfer of formalism to its mitigated version of relating to the Langerian 'forms of human feeling'; the advocacy of 'classical' music yielding seamlessly to the politically more correct multicultural model; the dominance of performance (based on the outmoded nineteenth century perceptions of its indispensability for familiarization with

[65] In his review (1996) of David Elliott's *Music Matters*, Reimer acknowledges it as 'an important and interesting event in the history of music education scholarship, because it brings to an end a very long period during which only one book entirely devoted to the explication and application of a philosophical viewpoint on music education, my own *A Philosophy of Music Education*, was widely recognized to exist, at least in North America'

repertoire) giving way to the legitimate promotion of a wider range of experiences, without, however, dispensing with the performance option; emotional discharge transmutes into the expressive possibilities of embodied feelings; the substitution of the trade (training) idea of music education by the professional (reflective; see Mary Lennon, Ref. I P xiv). All these essentially fluid positions are validated by Reimer's statement that 'aesthetic education, then, is not a dogma, or a fixed set of beliefs and actions, but an ever-changing, ever developing position that music is worthy of serious attempts to learn it, and that education in music include musical learning if its unique benefits are to be available to all'. This, it seems, is basic to the agenda of the position that Reimer holds, and seems unexceptionable.

The adaptability of Reimer's criteria for *quality* in music is particularly attractive and is open to application in all kinds of judgements of musical repertoire suitable in education. By using craftsmanship, sensitivity, imagination and authenticity[66] (another laudable shift from the 1970 position)[67]- 'characteristics sufficiently broad to apply to all the world's music' - ' a powerful means for making substantive and defensible judgements of merit exists'.

Reimer replaces the preoccupation with performance, skills and repertoire by the Tylerian and neo-Tylerian model of structure-of-discipline and concepts as organizers of learning. This, he claims, enabled music study to become more organized and pedagogically defensible than had ever previously been possible, and enabled music education to expand its notion of music curriculum dramatically. This form of prescription is attacked by Elliott as 'resulting in a steady stream of "teacher-proof" curricula that continues to flow to the present day'.[68] It is arguable, however, that the idea, limiting as it may be and too redolent of the 'verbal concepts' approach for the small percentage of teachers who may prefer to transcend it in their personally imaginative methodology, is probably welcomed by most teachers, who prefer prescription over the responsibility of liberal choice. The prevailing attitude of the majority of teachers is an important consideration and, if we are to take the climate at MEND as indicative of Irish feeling on the subject, it would favour the Reimer model.

Reimer's final contribution to overcoming former insufficiencies in music education proposes a balanced approach to teaching for variety and comprehensiveness which he defines under the headings of knowing *how* and knowing *within*, knowing *about* and knowing *why*; this approach, he suggests, suffices for all involvements and learnings, whether relating to general music education or in elective experiences across particular aspects of music (performing, composing, etc.).

In his peroration Reimer mentions the unfinished agenda of music education and indeed puts a pragmatic finger on the pulse of current concerns, not only in the United States but in Ireland too, albeit not always in an identical context.

1. He recommends that teachers in training should be exposed to readings on the philosophy of music education in order better to understand the reasons underpinning their pending decisions and to act as advocates for quality music education (See also Abeles, Ref. III P ii)

2. He gives cautious support to the idea of promoting musics of the world's cultures - cautious in the sense of his pragmatic awareness of the difficulties involved in a relatively young discipline. Implicit are his concerns about suitable ethnic choices, appropriate repertoire, the inexperience of the vast majority of teachers (including those in the United States). This problem, referred to above under the Irish context, would, of course, present a different dimension for us and one that needs urgent consideration,

[66] The question of authenticity requires another shift in definition to accommodate the more recent claim by ethnomusicologists that the implied dichotomy is largely artificial, biased and negatively value-laden.
[67] Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970), p 103
[68] Elliott, *Music Matters*. p 244

taking into account the importunity of the multicultural lobby in turning to its advantage the politically correct pronouncements concerning the relevance of other musics.

3. Reimer is conscious of the destabilizing effects of obsession with performance. Although we have a very different view in Ireland as articulated above, being in a sense the other side of that coin, we might heed his warning about perpetuating modes of instruction that are in themselves restricting, and apply our efforts, as we seem to be doing, to the fertilization of academically (knowledge-based) curricula with more experiential involvements with music. There is little likelihood in Ireland, in the foreseeable future, of high quality performance in schools, or the professional interests of performance teachers, being a negative burden on the comprehensiveness of music education. Reimer's admonitions might be generically classified as concern for the *relevance* of teacher training, also referred to above in the Irish context.

4. The question of equal opportunity is an issue very close to the heart of all Irish music educators and needs no special emphasis.

It is the immediacy and the common sense of Bennett Reimer's philosophical dialectic that so commends it for serious consideration. And it is worth reiterating that his leadership, which is neither dictatorial nor claustrophobic when exerted in a benign climate, has had no little part in the shaping of American music education in the past three decades; it seems to have had the long-standing admiration and support of a critical profession and it is still influential in the underlying rationale of the American National Standards, which are likely to dominate music education effort in the US for another two decades. Reimer tacitly and anonymously acknowledges the challenge of Elliott in his MEND address, in a way which is almost inconsequential. His 1996 book review, a retaliation to Elliott's iconoclastic attack in *Music Matters*, is, on the other hand, much more in the open, as is the Amsterdam statement which, in tending to destabilize itself and thus the whole thrust of an otherwise scholarly and impeccable presentation, acknowledged that the Elliott challenge was to be taken seriously, since he himself, in taking notice of it, had so perceived its threat as a real one.

We have an exact parallel to the American National Standards for schools in the promulgation of our revised syllabi, now complete (1999) with the issue of the Primary Schools documents. Our problem is not, as in the US, one of advocacy for their adoption since we have a *national* curriculum. Our concern should be to keep the implemented curriculum under active and constructive review as to its philosophical underpinnings and to try to influence ongoing policies and effect necessary modification (as provided for in the NCCA manifesto, confirmed by the chairman of the Music Syllabus Committee, Seán MacLiam) as our continuing absorption of philosophical pronouncements matures.

Ref. II P viii See Document 208 in Proceedings

Music Education, Music Performance, and the Irish Music Educator
Professor David Elliott (Professor of Music and Music Education, University of Toronto; currently [1995] visiting Professor at the University of North Texas)

"It is imperative to have a cadre of teachers who themselves 'embody' the knowledge that they are expected to teach."

Howard Gardner quoted by David Elliott

It may seem that the philosophy of music education as emanating from the North American Continent disproportionately dominated the deliberations of MEND and that it continues to exert too much influence, if not to the point of distortion, on the analysis of the proceedings with a specifically Irish relevance. It is true that any peg will do to hang one's hat on - to get a point across, so to speak - provided the context is clearly established. Paul Lehman (Ref. III P iii) states it with consummate

succinctness: 'Philosophy and practice are mutually reinforcing because philosophy provides a basis for practice and practice provides an opportunity to test and validate philosophy'. But the process by which philosophy transmutes into practice is considerably more fraught than the scholarly and clinically isolated exercise of developing rational underpinning in the first place. We are constantly witness, not so much as to how philosophy has failed in practice as to how practice has deviated from ideology. The post-MEND III readings have clearly illustrated how North American experiences, in highlighting these dissonances, from the beginning of the twentieth century right up to the publication of Elliott's *Music Matters* (in 1995, the year in which he addressed MEND), can be usefully applied to the whole Irish dilemma to discover fascinating and helpful correlations. This might be said to revolve around the nature of performance. The reader is again referred to the papers given by Reimer (Ref. II P iii), Straub (Ref. II P v) and Lehman (Ref. II P iii).

1. It appears that, in the midst of an uncharted conflict between music educators and the great American public, 'instrumental music became a fixture (in schools) in the *early* 20th century because kids enjoyed playing instruments' (Lehman). But this is not a simple unexceptionable fact. If we peruse the above readings it can be learned that this answered to the public perception (cf Harry White's papers [Ref. I P viii and Ref. III P viii, but especially the former]) of what music education should be - not the well rounded education (of composer, performer listener) as advocated properly in more recent philosophical pronouncements, but simply an exclusive concentration on the skill- and product-based fruits of the one-to-one mode of teaching; and there was plenty of justification for the ascendency of this mode of access to music. The sophisticated thinking of the Absolute Expressionists was also evolving simultaneously from the early part of the century but independently, it seems; it rounded the edges of the too formidable stance of Hanslick but might now be admitted as having also been a child of its time,[69] or at least in need of the kind of tempering which Reimer has subtly applied to it in the 1990s.

2. When Bennett Reimer's epochal *A Philosophy of Music Education* appeared in 1970 it must have been a rationale responding to a system, not searching for one. And, as we learn from the authoritative readings (see Straub), music in American schools was/is strictly an elective which has been allowed, for reasons that must have much to do with established norms of the match between teacher skills/employment and student demands, to create the extraordinary dichotomy (in context) of performers and non-performers (compare the Syllabus A and B dichotomy in Ireland which, though less drastic, produced enormous problems). This was barren ground indeed to support the well-intentioned provisions of the Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) Movement, since the performers, with an arguably cultivated minimal commitment to a rounded musical education, had already been syphoned off; the remainder were, by conscious choice and not by MEAE pre-classification, non-performers. It seems to an outsider, therefore, that American highschool music education failed, by its very structure, either to challenge or to empower MEAE. More than twenty years later the National Standards are now attempting to correct this intolerable abdication from eclecticism. But there is still copious visible evidence in the US that the long-established system dies hard.

In the midst of all this confusion and transition the Elliott book appeared. If one is to be guided by various critiques of *Music Matters* he had MEAE rather than American Music Education in his sights. The book is, putting it bluntly, iconoclastic, sets out (from its structural features alone) unashamedly to be so and drew a great deal of negative criticism in this context, but that is not to invalidate its ideas, which are fresh and stimulating, teeming with imagination, striving towards comprehensiveness. But for its conscious nonconformist tendencies, it would have been difficult to

[69] See Swanwick (MEND Ref. III iv) who referred euphemistically to Reimer's philosophy as a paradigm the 'has done its main work and could be laid aside'

understand how two such eminent scholars as Elliott and Reimer could have worked themselves into stances so ostensibly and diametrically opposed. If the chameleon-like Reimer philosophy (responding, as it openly purports to do, to the changing circumstances which are the guiding principle empowering shifts in philosophical stance in the first place) represents the middle ground of twentieth century thinking, Elliott indubitably is more provocative and is even subversive. Given the plethora of philosophical stances that variously inform music education, it is obviously not a question that any one has to be embraced or that there are absolutes of right and wrong; if it were so, we would not have so many. What is important, however, is that music educators have the confidence, born of familiarity even with the verbal statements (more is seldom possible), to debate the issues and eclectically to apply consensus, where possible, to the contextual realities of particular cases. Since the writer believes that the philosophies of Reimer and Elliott encapsulate as wide a spectrum as is likely to be encountered on a first reading, it is hoped that young professionals, by comparing them, will be encouraged to continue the debate - to analyse, call into question, demystify, clarify, challenge, accept, reject, modify, and reconcile - and eventually implement ever-better and more relevant philosophical ideas to ongoing practice. This is the proffered value of the exercise, undertaken below, to Irish music education.

The Reimer-Elliott debate has a copious bibliography; in fairness to the pretensions of David Elliott and to the extent to which his book has attracted international notice, the writer has consulted a representative sample of the literature (as listed in the footnote).[70]

The writer has argued that the universality of music has two manifestations - as experience and as faculty. 'Music-making is posited as a universal species-specific experience and faculty at least as old as language, born of a desire for communication between human and fellow human.'[71] Experience may be minimally thought of as a kind of passive listening exercise of the kind attributed by Elliott to

[70] It should be made quite clear that the impression made by David Elliott - from his somewhat sketchy MEND presentation (which he chose to deliver informally) to the more formal (and much more sophisticated) offering which the writer succeeded in eliciting subsequently from Dr Elliott; from the most thorough and painstaking perusal of his book (*Music Matters*) to the multiplicity of reviews (including his own lengthy rebuttal of the equally lengthy Reimer critique); from the fascinating triptych which the Reimer and Elliott responses to Harry White's paper (*A book of manners in the wilderness*) created - is not one that can be dismissed as insufficiently researched. The writer has been conscious of the responsibility to consult the widest feasible range of literature before coming to the conclusions presented in this report. I should also be stated that the nature of the debate itself and of the opening salvo by which Elliott's book created a hostile climate, must logically devalue the direct encounters (Reimer's book review and Elliott's rebuttal, analysed exhaustively in this report – Section 18.1.2)) on the Kantian principle of emotional involvement, lack of disinterestedness and detachment, and vested interest.
The following is a list of the sources consulted:
David J. Elliott. *Music Matters* (1995)
Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, rev 1989)
Bennett Reimer, *Music for Performers Only*: Review of *Music Matters* (Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Spring 1996, No 128)
David Elliott, *Continuing Matters: Myths, Realities, Rejoinders*: Rebuttal of Reimer above (Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education).
J.T. Humphreys, Review of *Music Matters* (Bulletin of Historical Research in Music Education, 17, January 1996)
A LeBlanc, Review of *Music Matters* (Music Educators Journal, January 1996)
N Sarrazin, Review of *Music Matters* (Ethnomusicology 40(3) (Fall 1996)
E.V. Stubley, Review of *Music Matters* (Philosophy of Music Education Review, 4 (1) 1996)
David N Aspin, Review of *Music Matters* (Music Education, ISME Number 27, May 1996)
Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education*?
(Music Education, ISME Number 29, 1997)
Harry White, *A book of manners in the wilderness*, (Vol.38 of College Music Symposium)
David Elliott, *Of Irish Myth: A Response to Harry White* (Vol.38 of College Music Symposium)
Bennett Reimer, *Through Irish Eyes*, Response to Harry White (Vol.38 of College Music Symposium) [71] Frank Heneghan, *Interpretation in Music: A Study in Perception, Expression and Symbol* (Dublin, University of Dublin ,Trinity College and Dublin Institute of Technology, unpublished thesis, 1990) iii

the thinking behind MEAE, while faculty could be construed as active music-making in the form of an undiscriminating involvement in performance, an equally far-fetched view of Elliott's praxis, as, for example, in the hands of the volitional non-performer. The writer has a much more interpenetrative and interactive view of both which, indeed, he believes the philosophies of Reimer and Elliott also reveal, as far as their intentions go, to the sympathetic reader. But let us assume, for the purposes of this exercise, that the simple division into experience and faculty does correspond roughly to the aesthetic experience (perception and response as centred in listening) of Reimer and the musical activity ('fundamentally music is something that people do') of Elliott[72]; neither is fully served by the definition but the premise seems plausibly non-pejorative and the distinction is not made with any covert agenda of distortion. Provided it is suitably qualified, it is therefore as valid to claim that the ineluctable and truly universal binding force of music is listening - and that we make music so that we can listen, as it is to assert that music-making is the central act and that we listen because music is made. Both confirm the interdependency of the two activities; in general neither is disavowed by the philosophies in question and it would be misleading to make such a suggestion for rhetorical or any other purpose. The nature of and the emphasis on each activity may need to be commented on but the principle is established, and both Reimer and Elliott would claim to be fully vindicated, in their own regard, in relation to this basic feature of the intrinsic interrelationship of music-making and listening, without positing their necessary coalescence in a single agent.

Both scholars attempt to produce a universal philosophy of music and it is here that the difficulties they encountered reveal themselves as implacable taskmasters in dictating the final form of each putative philosophy. It is interesting to speculate here whether composing performing and listening (or simply making and appraising) were separately confronted by the authors as potentially fertile starting points for the fabrication of a universal philosophy of music education. Certainly the results seem to confirm some such search for a dominating premise, as indeed they also bring into focus their polarities, since they characteristically choose different routes.

Reimer presumably started from his own aesthetic ideal of listening (with implied performance). As already commented on (Amsterdam ISME lecture, 1996), he invaginated his Absolute Expressionism in a Referential definition. He allowed for Formalism, paid lip service to Praxialism without in any way justifying it as a special categorization (in spite of the current disproportionate attention being given to it) apart from its separation from music as product and its basis in music as process. He gradually enlarged his matrix with reference to the extrinsic (anti-aesthetic/functional) benefits of music in education and finally introduced the socio-political and historico-cultural contexts which affect the way music can be thought of; he had already included multiculturalism as a value held in common, though this may be questionable in the context of its appearing as a response to political correctness in very recent years (a definition as to what multiculturalism means or actually entails is

[72] Lack of clarity or fluidity as to the nature of the intimate relationship between performance and listening (rather like the complementarity between music as product and music as process) has made for difficulty in arbitrating between Reimer and Elliott, since it has led to semantic wordplay which supports Reimer's defences as much as it enables Elliott to plead with such regularity that he is being misunderstood. It is relevant to ask whether listening is in itself an activity, separable from performance, and whether its notional optimal experience is one of vicarious performance. It is not quite clear in dealing with Elliott's overweening advocacy of performance (and the irksome parenthetical litany of related activities - improvising, composing, arranging, conducting - which are not treated with quite the same generosity of explanation) whether listening is conceptually just the other side of the coin in relation to any one of them, or how it fares on its own. Considering that listening (without physical [muscular] participation), accounts for probably more than 99 % of all musical experience, it is unsatisfactory that doubts linger over these questions, particularly over the very respectability of listening alone, and at all developmental stages, as an unencumbered musical pursuit in its own right. Is it possible to exert one's full concentration on listening in the ambience of the technical distraction of performing oneself, which, after all is fully validated as a cognitive act (in a purely craft sense) too? If the optimum way of gaining access to music is through activity (something one does [Elliott]) and if listening is an activity (which it certainly is), is it so naïve to suggest that the best way to learn how to listen is to 'concentrate while hearing' or to 'listen while listening' (!) in the same way as one listens while conducting, while performing and so on.

also called for). He leaves us in no doubt as to the incompatibilities between many of the stances in his matrix and the need for reconciliation 'to clarify what it is we hold in common at the level of our deepest values and fundamental beliefs'. Left with an amorphous array of humanistic influences he then attempts to relate these, by reference to the work of the cultural anthropologist Robert Plant Armstrong, to the nature and value of human experience - to the 'beingness or phenomenality' which every culture provides for its members. With terminology which echoes the writings of Hanslick (sonic form - 'Tönend bewegten Formen') and Langer (consciousness charged with feeling) Reimer tries to transcend the idea of music simply as communicating object or function or symbol, by presenting it, not as a universal, characteristic but unvarying affect, but as capable of first incarnating each culture's 'affective consciousness', celebrating it in all its particularity and separateness while transforming its experiences and values into sharable embodiments. The dimensions of form, practice, reference, and context (Reimer's four stances) are seen through his [Armstrong's] vision to be inseparable components of music, in what music is, what it does, and how it serves the deepest of human needs'.[73] This peroration is less convincing than the more objective philosophical mosaic which he so carefully defines, simply because it descends, however eloquently, into the metaphysical. Reimer cautiously leaves aside the *sui generis* ('Music means itself' [Hanslick]) qualities of music in order that it might be all things to all men, a more politically correct approach but one that he is obviously fearful about, lest it degenerate into a kind of musical anarchy which validates indiscriminately; this caution is admirable without being ungenerous.

David Elliott's approach (for he, too, is undoubtedly attempting to define a universal philosophy of music education) may appear, at first sight, to be altogether more robust. His *carte blanche* approach is made possible by two radical shifts which virtually deconstruct prevailing ideologies. One could imagine Elliott being happy with what Reimer, (quoting Danto [1964]) describes as music being 'whatever a culture's institutional policy-makers decide to call music', and ministering to that. He is mainly concerned with music as faculty, activity and process. Although he is an expressionist (his choice of terminology confirms this), he rejects Absolute Expressionism, as a paradox, simply by denying, by default, the subtle differences between emotion and feeling; and all the extrinsic benefits of music (self-growth, optimal experience, social skills acquisition, discipline etc.) are validated without question provided they conform to his basic premise of activity-based learning - curriculum-as-practicum. And all of this is acceptable as a basic premise. The other obstacle to a panacea universal philosophy of music education would be any hint of hierarchy between musical cultures; this David Elliott rejects out of hand. While this view does not invalidate his philosophy, it does serve to emancipate it as highly adaptable and attractive in dealing with multicultural education; Elliott is a committed multiculturalist. It appears that this claim by Elliott has stimulated a great deal of honest disagreement, judging by the fact that virtually every document that has come from Elliott's pen in relation to his philosophy has dealt with the subject (and in the same way), seeking to justify his stance (see Elliott *Music Matters* but also Ref. II P viii [both versions] and his responses to both Reimer and White).

This is what Elliott has to say: '". . . it would be foolish to say that any one music-culture was 'better' than another. Why? Because such a judgement is based on criteria from inside a single music culture. To call another music-culture's music 'primitive' imposes one's own standards on a group that does not recognize them (Slobin and Todd). But while no one Music is innately superior to any other, some musical practices may be educationally more appropriate than others. In other words, music education does not occur in a vacuum, but rather in relation to a variety of constraints - practical, social, cultural, ideological, political, and so on. Chief among these is the practical problem of curricular time. There is simply not enough time to teach all the world's Musics to all children. Thus, difficult choices must be made.' There is much food for thought in Elliott's words.

Elliott suggests criteria for attempting to establish musical hierarchy (But see also Reimer *A Philosophy,* 1970, p 103) only to claim the absurdity of each one. However he fails to consider the

[73] Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education*? (Music Education, ISME Number 29, 1997)19-20

possibility of evaluating the relative merits of two cultures by one skilled in the practices of both (see Prof. Ó Súilleabháin's remarks on this subject where he refers to a growing number of bi-cultural scholars. [Ref. I P/D N]. The influence of taste and prejudice is still, of course, a problem, but the exercise of evaluating between cultures is not to be discredited; it is an eminently possible scholarly pursuit and discipline which is highly desirable in certain circumstances). For Elliott to claim that 'no one Music [not even Western European art music(!), for that is the implication {let us be at least as honest as Harry White is - writer's insertion}] is innately superior to any other' is a *non sequitur*, in the context of a denial that there are no ways of establishing this within the normal processes of valuing and judgement, without which there really is a kind of anarchy. The use of the word *innately* does however soften the tone and should temper the possible thrust of any challenge to his assertion. As I have argued elsewhere (see review of Harry White - Ref. III P viii) there seems to be little objection to intra-cultural evaluations but the idea of differences between cultures seems always to touch a nerve centre. Are some Musics, by inference, so fragile that they need the protection of such an arrogant agenda? The claims of some multiculturalists in this regard are unworthy. There should be no problem with parity of esteem (see Santos, Ref. II P vii), nor should the claim of the multiculturalists for curricular time be disavowed, but to imply the equality of all Musics, from any stance, is surely not the strongest of arguments to put forward, if indeed the argument is necessary in the first place (see White Ref. III P viii and the Reimer response to same for interesting views on this debate), as Elliott seems to think it is. Nowhere else does Elliott directly try to shackle the powers of judgement, which are quintessential to the education process in any case; he speaks freely of valuing and selection, which are implicit in his statement that 'some musical practices may be <u>educationally</u> more appropriate than others'. But we need to judge in choosing the best materials. It seems inconsistent to suggest that our powers of judgement may be used provided we do not use them to arbitrate *between* cultures in certain circumstances. If it is impossible to judge the relative merit of another culture how then are we, as outsiders by definition, empowered to judge its products in an intra-cultural sense, in the first place, and isn't this privilege against the powers of judgement an affront to the capability of any culture to be self-justifying? The writer has to admit bewilderment and honest frustration at this central tenet of David Elliott's line of argument, which just does not make sense. And it is not fully congruent with the more subtle tones of the other multiculturalists at MEND (Patricia Shehan Campbell, Ramon Santos, Mel Mercier, Hormoz Farhat in particular). It seems that this moot point is still insufficiently clarified in multicultural dialectic to form, so prematurely, such a defining role in a universal philosophy of music education. It would seem almost preferable to make it clear that, while all musical cultures may not be equally developed, they are all entitled to parity of esteem in a humanistic sense and to special ascendency in context. 'When such recognition is withheld, or dishonest, the consequences can be grave. . . .[it] can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being'.[74] There must be some way to take the tension out of this sophistry.

As to the results of these two attempts to define a universal philosophy of music, it appears that here, too, the world community is still in an evolving state. Bennett Reimer admits that there are differences in ideology to be addressed and enumerates them in what is a very helpful exposé which, it should be recorded, attracted a capacity audience at the ISME Conference in 1996, surely indicative of the way the world, with some justification, looks to him as doyen for guidelines in the search for this utopian model. David Elliott's gratuitous efforts (for it is the writer who has proposed, in these pages, Elliott's New Philosophy as a candidate for universality) seem flawed or incomplete. First he rejects some philosophical stances as untenable while ignoring the existence of other divisions (intrinsic/extrinsic); secondly, the generally assumed inference to be taken from his writings - 'that no one Music is innately superior to any other'- seems too sweeping, controversial and eccentric to the middle ground of multi-cultural thinking that it raises more questions than he may think he has answered. But it is time to proceed to a further detailed appraisal of David Elliott's own philosophical stance which, it can be predicted from copious preparatory reading, is rich in positive elements and applicable ideology, and is eminently worthy of the world's appraisal. Since an evaluation has

[74] Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of Recognition'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992) 25. Quoted by Elliott in his paper (Ref. II P viii).

already been carried out (post MEND II) what it is intended to do at this post-MEND III stage is to extract the most persuasive arguments and to set these against both the negative aspects (as identified) that seem to be counterproductive and against the emerging findings of MEND itself.

It is a factor worth noting that Elliott is a former student of Bennett Reimer, a fact he acknowledged significantly when he said that 'I would not have been able to do what I did if Professor Reimer had not done what he did'. In this sense he casts himself in the rôle of taking 'the ideas of the past and weighing them'. His central premise is that music is a matter of actions and sounds, hardly a definition but an acceptable opening gambit. He also confirms his belief in the inseparability of product and process when considering music (or musicing as he calls the activity) and in the context (relevance to time and place) of what happens. Listening is described as a constructive cognitive activity but a covert one. He fashions a matrix of musicer, listener and context and claims that this set, or musical practice, represents what is universal in music. He goes on to map out the nature of knowledge involved in musical practices. He invokes the literature of cognitive science, cognitive psychology and philosophy of mind to define musical understanding as the possession of musicianship, which always includes listenership. It should also be noted that Elliott's personal readings seem, from his bibliography, to have been comprehensive and he is blessed with a command of language that is impressive, even if it sometimes leads him into ambiguity; there is sometimes a rather forbidding reconditeness.

Elliott places great importance on music-*making* as the central activity or practice, appending listenership to each practice (performing, improvising, composing, arranging, conducting) in a series of linked pairs. It is significant that listenership on its own, while it is not disavowed (it is dealt with comprehensively in Elliott's book, though less so in the MEND lecture, opening up the possibility for misunderstanding as to its importance), is played down; this is a stance that must, of course, be challenged. Elliott, in championing musicing (action) believes that we have been misled by Descartes into believing that thought is essentially verbal, and proceeds to enumerate five kinds of knowledge (thought in action) which are used in music as an activity, only one of which (formal) is verbally based. The first and most important is *procedural*, which may be informed by *formal* (verbal) knowledge but goes far beyond it. The writer has to comment that he finds Elliott's downgrading of knowledge-base in favour of action knowledge, without a context (or by using an arguably spurious one - skier/surgeon) is less than convincing; he has a point but it is too facile. The other kinds of knowledge that Elliott enumerates are *informal* (drawn from experience) *impressionistic* (or intuitive) and *supervisory*. Although these are, as Elliott himself admits, artificially separated for consideration, it is arguable that they might all be classified as being experience-determined but are a plausible set, however theoretical in concept, as useful in musical activity (and Elliott convincingly presents them so). What is difficult to reconcile is why he is so insistent that the listening process can virtually never be separable from the musicing activities themselves (although there is grudging reference later on, based on a quotation from Gardner, to having the rest of one's life to listen, whereas the younger years should be given over to the overt 'skills'). It is relevant to record here that, when asked about the need for skill acquisition to advance in performing, Dr Elliott remarked that 'skill is not a word in his vocabulary'. This is a crucial consideration in the final analysis of Elliott's position. He seems reluctant to accept that a performance-based curriculum cannot ignore the time demands of skill-acquisition if it is to operate at the kind of levels that are occasionally very explicit in the Elliott literature.

Elliott goes on to stress the importance of valuing and judgement (see above). 'There are no criteria that apply to all musical practices'; so says Elliott. As already stated, an implied inability to judge across musical practices would be the single greatest inhibitor to the progress of multiculturalism. And it calls into question the sincerity in following his advice that 'engaged with excellent musical works within musical practices, we have an educational responsibility to teach as many musical practices as reasonable'. How do we decide on the excellence of musical works if 'there are no criteria that apply to all musical practices', unless we take it by prescription and on trust from culture bearers; and Elliott is not enthusiastic about prescription, always favouring the independent judgement of teachers (see *Music Matters* p 246). Elliott tells us to make, in curriculum building, 'a very careful

choice of musical practices and then find the best examples of those practices and develop musicianship in relation to that. 'Music education is the development of musicianship in balanced relation to excellent musical works'. The advice is sound but the method is compromised. And there is another practical contradiction implied in his suggestion that ' if your time [as a teacher] is short, music education should dominantly be involved in performing, which always involves listening. . . .[If] we want to help create . . . excellent listeners . . . do it . . .[D]ominantly through making, through action, and then through performing, because in that situation you can get a lot done in terms of targeting intention.' To develop musicianship through performing must assume the acquisition of a certain level of technical competence, which in itself is a slow and time-consuming process. The writer has genuine difficulty with this piece of unguarded advice also.

In the hard-copy (formal) version of Elliott's paper there is a great deal of further valuable information which, though not all (in the writer's view) consistently argued, is applicable to the Irish context. Fundamentally he is presenting a philosophy which he defines as 'a critically reasoned set of beliefs about the nature and value of music education', with the rider that 'of course, no philosophy can be perfectly applicable to all practical situations.' The general principles of any philosophy must be queried 'in relation to national, local and daily concerns'. This is to stress the contextuality of philosophy, a criterion which will later severely test the Elliott version. And Elliott himself is the strongest advocate of this bringing to bear of critical intelligence by evoking 'judgement and not rote obedience' (Entwistle 1982).

According to Elliott, music, by definition, is intentional human action. 'Fundamentally music is something that people do'. Again Elliott defines the practice as comprising a doer, a product, the activity and a context. In fairness to Elliott note the inclusion of both product and process in the set, as this was subsequently challenged in one of the peer group reviews, as one of Elliott's omissions. Furthermore he also stresses the importance of listening as a force which binds musicers, musicing and musical products together. The interlocking pair of intentional human actions - making and listening - he calls a musical practice; there are thousands of Musics, or musical practices, each with a specific style. The practitioners of a Music, classified at competent, proficient and expert levels (interesting that there is no mention of a lower category of performing [beginner] at this stage), construct, transform, judge and interpret the emotional expressiveness - and so on. Elliott is punctilious in defining listening as cognition (minding) which processes "information" that arises in consciousness through interactions between, (i) our powers of attention, cognition, emotion, intention and memory, and (ii) the artistically created aural patterns we call a musical work. At this juncture in the paper, all (with the exceptions noted) is unexceptionable and succinctly laid out. It is in the process by which these actions (performing and listening) are carried out that Elliott begins to break new ground and to attract criticism.

Up to this point he is stressing the overt and covert construction characteristic of making and listening to music, the expression and impression of musical relationships. Again, he stresses that 'there's a direct and intimate relationship between music making and music listening'; this is also less than fairly conceded by his critics. It is only when he posits the inseparability of the two 'actions' (in other words when the action of listening ought not to be combined with the action of making by a different agent) that the theory becomes problematic for some, understandably so. This appears in the illogical jump by which Elliott claims that 'the proof of my musicianship lies in the quality of my music making. . . . to understand and assess that quality my evaluators (and other listeners) must possess a reasonable level of procedural competency in music performing themselves.' [75] This pre-justification for performing (composing *et al*) as the only means towards the acquisition of musicianship and listening skills is immediately challengeable on the grounds that the overwhelming majority of human

[75] There is an interesting endorsement of this in Aristotle's Politics Bk. VIII 13339b; 5-10. 'Why cannot we attain true pleasure and form a correct judgement from hearing others, like the Lacedaemonians? - for they, without learning music, nevertheless can correctly judge, as they say, of good and bad melodies. . . .why should we learn ourselves instead of enjoying the performances of others.' Ancient wisdom - but still arguable as to its Epicurean propriety.

beings are non-performers and presumably some (or many) of them are capable of listening and of judging very intelligently indeed. That is not to say that competence in performance will not assist and enhance their listening, but mandatory performance for all learners seems a rather drastic *modus operandi* to propose.

Elliott goes on, in this second document, to present again his five forms of knowledge - procedural, formal, informal, impressionistic and supervisory. In relation to informal knowledge there seems to be a suggestion that it cannot be taught (though this is later denied). 'Music making and music listening are not simple matters of "habits, behaviours, routines and skills" . . . and cannot be reduced to verifiable methods that always work and that can always be expressed in words. . . . The effectiveness of musicianship hinges on the critical selection and deployment of all forms of musical knowing'.[76] It thus seems that as many as four out of five of these knowings are empirically-based (this may very well be the strength of Elliott's proposals, in his own estimation). When it comes to formal knowledge, which of course he must include, Elliott's earlier concern to deconstruct if not to demolish Reimer's aesthetic education model is scarcely concealed when he so openly declares that 'music curriculum development ought not to take its direction from verbal concepts, not from so-called "aesthetic qualities", and not from recordings." This *bête noire* obsession with MEAE frequently succeeds in destabilizing Elliott's logic. And this leads also to the putative aberration of Elliott's assertion that 'no musical practice or music-culture is innately better than any other'; this is clearly a question of informed judgement (which is possible) and is neither true nor false in relation to any pair of cultures, in the abstract. While Elliott's very logical, though not original, advice about choosing musical practices in education that conform, at first, to student's "local" musical culture (see Shehan Campbell –Ref. III P v and McCarthy – Ref. III P vii) he is not correct in assuming that for Irish children this would necessarily always include traditional music.[77]

One must sympathize also with Elliott in his reference to time constraints in the curriculum while simultaneously recommending that '"music education" should be concerned with MUSIC in the broad sense (as opposed to just, say, one or two western "art music" practices, or just jazz practices and so on)'. It is admirable that he eventually comes down on the side of limitation. 'In short, musical breadth is not necessarily a virtue. Accordingly, when time and resources are limited, this praxial philosophy supports an emphasis on musical depth over breadth'. But he should not be so (frankly) astonished to hear an Irish music educator hesitate about the central (and rightful) place of Irish traditional music practices in Irish music education.

One gets the distinct impression from Elliott's incontinent attack on aesthetic education that he believes that to leave it with any vestige of credibility would threaten his own; and Reimer's provoked retaliation in his review of Elliott's book, *Music Matters*, is similarly barbed, unnecessarily diminishing *its* dependability. It appears that each has felt the tip of the other's weaponry. It is difficult to resist a negative reaction to both as read. To suggest pejoratively that listening to recordings is considered to be the proper focus for general music programmes is overstating the MEAE case, as if there is no intrinsic pleasure to be derived from listening as an activity. This is just an unacceptable premise and is an insult to the skills of teachers who may use that mode of listening as part of their teaching schemes. It must be remembered, as has already been copiously discussed, that the MEAE system was responding to a situation which had to be assumed to have been already totally denuded of those with any interest in performing. It is true that perhaps it should have attempted to change that situation (as the National Standards are now trying to do) but the power of tradition and the jealous guardianship of state-to-state autonomy in the US would have been formidable obstacles to have challenged with a subject so precarious in its prospects at the time, as the

[76] The works of Susanne Langer (*Feeling and Form, Philosophy in a New Key, et al*) and R. G. Collingwood (*Principles of Art*) engage this issue of the difference between craft and art in the context of selection.

[77] In fact, in Ireland, not surprisingly, the hierarchy in this respect might show a dominance of western popular styles followed, as poor contenders, by Irish traditional music and western art music. This, of course is one of the problems of contemporary music education - the question of the relevance of educational repertoire to life as lived by the majority.

history (see Straub – Ref. II P v and Lehman – Ref. III P iii) copiously illustrates. Elliott makes no mention of or allowance for this severely restricting dilemma. And the ineluctable implication of his quotation from Peter Kivy that 'to have Beethoven's Third Symphony in one's blood and bones" one must participate in the performance as a proof that 'to play is a necessary part of musical literacy' is to place the pleasure forever beyond virtually 100% of the population; this is intolerably élitist, if not just ridiculous and unacceptable. *Tout court*, both Reimer and Elliott (but the latter is really more culpable) should realize that to convince their peers they will not advance their philosophies one whit by this kind of banal hyperbolic overstatement or quotation out of context.

Elliott's admirably logical progress from the nature of music, musicianship and knowledge, and musical practices - to values and aims, has a convincing sequence. He suggests that approaches to music education based on his praxial philosophy, as prescriptively excluding other approaches (especially that of having any truck with the principles of MEAE) produce the "life values" of self-growth, self-knowledge, enjoyment (or optimal experience) and self-esteem. This is because the two necessary conditions exist: (i) multidimensional cognitive -affective challenges (i.e. musical works) and (ii) the knowledge (i.e. musicianship) required to meet these challenges. His failure to mention the psychomotor element is, in the writer's view significant. His explanation of how the matching of musical knowledge to musical challenge can produce musical enjoyment and "flow" (and this is well illustrated in his book - see p 132) is very convincing and attractive, if it did not have this hidden agenda of exclusivity about it. The end of this section (Values and Aims) is also laudably inexorable in the way it leads to ideas of performing (the writer nevertheless feels that the parenthetical nature of listening is problematic) propelling upwards to higher levels of complexity, to preserving a sense of community and self-identity and to an important form of multicultural education. The writer has two concerns here. There is reference to Gardner's advice as to the importance of 'continuing involvement in the arts as reflective practitioners. There will be time enough in university, and beyond, for more 'distanced' forms of artistic appreciation to become dominant'. And Elliott himself adds 'that students have the rest of their lives to sit quietly and listen to recordings after schooling is over'. It appears that the importance of listening alone is not in question but it is ostracized (to use Harry White's reproachful word) because of its distorted connection to a MEAE mentality, quite apart from the facile abdication that is implied - that listening alone need not be taught. And Csikszentmihalyi (admired and regularly quoted by Elliott) downgrades listening on the grounds of its being insufficiently challenging and complex in relation to performing and interpreting – surely, in itself, a very judgemental appraisal of how the majority of listeners function, and very unflattering to the true nature of informed listening.

The above stances are bold in statement but are potentially very vulnerable as conscious exclusions. The problem with listening may be that it is not taught well, but how much more could this be problematic in the more complex situation of teaching combined performing and listening (a notoriously demanding task for both teacher and learner - a phenomenon in which the writer has had copious experience . . . . and the problem is even severe with the very talented). The concern here is that Elliott's philosophy in action, viewed at this culminatory stage of his presentation, seems to presuppose music school students and not general music students, judging by the inferred complexities of the activities involved and, especially, the time constraints. When we find reference to a music curriculum for Ireland including broadly based practices reflective of our pluralism; engaging in the multidimensional nature of MUSIC as a reflective, artistic and social practice; production (performance) at the centre of the artistic experience; the absorption of musicianship at five levels of knowledge (all of which can and should be taught and learned, according to Elliott); *comprehensive* understandings of the musical works being interpreted and performed and/or improvised; formulating musical expressions of emotions, musical representations of people, places and things, and musical expressions of cultural-ideological meanings; self-examination and the personal reconstruction of one's relationships assumptions and preferences . . . this agenda, while admirably idealistic, seems out of touch with what Irish (and I suspect many other) educators would see as feasible in the time available. Yet the idealism in Elliott's vision is attractive. Were there not constant evidence of a 'queen bee' attitude to listening alone as an activity to be cultivated and duly honoured without in any way threatening the importance of performance, the philosophy would be

commendable in circumstances where the time to match musicianship and challenges at *technical* levels could also be made available. But perhaps the idea of teaching through action is so deeply implanted as the cornerstone of Elliott's philosophy that it really is intractable and cannot compromise.

Reading the conclusion (summary) alone of David Elliott's paper (*Music Education, Music Performance, and the Irish Music Educator*) gives a very clear view of his obvious idealism; few of the objections that arise come easily to mind. The aims of self-growth, self knowledge and musical enjoyment leading to self esteem and self identity are not just unexceptionable but are highly desirable end products of music education. The idea of close approximations to real musical practices, if they were expanded to include listening alone as another fully constituted *action* responding to the five kinds of knowledge, could not be but be ideal for optimum teaching and learning experiences. Musicianship as the embodiment of the five ways of knowing and as capable of objective acquisition - and applicable to all - is also an idealistic concept that is worthy of support. The slogan that 'the best music curriculum for the best students is the best curriculum for all students' is worthy of approval provided the learning situation has the flexibility to accommodate different levels of sophistication in balancing musicianship to musical challenges. But . . . . the separation of performing and non-performing streams, the time honoured reality of American high school music education is an equally worthy and pragmatic approach; volitional specialization as against general study are options that need not negate Elliott's ideas of the best curriculum. The development of 'the capacity in students to adopt different stances toward a work, among them the stances of audience member, critic, performer and maker' is idealistic too but it seems that the Elliott (and Gardner) philosophy is not taking a literal reading of its own advice. And the implication that works can only be absorbed through a student's involvement in the actual performance (which must be minimal, and restricted in any case by definition to one of the many streams in, say, an orchestral work - and by technical shortcomings as well) is not only idealistic to the point of being ridiculous but is not even true to the criterion of 'as close an approximation of real musical practices' which the multi-billion music industry evidences in the sale of CDs which are bought typically for the joy of non-participative listening. The disclaimer - 'in support of artistic listening-in-context, carefully selected recordings are introduced parenthetically: in direct relation to the musical practices the students are being introduced into. Similarly, formal musical knowledge is filtered into the continuous stream of authentic music making and listening as needed' is an amusing example of how Elliott regularly feels himself obliged to placate, or even to exorcise, the ghost of MEAE which benignly stalks him. The training of young musicians as apprentice musical practitioners is good, as is the standard teaching practice of directing listening to the music being made by students themselves provided this is done within the discipline and moderation of a balanced curriculum, hardly served by an almost exclusive involvement in performing (or any of Elliott's other parenthetical activities), which provides only for a severely limited *repertoire* of listening; admirable though those experiences are in context they are not sufficient.

The biggest problem in the application of Elliott's philosophy is the way he upturns the idea of music specialism which, whatever about the theory of how the American system is working, is certainly dear to the heart of the American public as an exclusively performance-centred concept. And balance this against Harry White's reference to 'the small measure of general music education that is available to Irish children'. It appears that Elliott would replace these input extremes with a master race of expert teachers; and his idealism again must be admired.

> 'The competent music educator requires two forms of knowledge: musicianship and educatorship. One without the other is insufficient. To teach music effectively, a teacher must possess, embody and exemplify musicianship. This is how children develop musicianship themselves; not through telling, but through their actions, transactions and interactions with musically proficient and expert teachers: "it is imperative to have a cadre of teachers who themselves 'embody' the knowledge that they are expected to teach." (Gardner). In other words, musical standards in teachers beget musical standards in students. . . . novice music teachers require music education professors who can model musicianship and educatorship through their own vivid examples'

In Ireland this ideal is negated by the student-centred system in primary schools which could not accommodate a performance-centred curriculum (of the Elliott intensity) at present. And secondary education, while it is changing, is currently embroiled in a low quality performance mode which is a far cry from the idealism of Elliott, even if it were to parallel or shadow it. In other words the regenerative quality of the education procedures, as envisaged by Elliott, are just not in place. In the US it is to be feared that the drastic changes in attitudes and mentality which would bring both academic teachers and practitioners into line with the musicianship approach of Elliott, highly desirable as much of it is in principle, are still to be negotiated.

David Elliott's *Music Matters* and the material generated from it break new ground in music education philosophy. His thoughts are presented in language that is compelling for those who take the time to immerse themselves in its complexity. The thrust of his arguments has been blunted severely (and subconsciously almost called into question) by an approach which seeks to discredit, if not to demolish, much earlier highly respected scholarship - and not just that of Bennett Reimer. This has tended not only to produce a secondary corpus of parenthetical method (the listening programme copiously discussed above is an example) which grudgingly acknowledges the discounted value of what he rejects, but to make him, himself, particularly sensitive to criticism (of which he has had his share) evidenced by his frequent claims that he is being misunderstood. Yet the philosophy is fresh, original and provocative; but as yet it lacks a successful track record. Elliott's philosophy is modern in that it poses, directly or by inference, many if not most of the questions by which contemporary music education is beset:

1. Is it high time to superannuate the exquisite theories of the Absolute Expressionists and the aesthetic ideal as failing to touch the majority in their engagement with music of all kinds? Is music as product finally to be recognized as only a part, albeit an important one, in the totality of musical discourse?

2. How are music educators going to deal at last with the nature of performance and how are they going to reconcile the notion within the constraints of curricular time and skill acquisition? The question is raised by Elliott's own theory of the centrality of performance (action) in education. How are the separate needs of professional and amateur performance to be met in music education?

3. Are the processes of music-making unique as forms of knowledge (and cognitive skill) and how does this impinge on the importance of music in the curriculum?

4. How are music educators to cope with the promise of multiculturalism - again within the constraints of curricular time? How is multiculturalism to be defined? Is the claim of the equality of all Musics sustainable and by what definition? How is the position of western art music to be sustained democratically in education without blunting the benefits of its pedagogical content and methodology through partial neglect? How is the high/mass culture dichotomy to be broken down in education and how can formal education bridge the gap and relate more effectively to the community?

5. How are the standards of valuing and judgement to be set in the future? Does musical taste have a legitimate place in curricular development?

6. How is the function of listening to be defined in modern music education?

7. How will the nature of and the training for music educatorship change with new approaches?

The writer's view is that Elliott's broadside into a complacent music education philosophical field will generate a great deal of new thinking and may yet rescue the profession out of the doldrums of its chronic failures and galvanize it into an action that will find new solutions to ongoing problems. They

may not be always congruent with Elliott's current ideas, but his intrepid interventions will play no small part in a new dispensation which reflects the ideals of a new millennium.

The Elliott book, *Music Matters*, has been extensively reviewed. The following is a sample of views to give a flavour as to how it was greeted by the profession.

Albert Le Blanc, Professor of Music, Michigan State University.

This review is rather mild and non-committal, and does not get involved in any of the contentious areas of Elliott's philosophical attacks except to say that they take issue with mainstream philosophy supporting music education as aesthetic education (MEAE). Le Blanc welcomes Elliott's intervention but joins other critics in drawing discreetly critical attention to Elliott's over-erudite style. Agreeing with Sarrazin (see below), Le Blanc sees Elliott's book as stimulating discussion well into the future; if it succeeds in doing this it will have served a very useful purpose indeed if only in sounding the challenge that 'an uncritical philosopher is no philosopher at all'

Eleanor Stubley, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Stubley draws attention to Elliott's astuteness in placing performance at the centre of music, thereby celebrating both the inherent action and cultural context. It is interesting that Stubley isolates one very revealing statement of Elliott as central to his philosophy: "The most powerful drive in the ascent of man [*sic*, writes Stubley] is his pleasure in his own skill. He loves to do what he does well and, having done it well, he loves to do it better" (*Music Matters* 113) Performance is seen as an opportunity to exercise and express one's musical individuality. This aspect of performance is, of course, more suitably situated in the professional stream of performance training, which could hardly be seen as the main concern of Elliott's philosophy, which really is centred in the classroom concept. Stubley is uncritical of Elliott's insistence on performance as the central thrust of music education and does not take issue with it in terms of raising some of the objections which it has evinced. She does, however, identify the implications for teacher training and the need to initiate change so that the philosophy in practice can proceed from a relevantly trained teaching cohort. Stubley charitably refers to Elliott's *combative* tone and attributes it to a desire to spur the profession into a realization that the aesthetic idea must be replaced by ideas which are more profoundly plural; this is perhaps to misunderstand the veritable plurality encapsulated in the now fashionably much-maligned aesthetic idea (this aspect is dealt with in the Rationalization under Music as Art and in the Arts Programme (Section 19.7.7). She also, somewhat uncomfortably for Elliott, refers to his position, on diversity of practices, being 'defensible in that depth in musical engagement in any practice comes only with time and repeated effort' - the very point that the writer raised with Elliott, in Fort Worth (Texas) in 1995, on the question of skill acquisition. The criticism of Elliott's weakness in not fully taking into account the regulative idea/open-ness of musical works by reference to Lydia Goehr's ground-breaking essay, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* is too esoteric to be meaningful. Stubley acknowledges Elliott's concern with self-growth as an end product of involvement with music but feels that he serves the idea no more effectively than the aesthetic lobby, and finds that his philosophy - as a set of reasoned arguments pertaining to the nature and value of a particular human practice - 'reduces the richness of individual experience within a practice to a few shared thought processes'. She takes serious issue with Elliott's 'circular definitions and vocabulary inconsistencies'; within this looseness of definition Stubley singles out *performance* as particularly poorly served in being held to a single sense. Again this review says nothing particularly constructive about Elliott's philosophy beyond observing (and Elliott himself has stressed this sense) that '*Music Matters* is a beginning, not an end'

Natalie Sarrazin, University of Maryland, College Park.

This short review is extremely succinct, and, using an ethnomusicological lens, extracts much of the essence of Elliott's book, taking a dominantly multicultural route to highlight strengths and weaknesses. The review impresses as very detached, fair, perceptive and scholarly. Dr Sarrazin welcomes Elliott's attempt to push ethnomusicological tenets to the very core of music education's identity. She does, however, take serious issue with Elliott's energetic dismembering of the philosophy of aesthetic perception and experience (response?) as a redundant device in promoting his own ideas. She finds 'the time and energy spent on the rejection of previous philosophies quite superfluous' claiming that 'criticisms in the first section with continued negativity throughout the book somewhat detract from his otherwise intriguing and provocative perspectives'

Sarrazin perceptively picks up on essences - Elliott's deprioritization of verbal propositional knowledge in favour of procedural or skill (*sic*) knowledge in the sense that the 'procedural essence of musicianship is epistemologically prior to verbal conceptualization' - the contextual over the conceptual approach to the nature and significance of music. In this latter regard the elaborate section of *Music Matters* (see Chapter 10, and pp 242-246 in particular) is accurately targeted, dealing as it does with the deconstruction of the Tylerian model of music as product and the structure-of-discipline approach. Sarrazin also makes the important correlation that Elliott's epistemological claims (music as a unique way of knowing, which, of course, is not a new idea) are well suited for acceptance in public educational settings.

While Sarrazin astutely recognizes the drift of Elliott's argument that in approaching music teaching as an exercise in understanding, a natural transition into multicultural applications is facilitated, she detects the flaw in asking how multiple 'close approximations of real musical practices', demanded by Elliott, can be provided by teachers themselves not steeped in those musical practices. And she asks the very pertinent question as to what Elliott proposes as a substitute for the residual aesthetic which is endemic in all cultural evaluations; this lacuna is treated at length in the Reimer/Elliott section (18.2 Contextual Philosophy)

Finally Dr Sarrazin, in a departure from the more scholarly-specific offerings of her colleagues here reviewed, asks the very pertinent and practical question as to how such a philosophy as Elliott's can be successfully launched in a coterie and partisan field where the self-interest of the commercial promotion of well established method has a vested interest in the *status quo*. David Elliott may well take from and read approval into Dr Sarrazin's neutral statement that his philosophy, in challenging existing beliefs, proposes 'a radical course change to a completely new direction'. The writer agrees with Sarrazin in believing that *Music Matters* is likely to dominate the philosophy of music education for the next thirty years and believes that the book will be a positive catalyst for change.

Jere T. Humphreys, Arizona State University

Reviewing the Elliott book from a very broad base of music education issues Dr Humphreys's critique is not only the most positive in Elliott's favour but the least personally idiosyncratic that the writer has had sight of. He notes at the very beginning a truth that both Reimer and Elliott subscribe to in principle, and that is the evolutionary nature of philosophy. As C.D. Burns has so succinctly put it, 'philosophers in every age have attempted to give an account of as much experience as they could. . . . all great philosophers have allowed for more than they could explain and have therefore, signed beforehand, if not dated, the death warrant of their philosophies' (C.D Burns, *The Sense of the Horizon*, quoted in Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key*, 5). Humphreys, in hailing Music Matters as a philosophical advance on MEAE, nevertheless belongs to the cadre of sceptics who believe that the idea of a single, all encompassing (universal) philosophy is probably futile. And indeed, although Reimer (in his 1996 position) and Elliott do make the intrepid attempt, this report has failed to find a totally convincing account in either. Unflatteringly to Elliott, Humphreys finds that his new philosophy 'perpetuates the traditional, conservative, pragmatic approach'. Humphreys is the

first reviewer to ground this in Elliott's own admission that his philosphy generally addresses formal intentional music education focusing on 'educational principles and procedures that are deliberately designed and formally instituted in school settings to enable and promote musical understanding'.[78] And here Dr Humphreys makes his own valuable contribution to philosophy, which is outstandingly apropos but continues to puzzle music educators. "Might not music learning and teaching be better if philosophy (and history) were to address the informal, non-intentional modes of music education . . .?' 'The profession's intentional efforts to improve the nation's musical tastes, then and now, have been singularly unsuccessful. Yet music education, both formal and informal, flourished then and continues to do so. Might not the profession's stated goals, and, yes, its philosophies, bear some blame for these perceived failures'.[79] And he goes on to cite the enormous contribution made to informal (unconscious or subconscious) music education by advances in technology which have brought so much music within easy access, and notably in a listening only mode ('not performing, conducting, or composing as Elliott proposes').

Dr Humphreys is quick to point out that Elliott's own writings partially cast him in the mould of MEAE but finds the thread of difference in Elliott's more ready acceptance of the extrinsic benefits of music education, an approach that has gained ground with the writings of the functionalists (Mason, Fowler, Merriam) and is not attributable only to Elliott. This is perceptive reviewing. "Why should music education philosophy take up only musical values, when the practice of music education clearly produces favourable non-musical outcomes?' and so on. The writer has asked this very question. 'Music may just amount to entertainment, no mean aim; the pleasure may be intellectually based; it can offer a simple sense of achievement - a very valid criterion also, if artistically questionable *per se*; music can be cathartic, offering the harmless discharge of emotion over a wide range of moods; it can be an aesthetic experience and in an intrinsic way which offers special benefits in education. And indeed who can lawfully invalidate any of these levels of enjoyment? This too is an important consideration in performance education, simply because the vast majority who perform with tolerable competence are blissfully unaware of the so-called aesthetics of what they enjoy. (Music in Ireland 1848-1998: Thomas Davis Lectures. ed. Richard Pine, [Cork, Ireland, Mercier Press, 1998, 92]) Elliott's manifesto is extracted, as it has been by several others of his reviewers, as 'the primary values of music education are the primary values of MUSIC: self-growth, self-knowledge, and optimal experience'. Although it is perhaps a little unfair, *en route*, to denigrate western culture as if it really does set up the notion of art objects (presumably in the western tradition) to be valued and revered in isolation from their cultural contexts (Harry White would have much to contribute to this argument), Humphreys convincingly singles out Elliott as having had the courage, not only, once and for all, to have called into question the tenets of the original MEAE (now 30 years old), but to have provided an alternative for consideration, notably based on ways of knowing and acting which largely depart from the verbal-formal model. He also praises Elliott's honesty in proposing musical discourse as leading to self-growth, self-knowledge and self-esteem without claiming that these benefits accrue only to the musical mode. Elliott's point that music is unique over other activities (poetry reading?) in its inwardness is, of course, not an Elliott original either, but it does add to the case that he makes for a new approach to teaching the subject which celebrates its *sui generis* qualities as much as it admits the extrinsic as valid contributors to its summative benefits in human discourse. Humphreys shares Sarrazin's opinion that *Music Matters* will become a paradigm and a sounding board for the testing of philosophical ideas well into the future and is more hopeful than she that the new philosphy of Elliott can successfully breach the defences of the commercially-conscious music education industry in North America.

David Aspin, in The International Journal of Music Education, Number 27, May 1996, pp 51-56.

[78] David J. Elliott, *Music Matters*, p313, note 2.
[79] Allen P Britton, *Music Education: An American Specialty*, in *One Hundred years of Music in America*, ed. Paul Henry Lang (New York: G. Schirmer, 1961), 214

[80]The review of David Elliott's book by David Aspin (1996) is significant as being the official critique of the International Society for Music Education[81]; it therefore represents, in a sense, how the book was introduced to the international lobby and to its wide circle of readers. The review is erudite, scholarly, ethical and informed, if a little formidably abstruse at times. Aspin is not slow to offer suggestions as to how Elliott might have avoided internal contradictions. But the solutions (Aspin's) offered, drawing on Schon and Wittgenstein, while suited to their purpose of exposing these contradictions, are even more recondite than those proposed in *Music Matters*, incurring their own fate of failing for want of immediacy and reader-friendliness. It is imperative that a philosophy of music education, to guarantee for itself a readership, and consequentially a hoped-for acceptability, ought to be couched in terms that are readily understandable and appealing.

Although this critique is consciously selective, but scrupulously professional, in what it chooses to highlight, it nevertheless provides an authentic flavour of Elliott's intentions, and praises what it can with some generosity; but it also homes in unapologetically on what it sees as the two basic weaknesses in the case made for music education in *Music Matters*. These, centring on the dominance of performance as method (Reamer is, thus, not the only reviewer to take this meaning), and on the proffered innate equality of all music cultures, have already been identified in the MEND Report as especially vulnerable, but an attempt will eventually be made to rationalize and to bring the Elliott case as far as possible into alignment and context.

At the beginning, Aspin's précis of Elliott's view of music is masterful and catches much of the nuance of the book; as such it seems accurate and unexceptionable, and although it is couched in generally neutral terms it nevertheless contains more than a hint of approval.[82] And Aspin also impartially draws interesting basic information from the text which is denied by Reimer in his review (*qv*). He lists the Gardnerian[83] forms of knowing (procedural, formal, informal, impressionistic and supervisory) that Elliott adduces as quintessential to musicianship, which in turn controls the activity of music-making. Aspin notes that these same faculties guide the covert construction of relationships and meanings that constitute effective listening. He therefore independently confirms Elliott's insistence that listening to and making music are but two sides of the same coin; but he does this without going so far as to accept that they are ideally inseparable, and virtually mutually inclusive, at all times, a stance that he attacks with fervour further on. But he also draws attention to Elliott's view that 'making and listening to music always involves (*sic*) cultural-ideological information of some kind. . . . Works of music are multi-dimensional "thought generators"'. It is reassuring to have his observation that the cognitive theory of music is being fortified. Another key benefit of music-making (which, according to Elliott, and very plausibly, occurs when there is a balance between musicianship and the cognitive challenge of the music-making itself) is perceptively noted: the fundamental values of self-knowledge (or constructive knowledge), musical enjoyment (or 'flow') and self-esteem accrue by bringing order to consciousness. This view is challenged by Bennett Reimer as disavowing the intrinsicality of music as a generator of *sui generis* experience.

---

[80] Permission has been sought, and is awaited, for the inclusion of this important review in the Appendices of MEND

[81] *Music Matters* is reviewed by David Aspin in the International Journal of Music Education, Number 27, May 1996, pp 51-56.

[82] To condense the précis still more it defines music as 'a particular human practice that is situated within the confines of the particular activities, conventions and traditions of groups of people, communities and societies, whose interests can be located in a context of time, place and culture. . . . Musical works result from human actions informed by histories and standards of musical practice, with structural properties reflecting the practitioners and theorists who work at particular times in the history of their music cultures. Musical works are thoroughly artistic-cultural constructions. Music is the multifarious human practice of making diverse kinds of music for different kinds of listeners.

[83] Elliott draws heavily on the writings (from 1985 onwards) of Howard Gardner to support his theory of multiple intelligences. See in particular *Reflections on Multiple Intlligences: Myths and Messages*. Phi Delta Kappa, 77(3), 200-209 (1995), for a contemporaneous account.

The exposition is promising and not, in any sense, unflattering to Elliott. And it must be said that, as an extended précis of a significant number of the book's salient philosophical points it augurs well. But it is not clear whether Aspin is convinced that Elliott's stance, thus far articulated, actually does have a novelty (a loaded word!) and originality that convincingly sets it against 'Music Education as Aesthetic Education' (MEAE) in the form of a real alternative with a substantive difference. And it would have been surprising if Elliott's invective against Bennett Reimer had not been taken up at this point. It is reassuring that Aspin, at this juncture, joins the legion of music educators who feel that Elliott's 'demonizing of Reimer threatens to go past the point of acceptable scholarly difference of opinion' and inevitably results in a psychological weakening of his arguments.

Aspin begins his complaints with a reference to the prose style, which he judges to be 'highly articulate but extremely dense' and to the format, which he found to be a 'particular struggle'. He queries whether the target audience, exemplified as teachers on an in-service course or, perhaps, undergraduates over a semester or year, may not find 'the extremely high level of linguistic articulation . . . daunting, though potentially highly educative'. And he takes issue with the unnecessary use of neologism - *ad tedium*. In particular he singles out the word praxial (from praxis) for which he suggests the simple substitution - practical; in doing this he gratuitously credits Elliott with the possible intention of associating himself with the Aristotelian notion of praxis as 'thought-impregnated action'. But he decides that Elliott's use of the word is tiresome and ambiguous. [It should be mentioned that in all of the MEND analysis the words - practical and praxial - are assumed to be simply interchangeable.] But before beginning his critique proper, and in anticipation of what it contains and of the eventual verdict that 'the book ultimately falls down', Aspin's statement that 'there is no doubt that there is a great deal of good in this book' seems gratuitously to damn with faint praise. But he accurately pinpoints Elliott's case for multiculturalism and his chapter on creativity as representing the strongest and most convincing material in his book.

In the end Aspin identifies two aspects (indeed one might say the cornerstones) of Elliott's philosophy as particularly intractable and vulnerable; these elements - the dominance of performance as method and the claim that 'no musical practice is inherently better than any other' - have similarly been targeted in the MEND Report. And they are so fundamentally significant as potentially to destabilize almost all contemporary philosophical leanings in music education and to defy accommodation within them, unless the philosophies themselves are subjected to comparative analysis (on the basis that they are currently being misinterpreted *vis-à-vis* one another; this applies especially to Elliott) with a view to eventual rationalization and compatibility. Aspin describes Elliott's proposal as an apprenticeship model - and even worse, dating back to a long-discarded routine of the nineteenth century - and claims that 'teaching is a much more complex series of transactions and interactions than are intimated by the trade/craft model of learning implicit in seeing it as a kind if apprenticeship'. If Aspin had left it at that it would have sufficed as a magisterial rebuttal of aphoristic brevity. But in enlarging on his verdict he seems less than fair to Elliott. It would be difficult to ascribe to Elliott the idea of an apprenticeship model with relatively closed outcomes, lacking *en route* the use of collaborative learning, teamwork skills and clear communication. Aspin also implies that Elliott envisages a one-to-one mode which he (Aspin) sees as unsuitable for schools, whereas MEND argues, but only in partial agreement with Aspin, that the one-to-one is indeed necessary for proficient performance but impracticable in schools, and because of that Elliott's performance aspiration must also fail, simply because he seems to imply that the one-to-one method is unnecessary; there is a subtle difference in outlook here. Aspin has his finger on the pulse of educational aims when he says that 'the whole point of education relates to very much more than actual practice: it relates to thoughts, feelings, emotions, judgements, sensitivities and virtues that are above and beyond the merely efficient and effective'. The problem with Elliott is not that he would disagree with Aspin on this issue. The dilemma for all educators is how most effectively to deliver on Aspin's admirable definition; it appears that in his analysis he has misunderstood, somewhat, Elliott's ideas in relation to the promotion of performance. His instinctively negative reaction to the idea of performance as almost exclusively dominant in music education (especially in schools and in general music studies, if indeed this is truly Elliott's intention) is still significant, but the idea must be countered by other arguments to establish its invalidity.

Aspin has undoubtedly uncovered a fundamental weakness in relation not so much to the theory as to the practice of Elliott's philosophy. The difficulty with Elliott is that in his various apologias (see below for his rebuttal of Reimer's review and also his response to Harry White's paper [above]) he constantly claims to have been misunderstood. While this may very well be true, it is also an indictment of his own exegetic method in the exposition of his philosophy in the first place, if persistent misinterpretations of his line of argument occur; the blame cannot always be levelled at the reader. And Aspin's invocation of Wittgenstein and his description of music as a 'form of life' (compare Swanwick's similar invocation of Oakeshot in describing music as an ongoing involvement in a 'conversation' - Ref. III P iv), while philosophically fetching, takes us a step further than Elliott's search for 'flow' and self esteem, *inter alia*, and introduces such extrinsic ideas as 'respect for others and consideration of their interest'; these sociologically apt connections between music and lifelong education are a far cry from the immediate concerns of music teachers in today's schools, where such niceties in the concept of music's functions are arguably irrelevant (except in theory) to a subject so straitened for time in the dispensation of its own intrinsic benefits.

Aspin seems particularly irritated by Elliott's claim that 'there are no such things as musical practices that are inherently better than any other . . . he [Elliott] goes on at length about this'. He peremptorily rejects this claim, out of hand, as palpably wrong and proceeds to show why he believes that Elliott is hoist with his own petard. He does not attack the negation of a musical hierarchy as such, but attempts to refute Elliott's line of argument as essentially erroneous. As Aspin says, 'some forms of argument *are* better than others - they avoid fallacy and adopt consequential reasoning. . . . [Elliott] actually decides to employ a particular convention of logic and argument in order to get us to agree with his case. This implies that there are cases that can be put forward that are more powerful, plausible and convincing than others. Otherwise, if he really believes that there is no difference in principle between one form of argument and another, why does he go on at such great length trying to convince us that his 'praxial' philosophy is the one that we should accept. . . . Unfortunately, his espousal of a relativist[84] account of the cultural equality of musical practices militates against his achieving [his] end.' Aspin bases this last statement on his belief that Elliott, in spite of his claim that music, well made, produces 'flow' and 'enjoyment' and 'self-esteem' and 'self-knowledge', does not establish a conclusively compelling argument for the intrinsicality of what music offers in education. Here, at last Aspin declares his hand and, whether unconsciously or not, throws in his lot with Reimer who, on the contrary, through his aesthetic theory, *does* offer that unique quality that Aspin demands. But such a facile dismissal of Elliott in this instance is not entirely prudent. It is very plausible that he (Elliott), based on the universality of music as experience and as faculty, can afford to be consciously unconcerned that it might be vulnerable in educational take-up because it lacks intrinsicality and absolute uniqueness in all its facets. Elliott's brand of multiculturalism, praised for its definition by Aspin, drives a coach-and-four through the limited capability, in his perception, of the aesthetic idea to engage the curiosity, interest and support of the vast majority of listeners. His idea of universality encompasses and accommodates all kinds of open-ended engagement in musical activity for whatever reason, and to that extent he addresses, without necessarily solving, the dominant dilemma of current music education in its humanistic and sociological nuances. But if this approach, *inter alia*, leads Elliott to the conclusion that all musical practices are inherently of equal value there is a case to be answered and Aspin is still under pressure for a convincing rebuttal.

Aspin on Value and Judgement

Although Aspin's line of argument, in which he again invokes Wittgenstein, is not easily accessible without perseverance, he does present a convincing philosophical stance of his own in relation to the degree of certainty with which we may 'give our choices and decisions some stable criteria of objectivity. . . . Human nature and the real world furnish objective referents for distinguishing the value of one activity over another. . . . Some things are more in tune with our human nature than

[84] Relativism in this sense is the theory that knowledge and principles are relative and have no objective value.

others. . . . [and] music is more functional to what Elliott calls 'flow'. The fact is, then, that some things do provide us with canons of correctness that enable judgements of discrimination and superiority to be made [see the Elliott/White analysis above for a reference to Immanuel Kant's ideas on this topic – Section 18.1]. Elliott would appear to deny that such criteria exist in advancing his thesis about the equality of musical practices'. But there are other arguments advanced, against Elliott's claim, in this report (see the analysis of David Elliott's presentation Ref. II. P viii). Aspin is particularly at pains, as he himself admits, to rebut this claim. He refers to Elliott's tacit acceptance, by the very nature of his own universalistic claims and imperative force, that there are coercive conventions at work in all our discourse which are *a priori* evidence of our capability to judge, to discriminate and to value. Thus, claims Aspin, if Elliott is in favour of 'rational argument' as a superior means of bringing people to accept his view, he is caught in a contradiction if he denies others the application of the same method in discriminating between musical practices. It should be added here that the three point argument advanced by Elliott (see his rebuttal of Harry White's paper) is arguably naïve in failing to recognize that there are many multicultural musicians who have cross-cultural skills of discrimination and can pronounce with authority on the superiority of some musical practices over others, if they can put prejudice aside.

Aspin's critique is rewarding to study, even if, at times, it seems almost too arcane to be worth the effort. It is particularly significant that it is a bifurcated attack on the very foundations of Elliott's philosophy. Without an aggressively dominant performance programme and a multiculturalism that relies largely on the equality of musical practices (and Elliott is assumed to depend heavily on these two assumptions) the philosophy is dealt a serious body blow that could well invalidate it. And it is an interesting aside that David Elliott regards the professional responses to his book as 'mostly positive', including this one by David Aspin. Some of these reviews have been commented on in this report as being relevant to the wider enquiry of MEND. Certainly, apart from the opening section of Aspin's review, where he is merely laying out the terrain to be surveyed in a neutral but far from disapproving way, the overriding thrust of his criticism, as it develops and as herein analysed, is towards rejection of the philosophy as a model for music education. Aspin does, however, end on a note of optimism which encouragingly and interestingly echoes one of the main findings of MEND, referring to the need for a contextual philosophy of music education, which implies an eclecticism born of the thoughtful reflecions of practitioners carefully guided towards consensus. He generously commends Elliott's "new" philosophy as material to be read and taken as a serious contribution to an ongoing debate. The writer, as the most cursory examination of the MEND Report will reveal, also feels, and very much in agreement with Aspin, that *Music Matters*, which is described in the reading as "a bit of a drudge and really quite hard work', is a diligently argued, if regrettably a flawed, work, which merits comparative analysis beside the numerous works which Elliott seeks to set aside. This analysis should be applied particularly to *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970 rev 1989) by Elliott's *bête noire*, Bennett Reimer. As Aspin so succinctly puts it: 'In doing so, music teachers will be given more than adequate resources to develop a music philosophy of their own. And in wanting this for them, I suspect that both Elliott and I would share some common ground'

Apart from the very lengthy and detailed review by Bennett Reimer, and Elliott's rebuttal of that review in a quintessentially important document of even greater length[85], David Aspin's commentary is the most penetrating that the writer has seen; but, as stated, a cross-section of other reviews is also considered in this report.

The Reimer/Elliott Documentation (Review/Rebuttal) on *Music Matters*

[85] It is not surprising that Reimer and Elliott, being perceived as representing virtually polar positions on music education philosophy, should eventually have confronted one another on this issue in the arena of scholarly dialectic. These crucial but lengthy documents are discussed in this report (Section 18.1.2 Contextual Philosophy).

1. The Reimer Response to *David Elliott's "New" Philosophy of Music Education; Music for Performers Only*

2. The Elliott Rebuttal of Reimer's Response - *Continuing Matters: Myths, Realities, Rejoinders.*

In the field of contemporary writing on the philosophy of music education there is arguably no more significant pair of complementary papers than the two which are listed for review in the above heading. As has been mentioned, Bennett Reimer's classic - *A Philosophy of Music Education* - first published in 1970 (rev. 1989), has not just profoundly influenced more than a generation of music educators; there is validity in the claim that, as far as North America is concerned, there has been virtually no other, for a quarter of a century, of sufficient weight and concentration to rival it. But once one has penetrated beyond the arguably pretentious sub-title - *A* New *Philosophy of Music Education* - of David Elliott's 1995 book - *Music Matters* - one realizes, from its length and the elaborate treatment of the subject matter alone, that here is a serious challenge. *New* is not a value-free term; it predicates the old and outmoded. One doesn't just feel this sense; one is made keenly aware of it from the very direct approach of the writer and the openly-stated commitment to superannuating the earlier Reimer work, not just on a variety of details but in absolute terms as to its very essence. From the outset it must be admitted that a philosopher who essays the levelling of a rationale of such globally recognized stature, in such unequivocal terms and with such unmitigated and relentless attempts at deconstruction, must be intrepid, passionately convinced of his counterposition and superlatively informed in the area in question. David Elliott, acknowledging himself as a scion of Riemer, is all of these things. It is important to realize this relationship, since it singles out Elliott as perhaps the obvious protagonist to mount a challenge to a philosophy that he may be assumed to be familiar with in its finest detail. The nature of his dissent is, however, so total and unalloyed as to border on the melodramatic. As might easily have been predicted, Bennett Reimer, nearing the official end of a long and illustrious career and vulnerable as to the timing of Elliott's attack (for that is what it was), reacted with perhaps less equilibrium and circumspection than is usual in his writings. Emotion can cloud judgement and give hostage to one's adversaries. It is arguable, in hindsight, that Reimer would have been prudent not to have accepted the editor's invitation to review Elliott's book. That was not indeed because he lacked the skills to do so, but simply because it was a veritable snare, with all the trappings of a supremely logical choice of invitee; it was also because the world of music education would stand by with bated breath to witness this clash, in which Elliott's anticipated rebuttal, as the grand finale, would be given the last word, so to speak. The exercise was, of course, productive in many senses. It enabled these two opponents to work off their mutual repugnance, albeit in the full spotlight of the world stage and in a manner that is difficult to present in analysis as having been at a level of detachment that one might look for in scholarly criticism. It served too to place side-by-side the essences of both philosophies, most particularly as to their perceived incompatibilities.

Claim and counterclaim, thesis and antithesis, denial and rebuttal and selective quotation of varying degrees of ethical gravity - all of these appear and even abound in both essays, each running to considerable length. It becomes very obvious from the outset that they were, and still are, a necessary part of the launch of Elliott's philosophy on the world of music education; they are, in fact, indispensable to one another. Without a thorough reading and understanding of Reimer's *A Philosophy of Music Education*, and its fall-out in terms of moulding the 'intended' curriculum (notably MEAE from the 1970s on) for American music education in recent decades, it is difficult fully to appreciate the cut and thrust of this contest for credibility. One thing is certain. Without Reimer's philosophy, whether accepted or not by the reader, the substance of Elliott's would lose much of its point. It is an antithesis on an epic scale, so much so that one wonders, if the wealth of disparagement and the constant self-assessment (and self-aggrandizement) by a Reimer yardstick were to be expurgated, what, of substance, would remain; and, indeed, one wonders whether Elliott bereft of a *bête noire*, would have put forward quite the same theories in the same way. The writer believes that this attempted analysis is crucial to the derivation of a contextual philosophy for the Irish case. As it is expected to be long and involved, drawing, for the reader's benefit, in quick succession from both essays, rather than dealing with them separately, the following format is being adopted.

1. **The writers' reading of what the realities of American music education are in relation to the claims and counter claims in the essays. It is critical that the potentially wide differences between the curriculum in its intended (published or theoretical), implemented and attained (delivered) aspects be kept in mind. The writer is grateful to Professor Richard Colwell (Ref. II P ix) for highlighting these necessary distinctions.**

2. **The Reimer claims for MEAE (Music Education as Aesthetic Education) and the Elliott comments or counterpositions.**

3. **What is considered (by Reimer) to be above reproach in the Elliott philosophy**

4. **The Reimer criticisms of Elliott's proposals and Elliott's rebuttals**

5. **Rationalization**

Reimer's case is a strong one and is well argued in a logical sequence with admirable use of supporting quotations from his own and other germane writings, including those of Elliott, of course. It argues convincingly for MEAE as an enabler for the implementation of the aesthetic theory in music education. Superficially, at least on a first reading, it inveighs successfully against the praxial philosophy as defined by Elliott *but* there is one overriding caveat; the Reimer interpretation of what Elliott means must be accurate. If it is not (and there is ample scope for Elliott to proceed to further exegesis, especially in relation to his meaning of the performance/process bias) we will undoubtedly be left with a new understanding of Elliott's philosophy which may, paradoxically, emasculate it in terms of its difference and newness as an alternative to MEAE as (re)-defined by Reimer below. After all, the caveat must allow for both scholars to have the opportunity to clarify their intentions.

It must always be borne in mind, in examining the Reimer/Elliott essays, that both points of view are potentially compromised by the similarity of the generic approaches they unarguably adopt. Each has a philosophy to defend and each has one to deconstruct and disparage, simply because each represents a threat to the other. Why else would the Reimer review be so isolated by Elliott as worthy of such special treatment, a procedure not adopted in the case of any of the other reviews, including that of David Aspin (see above), which seems, to the writer, to be potentially as damaging to *MM*, simply because it has the virtue of greater detachment. Although it is more evident in Elliott's essay, which unrelentingly maintains the antithetical stance of *MM*, there is a tendency for stark rejection by each of the other's point of view, giving the impression of total mutual polarization; there is little common ground admitted and weaknesses are identified and attacked as if they are unmoderated by redeeming features. Nevertheless this dog-eat-dog confrontation succeeds for the reader, as might be expected, in that the vulnerable aspects of both philosophies are gratuitously highlighted and scrutinized; this is helpful too for the analyst who is trying to preserve sufficient detachment to rationalize the points of view, as, indeed, seems eventually to be a real possibility, at least in some significant aspects. But there is no denying the fact that it was Elliott who fabricated this *mise-en-scène*. Although there is often a strong feeling that these two philosophies cannot coexist, if we were to allow ourselves to be swayed one way or the other by the rhetoric of mutual exclusivity, it must, nevertheless, be unthinkable that they do not also have a considerable corpus of common ground. It is the writer's aim to search out this shared thread in pursuit of what Elliott himself describes as the eventual evolution of 'individual philosophy building', eclectically fashioned. The emotional tone of both essays is evident in the choice of language. It is to be regretted that Bennett Reimer allowed himself to be goaded into a partial adoption of Elliott's abrasive style, which the latter adopted with renewed vigour in his rebuttal; in the event, and much to the displeasure of the reader (any reader) the result is to do no credit to either, on that score. Yet, each evinces impressive strengths and palpable weaknesses, in the writer's view.

1. **The Perceived realities of American (USA) School Music Education.**

This vital aspect of the Reimer/Elliott confrontation is dealt with (under its own underlined heading) as a subsection of the Reimer criticisms and Elliott rebuttals (see 4. below)

2. The Reimer claims for MEAE (Music Education as Aesthetic Education) and the Elliott comments or counterpositions

a. 'Performance is an essential component of any vision of music education but it is simply insufficient to carry the entire weight of the music education enterprise at this point in history'.

b. MEAE is 'notably inclusive of all the ways that people engage themselves with music - listening, performing, improvising, composing, judging, analysing, describing, and understanding contexts and relations to other arts and other aspects of culture.'

c. A comprehensive musicianship movement grew up alongside with and complementary to the aesthetic movement. It is assumed here that the aesthetic movement itself is the body which, ostensibly, supports and is attempting to implement the Reimer philosophy. The musicianship movement is therefore MEAE itself, or the application of the philosophy in the implementation of the curriculum.

d. The aesthetic idea is concerned with four dimensions of cognition, or musical "knowing" - knowing *within*, knowing *how*, knowing *about* and knowing *why*.

e. Reimer constantly implies that the new national standards in the US (see Lehman, Ref. III P iii) are synonymous with the intent of MEAE. Take for example the passage on page 68: 'Students of every age deserve to be acquainted with the musical goods of their cultural inheritance, through singing and playing, . . . through listening, through composing and improvising, . . . and through learning about contexts'

f. 'In my view, performance is an essential component of general education in music as both an end, for the sheer sake of performing, and as a means, for what performance teaches about the music being studied.' It is uniquely a way of knowing unavailable except by acting as an artist. Creating art (knowing *how*) is meaningful in and of itself, and adds an educative dimension to aesthetic meaning. In the performance elective it is performance itself that becomes the point, the purpose, and dominating involvement chosen by the student. This principle applies equally to all the other branches of elective musical involvement; they should be represented but not dominating in general music. Nor should the elective focusing on a particular musical engagement be allowed to be redundant within the overall scheme.

g. There must be a balance between general and specialized music (in this case performance), between experiencing and creating. General music has the entire world of music as its essential study material; it is *extensive* and *comprehensive*. Performance, on the other hand, has only a tiny percentage of the world's music as its essential study material but with each piece being experienced exhaustively; performance is *intensive* and *selective* in its approach to the art of music.

h. [G]eneral education must include performing, and performance electives must include learnings wider than the strictly performative dimension of playing and singing.

i. Reimer offers a theory to encompass the uniqueness of performance.

   i. 'The special nature of the performing act (in music as distinct form the other arts) is that it requires that 'craftsmanship, sensitivity, imagination, and authenticity be brought to bear on the inherent expressive needs of a piece awaiting actualization. . . . It is a double obligation - serving the music yet bringing it to life with individuality. . . . People who are performers serve their art uniquely. Arts[*sic*] serves such people uniquely.'

   ii. 'Musical performance is a unique form of intelligence. In addition to giving sounds meaningful form, this form-giving is dependent on and springs from the skills of the knowing body . . . the body as executive, in which *executive* is simultaneously noun and verb. Form and action, product and process, are inseparable in this conception. Mind and body, or thinking and doing, are also unified'. 'Although the bodily movements are not in and of themselves the music . . . the action of *making* the music is a powerful factor in the intimacy, or "self engagement", we feel when listening to live performances.'

This useful definition of performance from the acknowledged architect of the aesthetic philosophy of music education is a far cry from the accusation levelled by Elliott at MEAE as condoning a reduction of performance to mere 'sound producing'. (Note that a *definition of performance* has been highlighted by MEND as a quintessential prior clarification so that performance can be dovetailed meaningfully into all phases of music education.)

3. What is considered (by Reimer) to be above reproach in the Elliott philosophy

a. Reimer accepts that scholarly specialists devoted to the essential task of probing fundamental questions as to the nature and purpose of music education will precipitate philosophical contention and debate, as in this case. The benefit will be in the form of enabling philosophers better to assimilate into their work more deeply understood reasons for their professional existence (and presumably to continue to clarify areas of current differences).

b. Reimer draws attention and gives commendation to the fact that Elliott uses copious readings, and references to the literature of the subject, to strengthen his case. He does not equate this to mere borrowings (plagiarism) but believes it to be an enriching dimension of scholarly research

c. Reimer commends Elliott's treatment of the parameters of performance (and listening), which he acknowledges, at its best, as being mindful and intelligent (confirmed also by other reviewers), but on the grounds that he is merely restating accepted wisdom. Reimer enumerates the characteristics of good performance, relating them to Elliott's forms of knowledge:

   i. performers act with intention.

   ii. they select, deploy, direct, adjust and judge as they act.

   iii. their actions are specific to their particular practice.

   iv. They practice before they perform.

   v. their performance demonstrates understanding (procedural knowledge).

vi. the performance can be influenced by verbal understandings converted into actions (formal knowledge)

vii. ”savvy” (informal knowledge) affects what performers do and the way they think

viii. intuition (impressionistic knowledge) guides the performer to what is appropriate.

ix. performers monitor what they do (supervisory knowledge).

Reimer’s simplification removes the metaphysical tone.

d. Reimer is largely in agreement with Elliott on the *nature* of listening. ‘ . . . it is not that Elliott does not understand what listening entails - he certainly does. What is disappointing and illogical about his position is the stunning *non sequitur* he propounds as to what we as educators should do about cultivating listening abilities: to have all students become performers!’

e. Reimer, while he does not trivialize Elliott’s five forms of knowing beyond observing that ‘some of the language [he] uses is particular to him’, claims that all these ways of thinking about performing (and presumably also about the other four phantom-like activities regularly conjoined by Elliott - improvising, composing, arranging, conducting)) belong to the familiar territory of music education philosophy.

f. Reimer is not opposed to praxialism and deals with it in his paper on universal philosophy (see review of Reimer’s MEND paper above for details), read at the 1996 Amsterdam Conference of ISME. This is a very important document as representing Reimer’s revised thoughts beyond those contained in *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, Second Edition 1989)

4. The Reimer criticisms of Elliott’s proposals and Elliott’s rebuttals.

The writer’s comments are interpolated in the text.

a. There is a suggestion that the philosophical treatment in question has not been managed with scrupulous professional honesty and that it fails to be deeply relevant to the existing and emerging musical/cultural realities of the times for which it is being proposed.

b. Reimer notes two ‘remarkably faulty premises’ used by Elliott as bases for his philosophy:

i. His understanding of the purpose of philosophy itself as a ‘species of competitive sport in which the ultimate goal is to “win” by defeating an opponent’

ii. Performing is the essential good and the essential goal.

c. Elliott supports his proposals on two basic premises:

i. he offers a philosophy that is in opposition to the prevailing one, which he terms MEAE (music education as aesthetic education) and identifies with Reimer. This ‘new’ philosophy is seen as a ‘clear alternative to past thinking’. It seeks to identify, first, a dimension of music not in any way

recognized by the view he wanted to overthrow and, second, to demonstrate that it is important enough to sustain the whole music education enterprise. This dimension was provided by praxialist thinking, emphasizing engagement in actions (construed, by Reimer, to mean performance). Reimer claims that the 'sub-title "new", as signalling that the "old" should be discarded, is not compatible with reflective scholarship'.

ii. That MEAE neglects or denigrates performance. Reimer claims that this is not true, simply because MEAE has been extensively adopted by the profession, and performance is flourishing. He even quotes the MENC publication *The School Music Program: A New Vision*, which presented the new national standards, as stating that 'frequently music programs have been based exclusively on performance'

d. Elliott is not presenting a "balance" issue. He is claiming that

i. performance should be the central dominant, essential involvement and that

ii. MEAE is opposed to performance

e. Elliott's agenda forces him to separate process from product. In this context he makes a distinction between the questions "what is a work of music?" [product] and " what is music" [process]. Reimer gives an interesting sample of answers to the latter question, which he found to be overwhelmingly product-orientated. Reimer claims that 'it is not possible to have a musical product separated from the processes that went into its creation' and that Elliott needs the distinction so that he can build his philosophy on it. Reimer uses a quotation from Elliot Eisener (1973) which very relevantly points the issue - 'This myth argues that what is educationally significant for children is the process they undergo while making something, not what it is they make … whether that product is ideational or material. … we will never be able to see the processes the child is undergoing. What we see are the manifestations of those processes. … To disregard what the child produces puts us in an absolutely feckless position for making inferences about these processes. In addition, without attention to what is produced we have no basis for making any type of judgment regarding the educational value of the activity. … Product and process therefore cannot be dichotomized. They are like two sides of a coin. … To neglect one in favor of the other is to be educationally naïve'. Elliott is creating a caricature of MEAE programs, which rely heavily on composing, improvising and performing, along with listening, as essential ingredients of musical experiencing and learning. He has eventually to accept that works (examples of Elliott's phraseology are given) are important but he denigrates the product side of the coin, by confusing works with notated compositions. According to Elliott, '… music is a matter of singing and playing instruments. And even in the West … there are many kinds of musical situations in which the actions (in the intentional sense) take precedence over music in the narrow sense of esteemed works'. Reimer finds this globally condescending to the oral/aural tradition but especially to the musicianship of people outside the West and goes on to claim, convincingly, that works and the esteem paid to the best examples (instances) are the norm, and that such paradigms - 'exemplars of music - are ubiquitous throughout the world and in all styles and types of music'.

f. Reimer claims that the praxial philosophy reneges on its 'obligation to acquaint the young with the cherished achievements of [their] culture' by being so performance-obsessed as to endanger the healthy education of youth.

g. A result of Elliott's obsession with process is that the praxial philosophy, which he espouses, plays down the specifics of chosen repertoire ("esteemed" and "revered"). His approach denies the need to balance process and product and to recognize their interdependence. His single-strategy approach - 'treating all music students (including "general" music students) as apprentice musical practitioners (*MM*, p. 266) - fails, by definition, to honour the principle that different musical goals require different programs tailored to each'.

h. Reimer draws attention to a recurrent implication in *Music Matters* (it is never developed sufficiently to be more than this) that what applies to performance is equally valid for improvising, composing, arranging and conducting (but *not* to listening *per se*). This causes some confusion as when the philosopher Wolterstorff is quoted (by Elliott) as saying that "[m]ost of all, musicing reminds us that performing and improvising through singing and playing instruments lies at the heart of MUSIC as a diverse human practice. . . . the basic reality of music is not works or the composition of works but music making". This seems definitively to anchor Elliott's philosophy in championing performance; listeners (uninvolved in any other musical activity) are disfranchised in the process, Elliott's strategy being to channel them all into performance, whether or not it is their choice of involvement in music.

i. Elliott's catalogue of the component varieties of knowledge applicable to performance fail to capture 'what there is about performing music that is particular to its nature beyond what is shared generically with so many other human/cultural activities'. Reimer believes that professional music educators must '(a) demonstrate that performance opportunities should be supported in education and (b) teach for what performance offers that is unique to it and not just as easily attainable by doing a host of other things.' This is a very characteristic Reimer stance.

j. Reimer is concerned about the possible redundancy threat posed by technology to performance, and finds Elliott's failure to address this problem surprising and disappointing. Reimer's definition (which deals with the single case of a composer using computer technology to bypass the performer) does not go into the numerous psychological aspects of how the human psyche relates to the experience of 'real' performance - or as Reimer himself puts it 'the value of being involved in the act of musical creation at the performance stage', giving it uniqueness in its musical function; rather he advances the query because the use of technology represents, he concludes, a devastating prospect for Elliott's 'performance only' mode, in the special context of the claim that 'music is a *performing* art' and that the only way to know music is through performing it.

k. Elliott disagrees when '[s]ome people want to claim that musical understanding is distinct from knowing how to make music well. The claim is false. It rests on the dualistic assumption that verbal knowledge about music represents true understanding, while the ability to make music well is a mechanical skill or behavior. . . . This book's praxial philosophy of music education [i.e. referring to Music *Matters*'] holds that musicianship equals musical understanding'. This statement, based on Elliott's belief in a much respected theory that cognitive and psychomotor modes (dualistic above) cannot be separated, is sweepingly presumptive as an implication about MEAE and how it defines the connection between music making, understanding and musicianship. Note Reimer's description: 'Musical performance, I am suggesting, depends on the body as executive . . . . Notice that form and action, product and process are inseparable in this conception. Notice too that mind and body, or thinking and doing, are also

unified'. The Elliott passage is consistent with his tendency to play down, if not to outlaw, the fructifying contribution of verbal knowledge of all kinds to the musical enterprise, in turn identified by him as one of the fallacies promoted by MEAE (he does, however, eventually but grudgingly acknowledge verbal knowledge in his book). Reimer counters Elliott's claim with an array of scholars (among them Nettl and Sparshott - both Elliott heroes) whose literary works manifest supreme involvements with and understandings of music. He goes on, in decrying Elliott's 'narrow, exclusive vision of musical understanding (which equals musicianship as defined in its five-fold aspects in *Music Matters)* by asserting that 'there is simply far more to music, and musical understanding, musical learning, musical experience, musical value, musical satisfaction and growth and delight and meaning, than performance can encompass. Performance surely offers all these goods; they are offered as well in a great variety of other modes of involvement for which music education must be responsible, if it is to reflect the diverse ways music is manifested, and understood, in our culture.'

l. Elliott has contempt for teaching listening directly rather than always as a concomitant of performance; so claims Reimer, and he goes on to query Elliott's reference to a coterie group for each culture who 'act specifically as listeners or audiences for the musical works of that practice' as a bizarre idea which is not in touch with the reality of listening activities in all cultures. Reimer asserts that 'all people in western culture (and most other cultures) are music listeners. … The vast majority of people in our culture engage in music only by listening. … That music education has poorly served the needs of all people to become more perceptive, intelligent, discriminating listeners is perhaps our major failing, in that we have opted, instead, to focus our major efforts on helping the 15 % or so of students who choose to learn to be performers. Elliott, unfortunately, by focusing entirely on performance as the only valid way to be involved with music, would severely exacerbate this failing of music education'. An intervention, however premature, by the writer here seems necessary to draw attention to Reimer's persistent assumption that Elliott sees music making as the activity which alone can effect musicianship and that the activity is narrowly conceived as performing ('through singing and playing instruments'). Although there is some justification for arriving at this conclusion it is factually a misinterpretation, albeit a valuable one in opening up the discourse and throwing additional light on the activity of performing; in other words, it serves MEND's purposes.

m. Reimer takes issue with Elliott's key statement that '[i]n sum, educating competent, proficient, and expert listeners for the future depends on the progressive education of competent, proficient, and artistic music makers [performers] in the present'. As stated above, it seems perfectly understandable and excusable at this stage that Reimer should interpret *music makers* as meaning *performers*, since that is the general thrust of Elliott's rhetoric; his other branches of musical activity are almost always mentioned merely parenthetically, creating a distinct impression that he has performance in mind as his paradigm, as much as he certainly is *not* thinking in terms of listening alone. A very pertinent and useful quotation from Richard Colwell (a MEND presenter. Ref. II P ix) is appended here: 'The development of aesthetic perceptual abilities in the arts does not automatically result from performance experiences; the teachable aspects in such development are knowledge-intensive and dependent on direct, focused learning experience ….' And Reimer raises the very point that the MEND analysis (of Elliott's paper) has also focused on. 'Whatever learnings do accrue from performance are learnings unavailable to the vast majority of people in our culture, very few of whom can become, or choose to become, competent, proficient and expert performers, despite Elliott's illogical premise that this is achievable simply

by involving them in exploratory performance experiences in … school-supplied simulations [lacking authenticity] of what musical performing artists are required to do. … Elliott so overestimates what school music programs can possibly produce by way of performing expertise, even if all instruction were given over to performance as he would desire, as to insure that the music education enterprise would topple on such an insufficient, narrow base.' With reference to the enjoyment of the arts in general (and music in particular) '[h]ow illogical and irrelevant it is to insist that only those able and willing to achieve competence in producing these arts can possibly enjoy or understand them … including, if we are not to be hypocritical, many music educators, who are also incapable of performing competently, proficiently, or expertly most of the music they enjoy in their lives.' Reimer insists that performing and listening are disparate faculties, that levels of capability in them are typically and healthily unequal (in children), yet they can listen effectively to, enjoy and benefit from relatively complex music which is far beyond their capability to perform. 'To limit the musical experience of students - at every grade level - to that they themselves can perform "competently, proficiently, and expertly", is to deprive all students of satisfying musical experiences readily available in their culture'. He summarizes this section provocatively by stating that 'the mistake Elliott makes - and it is a profound mistake - is to reject the obvious fact that listening, too, is musical praxis, deserving of cultivation as much as (or, given its centrality and ubiquity in the actual musical lives lived by all people in our culture, perhaps more than) all the other ways music can be experienced.' He draws on Foster McMurray (writing as early as 1958) for support in this. Speaking of non-professional performers he claims that 'there must be a great gap between their level of aesthetic insight and enjoyment on the one hand and their technical ability as performers on the other. … Whatever the values of musical performance might be, we must recognize that performance is not a *primary* means to development of aesthetic sensitivity.' Since it is axiomatic that performance must invaginate sensitive listening to be considered a truly valid musical activity it must be assumed that McMurray is referring here to listening *per se* as a valuable source of aesthetic experience and learning. And it must be remembered that listening *per se* is a universal activity across all cultures.

n. Reimer finds Elliott's neglect of the sensuous and dismissal of the creative characteristics of listening to be ungenerously pejorative in relation to the cultural power and potential of the activity. As in the case of the bodily gesture used in the communication of musical essence through performance he attributes the same gestural significance to the act of musical reception, drawing on a Langerian quotation from Judy Lochhead: 'Perception is not a mechanistic process … or the intellectual process of interpreting the data of sensory input, but rather it is a *bodily enaction of meaning.* I meet the sounds with my body and through it I enact the melody as a felt significance'. On the question of the essential creativity of listening - the construction of musical meanings by the exercise of imagination - apparently rejected by Elliott, he has this to say: 'The active contribution to the process [of perception] by the percipient is also an essential factor in aesthetic engagements. . . . Aesthetic experiencing requires a reconstruction by the imagination of the percipient of the imagined interplay of occurrence built into the form by the artist [both composer and performer. In other words the listener as vicarious performer]'. Elliott claims that this is a covert act, that it cannot be witnessed, that it is not assessable and therefore is without creative value. Elliott's inconsistency is remarkable. Because, in his opinion, creativity in listening is not witnessable and assessable, he rules against it; yet, on the question of 'the innate equality of all musical cultures' he claims, selectively, that because hierarchy is not assessable, equality may be assumed! As Aspin remarks, he can't have it both

ways. Reimer disagrees with Elliott and believes that evidence of success in listening assignments can be effectively and readily collected. He quotes T.M. Amabile as claiming that 'creativity can be regarded as the quality of products or responses judged to be creative by appropriate observers, and it can also be regarded as the process by which something so judged is produced' and uses this to define the responsibilities of professionals in influencing 'the process by which students engage themselves with music as listeners as well as performers, improvisers and composers. … The process of learning to create musical meaning through listening is challenging, as is creating meaning through performing, improvising, and composing'. Again he observes that listening is concerned with both product and process as an inseparable pair, both of which can evince the measurable presence of creativity.

o. In relation to *Concepts as Learning Tools*, Reimer again interprets Elliott's concentration on performance as 'the curricular goal [which] is to organize music classrooms and programs as effectively and genuinely as possible by simulating the ways in which musicing and listening are carried out by artistic music practitioners [performers]'. This is factually an over-simplification as Elliott does include, however parenthetically, four other forms of activity as germane to practitioners. And presumably Elliott does, in some grand sanguine sweep, imply that all the other 'activities' listed by Reimer as part of a well-rounded musical education (the acquisition of musicianship) accrue from the ways in which these practices are taught, learned and implemented. But it is in response to Elliott's claim that MEAE 'negates the procedural essence of music [*inter alia*] … by reducing these knowledge domains to simplistic verbal objectives and concepts' that Reimer takes the ethical high ground by pointing to the use of selective, out-of-context, quoting; and certainly the example he analyses is clearly a transgression of significant proportion (although Elliott adduces a similar misquote by Reimer to balance the account, so to speak [see below]!) and creates a false impression, diametrically opposed to Reimer's intention and professional caution when he elaborates about verbal concepts: '… they are *only* tools , and it is important that we understand that, so we do not misguide our activities as we teach. . . . Conceptualizing, when it goes on without sufficient listening to music exemplifying what is being discussed, without sufficient performance to keep learning musically creative, without appropriate probing of inner musical conditions through analysis, and without musical assessments, becomes academic in the worst sense.' In further defence of language as an indispensable tool in music education Reimer adds two more highly pertinent quotations. The first, again in Langerian vein, is from Lochhead: '… concepts are the perceptual tools by which humans know their world. They are not simply intellectual abstractions from experience, but rather are the practical implements of which meaningful and varied experience arises.' The second, from Tait and Haack's *Principles and Processes of Music Education (1984)*: '… we need to explore the language connection . . . to identify and develop those forces that contribute to our feeling moved when we experience music. Language is not the same experience, the words are not the same feelings, but language is the essential tool that allows us to conceptualize and think about, to analyse and teach about these vital musical matters that ultimately can take us beyond words'. He also gives a useful reference (Dennie Palmer Wolf's *Becoming Knowledge; The Evolution of Art Education Curriculum' (Handbook of Research on Curriculum 1992)* as further material to set against what he believes Elliott is portraying as a model for curriculum building.

p. As in the case of performance, perceived by Reimer as effectively Elliott's preferred, to the point of being the exclusive, means of training musicians, Elliott's

failure to discriminate between the intrinsic and extrinsic merits of music itself (and music education) are targeted as leaving 'the profession in a more vulnerable position to being perceived as unnecessary in education'. Reimer calls for a celebration of the uniqueness of music by identifying qualities that it does *not* share with other activities. This has always been a fashionable and compelling stance, held stoutly by MEAE practitioners. As has been stated elsewhere in this report, it could very well be that Elliott's confidence in the robustness of music as an educational option dispenses with the need to be so fearful for its survival; but this is surely open to the criticism of being foolhardy, considering the unflattering statistics world-wide on the voluntary uptake of the music option in general education. But, let it be said, Elliott does engage and deal with the intrinsicality issue in his own terms.

q. It is interesting to compare Reimer's calling into question of Elliott's statement of the essential features of music itself, (especially in the context of how the affective dimension is dealt with and the dangerous reference to 'expressions of emotion') and Elliott's claim that Reimer's aesthetic theory has also been superannuated. We are left here in a limbo in which the fine distinction between the discharge of emotion and the expression of feeling, surely that most significant and hotly debated discriminating dimension in musical experience, is thrown into a new confusion.

r. Reimer finds Elliott's treatise wanting in the encouragement of understandings of the relationship between music and the other arts. This is highlighted in the fairly recent drafting of the National Standards for music education, in which music, for strategic and political reasons, was allied to the other arts for the purposes of their promotion as a group in the successful campaign to have them incorporated in the *Goals 2000* US legislation for education.

s. Reimer takes issue with Elliott's restrictive definition of general creativity as 'a congratulatory term that singles out a concrete accomplishment that knowledgeable people judge to be especially important in relation to a specific context of doing or making'. While this may seem to be merely a question of definition, Reimer is concerned that it excludes the many more modest acts of creativity that occur regularly along a continuum, which stretches right back to the most elementary instances of musical achievement which 'music educators - of *all* people - should immediately recognize' and reward. But it is surely educationally reprehensible in principle (and contrary to the *Implications for Music Education* so thoroughly and convincingly treated on Page 131 of Music Matters) to ridicule a commendable balance of musical challenge and musicianship at the novice level by denying that 'a beginner's toots are as creative as a solo by Wynton Marsalis'. That is not the point.

t. In his *Conclusion* (summary) Reimer returns to his irreducible objections to Elliott's philosophy, which he believes to be pursuing a 'doubly false agenda by any possible means'. These are grounded, first, in a model of philosophical discourse, which 'descends to ridicule . . . and stoops to deceitful tactics no scholar can condone', which Reimer believes to be 'potentially damaging to music education scholarship'. His second major reservation relates to his conviction that 'Elliott's limited vision is so fixated on the most traditional, most entrenched, most conventional aspect of music education - performing - as to represent a species of music fundamentalism, a deification of a historical value no longer able to satisfy [did it ever? Writer's intervention] all the music/cultural needs of our times and how our times are quickly evolving. He has put forth a philosophy for a time that has passed, based on a musical culture no longer dominant and quickly becoming

transformed by new possibilities. Elliott's "new" philosophy at best enshrines the status quo; at worst, it would direct us backward'.

Elliott's response to the first four Reimer objections (listed above) is taken *en bloc.*

He gives four motivations for the formulation of his philosophical thoughts

1. To act as spokesman for the plethora of philosophical theory that has been accumulating since Reimer's 1970 and 1989 publications

2. To insinuate the ethnomusicological case into music education theory and practice. Elliott comes through as a convinced multiculturalist.

3. To provide another foundational text-as-tool [alternative] to spur critical thinking.

4. To link philosophy with practice, reflecting the expertise of artist-teachers, hence the *praxial* philosophy.

Elliott explains that his application of the word *new* to his philosophy is unexceptionable as emphasizing *alternative* or *recent* perspectives. He goes on to suggest that the praxial philosophy is 'only one possible view . . . unlikely to replace completely what has already been done let alone discourage others from producing alternatives'. This is not borne out by some of the language of dismissal he uses in dealing with Reimer's work. 'A philosophy has been proposed in *MM* that includes "contending arguments" and "alternative views" - nothing more, nothing less.' This too would be acceptable, and an encouraging introduction, were it not for the vehemence with which he seeks to discredit other opposing views, as if they have no merit whatsoever. With characteristic lack of caution in relation to his own vulnerability Elliott claims that 'if even one basic principle in a highly systematic set of beliefs [MEAE, Tyler, Bruner?] is invalid, then the others must be considered suspicious, if not invalid', and goes on to quote Borhek and Curtis as saying that '[f]or highly systematic belief, any attack upon any of its principles is an attack upon the system itself; if one principle is abandoned, all the others must be, too. Therefore, the greater the degree of system, the greater the importance of negative evidence for the whole belief system. … In consequence a systematic belief system is at the mercy of its weakest link.' (*MM*, p 38). Presumably Elliott considers that *MM* presents a systematic belief system (the writer hopes so), too, and would accept, therefore, that it is subject to the same iconoclastic and nihilistic criterion of judgement. This search for human infallibility is clearly doomed to failure. Many of Elliott's critics have commented that he does not stop short at offering an alternative but rather seeks to raise his own stature by attempting to dismiss his opponents' views out of hand. Thus we find him not only rejecting MEAE but also the whole foundation on which it is based, including distinguished offerings by Charles Leonhard, Susanne Langer and Leonard Meyer in addition to Reimer's synthesis and expansion of those views. Consider C.D. Burns's far more positive view of philosophy in evolution (used elsewhere in this report because of its constant appositeness): 'philosophers in every age have attempted to give an account of as much experience as they could. … all great philosophers have allowed for more than they could explain and have, therefore, signed beforehand, if not dated, the death warrant of their philosophies'[86]. And Elliott's attack on MEAE, whatever the degree of vindication that eventually emerges, is more in the nature of total deconstruction, and ill-at-ease as evidence of his claim that '*MM* has begun to serve as a tool for critical thinking; this critical-companion text [a collection of critical essays responding to MM] is intended to contribute another meme to the ongoing process of philosophy-building in music education'. In other words, is Reimer's essay here to be included in the collection? In rejecting MEAE he faults Reimer's theory of "absolute expressionism" as combining two views of music that contradict each other, both views being deeply flawed in themselves. Yet Elliott fails to make the fine distinction himself between emotion and feeling (arousal/discharge and expression) which gives such a subtle and fine edge to Langer's theories - and between disappointment and surprise which modifies

[86] C.D. Burns, *The Sense of the Horizon*, quoted in Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key*, 5

the significance of Meyer's *inhibition* theory and permits compatibility with Langer's view. These speculations are far from an open-and-shut case for facile adoption or dismissal and are still subject to scholarly dialectic and fine-tuning. And there is no reason to believe that Elliott's first premise in attempting 'to build a concept of music by investigating the nature of music makers, listeners, music making, listening, musical works, and the contexts and interdependencies of all' would not also serve to define the aims of the aesthetic movement. Nor is there any contradiction or incompatibility evident when Elliott claims that 'listenership involves the covert construction of intermusical and intramusical information, relationships and meanings through the same *kinds* of knowing that make up musicianship: procedural, formal, informal, impressionistic and supervisory musical knowledge. The knowings required to listen effectively for the musical works of a given practice are the same kinds of knowing required to perform, improvise, compose, arrange, and/or conduct the music of that practice'. If listeners/musicians are to know even a reasonable cross-section of the mature works of a musical practice, he is surely not suggesting that it can only be done by personal efforts at performing them? There is more than a hint here that Elliott covertly validates a very large amount of listening separate from music making; and it would be comforting if it were true. But Elliott differs typically in failing to credit listening *per se* as a fully qualified musical activity in itself, this in spite of his admission that it has a place but one of far less significance than the practices that he names (performing, improvising etc.) as mandatory concomitant activities with listening. And in this section Elliott also points to another significant difference in his view - 'that *works* of music (in the praxial sense) are artistic cultural constructions involving several interconnected dimensions or facets of meaning including the following: interpretive, structural, expressional, representational, social, ideological and, of course, personal meanings.' Already he is calling into question (and rightly so, in many respects) the indiscriminate unyielding application of the artistic theory of music so pertinently commented on by Arnold Schönberg: 'If it art it is not for all: if it is for all it is not art'. Nor can Elliott's view be faulted in this attempt at democratization which seeks to open up music, in a humanistic sense, to all kinds of manifestations (social, ideological, personal, cathartic). But it must also be noted that Elliott's frequent preoccupation with, and usage of, the phrase *artistic performance* aligns him, even perhaps inadvertently, with the aesthetic theory of the interplay of mimesis (imitation), craft (skill) and human feeling (in spite of the fact that in a pre-MEND II personal interview with the writer [Fort Worth, Texas, 1995] he declared, in relation to praxial applications, that the word *skill* was not in his vocabulary!).

In responding to the arguably less intrinsic characteristics of a great deal of music, the pure aesthetic theory, having metamorphosed, so to speak, from Hanslick to Langer, needs now to relax, without abandoning its more absolutist tendencies, to embrace a much wider spectrum of musics as worthy of its attention and of reconciliation. Elliott gives a very pertinent quotation from Charles Leonhard (MENC 1985) where he reminisces: 'I began emphasizing aesthetic education more than thirty years ago in *Education*, a now defunct journal, with an article titled "Music Education: Aesthetic Education." At the time of publication of that article and during the intervening years, I never anticipated that the concept of aesthetic education would come to be used as the major tenet in the justification of music education. That has, however, happened. As a result, the profession has been sated with vague esoteric statements of justification that no one understands, including, I suspect, most of the people who make those statements'. This is surely cautionary in delimiting aesthetic education as to its potential for manifold application. (*MM*, p.300*)* And Reimer, too, has shown great resilience in this respect and his hand is evident in the flexible and non-prescriptive provisions of the US National Standards for music education, as indeed his attempt at sketching a universal philosophy of music education for the new millennium (Amsterdam ISME Conference of 1996) is also a worthy effort at compromise, recognising as it does a wide array of function for music and music education (including praxialism).

It might usefully be argued at this stage that MEAE (or the more extreme aesthetic ideal in music education) needs to essay détente with a much wider range of musical experience outside western art music (to which it is perhaps best, though not necessarily uniquely, suited) while the praxial philosophy (if we are to believe Elliott), which is an open manifold of accommodation for all kinds of music, needs to exercise caution in setting discriminating standards of judgement and value.

However, already, Elliott is declaring his hand. His openness to socio-cultural values is either influenced by ethnomusicological interests or directs him towards them; and, let it be said, there is nothing unworthy in that either, if thoughtfully managed. But ethnomusicology, itself a respected and growing area of scholarship, when education-targeted, is currently more concerned with the practices (music-making) of various cultures than with their indigenous scholarship, certainly as far as incorporation in school education curricula is concerned. This inevitably leads Elliott to his praxial *processual* philosophy and to his thesis as to 'the equality of all musical practices'- a stance he visits (unconvincingly) on Harry White's paper *A Book of manners in the wilderness* (*qv*); curiously, it is not challenged by Reimer, although it contributed largely to Aspin's rejection of Elliott's praxial philosophy. It is a great pity that Elliott, beyond acknowledging Reimer's contribution to MEAE as an important development in music education (but in 1970!) has absolutely nothing to say in its praise; this, of course, eventually mutes the plausibility of his own views. Considering the influence Reimer's *Philosophy* has exerted over the past 30 years (and indeed continues to wield), his rejection of an entire order (and the countless colleagues who have plied it over the years), without offering any means of accommodation or *rapprochement* whatsoever, is so unflattering, not to mention eccentric, as to discourage ready allegiance to his alternative rationale. And his wholesale misinterpretation of MEAE practices (as, for instance, equating its performance programme to mere sound-producing) is also damaging to his own credibility. The objections to MEAE, which he lists in his counter-attack, render *it* no more vulnerable, as to detail, than the praxial philosophy itself.

So, the writer believes that, in spite of Elliott's protests, perusal of *MM* will provide abundant evidence (particularly and significantly in the earlier part) that he set out to overthrow MEAE from the outset. If this is so, the ethics of the philosophical approach in his book must, at least, be open to question. Similar comments have been made by professional colleagues (see the review by David Aspin); certainly his aggressive style is most unattractive. On the other hand, it was a rash overstatement, on Reimer's part, to claim that the praxial philosophy is for 'performers only'; there may be abundant evidence in *MM* that this is a tendency, and this aspect will be teased, but Elliott potentially includes much more than performing in his definition of music making. And it is never clear, for the purposes of comparison, from any of the documentation studied, what the total remit of MEAE is in the perception of even American music educators. The writer's understanding is that, in the US, the performance option pursued by the 15% or so of all school goers can, at worst, be exclusive of many, if not all, of the other learnings insisted upon by MEAE (as ideally conceived), as Reimer himself has conceded. In fact it is not clear, either, whether the aesthetic movement can claim the performance programme, such as it is, as its own since, according to Professor Paul Lehman (Ref. III P iii), performance has been entrenched in school music in the US for most of the twentieth century anyway. And if MEAE is then taken to apply only to the remaining 2% who follow the general music programme as (volitionally) non-performers (Reimer's authority again - 'Fewer than 2 % of students after elementary school are involved in any music classes except performance, meaning that, starting in grades 6. 7 or 8, 85 to 91% [or so] are completely untouched by music education' [See the Reimer reply to Harry White, p. 78]; the parallels with Ireland are very real here), it is easy to see how a listening-rich education could be construed as anti-performance, which, of course, is not the case either. As Richard Colwell so significantly remarked at MEND II (Ref. II P ix), it is very difficult to find out exactly what the true situation is in relation to a *delivered* curriculum. But Elliott tends to interpret selectively for his purposes in this regard.

As stated, Reimer, although he still has a valid point to make, was unwise to extract (understandable as it might have been to do so) from *MM* an interpretation that "performing is the essential good and the essential goal" of music education. "Elliott's limited vision is so fixated on the most traditional, most entrenched, most conventional aspect of music education - performing - as to represent a species of music education fundamentalism". The writer would, on the other hand, have a different problem with Elliott's vision as being so idealistic (admirable in itself), and tending towards an all-inclusiveness (five species of music making - all mandatory to a greater or lesser degree), that it crumbles under the very notion of time constraints and practicability. And it might have been better for Reimer to have organized his rebuttal (of *MM*) by trying to anticipate Elliott's counter-rebuttal (being reviewed here) and stating the full range of his notional activities only to highlight the

impossibility of taking such a plan to fruition. However Reimer does use this strategy later on. So let us examine Elliott's activities and comments.

Elliott urges that 'music education should activate students' musicianship and musical creativity [a problem word, remember, and a source of dissension between Reimer and Elliott] in *all* forms of music making.' . . . laudable so far. He then proposes that "*all* music students ought to be taught in essentially the same way: as reflective musical practitioners engaged in *music making generally and musical performing particularly.* Artistic music listening ought to be taught and learned in conjunction with artistic music making". For the moment let us not take him to task as to what he means by artistic (from art!), which is dangerously encroaching on the whole field of aesthetics, mimesis, form, craft, feeling and their interconnections. His five forms of music making (each with a conjoined listening dimension, which it should be hardly even necessary to enjoin) are performing, improvising, composing, arranging and conducting. The writer maintains that all of these activities demand considerable levels of skill (craft/technique) to be effective, quite apart from the problem of balancing the offerings to each student (all being taught in essentially the same way!). Already a considerable input of time is being predicated for students in the general music curriculum, most of whom typically (if we take the US statistics, such as they are) do not want to be involved anyway. Conducting is an early casualty in Elliott's essay, meriting only a perfunctory mention in what follows. Since composing and arranging in a curriculum-as-practicum must have outlets in performance Elliott then notionally elevates performance and improvising to a position of *first among equals*. He further expands his ideas with the instruction 'teachers must decide which forms of musicing to select. … [they must] focus primarily (*but not exclusively*) on music making through performing and improvising. Composing, arranging and conducting ought to be taken up with reasonable frequency. … In addition, … listening ought to be taught in direct relation to the musical practices and works students are learning in and through their own active music making'. It seems to have escaped Elliott that this closed system, where everything, seemingly, is dictated by what students can themselves perform, is limiting to the range of artistic experiences that composers, arrangers, conductors and improvisers (and even performers) can have. It certainly places the onus on performance to do more than its part and cries out for a less restrictive way of teaching listening, which cannot be fully fertile under such a constrained definition. It is only in this limited view that Elliott's musicianship is wanting. Otherwise his statement about matching cognitive challenges and musicianship is an elegant and convincing way of defining how students achieve the primary values of 'musicing' and listening [music education?]. And he continues with a further expansion of his multiculturalist views, all perfectly acceptable as one valid stream of philosophical dialectic about music. The writer, in disagreeing with the term 'educating feeling [rather than *taste*?]' (attributed to Reimer) as an outcome of music education, finds Elliott's goals of self-knowledge, self-growth and enjoyment (flow) to be feelingful terms and not unacceptable as valid and desirable outcomes of music education, if, as Elliott demands, 'they are generated in an intrinsic way unattainable in any other domain, artistic or otherwise'. Note that here Elliott is reaching towards the criterion of intrinsicality, denied him by Reimer.

But we are left with Elliott's own (quoted) progressive portrayal of priorities in the implementation of the praxial philosophy. In the writer's view (but it is, of course, for each reader to judge for himself), pragmatism itself defines performance as by far the most important (Reimer claims it to be the exclusive) activity in Elliott's scheme, and the only feasible one, as the time/skill factor alone relegates the other activities to nominal involvements, whatever the laudable aspirations of the philosophy. And unless Elliott is proposing a model for music education which literally uproots the norms of current practices (and this may be the case) with all that it entails in terms of the training of teachers alone, a simple statistic drawn from the numbers of school leavers who would currently rate their relative expertise in performance, improvising, and so on, there is little doubt that performers would greatly outnumber all the others together, further proof that Reimer was not astray in his basic assumption. And, in the writer's view, Elliott also hints broadly that, even with music education as praxial education, the mix would not significantly change. It is a matter of some concern also (see Aspin's review) that Elliott seems to take considerable pride in Custadero's (1996 review) summary of praxial themes in that 'students are perceived by the author [Elliott] as apprentice performers,

composers, improvisers, arrangers, conductors and dancers'. The apprenticeship model of education, redolent of practical training by one-to-one instruction, imitation and skill acquisition (and necessarily limited personal repertoire), is a difficult concept to promote in general education. The failure to encourage the idea of the kind of listenership *activity* which does *not* depend on a concomitant form of intrinsically limited music making (see above) for validation, and which alone can ensure that students of all activities have an open opportunity to know the widest spectrum of the repertoire relevant to that activity, is a cause of concern; it must be attributed to Elliott's lack of generosity in failing to consider or allow that listening, according to his exaggerated and pejorative notion of how MEAE operates, might often, like the many other commendable teaching styles that he attributes to praxialism (alone), also be effectively guided in MEAE by knowledgeable teachers acting as 'reflective music educators'. It has to be stated once more that Elliott's typical and unrelieved condemnatory tone (quite apart from its naïveté as a dialectic procedure), from which one might be forgiven for deducing that all MEAE teachers are uniformly in error, simply by virtue of their truck with the concept itself, and all praxial teachers now and in the future can only, by contrast, be exemplary, does not advance his case one whit and is very little short of a gratuitous insult to 'tens of thousands of music educators who are not as stupid and misguided as Elliott portrays them, nor as hopelessly simplistic' (Reimer p 83).

In passing it should be acknowledged that Elliott's response to Reimer's criticism (which should, in fairness, be read in context) that in *MM* 'no mention is made of the teaching of composition as a major new opportunity for the music education profession and for creative musical experiences in schools' reads very well as a statement of recurring concerns about facilitating the teaching of composition for the relatively small number of learners who choose to pursue it seriously. While no broad-minded musician could deny that the composing option is worthy of equal support with other activities, and while talent for it must be identified and subsequently encouraged at all stages, there must also be a balance in the extent to which it can feed, as a right, on other activities, unless such collaborations are in the best communal interests. There is no reason to believe that MEAE, or the new US National Standards programme, or the praxial philosophy is not fully cognizant of the problems in supporting this activity appropriately or that they are at odds with one another in this regard. Elliott's answers often create the impression that only the praxial philosophy has the answer; in this particular application the writer has no sense of a basic difference in approach. If one is accustomed, at this stage, to ignoring such fatuous statements as '[f]or example, I have often seen MEAE-based classes [only?] in which students "compose" … by chunking sound patterns together in meaningless, sloppy, "chance music" productions', the rest of his response reads like an enchiridion of good composition teaching practice, including the cautionary advice that 'until students come to know the essential nature of musical works as performances … composing should not be the primary way of developing musicianship', at once proof of pragmatism and deprioritization.

Elliott's response to 'Myth 4. Reimer claims that computer technology "effectively renders performance obsolete for music from this time forward" and that Elliott never mentions the "precarious position of performing at this moment in music history"' should be acknowledged as very convincing. The question of composers being able to convert their ideas directly to sound through technology, thereby apparently giving them the power to dispense with the services of performers has, naturally, raised temporary concerns of a superficial nature. Stravinsky (see his Poetics) is known to have favoured the idea of a milieu in which composers could dispense with the services of performers. Theoretically it is possible, by the most sophisticated techniques of digital sound derived from real acoustic models (if that is the desired end-product) to simulate a 'performance' of a work in a laboratory, and this facility undoubtedly has its uses, attractions, verisimilitude and advantages. But even the edited (or live) recorded sounds of the greatest music makers have a tendency to lose their immediacy even after the first rehearing, even for the ordinary listener, let alone the aficionado; it takes very little reflection to arrive at the psychological reasons behind this phenomenon. Feeling, interpretation and sensuousness (Reimer's word) are protean qualities which give performance (not 'sounds as produced' to use another unmerited Elliott criticism of MEAE) its quintessential and unique quality, a deliciously ephemeral characteristic which is intrinsic to the process and can create the appetite for further hearings. Technology has its part as a single (or even a random multiply-controlled) stream in this process but it hopelessly lacks the human characteristic of creative whim or

definitive artistry (where the end product is unpredictable while the performing art is in process - an essential quality if it is to be judged as true art and not just as craft). By this criterion art has little to fear by way of being superannuated.[87]

It is surprising that 'Homer nods' in relation to this issue, considering that aesthetic theory so magnificently defines and supports the art process and its essential attributes. And Reimer himself is at his most impressive when he discriminates, within experience, between the necessary dimensions of perception and response if the experience is to have artistic value; this is to point the difference between 'sounds as produced' and 'sounds as interpreted' whether in the ear of the composer, performer or listener. Elliott makes the most of this extraordinary lapse on Reimer's part; his response is eminently sensible in its theory but caution is urged on those who may still wish to avoid the subliminal absorption of some questionable praxial thinking, especially when it is derivative, without acknowledging its sources. Elliott is totally convincing when he states, in relation to authentic "performing" that "[p]erforming music expressively - through singing or playing instruments … involves listening keenly for all the dimensions of the musical work one is attempting to *interpret* and express creatively in relation to the standards, histories, and artistic ethics of a musical practice. Musical interpretation-in-context is central to musical artistry and creativity'. But this statement takes for granted so much received wisdom on the nature of art and is so redolent of the pronouncements of the aesthetic lobby (to which Reimer would admit himself to being but a minuscule contributor, such is the abundance of relevant, and, yes, often mutually-contradicting literature) that Elliott would have to clarify his view as to how universally applicable his statement above is to all forms of music making. In particular, he should clarify his understandings of expression (of emotion or feeling?), *their* place in the artistic/creative scheme of things, the compatibility, mutuality and inclusiveness of art and craft as a pair, the conditions under which music may lay claim to artistic integrity, the interface of art and function in music and a great many other parameters that are left vague in his otherwise laudable but all-embracing accommodation of music as 'the outcome of a particular kind of intentional human activity. Music is not simply a collection of products or objects. *Fundamentally music is something that people do'*. There is very little in this quoted opening gambit (*MM*, p.39) that is intrinsic to music. Yet it is interesting also to note Elliott's unattributed cleavage to some form of artistic definition of the nature of music. And one is entitled to reserve judgement on the absolute truth of his alluring statement that ' the best preparation for listening to and enjoying the fruits of present and future musical practices is to engage students in a balanced program of music making in relation to a reasonable diversity of musical practices' until the significance of every word is pondered as to its potential to exclude unstated but necessary experiences. If, for instance, unencumbered listening to a reasonable diversity of musical practices does not qualify in itself as a *reasonable* example of musical practice, there is ample cause to demur. MEND is insisting (in an Irish context but also as a generally applicable concern) that the nature of performance must be defined. But it seems that, in the light of the praxial philosophy as defined by David Elliott, the activity of listening is even more urgently in need of definition and advocacy.

The Inseparability of Product and Process

---

[87] Frank Heneghan, *The Interpretation of Music: A Study in Perception, Expression and Symbol*, (Dublin, University of Dublin, Trinity College, 1990; unpublished treatise), p. 12.
'Art encroaches upon life, and the sharing which art makes possible can best be considered as an attitudinal engagement between an art-object, such as music, and the individual perceiver; therein is the invitation to creativity to which music handsomely responds. Steinbeck provides a fitting epilogue (in East of Eden):

> Our species is the only creative species, and it has only one creative instrument, the individual mind and spirit of a man. Nothing was ever created by two men. There are no good collaborations, whether in music, in art, in poetry, in mathematics, in philosophy. Once the miracle of creation has taken place, the group can build and extend it, but the group never invents anything. The preciousness lies in the lonely mind of a man.

Here, then, is the heart of the matter; can there be a philosophy that would cavil at that?'

We are presented here, in what is probably the core issue (product versus process) of the differences between Reimer and Elliott, with another example of each writer presenting the 'worst case' understanding/interpretation of what he believes the other means. Elliott always seems, flatteringly in a sense, to regard MEAE as synonymous with Reimer's ideas, acknowledging in turn the power that seems to have been invested in this one man through a virtually global acceptance of his philosophy, as unassailable, for a quarter of a century - a formidable admission of an educational institution in itself. One must ask, therefore, whether MEAE is really so eccentric that it devalues *process* by raising the idea of *product* (esteemed works) to a place of such disproportionate eminence. The answer simply is no, as can be attested by any musician who is sensible and fair-minded enough to observe the scholarship that has fed on it and the reliance which a significant part of the music education force in America alone has placed in it (and in practice too) over an unprecedentedly long period. We cannot assume American music education in that era (1970 onwards) to have been the dismal failure that Elliott now predicts for it if any vestige of MEAE remains in operation. The writer would not expect an exact converse to be the outcome if similar but suitably rephrased questions were to be advanced in relation to the so-called praxial philosophy; and Elliott's simple denial that he is denigrating product in favour of process is sufficient to point the imprudence of Reimer's case, in spite of the many valid points made *en route*. In fact it leaves Reimer's questions and observations somewhat without a real target. As in much dialectic of a cavilling nature, so much depends on definition and authorial intention, as on the broader view which must normally be invoked by an outsider, often suggesting means of reconciliation. And after all, surely that must be an aspiration of true philosophical enquiry - to allow admirable theories to coexist without the feeling of total antithesis, which is damaging to the good faith of those who seek eclecticism and not just an either/or option. If these writers had pondered the significance of every word written in the context of its vulnerability to the other's case, eventually leading to this *denouement*, it is likely that the phraseology would have been much more carefully chosen and guarded; but perhaps it is an advantage that we are witness as much to their weaknesses as to their strengths.

Elliott's response to Reimer's concern is full of interesting, compelling and persuasive things but it attracts criticism also in terms of its incompleteness, its misunderstandings, or rather of his implication that his so-called multi-dimensional ideas of a musical work are all, save one, foreign to the notions of *aesthetic* thinkers. It is true that Elliott carefully and systematically constructs his model of A Musical Work (see pp 93, 155, and 199 of *MM*); in that he can defend himself ably against Reimer's accusation. But it cannot escape notice that the first of its basic dimensions is not the pristine conception (as begotten, so to speak, in the ear of the composer, and independently of such niceties [of its eventual overt aural realization] as notation, improvisation and so on) . . . but the *performance* or *interpretation* (correctly to point the need for meaningful expressive performance). It is, of course, admirable that he invokes P.G. Woodford's confirmation of a widely held view of the democracy of creativity (with which it is unthinkable that Reimer would disagree) that "[t]he performer's work may be treated as a distinct composition in itself. Performance, itself, is viewed as a process of realizing musical ideals (i.e. cognitive representations of musical composition).' This is surely to give hostage doubly to Reimer, yet again, as stressing performance and the performer(s) (and not, typically, the conductor/arranger/ composer or even an improviser's unique skill), by definition, over the work itself which has, and had, conceptual existence prior to the performance. His other dimensions are musical design, standards and traditions of practice, expression of emotion [feeling?], musical representation and cultural/ideological information, none of which can be excluded from the paraphernalia of aesthetics, albeit requiring some clarification as to definition.[88] And it is inaccurate and even a little churlish of Elliott to impute to the hated verbal concepts, which are only part (and a very small part in context) of aesthetic education, the sole intention of constraining students to listen (and, therefore, to perform, compose and improvise) narrowly. And generically to confuse processes in human experience (as, for example, listening) with the theories of how they happen, is to make nonsense of philosophical endeavour, even his own. Is he seriously suggesting that listeners cannot and do not

[88] The reader is again referred to the writer's treatise dealing, in great detail, with the subject of interpretation in music. Frank Heneghan, *The Interpretation of Music - A Study in Perception , Expression and Symbol* (Dublin: University of Dublin, Trinity College, and Dublin Institute of Technology, unpublished thesis 1990)

have aesthetic experiences without understanding the complex theory of aesthetics? The theories are merely attempts, *a posteriori*, to analyse the processes; they may be flawed but they do not invalidate the experiences they are trying to explain. And are we to assume that we cannot be musically active without being aware of our separate faculties of using procedural, formal, informal, impressionistic and supervisory knowledge? Of course not! In fairness to Elliott this theory of knowledge is a fascinating exposé, but musical activity, right up to the highest levels, does not depend on its tenets. The writer can accept that the more inflexible form of aesthetic theory, which can comfortably accommodate and inform the absolutist ideals which work for Epicureans, needs to relax into a more familial attitude towards other forms of musical experience which Elliott champions. It is interesting to observe Reimer's metamorphosis in this respect where, in his model for a universal philosophy of music (Amsterdam ISME 1996), he seems to favour classifying Absolute Expressionism as rooted in Referentialism (the *representation* of human feeling). What is important here is that perfectly adaptable theory should not be so summarily dismissed, but rather subjected to careful reappraisal and modification to suit the case in point. And there is no reason to suppose that aesthetics does not have manifold applications to praxial themes. Aesthetic theory, as distinct from MEAE, seeks to define the features of music in artistic (art) terms - no more, no less - or so it should be. Its function is not, or should not be, to demean other related activities,[89] but merely, within its brief, to define them. Thus the word *musical*, which figures largely in Elliott's writings, is less related to music as a generic ontological term than to a certain mode of performing music which is artistic and therefore interpretative in nature. In her critical analysis, *On Interpretation*, Annette Barnes[90] reinforces Danto's insistence on the intimate relationship between art and interpretation.

> The moment something is considered an artwork, it becomes subject to interpretation. It owes its existence as an artwork to this, and when its claim to art is defeated, it loses its interpretation and becomes a mere thing.[91]

This is a very strong and apposite statement - one which, the writer believes, handsomely accommodates both MEAE and praxialism without any need to insist on mutual exclusivity. But praxialism cannot have it both ways. If Elliott deals with interpretation (as he does, and not only when he refers to *musical* performance) he is predicating art. This forces him into difficult choices when he is admitting all kinds of music, which he may not necessarily be including as art, into the wider domain of music as experience. No disrespect for music is entailed here, nor does it fail to have meaning, if it does not pass muster as art by the canons of aesthetics (and no others will do, nor are they necessarily Reimer's, Elliott might be relieved to hear). It is a matter of definition and it is unlikely that Elliott sees himself as the ultimate authority in this area. He cannot usurp the rubrics of aesthetics and coin his own definitions, nor is there any need to do so.

---

[89] The reader is referred here to the excellent and highly relevant treatment of this subject by the British aesthetician R.G. Collingwood. Collingwood (1889-1943), philosopher and historian, was Waynflete Professor of Metaphysical Philosophy, Oxford University. One of the most learned men of his generation, he had a remarkable breadth of interest and knowledge and originality of mind. He is the author of many notable books, including Essay on Metaphysics, Essay on Philosophical Method and The New Leviathan, Speculum Mentis: or The Map of Knowledge (cover note to The Principles of Art). His theory of aesthetics, equating art with expression, is generally linked with that of Benedetto Croce. According to Monroe Beardsley, however, "the extent of his indebtedness is not clear, but it must be considerable (despite the fact that Collingwood hardly refers to Croce in his works), even if we allow - as we must for such a strong and go-it-alone mind as Collingwood's - that he could have worked out a great many of the ideas himself, given only a few suggestions. Collingwood is not to be dismissed as a mere follower, in any case; his own originality shows in his determined search for the differentia of art, as opposed to all manner of things confused with it, and in his detailed analysis of *imaginative expression* as a process in which inchoate emotion becomes articulate and self-aware." (Beardsley, Aesthetics, 324.)

[90] Annette Barnes is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Her work is valuable in that her treatment of the interpretation of art works refers to textual in addition to the more conventional aspects.

[91] Annette Barnes, *On Interpretation - A Critical Analysis* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, l988), p. l67.

Examining Elliott's blueprint for the nature of music, combining 'musical practices, products, processes and contexts' we find a reference to MUSIC (a diverse human practice), Music (the individual practices each combining *music making* and music listening) and music (products, works, or listenables). Since there is always an element of ambiguity in Elliott's use of the term *music making* (which he normally attributes to five sources - performer, composer and so on) we must turn to his own definition of a Musical Work on p 93 of *MM*, to find that it (a work) refers to a *performance* (see Figure 4.2), hardly to be construed as the composition itself and therefore the work of a composer (even by the broadest of definitions). This, probably quite consciously, obviates alignment with what Elliott would see as an MEAE idea from which he seems to feel the need to distance himself unequivocally. So the result is that we are left with the equation of Elliott's *music* (lower case, the third of his blueprint components noted above*)* or 'products, works or listenables' with a *performance*, aided by Woodford's corroboration (p. 12 of the essay; also see above). The writer has no major reservation about this somewhat idiosyncratic nicety of definition (believing that the work as authentically interpreted is inseparably bound to the composer's concept anyway [but not so to Elliott, it appears]); but the comment is necessary to show how Elliott, by his own hand, invites an interpretation of his blueprint for music which really *is* a matter of process. Reimer's claims, so based, are not so absurd as Elliott would like his readers to believe.

The nub of this matter is surely the nature of aesthetics as a discipline, removed from all association with Reimer and his sophisticated treatment of its applicability to music and music education. Such an appraisal would obviously be a gargantuan task and would not be appropriate in this analysis. But there are a few vital elements that must be taken into account in attempting to explain some of Elliott's too facile (mis)understandings of how this highly respected discipline can illuminate much of what happens in the *feelingful experience of music*, if that would be accepted by Elliott as applying to most, if not all, of his open list (by definition) of musical practices. There is a danger that one can become incarcerated in one's own culture to such an extent that its products can be taken for granted and even misapplied in a philosophical sense.[92] It should, therefore, constantly be borne in mind that most of the philosophy of music (obviously excluding the contribution by the Greeks) and of music education (including MEAE and Praxialism), and the disciplines of aesthetics and ethnomusicology are themselves largely rooted in the cultural traditions of post-Renaissance Europe. Ethnomusicology is the most recent and is, of course, by definition, not ethnocentric. But aesthetics, although as a scholarly pursuit it has its origins in 18th century Europe, is nevertheless also not Eurocentric. Described variously as the science of perception (Baumgarten), philosophy of the arts ((Sulzer) or simply as a study of response to things perceived, it invariably plays down the idea of the art object; response is the crucial quality. But it essays to examine response to all the arts in all their manifestations; it thus does not place European art music in any privileged position. We must also recognize, but without any odorous comparisons at this stage, the eminence of the European musical tradition in its own right but - more importantly, the scholarship associated with it, particularly that related to educational theory, methodology and practice.

It is now crucially necessary to come to some understanding of music (or Elliott's *Music/music*) as art. This should be merely a question of examining the definitions and coming to a decision on the basis of the dozen or so criteria that are in general circulation; they include mimesis (or imitation), craft, unity in variety, judgements of beauty (again with their own canons, conventions and contexts; it is not just a question of taste or fiat but of the exercise of judgement based on experience, which may [or should] be cross-cultural), feeling/emotion, expressiveness, function and so on. If a segregation of musics is necessary, it should be well founded and should carry neither stigma nor accolade; it is merely a question of classification. But this is where the problems and misunderstandings arise. In spite of what Elliott claims about the innate equality of all musical practices (dealt with in detail elsewhere in this report; see review of Elliott's MEND lecture [Ref. II P viii] and the treatment in David Aspin's *MM* book review), there is an almost instinctive and very prevalent propensity to elevate some music above others; this may be a question of conditioning, socio-cultural perceptions, and the like, but of its

[92] The reader is again referred to the writer's thesis - Heneghan, *The Interpretation of Music - A Study in Perception, Expression and Symbol*, p. 13.

existence there is no doubt. There seems to be little objection to intracultural judgements of excellence and value. In fact it seems almost crass and inane to deny that, for example, in western art music (even within the output of one composer) some pieces are palpably better than/superior to others. The writer struggles to find a vestige of substance in the claim that similar judgements, backed by experience and scholarship (invoked by Elliott in his treatment of creativity, in which he has no qualms about elevating certain manifestations over others in value and authenticity), cannot be applied interculturally. If there is a hierarchy within each culture or genre (note Elliott's treatment of Duke Ellington's *Daybreak Express* as a masterpiece) why are intercultural judgements not subject to the same relativity when authentically appraised by multicultural experts? No disrespect for what is excellent in any culture is entailed in the belief that the inter-cultural continuum of excellence would reveal a substantial amount of overlapping between cultures, should the exercise ever be necessary to establish this. What is important here is to recognize (as Reimer suggests) that a hierarchy does exist, that there is a basis for judgement, and that reflective practitioners bring to bear their experience and differentiating powers in ensuring that the best examples of any culture should normally be offered in a curriculum in which it is a worthy component. On one side of this exercise in discrimination there is rejection akin to élitism: on the other there is resentment, accounting for many well-known phenomena. Harry White referred to one of them, in which the aficionados of musics other then European art music borrow its academic jargon to storm its citadel in academia; another is the common practice in the publicity surrounding pop stars to refer to them as *artists*, again showing that most musics aspire to the condition of art. Artistic endeavour may be a labour of love, but its achievements are time- and work-intensive; there is a tendency for the pseudo-arts to aspire to the inner sanctum. If they cannot all be admitted the blame cannot be laid at the door of aesthetics. In the case of music, the writer believes that there are exclusions which define themselves, but they do not cease to be music on that account. Thus, for example, it is not inconsistent in an artistic (musical/expressive/interpretative) sense for Reimer to refer, in a non-derogatory way, to practices which are unmusical simply because they are outside the consideration of art (see Collingwood [*Principles of Art*] footnote below). If these practices, on the other hand, and as seems to be hinted at by Elliott, are found to invaginate artistic qualities by virtue of their craft and/or expressiveness, then they are candidates for readmission as art. But this is not a theory we can attribute to Reimer.

There is a real need here for Elliott to reappraise aesthetic theory with a less jaundiced eye. The writer is unsure as to how Elliott views music's claim to being globally and indiscriminately artistic. If he supports it unconditionally he is just being iconoclastic in relation to a wealth of well-founded and highly respected aesthetic theory, which evolved, not with the idea of exclusion but for metaphysical clarity. If he does not, he is, on the other hand, opening up an abundantly helpful area of relevant and potentially fruitful enquiry as to an enlarged context for music, which *is* pressing. This is a major concern for music education in the new millennium. It was raised by Harry White in his paper, and commented on by Reimer in a very candid and honest way which pinpointed three issues - multiculturalism, popular music and performance (definition) - as being central to the dilemma. In the writer's view, Elliott's stance which, *inter alia*, seems to be saying that music education should just become multicultural in its broadest sense (even if one were to ignore the confusion about product and process and the dominance of performance in the scheme) is simplistic if the methodology of doing this is not crystal clear, which it certainly is not from Elliott's generalizations. Whatever about attitudes within MEAE (as the 'official' music education philosophy in the US, according to Elliott), certainly Reimer has long ago dispensed with notions of absolutism (if he ever had them); he has expanded his ideas into the softer version of Absolute Expressionism which aligns it with Referentialism; he has adopted the developing ideas of multiculturalism, which were not so relevant when he wrote *A Philosophy of Music Education* as they are now; he has included praxialism as a possible approach to music education and philosophy (though he specifically does not support what he considers to be Elliott's extreme version). He seems, on this evidence, to be ripe for détente. While Elliott is writing such obviously spurious comment as that 'MEAE assumes that the Navaho people listen to and value their musical achievements as "unconsummated presentational" symbols and for structural elements (e.g., contrasting sections high and low, nasal timbre) to achieve "insight" into the general forms of feeling (Reimer, 1989, p.86 [which does not seem to refer])', he seems very far from compromise or rationalization.

Aesthetic theory has much to offer to the widest spectrum of musical experience to explain its nature. As proposed above, the wealth of philosophical material available from the treasury of European cultural history has blossomed into an elaborate and multidimensional pedagogical and methodological system, to which MEAE is one, though by no means the only, contributor, as far as music goes. At least it has had the courage to lay out systematic approaches to the teaching, appreciation and enrichment of musical experience for learners. Whatever the flaws imputed to it (and Elliott can find little else) it does attempt, even in the example quoted (Navaho music) to provide some point of entry (no more - and typically to an ethnic example within a multicultural programme), not for the Navaho Indian (who doesn't need it anyway - and Elliott's mocking tone noted above is impertinently irrelevant here) but for the novice outsider, typically representing almost 100 percent of learners who may have little opportunity to hear or witness an authentic performance of it except through recordings, and even that is a resource issue by no means easy to make provision for (in a comprehensive way) which is fair to the diversity of music which Elliott is at pains to stress. There is nothing to prevent the reflective practitioner (even an MEAE devotee) who is enthusiastic about such music and judges it to be a valuable experience for his students, as a priority - from taking all kinds of initiatives to bring the experience nearer to the reality of a Navaho involvement. Contrary to what Elliott is suggesting, MEAE is not trying to 'educate the feeling' of a Navaho Indian; neither, presumably, is it attempting to give to the arbitrary listener anything more than a flavour of the music with some practical help in its absorption and enjoyment . . . nor is it essaying the impossible task of so identifying with the culture as to ensure that the alien listener will have the same rich experience as the Navaho in recognizing the music 'as a cultural identity that belongs to [him] and to which [he] belongs … this sense of musical belonging is something to be cherished' (*MM,* p 211) Pragmatism alone, in relation to choice from the myriad experiences that constitute a well rounded musical education (within the virtually insupportable time constraints of the general music programme) rules that little more than Reimer's suggestion is possible; it may be typical of the Concept as Tool approach, but it is not just trying to tell ('notify, inform, advise') students of something (since it is merely a preliminary to the experience of the music itself), but is an aid which most listeners will attest to as a real help in enriching the experience, no matter what Elliott says. While it cannot be denied that he is idealistic and well-intentioned (except in his outright refusal to credit MEAE with any merit whatsoever in the educational process), Elliott's slice-of-life answer to MEAE (p.14 of his essay) is hopelessly out of touch with the realities of the general music curriculum, even in ambiences which are much more benignly multi-cultural and better resourced than (say) Ireland; the criticism is, however, generally aimed. Taking any example of music (Elliott chooses the Zulu song *Siyahamba*) and gathering from his comprehensive list of how it should be taught we find him insisting that the 'performative, expressional and cultural dimensions . . . together with the structural dimensions' should be dealt with; that the music should be evaluated comprehensively, contextually and authentically in *all* relevant dimensions; that it should be performed and interpreted according to genuine tradition; that other performances (live and/or recorded) should be critically reflected upon [without the crutch of verbal concepts?- writer's insertion]; that a video should be watched with a view to identifying and solving problems, and leading to enhanced performance; that another work from the same culture should be introduced and studied; that composing, arranging and performing works in that style should form part of the class activity. Presumably there would still be sufficient time to 'learn to sing arrangements/compositions chosen from more (or less) familiar musical practices ….'! The writer struggles to envisage a time dimension unfolding manageably from such an aspiration, so redolent is it of the specialized study (ethnomusicological in this case) appropriate to undergraduate level (or higher) described by Patricia Shehan Campbell and Ramon Santos in their presentations (Refs. III P v and II P vii). It seems far beyond the scope of the school general music programme if a balanced menu of music is to be attempted, and particularly in the contexts of (a) the relevance of the music to the population and cultural needs of the school (a problem that the multiculturalists and ethnomusicologists are far from having solved as yet. There is no disrespect implied here for Zulu music); (b) the readiness of the class to participate in the niceties of absorbing cultural, contextual and interpretative 'information' from the music itself with no other props, such as conceptual tools; c) the ability of average teachers to be so comprehensively 'clued in' to a potentially wide variety of unfamiliar music; (d) the resource implications; and (e) the problem of authenticity,

style and tradition in performance, which will tax the average teacher, typically, in most of the performing/interpreting repertoire, and not just in that of unfamiliar music.

Multiple questions arise, as one reads his essay, as to what extent Elliott is providing well defined and workable alternatives to the more comprehensive statements of the aesthetic movement. Even if one were to indulge his criticism of MEAE as effectively attempting to 'homogenize the diversity of musical endeavors and musical products worldwide', when his own generalizations are discounted and the extravagance of his alternative slice-of-life pondered as to its feasibility and its capability to 'target, teach and esteem all dimensions' in a typical course time-allocation, one is as daunted by its impracticability as much as one can admire its starry-eyed intent. There are obviously questions of balance and curriculum management to be taken into account here. And one must honestly ask whether, in the many admirable things proposed, aesthetic thinking in practice (by reflective practitioners, who are engaged in 'the bringing to bear of critical intelligence upon practical tasks rather than [in] the implementation of good advice' (Ref. II P viii p.1) cannot be aligned with the very processes that Elliott seems to be claiming as his own. There is an uneasy feeling that the amount of distortion, of both aesthetic and praxial themes, introduced by both Reimer and Elliott, is occluding a considerable amount of common ground. And Elliott's quotations from his reviewers, when he considers them complimentary to his approach, raise similar questions. Thus one must ask in relation to Natalie Sarrazin's review, whether there is consensus that music education should be responding meekly to the demands of the social sciences and ethnomusicology. And she cannot have been aware in 1996 of Reimer's work on a universal or 'inclusive philosophy', placing music in psychological perspective, in addition to 'placing music education in the company of most recent ideas in the social sciences' without having recourse to theories that are no more than hypothetical. And the attribution of the idea of the multidimensional work to Elliott by Stubley (*qv* above) could be challenged in all its dimensions as having been debated long since by various contributors to the aesthetic dialectic and, indeed, rejected by some on convincing arguments.

To conclude his commentary on what he refers to as Myth 5, Elliott repeats his insistence, that neither he nor his colleague Jerrold Levinson ever stated 'that music exists only as a process' and, also, that 'the praxial philosophy makes a central place for musical works/products in its concept of music'. What he *does* say in his book, by equating musical products or works with performance, which is clearly process-based, is reported above for the reader to pontificate on how justified Reimer was in his converse interpretation. But it does not alter the heartening reality that both philosophies recognize the inseparable interrelationship of the two (product and process). Elliott claims that the question "What is music" cannot be answered by some version of the aesthetic concept of music which denies "the epistemological and social nature of music makers, music making, musical works (broadly conceived)". Admittedly Elliott is putting forward a burning question here that must be a preoccupation of music educators, in this millennium, faced with the ever-widening chasm between many purely social experiences of music (and music making) and the perception of how music is taught in schools. But it would be more cautious to essay an enquiry into the musical epistemology and nature of some social behaviours as to rule that *all* socially- as distinct from humanistically-based musical experiences must be allowed to usurp the musical picture and skew the image. In this context aesthetic theory, which is humanistically based, by definition, has a great deal to offer in the analysis. Elliott's philosophy must come clean on the artistic nature of music and, in the resolution, if certain musics emerge as unduly dominated by their social content we must know what to do with them - above all how (or if) they should be taught. As Reimer pragmatically and provocatively observes, '[m]uch of popular music is a vehicle for non-musical experience and therefore has little to do with the function of school music as aesthetic education. We can bypass such music safely because few youngsters would expect or want it to be brought into the school.' (*A Philosophy of Music Education*, 1989, p.144. The passage must be read in its entirety to derive its full significance.) The writer is comfortable with the idea that the teaching of music in school by enlightened and reflective practitioners who may wish to adhere to the most recent thoughts on the application of aesthetic theory to music teaching, can prepare students to be more discriminating in their choice of music for listening. If learners value music merely for the social experience of it - and this (being a perfectly normal human behaviour) is not necessarily being denigrated - they do not need to be inducted into

the process by elaborate and painstaking methodology. And indeed one wonders whether, in fact, such methodology exists in the same refinement as in more conventional approaches. But Elliott obviously has more in mind than clarifying the place of pop music in the western tradition. His multicultural preoccupations are beginning to emerge and dominate; these must now be rationalized as to their feasibility for inclusion in the general music curriculum.

In summary, Elliott's response to the Works of Music/ Product/Process criticism makes the following additional points.

> 'A central aim of the praxial philosophy is to offer students and teachers a comprehensive model of musical products that can be used as an open and flexible guide for listening to music . . . as an alternative to the *aesthetic* concept of works'. This ought to be challenged on several fronts - not with the intention of demeaning Elliott's idea, but with a view to rescuing aesthetics from the restrictive and narrow interpretation that Elliott invokes with monotonous regularity. Elliott himself eventually accepts the idea of usefulness of verbal knowledge (which is equivalent, if one does not cavil unduly, to 'concepts as learning tools') but it seems reprehensible that he should so repetitively latch onto this as, seemingly, the only educational device in the armoury of MEAE. It is true that both Reimer and Elliott impute to one another a failure to have read the supporting documentation in relation to the points they make. Here it might be commented, in fairness to Reimer, that the scope of his book *A Philosophy of Music* (1970 and 1989) is infinitely wider and more sophisticated than the image which Elliott's caricature of it presents, which takes little account of a wealth of sensitive analysis in the treatment of the subject; and for the purposes of this analysis (though Richard Colwell's cautionary words should be heeded (Ref. II P ix) that theory, practice, and outcomes seldom, if ever, coincide) we must take Elliott's evaluation that Reimer's philosophy (presumably only that of 1970-89 but obviously ignoring later pronouncements) and MEAE may be taken as being in a theory/practice relationship. If Elliott also accepts the idea of the equal importance or interdependence of product and process and the notion of esteemed works, performances or manifestations in all cultures (and there is no longer any reason to doubt this, although it is distorted in Reimer's apologia) it is amazing that he accepts and portrays, as approval, the statement of one of his reviewers (Humphreys) that '[h]e [Elliott] takes dead aim at the distinctly western notion of art objects as having value in and of themselves, apart from their cultural contexts' This just is not true (see Harry Whites *A book of manners in the wilderness* [Ref. III P viii] for an unambiguous statement of how great works are mediated through their culture and *vice versa*, apart from their additional qualities of timelessness) if the 'western notion' spoken of is assumed to be in line with aesthetic theory, which is also careful to stress response - the effect the so-called art object has on the sensibility of the person who engages with and *experiences* it visually, aurally and so on. In the writer's view it is splitting hairs, if indeed it is not pure misrepresentation, to claim that philosophies of music other than Praxialism are unconcerned with 'meanings pivoting on shared thought processes and public standards of evaluation that arise in and work through the music making itself; that assumes, of course, that music *listening* may also be included as an act of music making. The concept of listening artistically, supported within MEAE, is equally as benign, flattering to the ear, democratic and all-embracing as anything that Elliott brings forward by way of opening music to the most comprehensive interpretation of its nature, significance and value. Elliott is not the first music educator to show well-intentioned concern about the sociological phenomenon of the cleavage between 'high' and 'popular' cultures and the compromised condition of ethnic musics ('whatever ethnomusicologists, say, would agree is music in cultures other than our own') in western perception, in spite of their validity. But in seeking to sanction "the widest most inclusive central usage of 'music' [in the product sense]

current at the present time" his starting point is obviously an aspiration towards a universal philosophy of music education, and is setting a task that may very well be impossible because of the levels of adaptability to so many standards that it entails. One wonders, therefore, whether he is not being too idealistic and whether, indeed, if the mysterious candidates which are being outlawed (according to Elliott) by artistic theory (Reimer, MEAE, or simply classical aesthetics) were to be identified, we are not dealing with a marginal and minuscule area of music that can be validated, for their purpose, by other worthy criteria. The writer believes that music as art is a hardy and compelling notion that encapsulates ideas of judgement, value, quality, excellence and comparative standards to which he would not imagine Elliott to be averse; it is totally interpenetrated with aesthetic theory and is too pervasive and valuable a mentality to be discarded, if indeed this would be Elliott's intention. And the idea of music as art is not peculiar to western culture. Elliott's obsessive and somewhat myopic aversion to Reimer's philosophy is therefore placing him in a compromised, if not in an inconsistent, stance.

In claiming that the praxial view goes beyond the 'design' dimension and evaluates musical works comprehensively, contextually and authentically, in all their relevant dimensions' it is not clear to the writer how Reimer's philosophy fails in this respect. The multidimensional concept of the musical work is honoured comfortably in the aesthetic approach which certainly takes account of the nature of performance, and interpretation (and not just by equating them to 'sounds as produced'), to musical design, to standards and traditions of practice, to expression of feeling (discriminating between it and raw emotion), to representation (in the symbolic sense which is a highly respected general theory, not to be despised or trifled with, of how the human condition functions and expresses itself) and cultural information. There are differences between it and Elliott's form of praxialism, of course; but it is certainly not unidimensional and actually addresses Elliott's six dimensions in a significant way. Just as it must be accepted that Elliott recognizes the inseparability of product and process, Reimer must be credited with the same belief in all its fullness. Thus there is no 'narrow [aesthetic] sense of esteemed works', except in the narrow [aesthetic] sense of inflexible Formalism (which Reimer places in admirable perspective in his Amsterdam paper as to its theoretical value but superannuated fashionability); nor can it be claimed that Reimer's philosophy ignores or plays down the importance of 'performative, expressional and cultural dimensions' in music. Reimer suggests criteria for evaluating music (*A Philosophy* 1989, p. 133 *et seq.*); it is true that they are related to music as art and that they eventually create a hierarchy and a continuum with a flexible threshold of acceptability. It is significantly open to all kinds of music (typically western art music, popular and ethnic musics and their hybrids, which define a very large, if not all-embracing, constituency in themselves). There is more than an implication that Elliott supports the idea of excellence (e.g. the Ellington masterpiece). One wonders specifically, therefore, as to which of his *musics* is beyond the pale of Reimer's criteria and indeed on what grounds he would validate them himself, if they are. Since human feeling is deeply embedded in the social context of music it seems to be a 'red herring' to point to an appreciation of the social aspects of music making as a significant differentiating and polarizing feature as between praxial and aesthetic approaches. And note Reimer's confirmation that in certain cultures (e.g. 'that of Bali, famous for its integration of art with life') 'few if any distinctions are made among arts or between artworks and life itself; the process of doing art, and the products of those processes, are recognized as necessarily interdependent, in which specialized products are made by people who specialize in the process of making them' (Reimer review of Elliott *MM*), p. 67).

Again it should be noted with satisfaction that Elliott, in being goaded by Reimer into clarifying his sometimes unguarded statements, confirms his belief in revered pieces (e.g. Ellington's *Daybreak Express*) and honours the musicianship of artists outside the western tradition (e.g. the Dagomba *master* drummer [note the hierarchical and élitist

connotation here], 'who knows why, when, and how to shape the "ongoing texture of rhythms" in ways that are artistically and socially significant' [again note the use of the purely aesthetic term *artistically*]. The confusion is clarified but Elliott's phraseology makes him vulnerable to misinterpretation, as, for instance, when he claims that '[in] many cultures, music is not a matter of revered pieces . . .; music is a matter of singing and playing instruments. . . . And even in the West, there are many kinds of musical situations in which the actions of singing and playing (in the intentional sense) take precedence over music in the narrow sense of esteemed works.' Elliott is admirably drawing attention to the social dimension of music (an aspect of music on which there is consensus in present day music education as to its importance and as to the urgency of developing a more benign attitude towards its influence on the way many people regard and enjoy music), whereas Reimer is justified in querying the artistic content of such performances and in suggesting a continuum in which each performance can be classified, with each potentially becoming a revered work. The writer has no problems with either stance or with the compatibility of both. It is merely a question of how their own words can expose these adversaries to mutual misunderstanding and inevitable criticism and point-scoring, a practice disavowed by Reimer but one in which he is tempted to indulge throughout his essay.

'Making music, and listening to the music one is making, is both an end in itself and a stepping-stone to understanding and cherishing more challenging works in the same musical practice that students may never have the opportunity or level of musicianship to perform themselves' (Elliott). While this is unexceptionable as it stands it should not be taken to mean, categorically, that it is the only or best route to understanding and cherishing other music, as Elliott states elsewhere: 'the best preparation for listening to musical performances in the future is full participation in music making in the present' (p17 of his essay). And participation (even as a listener) in more challenging music is less a question of opportunity than of developing musicianship; this, in turn, is related to the inculcation and acquisition of skills which, in the variety and complexity suggested by Elliott (improvising, conducting, composing *et al*) are far beyond the capability of general school music programmes (as we currently see them in operation). Both MEAE and praxialism aspire to the same involvements in music making that Elliott lists; but MEAE seems to be more pragmatically based and vehemently attests to the value of unencumbered listening as an aid to appreciation (as, also, to active music making), which it undoubtedly is when artistically and imaginatively taught as context demands - a possibility that Elliott does not seem to envisage as normally feasible or desirable. As one delves further into Elliott's essay (and indeed, at source, into *MM)* one is struck more and more by his insistence that listening to music (and, yes, simply and baldly interpreted, only because it is an essential component in the MEAE approach) be disallowed as a 'key to "systems of meaning"' which relies on 'a unique, multidimensional, and practice-specific form of thinking and knowing called musicianship'. Is one to assume then that listening to music is a grossly inferior way to inculcate musicianship and that it is neither a unique nor practice-specific form of thinking and knowing about music? Although Elliott will argue that listening *per se is* allowed for in the praxial approach, it is not accorded the status of being a musical practice; it is deprioritized as a passive pursuit (which it certainly is not) in relation to the active components such as performing; it is *postponed* as a private procedure more fitting to adult life, and is denied the specific teaching (unattached, for its purposes, to active music making) which must surely be necessary to ensure that it can be indulged to maximum effect in that form, which is typical of most involvement in music, if we are to trust the statistics and the commercial evidence of investment in music listening.

The writer finds nothing in Natalie Sarrazin's description of Elliott's philosophy (as based 'on ethnomusicological theory . . . a multidimensional model aimed at aiding musical understanding . . . . This multicultural music is subsumed through praxis, where

all learning is to occur through culturally informed significant musical challenges') which is outside the scope of the aesthetic approach (as fully treated in Reimer's book). Again what is wanting here is a clear definition of what *cultural* means and the extent to which it should be allied to artistic considerations (enlightenment and refinement of taste acquired by intellectual and aesthetic/artistic training) or just considered as the typical behaviour, customary beliefs, social forms and material traits of a racial or social group; and this latter meaning does little service to the artistic aspirations of such groups, which may be very real and very valid indeed in many, if not most, of their musical manifestations. Clarification of this confusion (in which Elliott constantly refers to *artistic* performance and *interpretation*, both redolent of aesthetic treatment - which does not recognize the artwork as an entity in itself, divorced from the response of the percipient, let it be said)[93] would throw considerable light on the apparent contradiction in which Elliott first asserts that '*MM* never states or assumes that "music" is different from a work of music' and then follows this by challenging the assumption that "What is music?" is the same as the question "What is a *work* of music [in the *aesthetic* sense]". It does appear as if Elliott, in his investigation of the social nature of 'music makers, music making and musical works (broadly conceived)' regards the art connotation (in spite of his constant invocation of artistic phraseology) as insufficient and unnecessary for his purposes. It certainly leads to an interesting (if somewhat pointless, because it is a too loose) definition of music as a diverse human practice. While it celebrates music as a mere skill-based artefact (although he disavows the need for skill), it does little to establish a sense of distinctiveness or even of uniqueness for music which has no aspiration to artistic utterance; the definition is pejorative for an overwhelming repertoire of music which definitely is conceived by its makers (composers, interpreters and listeners) in artistic terms.

[93] R. G. Collingwood epitomizes this concern in his *Principles of Art* (pp. 41 and 108):

> Aesthetic theory is the theory not of beauty but of art. The theory of beauty … is merely an attempt to explain away the aesthetic activity by appeal to a supposed quality which is in fact nothing but the activity itself, falsely located not in the agent but in his external world. … There is in art proper a distinction resembling that between means and end, but not identical with it; something to do with emotion, with a resemblance to arousing it, but [which] is not arousing it; something to do with making things … but not by skill.

Listening

In **4** h above, Reimer draws attention to a recurrent implication (it is never developed sufficiently to be more than this) in *Music Matters* that what applies to performance is equally valid for improvising, composing, arranging and conducting (but *not* to listening *per se*). This causes some confusion as when the philosopher Wolterstorff is quoted (by Elliott) as saying that "[m]ost of all, musicing reminds us that performing and improvising through singing and playing instruments lies at the heart of MUSIC as a diverse human practice. … the basic reality of music is not works or the composition of works but music making". This seems definitively to anchor Elliott's philosophy in championing performance; listeners (defined as those uninvolved simultaneously in any other musical activity) are disfranchised in the process, Elliott's strategy being to channel them all into performance, whether or not it is their choice of involvement in music.

What emerges from the section on 'Musical Listening' (p. 16 of the Elliott essay), when it has been divested of the predictable trappings of thesis, counterposition, claim, counterclaim and defence, is that both Reimer and Elliott value listening, although their approaches are somewhat different, notably in the way Elliott consciously avoids overt enthusiasm for any procedure that might be seen as aligning him with MEAE. It is palpable how he damns with faint praise (verbal concepts and listening are particularly targeted) only to readmit the perceived so-called MEAE practices with cautionary qualifications. The point at issue is not whether active music making (performing, conducting, etc.) demands cultured listening, which no reasonable person would deny. Enough has been said about Elliott's failure to stress the importance of listening as an independent activity, as employing situated forms of knowing, and as a comprehensively challenging activity in its own right; and his isolation of performance (by various comments that deprioritize the other activities into parenthetical and nominal roles) as his effective route to musicianship and to listening has also been commented on. The dominating effect of Reimer's (MEAE?) philosophy is evident in Elliott's repeated reactions to it, resulting in implausible sequences, simply because they are incomplete (except in the *small print* or as elicited by Reimer's criticism). The central issue here is the status of listening as a freestanding activity in its own right. It can be taken from Elliott's defence that it may now be admitted as a valid pursuit. And Elliott may be credited with sincerity in the assertion that his 'concern for music listening as praxis - the nature, values, teaching and learning of music listening - outweighs the attention [he] gives to any other topic'. This, of course, should be axiomatic in any philosophy of music education.

The upshot of all this selective and pejorative interpretation by each writer of the other's intentions and a dogged insistence on playing down the full spectrum of activities provided for in the rival philosophical approach, attempting to deny it credibility, is that the similarities between the two eventually emerge more vividly than their incompatibilities, at least on the subject of listening. Elliott's activities (all five, but on a rapidly diminishing scale of feasibility, leaving performance implicitly as the dominant mode) are included in the wider context of MEAE (or so the writer believes). It seems grossly unfair to single out the school curriculum for *voluntary* non-performers as defining the totality of MEAE - an impression that may easily be taken from Elliott's implications. And Elliott is at pains to correct Reimer's interpretation of praxialism as discouraging listening when it is unrelated to one of his (Elliott's) activities. There is, of course, still the question of balance and emphasis which, in a North American context, is imponderable since the autonomy of individual state control of the curriculum (or the adoption of proposed standards) intervenes, adding an extra dimension of confusion to the shortfall between the intended and delivered curriculum. And there is as yet no edifice of methodology devoted to the wholesale delivery of praxialism (and the National Standards in the US, couched in very general and neutral terms, evince no special commitment to it), so its effectiveness remains conjectural.

The section dealing with musical understanding is another case of futile arguing and point-scoring on an issue which really is as unsolvable as the theories in each philosophy are unprovable in absolute terms. Ignoring Reimer's unwary isolation of performance (which is irrelevant to this issue anyway) as Elliott's only substantial activity, there can be little doubt that immersion in one or more of the

activities of performing, improvising, composing, arranging and conducting will lead to enhanced musical understanding. The number of professional musicians (including scholars) who have been untouched by some form of music-making (as defined by Elliott) must be minuscule. It is also probable that the vast majority of these musicians have been exposed to a balanced (pre-praxial) diet of both practice and so-called academic experiences. There is therefore little substance in an argument (Elliott's) that just *asserts* that their musical understanding emanates from a specific component of their training (music-making). Many people have their experiences and understanding of music enriched by their reading and by listening *per se* (two areas of involvement that are accorded only a kind of second-class citizenship by Elliott). And those who make their contribution to the music enterprise by writing about it certainly contribute to those understandings, both in their own concentrated listening-based research and in the subsequent appreciation of their readers. It is a truism to assert that all understandings in music must, of course, and by definition, be music-based. If, as seems now to be the case, Elliott has made a place (albeit a relatively lowly one) for listening *per se*, it follows that listening as an activity in itself can and must contribute (and handsomely, the writer believes) to musical understanding. Apropos, it seems an artificial distinction which denies listening a full role (or accords it only a compromised one) as an activity, since Elliott claims that it, like all his preferred activities, employs the full range of five forms of knowing that he proposes for our consideration. It therefore also seems ungenerous and pessimistic, if not spurious, for Elliott to assert that 'intelligent writings about music are not manifestations of *musical* understanding in the fullest sense. The writer knows non-practitioner musicians in academia who write about music, not only with great appreciation, understanding and passion, but in such a way as to stimulate their readers and to communicate to them much of what they feel, which is undeniably truly musical. Nor are such understandings to be equated to mastery of certain concepts like 'style' or 'rhythm' or 'the Renaissance', as Howard Gardner suggests pejoratively. If one keeps listening in mind, as one of *now six* modes of music-making, Gardner's definition fits very well: '… any notion of understanding ought to center on the capacities exhibited and the operations carried out by masters of a domain [including writers/listeners?], and each domain features its own characteristic constraints and opportunities', though doubtless this is not Gardner's intended meaning.

It is becoming increasingly obvious in this comparative study that we have two scholars here who see themselves, and behave, as if they are in polar positions, while the writer believes that the polarity is without real substance. In one case it is assumed the better to ward off siege and threat: in the other, by deconstructing the strongly established and widely recognized position of the first and by distancing itself from its 'suspect' tenets it is hoped to persuade the readers to reject them and embrace the opposite. Elliott places this polarity apparently at its most extreme when he quotes Reimer as saying that '[p]erforming, in the general music programme, is an essential but contributory mode of interaction with music' whereas his stance is that '[l]istening to recordings in the general music program, as in all praxial curricula, is an essential but contributory mode of interaction with music'. But aren't these statements also merely variants of the same basic principle - that performance (activities) *and* listening are quintessential in the music education dispensation. It seems to the writer that we are dealing here with a pragmatist (Reimer) and an idealist (Elliott) but, apart from these differences, each defining a respected approach to philosophy (in practice and in concept, though paradoxically they are in reverse roles here, Elliott being the more academic and Reimer the more practical in approach), we are not always comparing like with like.

Towards Rationalization

It might be helpful, at this point, to sketch the parameters that need to be weighed in the balance

1. Although Elliott is Canadian, it may be taken that both he and Reimer are addressing the school music education scene in the United States for the purposes of their confrontation in this instance.

2. Music education in the United States is not uniform in approach and this accounts for much of the confusion. Reimer's position has changed with the realities of the perceived successes and failures of the dispensation, as far as it can be assessed in general terms, and this has always been made admirably clear. It should be affirmed, however, that his base philosophy and his commitment to the aesthetic principle has not changed and this is stated in the 1989 second (revised) edition of his book (p. xiii). There is no doubt that the system - Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) is largely attributable to him, as intellectual property, but much further confusion has been generated over the years as to its total remit (and Elliott has compounded the confusion). If one is to be guided by A Philosophy of Music Education (1989) it is clear that the approach considers the comprehensive programme in schools and so, for the purposes of this study, does not elevate listening over performance, as any honest reader will soon discover. To interpret Reimer's book otherwise would be an injustice. There is thus no cause whatsoever for Elliott to be triumphalist (see Note 11 of his essay) about the order in which the American National Standards (MENC Music Content Standards) list music activities; it would be very strange indeed if performing music did not occupy an important position, as it would be if listening were not also included. But it should be remembered that, as Paul Lehman states in his paper on these very standards (Ref. III p iii, p. 8), they are no more than an aspiration, an attempt to make a 'clear and explicit statement of what every young American should know and be able to do in music. . . . Our [US] standards summarize what results we seek from music instruction rather than what activities [writer's italics] we think the students should engage in. They are not advocacy statements. They don't promote any particular methodology. They are not a curriculum . . . . They say nothing about how they are to be achieved; that is left to the school districts and individual teachers'. Could anything be stated with more neutrality or less hierarchical intent?

<u>The Realities of American Music Education</u>

The realities of American music education, with a long history which predates Reimer by half a century or more, are that music *is* and *has been* perceived as a matter of performance, with supplementary ancillaries as dictated locally by music educators and education policy. Nor is this surprising; we have had a similar attitude in Ireland, which is the concern in Harry White's paper. Reimer cannot be credited with or criticized for the performance programme as it has evolved in the US. And he has made it clear on many occasions that, in spite of its successes, which are considerable and impressive, it tends to be too unidimensional; it is doubtful, reading Elliott's *MM* as he would wish, that such a programme would meet with *his* unqualified approval either. The problem that faced Reimer and the music education strategists (before 1970 and even up to the present) is the stranglehold that the performance programme exerts over the music education mentality, in its widest contexts, and for reasons that are complex, socially and politically, and far beyond the scope of this study to explain. Suffice it to say that the performance programme is a sturdy irreducible and fixture that presents an enormous challenge to the National Standards, in their acceptance and enactment, to modify. The performance programme is a matter of national pride in the US (up to 15% of schoolgoers participate, according to Reimer) but its robustness (tied, *inter alia*, into issues of the employment of performers as music teachers) is such that it also controls the attitudes of student participants. Thus only a negligible part of the performance cohort participates in the general music

programme and, considering its optional status in middle and high schools (whatever about the future), there is little that could have been done in the past to change that. Thus there were and are two music education programmes in schools - one performance-dominated to the point of suppressing or merely paying lip service to the many supportive activities, the other, erroneously assumed to be MEAE, by definition or by a natural process of students exerting options (or not) being virtually bereft of performers. It is arguable (and Elliott's idealism is compelling here) that this pseudo-streaming, in operation, has had discriminatory effects (on both cohorts) but, considering that it is only in the 1990s that the arts have been accepted as essential in education (see Lehman – Ref. III P iii), Reimer and his colleagues were faced with a virtually immutable situation in the 1970s. This gives a totally different perspective to Reimer's statement that '[p]erforming, in the general music program, is an essential [note *essential*) but contributory mode of interaction with music'. Faced with this entrenched socially-based (as distinct from school- or educationally-based) dichotomy, with music education in a weak and vulnerable position *vis-à-vis* the employment-potential of other (core) subjects, the question might very well have been asked as to what options were open to music educators. It must have seemed plausible and compelling that they should have tried to salvage some musical experiences for those who were, by choice, non-performers (in the sense of falling short of even competent, not to mention proficient or expert level) by exposing them to the widest feasible repertoire of music through listening, and (presumably with the mediation of inspired and inspiring teachers), to help them to listen with more enjoyment, purpose and understanding. There is no reason to believe that Reimer and colleagues would not have been delighted, if they had been presented with the resources (teacher training), the time and the guaranteed interest of students, to have developed performance-rich curricula which would also have included balanced offerings of other activities, including listening. Now the situation is vastly changed, at least potentially, but, as noted above, although music is included in the Goals 2000 Education Legislation, the National Standards have no power to impose a single programme to replace the two-stream one hitherto in operation. MEAE responded and adjusted (through the MENC document [National Standards]) to the promise of the legislatorial provisions; indeed, since the advocacy movement was already showing signs of a major breakthrough as early as 1992, Elliott's book (1995) could also have taken advantage of the enhanced status of music education, even to the point of assuming that in its delivery the new dispensation would not be inimical to praxial ideas. The National Standards do not amount to a mandatory national curriculum; they rely for their implementation on state-by-state adoption, but statistics and predictions are encouraging that this is happening. It is heartening too that federal legislation supports the arts in education, but it is difficult, if not impossible, to predict the detail of their implementation, especially in such matters as the balance between curriculum-as-practicum (Elliott's maxim) and the more traditional approaches of MEAE. Comparing the Standards broadly with the terminology of the multiple British systems, we find the three-fold and two-fold elements (composing/ performing/listening, or just music-making/appraising) predictably included. (Only conducting and arranging are omitted) In fact it is difficult, in the light of the template provided by the National Standards, to imagine how Praxialism and MEAE (in its broadest sense) differ, since they both seem to fit so comfortably (and would claim to do so) with the aspiration of the published Music Content Standards.

Let us for the moment circumvent the argument about Elliott's five (only!) forms of music making and assume that performance is typical of the challenge in each, as involving all his suggested forms of knowing (procedural, formal, informal, impressionistic and supervisory). We are thus left with two philosophies, each recommending thorough involvement in performance and listening, each conscious of the intimate relationship between and mutual inclusivity of product and process, neither eschewing concepts as learning tools when appropriately employed. Both are concerned with giving to all learners the best possible legacy of truly musical experiences. There is a range of relevant parameters to consider in deciding on the best approach to this classical dilemma of optimizing the educational experience:

1. The nature of music and the characteristics that we wish to transmit in education. While the ultimate goals of music education remain unfulfilled this must be a perennial preoccupation with strategists. In particular it is necessary to relate music to art, not to

define it so absolutely (because of the danger that it would fail the criterion of universal validity), but simply because the relationship is a common perception of the nature of music and is probably and primarily so in most if not virtually all cultures, whether conscious or intuitive. This is not to revive any spurious and obsolete dichotomy which distinguishes between the terms 'fine art' and the so-called 'useful arts' (based on function and the technical theory of art as an example of craft, means and end). The aim here is to be sure of and honest about educational motivations. Music may be related to anthropology but we should be clear as to whether we are teaching it in this context or for its intrinsic qualities; it is not to disavow either approach when vindicated in practice, but it is necessary to be sure of the precise orientation. If music as art is insufficient for some contemporary views of comprehensiveness (and this is becoming increasingly problematic) there must be clarity as to when it is *not* art and why and how we teach it in that context. That is to throw down the gauntlet to certain praxial ideas and to demand more finely wrought and unambiguous theories than are currently available. Theory should flow from empiricism and should in turn fertilize practice. But it appears to the writer that the relationship of music and art is not satisfactorily resolved in Elliott's philosophy; he consistently uses terms in reference to music making (musical, expressive, artistic, interpretation) which are redolent of art contexts, yet he shies away from the aesthetic connotations, for reasons that have become obvious.

2. The distribution of talent, interest and commitment amongst the student body. This is typically Gaussian and makes a strong case for streaming.

3. The nature of performing and listening, how each contributes to overall musical refinement as a product of teaching/learning, and the possible dominant reliance on one or the other as a vehicle for instruction and participation.

4. Whether to have one or two programmes and the relationship between them (see 2 above).

5. The availability of relevant teaching expertise.

6. The realities of the terms competent, proficient and expert and the associated time constraints in the acquisition of these skills.

Now let us examine the remaining so-called 'myths' to which Elliott has responded. Reimer claims that 'whatever learnings do accrue from performance are learnings unavailable to the vast majority of people, in our culture, very few of whom become, or choose to become, competent, proficient, or expert performers, despite Elliott's illogical premise that this is achievable simply by involving them in the exploratory performance experiences in schools (what he terms "curriculum-as-practicum")'. Elliott's response runs as follows: 'Reimer seriously underestimates people's musical capacities and the expertise of music educators past and present. The vast majority of people have sufficient musical intelligence to achieve competent (if not proficient) levels of musicianship through systematic programs of music education. Musicianship is a form of knowing that is accessible, achievable and applicable to all. … Reimer's tendency to undervalue the artistic potential of music students and music educators is a major weakness in his philosophy'. The realities and the statistics are overwhelmingly against Elliott's theory. It is not a question of doubting people's musical intelligence or the expertise of the best music educators. It is just undeniable that propensity seldom runs to the commitment of time to acquire serviceable skills of performance (Elliott's ideal); the Gaussian distribution will ensure that performance is exploratory (to use Reimer's word) for the vast majority, even if they are forced into it. And its exploratory nature will undoubtedly limit it as a vehicle for even modestly sophisticated learnings and exposure (through the music making itself) to the wealth of music to which they should have access. It is not valid for Roberts to cite 'the most impressive successes of our profession [as having] already proven his [Elliott's] case'. The music programme has to be implemented within the capability of the average teacher. The levels of expertise assumed in

Elliott's philosophy (and he has admitted it to the writer in an interview [Fort Worth, Texas, September 1995]) are aspirational and therefore idealistic. And even if all were paradigmatically excellent it is still impossible 'to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear' when attitudes are indifferent and time is wanting, especially in a performance programme. The writer believes that the skill element, in which time dominates over levels of commitment, interest and talent, militates against the potential of Elliott's curriculum-as-practicum, in spite of his sanguine assertions to the contrary. And Stubley's words, quoted by Elliott in his own favour: '[t]his perspective differs from pragmatic approaches in that the problems to be solved arise in and evolve through the music making itself . . . through exploration and interpretation of musical works as multidimensional challenges', would not define a real difference if listening were to be considered as an act of music making with all its wealth of musical problems to be solved; the flattering proposition of 'listening as vicarious performance' is not lacking in distinguished advocacy. Finally the writer, who has a lifetime of experience in the teaching of performance up to the highest international standards, can attest to its value and suitability as a vehicle for exposing learners to the most transcendental musical experiences but, at the levels typically attained in school settings, it is so hampered, as it is dominated, by the multifarious tasks of mere technical control that it is severely limited in its scope to maximize other musical achievement outside of itself.

Myth 10 - 'that Elliott makes clear his aversion to language to clarify musical structure' may be taken as a misapprehension on Reimer's part in the light of Elliott's response, which simply denies the claim, providing ample quoted material from *MM* to reassure us on the question of the undeniable usefulness and, indeed, the indispensability, of language in music education. It is on the question of using verbal concepts as organizers of the curriculum that Elliott takes his stance, leading us to consider Myth 11 (Elliott's curriculum 'in its massive concentration on performing as the only proper way to encounter music . . . allows for only the performer's perspective on what musical experiences can properly consist of'). Reimer's accusation clearly overstates the case here, by stressing the bias on performance and ignoring the other activities which Elliott almost always includes, albeit usually parenthetically, leaving himself, withal, open to facile misinterpretation. This is balanced by Elliott's distortion of the listening issue and his pejorative description of how it is approached in MEAE; this is at the core of how these scholars can so easily misinterpret, rather than misunderstand, one another by conveying the impression that their philosophies are incompatible and mutually exclusive in application. If Reimer's insistence on Elliott's exclusive championship of performance is unfair, it is, on the other hand, illogical for Elliott artificially to separate listening from the other five activities and, further, to deprecate it by minimizing, if not denying, its creativity (see below). Furthermore it is misleading to claim that MEAE (only [writer's insertion]) 'organizes curricula in relation to verbal concepts about musical elements (tied primarily to recordings)' whereas, in fact, on the one hand, it is treating listening as a music making activity and on the other it also has a performance programme where, in all probability much of what Elliott is recommending is taken for granted as an inclusion. Is this tendency to ignore Reimer's ideas about the performance programme (see *A Philosophy of Music Education*, pp. 182-213) deliberate? Apropos, in the writer's view, amongst the music makers who do not physically make the actual sounds (composers, arrangers and conductors) it is inconceivable, anyway, that listeners should be excluded as music-makers, since, interestingly and generically, without them there is virtually no music at all. It is also true that listening is the least egotistical of music making activities; and without the 'thousand-headed public' to communicate and share with, all other forms of music making are relegated to a much smaller and solipsistic world. It is vehemently suggested, on the writer's total conviction, that if Elliott were to abandon his subconscious aversion to listening *per se* (because of its MEAE connotations?) much of the phraseology of his praxial philosophy would read more naturally and more convincingly. The feeling of an anti-MEAE (Reimer) agenda is so pervasive as to detract constantly from his plausibility. Read, for example, the following passage, in praise of praxialism, without excluding listening as a 'focused artistic transaction' (a credible and not extravagant claim): '[f]irst the values of music arise from focused artistic transactions with meaningful musical challenges. Achieving musical values depends on developing students' musicianship-listenership (forms of *working* understanding) in direct relation to excellent musical works'. Such a passage could arguably have been written by Reimer, and he would have been proud to have acknowledged it; the writer can find no incompatibility with Reimer's ideas.

And it is close to dissembling when we find Elliott, again reacting to a perceived MEAE device, first legitimizing verbal knowings and then damning them with faint praise although, as 'formal knowledge', they are included in his five knowings. 'The core of musical understanding is essentially tacit and procedural: it is the non-verbal know-how, intuition, savvy, and metacognitive strategies that listeners and music makers (of all kinds) use to construct musical patterns and meanings as listeners and music makers.' Again anything that smacks of MEAE lore is downgraded. But what are we to make of these passages in themselves as revealing Elliott's inconsistencies? He speaks of *excellent* musical works, explicitly declaring that judgement, valuing and hierarchy are in his educational armoury (as they should be) although he disallows them in any intercultural sense (note his insistence on the innate equality of musical practices. And see Aspin, [International Journal of Music Education, Number 27, May 1996, p. 56] for a direct challenge to what Elliott is interpreted as implying). And is he telling us that non-performing listeners (who *are* validated) *do construct* musical patterns and meanings using all of his musical knowings (though it is derisory as to how verbal formal knowing can be selectively downgraded relative to the rest in the process)?

Surely the sensible attitude to verbal concepts about music is to see them for what they are - an aid to the better understanding, and so the more fruitful experience, of music itself. It seems perfectly normal and unexceptionable that concepts or principles would evolve naturally within any system taking a philosophy to the practical stage of methodology; it is implicit too in Elliott's philosophy although, because of its newness, it is perhaps less developed in this context. But reflective practitioners (Elliott's term) must be trusted to use these tools with prudence and circumspection. Concepts are not to be viewed as a set of solutions in search of problems, or, as Reimer so wisely advises, 'we do not use concepts for the sake of teaching concepts'. Swanwick is even more pragmatic in observing that' the only good reasons for choosing anything are that it has musical potential'. But let Elliott have the final word, which does not, in the writer's view, contradict the clear intent of MEAE as articulated by Reimer. Here is what Elliott says: 'the praxial philosophy advocates a context-sensitive use of all forms of language and conceptualization; *MM* gives verbal concepts an important but contributory role in music teaching and learning'. In any pragmatic approach, not influenced by bizarre and far-fetched interpretations of what aesthetic theory is proposing, the two philosophies being compared here are not appreciably at variance. If indeed MEAE is as narrow in its outlook and method as Elliott is claiming (and this is open to question if we are to credit the profession with a thoughtful and analytical approach to the implementation of the curriculum and the primacy of the music itself over method) it is high time that the underlying philosophy be reappraised and modified as appropriate. But there is clear evidence that this has been done. If the 1992-94 National Standards (Music Content Standards) in the US are scrutinized, they can be seen to reflect federal approval for the idea that students will no longer have the option to minimize their participation in performance; nor will educational strategists be faced with the impossible and depressing task of coping with that option. In this sense American public opinion itself (and Reimer is the first to advert to it. See his response above to Harry White's paper *A book of manners in the wilderness*), in confronting and defeating government on its initial failure to include the arts in the *Goals 2000* legislation, has finally brought about a review of the worst features of the dual system. It is to be hoped that in the state-by-state enactment of the Standards a more balanced approach to music content will be possible - one that neither reaffirms the predestined failures of MEAE (in the general programme) to cater effectively for the non-performer, nor swings too far towards a skill-intensive praxial approach which places impossible constraints on student availability of time to cope with even the performance component. In this sense Swanwick is justified in claiming that 'music education as aesthetic education [but only in its attempt to save the general programme (writer's insertion)] seems indeed to have had its day'. And in this context Humphreys's comment (Elliott's essay. P.24) acquires real significance, though not necessarily that envisaged by Elliott: 'Elliott is so convincing in his numerous discussions about the narrowness of MEAE and the inadequacies of its handmaiden - listening-centred general music curriculums - that music educators should settle the arguments about the utility of MEAE as a comprehensive philosophy for the field once and for all'. Humphreys, perhaps unknowingly, is confirming the fact that MEAE indeed has and had *two* forms (performance and general), which together comprised its comprehensive form. It will be interesting to see how the aesthetic principle enshrined in Reimer's work can metamorphose in

practice to match the as yet undefined mode of reformed American music education in schools. The burning question will centre, as it always has, around the nature of performance and its accommodation and growth without loss of the outstanding and historical achievement of a talented and committed minority cohort of learners in this branch of music making. And this too is a problem for Ireland, though the scale and the context are somewhat different.

In spite of Reimer's claim that Elliott has 'contempt for any interest in the idea that music might be fruitfully studied as one part of a larger family of the arts', they are found to be of one mind. The question arises because of the provision in the National Standards for students 'understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts'. One would expect music educators to insist that inter-art collaborations or the study of music which is combined with other arts (dance; poetry; drama) should not unduly dilute the intrinsically musical components in the hybrid study. In fact, Elliott is perhaps a little too accommodating (when the time element is considered in relation to what can be achieved within a limited allocation) by suggesting that 'to learn how to make and listen for musical works that involve other artistic practices requires reference to the whole web of beliefs, concepts, traditions and standards that explain how certain musicers and listeners understand the contribution that other performing and non-performing arts make to their music cultures.' Suffice it to say that in relation to the polarity of the two philosophies this is really a non-issue. It is interesting, however, to note Elliott's heading for this section - Music and the other Arts - which can only mean that he considers music to be an art; if this is so it would be equally interesting to have clarification on the aesthetic theory that he espouses. Aesthetics is, after all, the theory, not of beauty, but of art (Collingwood)[94] and exists in a massive corpus which predates Reimer's excursions into the field. In this respect, Reimer's derivations are admirably lucid. To reject them in the name of music 'in the broader sense of musical practices, cultures, works, processes and more' is acceptable as a thesis only if the earlier aesthetic theory is suitably revised and presented in a modified form which satisfactorily explains the artistic connotations of music that aspires to the condition of art. And even in this context, it has to be stated that Elliott's pejorative description of the aesthetic concept (p21 *et seq*. of *MM*) is not flawless as to accuracy; the sweeping statement that 'music is a collection of objects or *works'* is immediately challengeable, and he plays down the insistence on response, which concentrates the value of the experience in the person and not in the work. And remember that Elliott himself has conceded that product and process are inseparably interpenetrated, so whatever his aesthetic stance, he too is bound into the idea of music as works. Elliott's code of values (implicit in his treatment of the aesthetic concept) includes 'social religious, political, personal or otherwise practical connection these qualities may embody, point to, or represent'. He is therefore enmeshed in the technical theory of 'art' as the useful arts. But there is that marked preponderance of reference to artistic and musical interpretation which constantly confuses the picture.

The question of musical creativity is another issue on which there is a considerable difference of opinion (between Elliott and Reimer) but it is not one on which either philosophy will stand or fall. It really arises from Reimer's situated view that the recognition of creative effort in school music contexts should be as flattering and encouraging as possible to students over the widest spectrum. Creativity is arguably an artistic term as it is certainly subjectively loaded and refractory to exact definition. We may take it that Elliott is correct when he says that originality is necessary for creativity, but it is not sufficient; but he also refers to originality (see the quotation in his essay [p.25] from p 221 of *MM*) in a way which seems to imply otherwise. In responding to Reimer he is impaled unnecessarily in contradiction. First there is a vast difference in degree between Elliott's relatively modest idea of creativity as arising from 'a person engaged in thoughtful processes that result in a tangible achievement judged as innovative (or not) by people who know the standards and history of a domain' and the supporting statement he offers from Czikszentmihalyi who insists that 'the creative individual is a person who regularly solves problems, fashions products, or defines new questions in a domain in a way that is initially considered novel but that ultimately becomes accepted in a particular cultural setting' The matter can only be solved by agreement on a definition and these two do not coincide. Elliott tells us that 'musical creativity and musicianship are mutually interdependent and

[94] *Ibid*

interactive' and that 'creativity and musicianship should be taught concurrently'; he illustrates musicianship on a continuum (novice to expert. See p132 of *MM*), yet he denies creativity the same continuum. He also states that 'children (and all music students) can achieve creative musical results in their performing (*et al*). . . . because developing students' musical creativity overlaps and extends the process of developing students' musicianship'. But elsewhere Elliott claims that 'musical creativity is not something that a novice can achieve' yet musicianship is, and the two are inseparably bound; there is something very arbitrary about this distinction. The writer struggles to equate this view with those of Gardner and Czikszentmihalyi in Elliott's further invocations. It appears that the real crux of the matter is not Elliott's own views on creativity (which merit Aspin's praise, without pontificating between Reimer and Elliott) but his insistence that creativity can only occur at the higher levels of achievement (competent is one suggestion on p.26) and his aligning himself with Gardner and Czikszentmihalyi in adopting a highly sophisticated definition such as the 'best professional examples' but also descending to 'what expert music educator's recognize as good artistic and creative secondary -school jazz improvising, middle school composing, children's choral singing, and so on'.

Holding Elliott's own views up to Collingwood's artistic theory might help to place the matter in true perspective. Collingwood demands something more than means and end or the exercise of skill or craftsmanship; and he expects a feelingful element that is not equivalent to emotional arousal (expressiveness is the Langerian word). What is involved here are artistic choices (and not just random decisions) by the use of intuition and indeed by the skilful combined use of Elliott's own five ways of knowing that constitute musicianship in its development and achievements and at whatever level. It is inconsistent and educationally questionable to set a lower limit on when the mutual inclusivity of musicianship and creativity has its earliest manifestations. There is, of course, no question of suggesting that the judgement of creativity is a self-congratulatory process at the disposal of every musician who makes music. What Czikszentmihalyi calls social validation (Kant calls it universal validity) is necessary but this should not arbitrarily exclude part of the musicianship continuum. It is perfectly plausible (and is enacted typically every day in the examination of performance candidates in the British system) that a cohort of reflective music practitioners (teachers/ assessors) would individually agree that the performance of a child at the most rudimentary level can be particularly musical (the writer has observed copious examples of this) and, therefore, that the performance can be artistic and, by definition, creative too, because of a unique combination of craft, feeling and musical intuition.

As to the denial by Elliott that there can be such a thing as creative listening, this obviously is influenced by his exaggerated aversion to his own interpretation and distortion of MEAE's so called 'listening-centred general music curriculums'. To deny that listening has no tangible musical achievements that can be witnessed and measured is a denial of the whole purpose of listening and its educational potential. Why would anyone want to listen or teach listening if it represents no achievement, educational or otherwise? The most rudimentary popular perception immediately debunks Elliott's assertion. This is also a denial of one of the most serviceable of all teaching strategies in instrumental or vocal teaching - that of modelling. If a teacher, by a practical illustration or by using a recorded performance, stimulates a student to an immediately more artistic/creative performance, the creativity is the direct (measurable/witnessable) result of the listening itself, which by any reasonable interpretation would itself have had to have been open to creativity. Creativity is, in the end, merely a matter of definition but it should surely hinge on educational usefulness in a philosophy of education. Elliott is not convincing in the defence of his definition of creativity as to its serving the education of the young in the most encouraging way.

Reimer's deconstruction of Elliott's six dimensions of music to point out their flaws is one of his less successful critical ventures. He is, in a sense, hoist with his own petard when he acknowledges 'the growing literature of music in which performance is absent' and suggests that it threatens the survival of Elliott's performance-rich strategies. It is surprising that Reimer does not refer to the aesthetic barrenness of this type of music, which is 'devoid of affective consequences' because the production is pure craft, which is necessary but not sufficient for an artistic event. Elliott is much more focused

here in stating that 'even in those very few musical practices where compositions are made "directly available" to listeners through technology, composers are inevitably concerned with much more than producing patterns: they are concerned with the artistic and creative presentation of musical events.' And Elliott does speak of *performance-interpretation* which not only establishes that quality of performance which uniquely distinguishes it from technologically produced sounds, but gives it artistic credibility and integrity. And it also makes the provision for feelingful content which then allows him to separate the idea of syntactic and non-syntactic parameters without incurring the allegation of not taking affect into account. But he goes on to explain (what is not obvious from his terminology) that 'cognition and emotion are interdependent. There is no such thing as emotion without cognition (of some sort) and vice-versa'. So listening to musical structure or 'listening deeply to excellent music demands the full range of our conscious powers (attention, intention, cognition, emotion [feeling?], memory)'. The affective content, therefore, is implicit. The difference between Reimer's and Elliott's views here is not a matter of the subtle distinction, drawn by Elliott, between pleasure and enjoyment, but rather of that between emotion and feeling. There is a vast literature on the nature of expression; it is a quintessential quality of the arts which has occupied philosophers, aestheticians and other thinkers for centuries; it is epistemologically rich in potential but it is unlikely that agreement or even consensus will be reached on its matrix of characteristics. However, much is made of the distinction between the direct *expression of* something and simply being *expressive of* its qualities. Thus, whatever about Elliott's real intentions here, he uses the terminology that a performance-interpretation can be an 'expression of emotion' (p.155 of *MM*). In his essay (p.29) he modifies this to 'music being *expressive of* [writer's italics] ordinary human emotions'. And the authority he quotes (Davies) is circumspect about phraseology, which can hardly corroborate Elliott's ambiguous stance: 'music is expressive by presenting not instances of emotion but emotion characteristics in appearances. . . . Emotions are heard in music as belonging to it, just as appearances of emotions are present in bearing, gait, or deportment . . .' Much depends here on an understanding and definition of what constitutes emotion and/or feeling. There is little doubt that both are cognitive and thoughtful. But if emotion is thought of as the *demonstrative partial* of feeling - something which craves discharge, while feeling is embraced as something to be retained in and by the thought processes, it is unexceptionable that Reimer should take Elliott to task and demand greater clarity in relation to this artistic concept. But it is clear from this and other passages that these scholars differ radically in this aspect of how music functions.

The question of 'musical representation', listed by Elliott as one of the six possible dimensions of a Musical Work (p.155 of *MM*), is tied into another philosophical stance - that of simple Referentialism, which has been rejected by all schools of Absolutism from Hanslick to Langer. As its name implies, referents outside the music are constantly being searched out; this extrinsic interest distracts the listener from the sounds themselves - or so the aesthetic lobby would claim. Harold Abeles (Ref. II P ii), who is very eclectic in his philosophical preferences, states in *Foundations of Music Education* (p.57) that 'not only does it focus attention on things other than the music itself; it also doesn't work'. But if one ponders the claim that more than 90% of music experience and participation is non-aesthetic in intent (though this does not mean that it fails as art or that there is no aesthetic experience), there is a case to be answered. Whether Elliott's laudable attempts to recognize and advert obliquely to this fact will succeed in changing the educational approach, and open the school repertoire to all kinds of Musics, is not clear at this stage. The argument that teaching music as art is educationally straightforward, well developed methodologically, and prepares the student for the accommodation of most, if not all, other forms of music is a comfortable and robust stance but one that is being increasingly challenged by idealists, Elliott included. But the idea that art can be useful and functional too, without ceasing to be art, is not incompatible with aesthetic theory. While it is inaccurate to claim that in Reimer's philosophy 'everything "outside" structural elements is stigmatized as "extramusical"', especially if the argument above as to the relationship between cognition and feeling is taken into account, there is still a need to relax the canons of aesthetics if music in education is to have a real significance, at all times, to life as lived, in whatever community. Reimer's response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness* (see above) is a very candid comment on the difficulties to be faced in effectively widening the repertoire and providing for the expert and effective teaching of music in the general school programme with this expanded brief.

Elliott responds very convincingly to Reimer's suggestion that he (Elliott) misses 'the sensuous dimension, in which what we experience as we listen is, in important ways, experienced in, through, and by the body. Without this dimension the experience can be conceived of as entirely cerebral and therefore devoid of an essential aspect of its pleasure and meaning'. This tit-for-tat recrimination on the subject of the lack of appreciation of sensuous qualities or affect, quite apart from being mildly puzzling, is another example of how these two writers regularly choose to misinterpret and misrepresent one another's pronouncements. Reimer's mistake is that he finds Elliott's six dimensions of a Musical Work too bland in failing to emphasize the affective (Reimer does not accept the validity of 'expressions of emotion'); this is perhaps a plausible view until Elliott's response, linking cognitive and affective responses inseparably in a general phenomenological way, corrects the misunderstanding. Elliott's theorizing, if it did not have such an air of assumed infallibility and were it not couched in such dismissive terms (an attitude all too prevalent also in Reimer when addressing Elliott's claims), is compelling in relation to a widely held belief that 'the mind and body are one'. But Reimer makes this very point in his essay (p.72) when claiming that performance is 'giving sounds meaningful form - a condition shared with composers and listeners - form and action, product and process, are inseparable … mind and body, or thinking and doing, are also unified'. Bearing this in mind, his statement that 'sound is experienced and enjoyed with the body as well as with the mind' is confirming that belief, not contradicting it, as Elliott seems to think. Reimer is not trying to separate body and mind but emphasizing that the integrated bodily experience should be artistically rich, a view with which it may be assumed Elliott would concur, since he constantly stresses the artistic dimension in performance as in all musical experiences. The outcome of this altercation is to confirm that both Elliott and Reimer value the affective and artistic in music, in all its forms, and that this artistic criterion is insufficiently served by certain kinds of cognition, such as the recognition of syntactic and non-syntactic elements alone, devoid of their feelingful charges. In other words the intensity of the feeling must be concentrated in the artistic, if the performance and listening experience is to be an artistic one. Presumably neither is denying that there is a vast difference in essence between the feelings generated by structural elements only and those that are produced by an interpretation which discovers and celebrates their artistic relationships.

Elliott's response to Myth15 is probably the best example in the whole essay of the way in which these adversaries can be at cross-purposes. Here Reimer levels one criticism and Elliott seems to answer a different question. According to Reimer, 'self-growth, enjoyment, self-esteem, and optimal experience [ends highly prized by Elliott as outcomes of music education] are "bereft of qualities unique to music". He charges that the praxial view of musical values puts our profession "in a more vulnerable position to being perceived as unnecessary in education"'. The intrinsicality of music, in an aesthetic sense, has always been a crucial part of the Reimer philosophy; it is therefore not surprising that he should have challenged Elliott's intentionally more liberal view of the meaning of music in human discourse - 'the situated nature of music cognition and musical works, the social and cultural ingredients of particular musical ways of life, the affective specificity of musical enjoyment, and the centrality of artistically produced sound - all these differentiate music and the values of music from all other human pursuits.' Elliott's response goes on to define many aspects of how engagement with music is to foster unique experiences; as he defines these involvements, their properties and their significance, he succeeds in giving a revealing précis of the basis of his whole philosophy, which is not wanting in conviction, post-modern novelty (gleaned and gathered from a variety of sources-psychological, ethnomusicological and philosophical, enriched by his own persuasions) and plausibility. His theories are compelling in the current climate of searching - for ways to bridge the gap, in western society, between school and community, without excessive erosion of traditional and cherished educational values; to bring about a revolution leading to a utopian multicultural democracy without overstraining the resources of student capability and interest, teacher expertise and available time; and for a formula to endow music as a subject (within the arts programme) with a benign ambivalence and adaptability to function as art, within the canons of aesthetics and all that they entail, while ministering to the wider unarticulated and subconscious demands of a much wider dispensation which, on the one hand, may be pseudo-art, on the other a socio-cultural construct which is not without validity as an objective of education in the broadest sense. Elliott's philosophy has many suggestions to contribute to this massive problem-solving exercise which currently preoccupies the

music education lobby at the beginning of a new millennium. But so also does aesthetic theory when permitted to make its case, fructified (see p xi of Reimer, *A Philosophy*, rev.1989) by its own adaptability to metamorphosis, whether attributable to honest and frequent self-appraisal in the light of imported progressive thinking or to a survival instinct that recognizes a threat; the motivation matters little if the modifications are educationally consistent and convincing. But since Elliott's philosophy is the one on trial in this review of the literature in relation to it, the question must be asked as to whether it is internally consistent; this criterion can be applied to Myth 15. Elliott, it is assumed would acknowledge that he has written what is, in essence, an anti-aesthetic philosophy. And yet his work is permeated, if not dominated by aesthetic references which leave an aura of ambivalence that is difficult, and would be misleading, to disregard. Consider Elliott's definition: "The term aesthetic experience refers to a special kind of emotional happening or disinterested pleasure that supposedly arises from a listener's exclusive concentration on the aesthetic qualities of a musical work [note that Reimer uses the words *musical*, *artistic*, and *intrinsic* interchangeably with aesthetic <writer's insertion; Reimer, *A Philosophy*, rev.1989 p. xiii>], apart from any moral, social, religious, political, personal, or otherwise practical connection these qualities may embody, point to, or represent (*MM*, p.23) We may assume that these other connections are valued equally by Elliott. This is a clear discriminating factor between the two philosophies. But Elliott's uniqueness of music is so redolent of aesthetic theory, in its articulation, as to be deeply indebted to it, as for example 'the situated nature of music cognition and musical works, the affective specificity of musical enjoyment and the centrality of artistically [aesthetically?] produced sound'. It is not even clear whether the social and cultural ingredients of particular [not all?] musical ways of life are without artistic connotations. The precise nature of these social and cultural interactions is rather vague and is certainly not covered in any great detail in Elliott's essay, and yet they seem to be the key to the essential difference between Reimer and Elliott. But to return to Myth 15, Elliott does not address the question that Reimer puts. He admirably gives his version of the intrinsicality of musical experience, and this is well done, but he does not justify 'self-growth, enjoyment, self-esteem and optimal experience [perfectly valid *educational goals* though they may be, as Bruner (1996) confirms]' as instrinsically musical. Thus we are again left with Elliott's technical theory of art which, if we are to insist that he also invokes the truly aesthetic, comfortably aligns the two philosophies - one (Reimer's) as a pragmatically modified version of strict aestheticism, and the other (Elliott's) as an expanded variant and derivative which seeks to open music (and education) to a considerably wider and, incidentally, a more refractory brief, in an artistic sense. As Reimer wrote in 1989: '[w]hile many of the concepts of aesthetic education remain imperfectly understood and many of its implications remain imperfectly applied, the general view it proposes has become the bedrock upon which our self-concept as a profession rests'. While the assertion may be gratuitously self-congratulatory, and while the time may be propitious to reappraise the tenets of MEAE, it is not without truth.

Rationalization

The rationalization is dealt with in Section 19 of this report.

Ref. II P ix See Documents 209a & 209b in Proceedings
Issues in Progress about Changes in Music Education in Ireland (Document 209b)
Professor Richard Colwell (Chair of Music Education at the New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Massachusetts)

Professor Richard Colwell may be considered a key figure in the enactment of MEND. He was invited to present on the basis of observed outstanding performance as a conference speaker who combines comprehensive and virtually non-partisan insights into music education with an imaginative approach to problem-solving. As he himself significantly observed, he holds the professorship of music education within the New England Conservatory in Boston, one of the world's most prestigious institutions devoted mainly to the training of performers; this gives him a very powerful voice in speaking authoritatively on the notoriously complex cross-over tensions between academic and applied (practical) aspects of music education at third-level. [Note: Professor Colwell is not consistent on what he means by *applied* music. It is used in both academic and practical senses]. But Professor Colwell's claims to distinction in his field do not end there. He has been involved in an impressive cross-section of scholarly research into issues of music education, particularly, of course, in the United States, and was the editor of the Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning, a project of MENC (Schirmer/MacMillan, 1992), with contributions, *inter alia*, from Ableles, Lehman and Reimer, three of the speakers at MEND.

It should be noted that Professor Colwell's paper (Issues in Progress about Changes in Music Education in Ireland), by far the longest of any of the presentations prepared for MEND, was not, in the event, given at the Conference itself. Instead, Professor Colwell graciously undertook to act as moderator to the whole international section of MEND (Phase II) and made his presentation on that basis; it is separately reviewed as a follow-on to this analysis of the intended (programmed) paper. It should therefore be made clear that the delegates to MEND, who were in plenary session when Professor Colwell spoke at the culmination of the Conference, were not witness to his concentrated comments on the Irish scene of music education and are therefore dependent on perusal of the document itself, reproduced under the Proceedings (or on this review) to extract the copious wisdom that emanated from his pen. The paper was reviewed in the Interim Report of Phase II, but at that time it was decided that verbatim extracts should be itemized as a fair representation of Professor Colwell's most focused observations in relation to Irish music education and to the ways in which North American practice and his own copious experience as a music educator might be brought to bear on our problems. On re-reading the paper at this post-MEND juncture new insights are emerging which establish it as one of the most significant contributions to the debate.

It must be acknowledged, with immense gratitude, that Colwell approaches his work with consummate professionalism evidenced by the care with which he obviously studied the copious literature sent to familiarize him with the progress of the MEND project and the nature of the problems that the initiative was attempting to confront. And how accurately he identified the essences and succinctly summarized his understandings of what our problems are, the underlying causes, and the potential remedies! On the other hand, the paper itself could not be claimed to be in a finished state. It reads as a stream of consciousness, with many diversions and a tendency towards prolixity, in the body of which is contained the real wisdom, fortified by experience - which sometimes gives a hint of an underlying cynicism; it often emerges, too, as an exercise in 'blowing the whistle' on many of the claims that are being made in relation to music education and which are inadequately supported by unambiguous documentation of undeniable fact or statistical accuracy.

Looking forward to Paul Lehman's suggested close correlation between (stated aspirational national) standards, curriculum design and philosophy of music education it comes as no surprise that Colwell makes the same connections. He stresses the fundamental importance of the optimal educational experience (curriculum) while drawing attention to the fact that on this crucial issue consensus is typically lacking. He claims, with some justification and not surprisingly, that MEND documentation (Interim Report Phase I) did not satisfy him in defining the Irish Music Education curriculum and assumes, for the purposes of his reflections, that this is because 'there *is* no *effective* curriculum in Ireland'. Colwell has his finger on the pulse of educational folly when he remarks that the hubris of curriculum commentators (especially from within the profession) is that they fail to recognize that there are three possible readings of what curriculum might imply - the intended, the implemented and the delivered. It is characteristically only the first (the intended) that is most invoked when curriculum is being discussed; this distorts the real situation, a typical example of this being the false claims contained in the *Deaf Ears?* Report, as unmasked by Donald Herron.

Professor Colwell tackles the thorny problem of Performance and makes many pertinent comments, which throw valuable light on the subject. He attaches a great deal of importance to parental attitudes and influence; this is an aspect of music education curriculum (reform) which is, perhaps, understated, as to its significance, in much educational literature. Like Bennett Reimer, Richard Colwell acknowledges the positive effects and valuable by-products of having substantial performance training, at a high level of achievement, available in schools, an American phenomenon which is discussed (also in its negative aspects) in the analysis of the Reimer/Elliott philosophies and in particular in connection with the criticisms that have been levelled at the Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) movement in the US. Colwell makes claims as to how strong performance-orientated music programmes can infuse the whole general educational system, even as to recruitment policies, right through to third level. Sadly this facilitation of performance in schools, in spite of its double-edged downside (see Reimer/Elliott debates), is not a reality in Ireland and is one of the major deficiencies in our system. Colwell chooses a pragmatic criterion, as to how the success of music education programmes in schools might be judged, by applying the simple test as to the positive memories they leave behind for the parents of the future. If parents have had a good experience in school they will want their children to have them also. This boosts the popularity of the music programme and invites support for it; this regenerative feature is a most important aspect in the advocacy campaign for better music education and is far too seldom taken into account. Colwell believes that parental attitudes, based on positive experiences, can progressively influence policy-making and decisions at community and government level.

Richard Colwell quickly turns to the question, indeed to the indispensability, of a sound philosophical basis for all education, including that in music. He prioritizes the aim of imparting and acquiring competitive knowledge and skills (these perceived essentials surface many times in Colwell's text) and asks how these might be defined. In relation to the advocacy and promotion of music as a core subject, or favoured option, in a well-rounded education, this could very well be the nub of the problem - how to justify the humanities within a materialistic approach. Yet he claims that 'the support for a humanist interpretation to general education for all students is relatively strong; it is just a question of staking music's claim convincingly. But he recommends, in a situation where there is little real knowledge of how the public discriminates between a good and an unsatisfactory music programme (and how can authoritative wisdom be expected from this source?), that arguments in the abstract should not be employed. "Understanding the value of music instruction may require personal experience; the argument for it in the abstract is awkward'. National standards or promulgated curriculum/syllabus materials (even philosophy) are merely political tools (typifying the value of documented intentions) that can be used to garner the support of administrators, parents and students - but also to exert power over their implementation. But in the ultimate it is the success of and the associated publicity about music programmes in certain schools that generate and spread enthusiasm to a wider sphere of influence. It is worth reiterating here that Colwell touches on a fundamental truth that to produce favourable experience for students in school music programmes (ensemble performance in American schools seems to have achieved this objective handsomely, whatever the downside in terms of the associated musicianship and listenership [again see the Reimer/Elliott

arguments]) is the most effective path to the survival and growth of those programmes; but that is not to play down the value, in the first instance, of a consistent and well-thought out philosophical approach. There is a hint of the bizarre in Colwell's view of the practico-academic dichotomy; he views the development of a host of academic pursuits in music - philosophy, evaluation, research, technology, composing, learning about musical careers, studying other cultures, on occasion the history of teaching and learning, and more - as a possible provision in music education, to balance out the long-term educational experience in performance, but for the 'drop out or non-performer'. This, of course is a deliberate exaggeration but it does bring the dichotomy into focus as a negative force to be reckoned with (see MEND Findings). On the other hand he also draws attention to the reality of the differences between the education for academic as against practical (performing) musicians. '[T]he idea that the knowledge and skills of a public school teacher and a professional musician are the same has no basis in fact. It exists only by tradition and the fear that a music educator, if educated different[ly], would not be respected'.

Again staying with philosophical issues, Colwell asks the fundamental question (on behalf of education reformers and in relation to "what knowledge is of most worth") as to whether music is of sufficient worth to be required in education and how much instruction is necessary for *all* students. He also sees this question against the background of one possible 'purpose [of schools as] enabling students to make a living, [when] the type and amount of music instruction will not have much meaning except for the few'. But 'if learning is relevant and enjoyable, patrons will return. The human being is structured to learn and to seek learning experiences'. This touches the nerve centre of the Irish dilemma. We have, at least on paper, a curriculum, but it is in the relevance, implementation and delivery of that curriculum that we have potential problems. Again Colwell comes down on the side of insisting on the outcomes and inbuilt processes of the curriculum - standards, competency, knowledge, skills, assessment. Although he does not deal specifically with the question of continuum (see *Deaf Ears?*) he supports the idea when he states that 'daily instruction has been satisfactory in other subjects and should be in music' and again ' Instruction only in post-primary seems rather late'.

Professor Colwell divines that, in relation to the state of music education in the two countries, there are more similarities than differences in the American and Irish systems. But he argues that the differences between liberal and conservative approaches are such that, either in pure political or other strategic terms, there is a tendency to specify less and less, to the point of minimizing or neutralizing requirements, so as to be politically acceptable to all parties in the context of culpably confused notions of the pursuit of excellence and equality of opportunity; music education is suffering from this ambivalence. Colwell claims that the public perception of music in school programmes is that it is for the talented (an élitist subject) and that, conversely, the programmes are seen as a talent-spotting device. He is adamant that this spurious idea of music as an élitist pursuit must be eradicated. But he also draws attention to the fact that programmes in exclusive listenership (non-performing) are fraught with difficulties and negative connotations in the American experience and have to be approached with caution if a satisfactory experience is to be achieved for all students and a healthy perception of music education is to be inculcated in the public. But he is openly sceptical too about the value of arguments/strategies in music education that invoke left-right brain functions, multiple intelligences and transferability of skills. And it must be prudent to regard the claims in this regard as imponderable, at best, and difficult to extract convincingly from the cloud of partisan rhetoric that surrounds them.

Colwell is particularly sceptical and suspicious of the many currently fashionable approaches to music education which might be defined as eccentric to the mainstream traditional approach. In this he shows a slight bias towards Reimer and away from Elliott, if that is a relevant criterion. In particular he attacks the MEND manifesto which refers to the desirability of incorporating folk elements in the music education programme to a greater extent than that which currently obtains, but he justifies his stance, claiming, with some plausibility, that: -

1. Focusing on folk music diminishes the resources for addressing more fundamental educational questions. Here Colwell is touching on the crucial and correlated elements of

available time and the decision as to what is absolutely essential for all students to know/experience in music education. Of course, as stated, educators are divided on this latter issue, but Colwell's counter-arguments are difficult to debunk.

2. Folk music is a complex medium in which to teach comprehensively; it is essentially a coterie activity when compared with the great stream of Western Art Music. In this context Colwell is of the pragmatic turn of mind that in Ireland, as in the US, we are bound into the wider tradition of western culture and there seems no justification for attenuating or playing down its importance unduly.

3. It is difficult to teach, exclusively through folk music, discrimination skills useful (essential) in making a distinction between good and great music. Colwell is touching here on the fundamental issue in education of inculcating skills in judgement and valuing (recalling one definition of education as preserving that which society values)

4. The (excessive) dependence on folk music interposes a barrier to thinking freely about a great music education curriculum.

5. Folk music, contrary to Colwell's idea as to what MEND claims, is not the music of Irish youngsters; their music is typified by that of Michael Jackson and the music that is 'on the charts'.

6. With a folk music approach, there is a danger that teachers might focus on the culture and lose sight of teaching MUSIC.

7. It is Colwell's opinion that the rightful place for music folk culture, as for all other culturally influential art 'objects' (literature, poetry, painting etc.) is in the Irish history course. His believes that, in Ireland, history courses should be focused appropriately on our cultural heritage in a balanced way.

8. Indoctrination in schools should be reserved for the crucial elements of the democratic way of life and the norms of civilized behaviours. This issue is another that crops up regularly in Professor Colwell's writing and it is one on which he is prepared to take a stand.

Colwell goes on to the wider issue of the multicultural programme, and targets the notion that it is well served by matching the ethnic mix in a specific class to the repertoire of (folk) music used to teach the music programme. He implies that this negates the idea of some standardization of materials but he is outspoken in attacking the potentially damaging psychological effects of classifying children by exposing/recognizing their ethnic origins while they themselves may have more cosmopolitan aspirations to transcend a perceived stigma in ethnic earmarking. There is food for thought in this line of argument. Although MEND was not suggesting an approach to music education, in general schooling, dominated by the folk tradition, it is, nevertheless, being prudent in invoking considerable sensitivity in dealing with the conflicting interests.

Colwell takes up the teacher training dilemma and, in particular, tackles the burning question as to whether music in primary schools (with their formative significance in relation to lasting student perceptions) should be taught by the classroom teacher or by a specialist. He recognizes this quandary as being of such commanding importance that he proposes a mini-spectrum of options.

> A new breed of teacher, who can improve upon the traditional educational offerings, is needed. We should expect that the classroom teacher has learned to sing and to play an instrument. … music instruction must be both short and frequent for young children, precluding the exclusive reliance on a specialist. … If the music specialist provides all of the instruction, it is only natural that students will form the opinion that music is

> something that takes specialized training and is available, primarily, to the few, should I say, the élite? Without rigorous music education for the classroom teacher the idea that music is for individuals with special musical talents will be confirmed because the student perceives his classroom teacher to be competent in English, Irish, math, social studies but not in music. … The interim position is to have a number of music specialists educated in a teacher's college [i.e. *education rather than music as prime competence* - writer's italics] with one other non-art specialism. If the science teacher is also the music teacher, my concerns about student perception will be satisfied. … We are unsure whether music specialists should be prepared for teaching music in the early grades. … It may be that a program[me] in elementary music should prepare professionals who are supervisors of music and a resource to the classroom teacher … competent in providing in-service education … with a grounding in curriculum and instruction, a strong commitment to a personal philosphy of education and of music. … Most of the 18- or 19-year-old students are not ready to make a long-term commitment to teaching; at this stage they can think only of improving their musical skills (performing?).

Colwell draws disapproving attention to another questionable method of teacher training which is now coming into vogue (see also McCann - Ref. I P vi), namely that of the extended apprenticeship with university (rather than teacher training college) connections. He sees teacher education and university education as being essentially different while simultaneously advocating the idea that teacher training should be guaranteed academic respectability (presumably in course design) while maintaining its emphasis on classroom practice, leaving more sophisticated concepts (child growth and development, philosophy, curriculum, current trends in music education) for the graduate stage. Colwell also encourages the idea of attracting 'second chance' professionals, from other fields, into music education post-graduate study, provided they have maintained an interest and involvement in the performing function.

Professor Colwell discusses reform in music education but again he is sceptical about the philosophical focus and integrity of such attempts in the US and, by implication, elsewhere. While he applauds the idea of assessment and associated standards in music, based on its intrinsic qualities, he warns that this is distinct from the reform movement that is aimed at achieving outcomes such as improved problem-solving and reflective and critical thinking, leading to his doubts about the existence of an 'underlying vision guiding the effort to improve education'. He is concerned at the confusion in the application of these efforts, as typified by the incompatibility between the ideas of national standards and greater local discretion, or between excellence and equal opportunity. In relation to standards he wisely draws attention not only to the content issues but also to the associated standards of performance (i.e., how well the students are delivering competencies in the content), standards as to opportunities to learn (school-based and system [governmental agency]-based). Finally there are teacher training standards, perhaps the most critical of all to the hoped-for outcomes. The connection to the resource, both human and fiscal, has strong resonances for Ireland. Again there is a marked scepticism in his reference to the equality issue as capable of sorting out the education dilemma, in spite of its political correctness; he sees it as eventually degenerating into a multiplicity of options and a liberalism that will ensure that 'at least 20% of students will be unable to finish [even] a secondary education course of study'. Colwell warns against rationalizations which advance spurious arguments to resist change - arguments that actually have little relevance to the basic goals of schooling or to the rightful expectations of students in relation to their education.

Continuing on the topic of assessment, Colwell believes that 'examinations are the focal point of any power over the curriculum and of power over teaching in the schools' (note Professor Colwell's tacit acceptance that it is in the general school system and its operation that the real control of music education as a national aspiration resides). And he sees the accumulation of reliable assessment data as a powerful tool in controlling what is taught in schools; this is, of course, obvious in the Irish context in the number of reforms (the latest comprehensive one throughout the 90s) that have been made in school music education as a result of the application of objective data to the outcome expectation. This inevitably leads to concerns about the type, quality and relevance of the assessment

procedures used (see Swanwick Ref. III P iv). Colwell also 'blows the whistle' on another generally suspected Irish educational folly when he states that 'making the examinations easier only to inflate the pass rate is a short-term solution. This tactic fools fewer individuals all the time. The US has tried this approach in student and teacher examinations and I hope has learned the consequences. Solid argument for improving society and education centre on examinations that demand increased rigour and comprehensiveness'.

Colwell is unsure that the notion of assessment and evaluation (which he uses as interchangeable terms in his paper [see Swanwick - Ref. II P iv]) has universal acceptance, quite apart from the method, since he is uncertain as to whether there is a serious interest in changing current music programmes; the two are, nevertheless, linked. But this is not a reason for demurring on reform. He believes that students, parents and teachers benefit from assessments at regular intervals and that postponing assessment to the point of exit from the educational system (LC) is totally ineffective as a means of correction. But, in the ultimate, evaluation/assessment is not an infallible measure of musical potential, and for this reason it will always be subject to controversy and a certain amount of opposition. Colwell sums up his opinion by asserting that 'despite the magnitude of assessment in music and the controversy, it appears to be the most powerful instrument available to Irish music educators desiring change'. (See Lehman, Ref. III P iii)

Professor Colwell incorporated some of his own personal recommendations for music education in Ireland in his moderating address, with the help of a number of slides. These are summarized below.

Recommendations

1. The rationale and methods for teaching music must be as strong as those used in the promotion of other humanist subjects. Some consensus on a philosophical approach to music education is a *sine qua non* if music education is to be effective.

2. Folk music should not be the dominant element of methodology if a well-rounded musical education respecting the real current musical heritage of (Irish) children is to be the aim.

3. Most music for Irish audiences is western-orientated; it must therefore be taken into account as a priority by music educators in applying a systematic curriculum.

4. Music programmes should reflect the popular belief in the importance of talent for success in music.

5. Treat coalition in the arts with due caution as, in reflecting different agendas, they are likely to become far too general in stated outcomes and very often have less commonality in artistic matters than in purely intellectual ones; this dilutes the thrust of the intrinsicality of music experience as a plus in education.

6. Ideally, the requirements to be an educational leader or policy-maker should include as broad an education as that envisioned for students in the 21st century. And that broad education includes music.

7. The lack (*or imminent provision* [writer's italics]) of a National Conservatory should not be an excuse for a less than adequate public music education.

8. ' … The public school system should prepare all interested and talented students with the knowledge and skills that would enable then to enter a music conservatory of their choice'. There are, of course, resource problems here.

9. Magnet (specialized music) schools are not a substitute for the general school system establishing a competency to provide quality music instruction to all students who desire it.

10. In order to have true freedom of choice, and to decide on the role of music on their lives, students must be given knowledge, skill and perceptual ability to hear the subtleties of music. … 'the better one is educated the more accessible the works of art become'.

11. On the understanding that the Leaving Certificate has enormous potential for improving Irish music education, LC students should be required to give evidence of having been a contributing member of a music ensemble for a year or two, in addition to passing an exit examination.

12. 'The term élitism should be banished in reference to educational objectives. It is an oxymoron. . . . Enabling students to gain competencies that were once reserved for the privileged does not seem to be altogether bad. … In education quality distinctions are not élitist and not only in the eye of the beholder. … The trappings of élitism are assumed.'

13. The specialist music educator should have: maturity; musicianship; personality; a commitment to continued learning, realizing the importance of life-long self-education; knowledge of how to teach strings, brass, woodwind, percussion voice, fretted instruments, keyboard.

14. It may be desirable to have all teachers return to the campus after teaching for a year or two (see McCann - Ref. I P vi). There is a case to be made for regarding teacher training and certification as being most appropriately situated in the area of graduate study.

15. There should be assessment in music education at regular intervals.

16. Teacher Education (and ultimately the music education programme) should place much emphasis on *classroom* teachers. They, in turn, should be encouraged to establish a philosophy, appropriate goals, method of delivery and to provide appropriate feedback. Goals in music education should be based on delivery expectation by primary school teachers. The aim should be to provide 4 - 6 years of effective mandatory instruction. On the other hand, music professionals (specialists) must be responsible for the establishment of standards (curriculum) and for accomplishing the goals of the school.

17. Improving music education in Ireland should be examination-based.

18. Music education in Ireland should be based on fundamentals derived from research and practice

19. Music as an elective, with competent teachers, should be made available to all interested students.

20. Partnerships with cultural organizations in the community should be established to boost music education, especially in the provision of performances in schools but also to provide instruction for talented and/or interested students, where appropriate. (See also Abeles - Ref. III P ii)

21. Partnerships with the community (local bands, private teachers, choral organizations, folk groups) should be established to boost the music instruction programme through performance. Funding can be offset against savings on additional staff.

The shorter lecture given by Professor Colwell at the culmination of Phase II of MEND (12 November 1995) is summarized below. The paper generally follows the salient points in the definitive paper (not read) but there are some additional comments and recommendations that are worth noting. See Document 209a in Proceedings

1. The success of school music as a facilitator of general music awareness and enjoyment is dependent on the generative effect of antecedent music programmes which the parents of current students have enjoyed. Parents must be influenced to appreciate the importance and value of music in the curriculum.

2. Initiatives in setting up local community ensembles (bands, choirs etc.) should be encouraged.

3. The 'opportunity to learn' (resource) standard has been overlooked during the MEND conference.

4. Decisions are needed as to what music in General Education is intended to achieve. This must *also* be assessed in the context of the needs of talented students and whether special provision is necessary to deal with this important cohort.

5. There is a certain type of music (western art music?) that has been traditionally used for pedagogical purposes (teaching skills, perceptions and attitudes in a sequential curriculum). This must be protected for its value in this respect; it must not be threatened by, or seen as a threat to, the aspirations of other musics.

6. 6, Every music educator should be at least as competent as the students are required to be.

7. Competence in music should not be seen as having an exaggerated dependence on basic talent. This erroneous perception is detrimental to the uptake of the music programme.

8. The standard expected in the exit examination (Leaving Certificate) should not be negotiable on the basis of statistical norms and higher (spurious) pass rates.

9. There must be accountability in requiring and reaching standards if students are to take the music programme seriously and value it. Standards are no more than good intentions, and are of no value without an examination system.

10. Standards in music education should concentrate on the intrinsic qualities of music and should not be diluted by association with other arts, leading to vagueness and/or ambiguity in the definition of standards. There must be a clear statement and understanding of objectives which balance the needs of the 'pursuit of excellence' (conservative idealism) and those of equality, social reform and student self esteem (liberal idealism).

11. Liaisons with the community (bands, orchestras, choirs, private teachers) are essential to promote a healthy music programme in which performance is valued appropriately.

12. The setting up of a professional organization is of less significance than the leadership required to make it effective.

Conclusion (Philosophical)

Music Education Philosophy - Universal or Contextual. The Relevance to MEND Findings

It had always been the writer's view that philosophies of music would have to be confronted to shed light on the process, and eventually to lead to the findings of MEND. And he believes that it was only in the exhaustive treatment of the subject facilitated by the coincidence of MEND with the philosophical eruption in North American music education in the years 1994 -1996 that clarification of the underlying causes of problems in Irish music education has been possible. It is one thing to identify problems, and MEND Phase I admirably performed that function; it is quite another to attempt to explain them and to relate them to global trends, with a view to facilitating their removal. An attempt to do this is made in the contextual treatment in Section 19.7.

18.1.3 Composing (Creativity: Buckley I P iii): Performing: Listening

Ref. I P iii See Document 103 in Proceedings
The 'Composer' in the Classroom. The Demystification of the Concept of Creativity.
Mr John Buckley (Irish Freelance Composer)

The paper is reviewed in the Interim Report of Phase I of MEND. The review stands and was not in need of revision at the Phase III (re-reading) stage.

Recommendation

Traditional skills should be taught as an enabler in composition.

Ref. I D ia See Document 151 in Proceedings
The Identification and the Encouragement of Creativity in Music.
Towards a Non-Threatening Definition

Chair: Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate Teacher Training College, Limerick)
Reporter: Mr Philip Carty (DIT and St Patrick's College, Maynooth)

There is much to be learned by inference from this report, which should be viewed as a pendant to John Buckley's paper (Ref. I P iii). It is to be noted that the group included two established composers and other senior academics. A very strong message emerges that teachers in Ireland are still very unsure as to how to cope, either in dealing with creativity as identified in students or in encouraging it in the first place. And, as has been stated, there was no evidence that we were dealing with an unpromising cross-section of participants in this debate. The group relied heavily on Mr Buckley and on the Ballymun Project, which he led, to explore the possible parameters; the exercise impressed as having been a virtuoso effort on Mr Buckley's part. In his comments, he was admirably consistent and scrupulously honest in giving his impressions as to the ultimate value of the Ballymun Project; the group did not reach a consensus on that issue principally because there was no progression or feedback to report. Some doubts were expressed as to whether the stimulation of the imagination in a non-musical or remotely-musical way would transmute into a higher general level of creativity in music studies. Mr Buckley, who showed himself throughout the morning to be an imaginative innovator and teacher in addition to enjoying recognized eminence as a composer, was the most ardent supporter of the idea that traditional skills are a *sine qua non* when creativity in any form makes its appearance.

An interesting point was made linking creativity with the full spectrum of musical experience, suggesting that its exploitation in performing and interpretation should not be disavowed. Ultimately it emerged, from this group, that creativity in teachers and in students, without having any direct correlation, is largely a matter of personal talent, and that to be prescriptive in curricula about its inculcation is imposing a burden with which they are ill-equipped to deal; this is especially true of non-specialist teachers. The correlation with the negative findings of the *Deaf Ears?* Report is a matter for serious consideration should the development of creativity be proposed as a dominant feature in the approach to curricular transmission in the future.

Ref. I D ib See Document 152 in Proceedings

The Listening Process. The Core Curriculum for the Inculcation of Basic Awareness, Appreciation and Literacy

Chair: Ms Ite O'Donovan (DIT)
Reporter: Ms Bernie Sherlock (DIT)

The delegates at this debate engaged with the conventional challenges of the listening function and the listening programme. Nothing revolutionary emerged, nor would it have been fair to have expected a different outcome. The meeting confirmed the canons of standard practice in dealing with aural development

1. Teach the sound before the symbol

2. Try to ensure that in a listening programme it truly is the ear and not the eye that takes the lead in the musical learning.

3. The earliest possible start is desirable but it should be geared to what is feasible by way of listening and age-related skill patterns

4. Rhythm and pitch training are equally important but rhythmic training, through movement, is a more promising starting point for very young children.

5. A well chosen repertoire of songs is useful in pitch development.

6. Instrumental performance should ideally be preceded by pitch training to encourage inner hearing and to discourage a 'visual only' approach. This is a critical consideration with young instrumentalists. Listening is central to effective and musical performance.

7. The idea of specialist teaching or of assistance in the transmission of the music programme in primary schools was whole-heartedly supported by this group. This was juxtaposed with the concern that the method of recruiting candidates for primary school teacher training takes little or no account of their eventual rôle as music teachers.

8. Suitable age-related teaching materials should be available for primary school teachers. There was unstinting praise for Dr Bradshaw's research-based teaching material.

9. While an element of choice, dictated by opportunity, is desirable, children should, under ideal conditions, be able to sing before they learn an instrument

10. Students should also have a sense of pitch separately developed before progressing to reading.

11. The teaching routines for all students should be systematic and progressive, and should establish continuum at all transition points.

18.1.4 Time Management

Ref. III D ib See Document 352 in Proceedings

Time Constraints in Music Education. Politics and Strategies for Acceptance and Implementation of an Effective Music Curriculum

Chair: Ms Ite O'Donovan (DIT, Adelaide Rd)
Reporter: Mr Martin Barrett (University of Limerick and RIAM)

This debate was not reported, owing to technical difficulties.

18.1.5 Dichotomy

Ref. II D ia See Document 251 in Proceedings

Philosophies of Music Education and the Great Divide

Chair: Dr Ita Beausang
Reporter: Sr Barbara McHugh
Panel: Professor Richard Colwell; Professor Bennett Reimer; Professor Ramon Santos

[It was reported that this debate was a short one as a result of overshooting the timetable at earlier sessions.]

The meaning of the title of the debate was intended to be provocative and to elicit various interpretations. In the event, although the possibility of seeing the Great Divide as symbolic of the fissures evident in current philosophical pronouncements surrounding the relative importance of such complementary concepts as product and process, listening and performing, praxial and contextual/referential approaches (see the Reimer/Elliott debate fully treated in this report - Refs. II P iii and II P viii *et seq*) was inviting, **the delegates identified it as more relevantly related to the equally troublesome dichotomy between academic and practical aspects of music education in Ireland as elsewhere**. It proved difficult for the chair-person to keep the discussion focused on purely philosophical issues - convincing evidence in itself that the majority of music education practitioners in Ireland have been untouched by the current global conflict in philosophical statement, if indeed philosophy could be claimed to exert any significant influence on their professional decision-making.

The salient points that emerged from the discussion are best summarized point by point: -

1. On the question of multiculturalism there was no dissent from the idea that 'all music traditions should be respected' (*sic*). With regard to musical experiences for Travelling Children - and, conversely, any musical tradition that they, as a distinct cultural group, might bring to the Irish musical scene - it seems clear, from the brief discussion, that their potential intrinsic contribution, as distinct from any benefit they might derive from the imposed norms of music education, is difficult to define, probably because it is not unique in the first place.

Some concern was expressed that, because of curriculum/syllabus revision in Ireland in the 1990s we are in a transitional phase and, seemingly (as far as school music is concerned), learning to cope with a much greater emphasis on performance and less on the academic aspects of music education that hitherto. Presumably the point being made was that Ireland's circumstances are not currently ripe for significant multi-cultural interventions.

2. Professor Colwell, in characteristic fashion (see Colwell - Ref. II P ix), confirmed that tensions between academic and practical musicians exist also in the United States. He commented that there is little agreement on philosophies of music education and therefore even less on a philosophical way forward, although it is difficult to see the philosophy/dichotomy in a cause and effect relationship.

3. Professor Reimer confirmed the contextual approach to philosphy, in which a philosophical stance should be influenced by the circumstances and value system of the scene to which it is being applied. **Both Colwell and Reimer urged that Ireland would not rush into new areas (e.g. exploring multiculturalism prematurely)** but rather should cherish what it has, add to knowledge and experience from something that already exists, while integrating new ideas as appropriate.

   Professor Colwell confirmed his view that a philosophy of music education is an absolute priority, which should then inform the other activities in the educational sequence - curriculum, syllabus, materials, method, assessment, feedback etc. A philosophy enables the basic decisions to be made in relation to all the circumstances obtaining as, for example, the number of years of tuition in schools, the corresponding competencies expected to accrue from that period of study, and the hierarchy within the standards (content and achievement targets etc.) set in implementing the curriculum.

4. By anticipation, Professor Colwell's concern about a prevalent psychologically-based perception amongst teachers and students that they are not musical and have no talent was voiced by one of the delegates. This confirmed the need for those who are musically well-trained to act as advocates in stressing (from a stance of thoughtful analysis) the importance of music in education and its adaptability to all levels of awareness. One of the advantages of a clearly articulated philosophy of music education is that it enables cogent arguments to be made and defended.

5. Professor Reimer stressed the importance of teaching students to respond to musical experiences, in the first place. In this context, and at the rudimentary stages, the need for notation need not be over-emphasized.

6. An important synthesis of comments by Dr Beausang, Dr Bradshaw and Professor Reimer concerned the true nature of listening and ear training. Professor Reimer confirmed his celebrated and convincing stance that 'it is not a question of [deciding between] listening to and active involvement in music'. Listening *is* creating music and is the *fundamental* active engagement in music (see Reimer/Elliott - Refs. II P ii and II P viii)

Recommendations

1. All music traditions should be respected.

2. Ireland's circumstances are not currently ripe for significant multi-cultural interventions in music education.

3. A philosophical stance should be influenced by the circumstances and value system of the scene to which it is being applied.

4. When standards for music education (content, achievement targets, resources and teacher training) are promulgated they should be prioritized.

5. The ideas that music is a difficult subject reserved for the talented, and that most people consider themselves to be unmusical and to have no talent, must be discouraged and addressed within the advocacy movement (based on philosophical clarity of thought)

6. The learning and use of notation in music education should be minimized at the early stages.

7. The idea that listening is an active involvement in music should be promoted.

18.2 State of Music Education in Ireland

18.2.1 General Provision

Ref. I D iia See Document 154 in Proceedings

An Appraisal of Current Primary and Pre-School Provision as Music Education Strategy in Ireland

Chair: Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
Reporter: Ms Eithne Donnelly (Mater Dei Institute)

This debate must be viewed against the background of the failed music curriculum in primary schools (An Curaclam Nua 1971), a reality that was accepted by the Dept of Education official in attendance and is still with us. As yet the new primary curriculum (1999) had not been issued, of course. The expression of general dissatisfaction with current provision therefore formed the substance of most of the discussion. In this respect the following points were made, confirming the *Deaf Ears?* findings but adding little original by way of positive suggestions for the future

1. Patterns of musical illiteracy extend through the whole spectrum right up to senior cycle second-level. The fact is that school music education for many has been a hit-and-miss affair, depending on the arbitrary circumstances of their school ambience. The absence of a well articulated and realistically implemented policy at national level was decried.

2. That there are genuine feelings of incompetence, diffidence, nervousness and fear in relation to the implementation of the primary curriculum was confirmed. The triple demands (so defined) of teaching for creativity, performance and listening were considered to be beyond the unaided competence of most non-specialist teachers (the norm by definition), in spite of the non-examination and intentionally non-threatening orientation.

3. While there was a mixed response to the desirability of having specialist teachers, as such, in primary schools, various compromises to achieve commensurate results were discussed, notably on-the-spot in-service modules for teachers and assistance from peripatetic (specialist) teachers on an ongoing basis (see also the Debate on Continuum Ref. I D ic)

4. There is difficulty in having and implementing a national policy for pre-school (music) education owing to the large number of schools in independent private ownership.

5. Poor resourcing. As with the 'Listening' Debate (Ref. I D ic) the paucity of materials was cited and there was, again, fulsome praise for Dr Bradshaw's groundbreaking work.

6. 'Sound Awareness' routines, as expounded by Mary Stakelum, were also considered as to suitability for pre-school experience. The idea of an approach through movement and singing using materials specifically from the folk/art range was taken up in consensus. It is particularly important to draw attention to the fact that nowhere in the MEND debates was there support for the idea that teachers themselves, especially non-specialist teachers, should be obliged to be creative, do their own research and/or find suitable materials for teaching. Although originality and creativity were always an object of honest admiration, prescription was the preferred approach with copious easily-assimilable materials coming by way of support from the system itself. It was, however, confirmed by the Dept of

Education representative present that prescription would not extend to method (see also Sean MacLiam's paper on the proposed syllabus change in Leaving Certificate for further confirmation on this issue. Ref. I P xiii).

7. The need to consider a pre-school to primary continuum was discussed, should the two provisions ever be absorbed as a linked pair in curriculum planning.

8. The fact that there is currently no official provision for primary school teacher in-service (music) was noted as a matter for serious inclusion in the programme for enhanced teacher training as currently proposed (See 1995 White Paper). Lack of confidence amongst non-specialist teachers was attributed partly to the knowledge that training schemes are not available to counter it. Mr Kitterick (Dept of Education) confirmed that it was in the Government plan to make such provision.

9. The suggestion to use live music, typically supplied by visiting teams of local musicians, as a means of stimulating interest amongst children was highly lauded although the resource implications were appreciated. (Note that this strategy is developed in Professor Ableles's paper [Ref. III P ii] given at Phase III of MEND).

Ref. I D iiia See Document 157 in Proceedings

Second-Level Music Education. The Feasibility of Senior Cycle Music Uptake as Long-Term Target.

Chair: Ms Brighid Mooney (DIT)
Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association)

The list of participants in this debate was a very revealing and useful guideline as to how focused it could have been, and how involved in the subject matter the contributors were in their professional pursuits. There was a significant attendance by particularly influential members of the Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association. This gives added authority and relevance to its findings. In the event the debate proved to be a vindication of the strategy to stream the proceedings of MEND to allow for special focus issues. In the writer's view it successfully, by stating one view, polarized two diametrically opposed perceptions that must be taken into account if interrelated problems with Leaving Certificate uptake are to be fully understood and addressed. Alternatively, and even more importantly, the debate pointed up the crucial nature of senior cycle uptake as an indicator of (1) how music education is seen *per se* as a refining 'humanities' subject; (2) how it is perceived against the potent criterion of university entrance credit; and (3) how it is affected by the standard/results issue. All of these considerations are worthy of appraisal in the search for the real crux with school music and possible solutions. It should be reiterated here that this area of enquiry (the Leaving Certificate and its interactions with other issues in music education in Ireland) was specifically signposted in the MEND agenda as one of overwhelming relevance to the identification of irreducible target issues to galvanize educators into corrective action.

The subject matter for the meeting, and its mood, was well reported in a very straightforward way, facilitating cross-referencing to other views of the same problems. The debate was held (April 1995) *before* the revised Syllabus for Leaving Certificate Music was due for implementation (1996). The concern of the delegates was to establish, not to restore, music as a popular subject in Irish education. The perceptual status of the subject as a feasible or pragmatic educational choice in second-level is influenced by a complex matrix of interacting elements, the majority of which can be inferred from the material generated by this debate.

1. In current Irish second-level education it must, realistically, be accepted that music is a minority non-core subject with an increasing element of option/choice in the later years

of secondary schooling. Availability, accessibility and continuity of music education are inequitable in a country-wide context.

2. Realistically also, it can be argued that subjects exist in second-level in a democratically decided hierarchy in which those with higher time allocations cannot but be classified as specialized (e.g. maths or language). The natural grouping of subjects in senior cycle (maths with sciences, language sets etc.), with clear third-level aspirations and destinations, further confirms the specialization mentality. Music is disadvantaged and isolated in this respect, accounting in part for its coterie (only) popularity but also for a general ambivalence as to its relevance in education (especially in second-level education seen as a transitional phase to third-level).

3. It is difficult to avoid the perception that music as a subject in second level is tolerated rather than supported and encouraged. This is confirmed in the observable attitudes of politicians, educational strategists at high level, economic pragmatists, the local management and teaching cohorts in schools, parents and the students themselves. The subject is in need of highly professionalized advocacy (see Straub [Ref. II P v] and Lehman [Ref. III P iii] for corroborative evidence of successful advocacy in action). Given the time restraints vis-à-vis other more favoured subjects, it would be impossible to reach comparable educational standards in music, considering this time-dependency. If this is counterbalanced (with a certain justification in context) either by attempts in second level strategy to establish or maintain comparability of standards . . . . or by third level interests to impose it, the subject is being asked to deliver more than is possible. This produced the all-too-familiar crisis symptoms of:

    a. An honestly-stated but poor relative standard of achievement judged by what is possible for subjects with more generous time allocations. Alternatively, comparable standards became dependent on unofficial extra time donated by teachers or were just a reflection of outstanding ability in the few. OR

    b. A perception that the subject is too difficult (considering the effects on starting standard of the fractured continuum between primary and second-level) and therefore causing a decline in the option uptake for music. OR

    c. A similar decline in its fortunes as a chosen enabling subject for credits in third-level prospects

    d. A demand for relaxation in the standards, leading to

    e. Poor comparability with music third-level entry requirements, endangering the regenerative nature of education for music by inevitably steering quality candidates away from the subject at third level. and

    f. Inimical dichotomization (1995 and earlier) of the Syllabus A and B cohorts along the lines of élitism.

All of the above reflect badly on the prospects for music as a ‘minority subject with equal rights’. It has to be acknowledged that the task facing the NCCA Music Course Committee was an impossible one. The list also highlights the urgent need to reappraise aims and objectives as relating to music in school, not so much as an examination option (which is a totally separate issue and redolent of a certain unacceptable mentality towards a subject, steeped, perhaps more than any other, in the notion of its refining influences and its ‘humanities’ character) but as to its functional, aesthetic and behavioural/processual nature in offering a vital formula for better living. Ideally music should be valued, above all, for its intrinsic *sui generis* uniqueness. But *if* its extrinsic functions come, as they *must* occasionally, under scrutiny, its career possibilities must be, at least, equally weighed in the

balance with its adaptability as a third-level enabler (university credits), the latter not even recognized by the NCCA (as presumably standing proxy for ministerial authority) as a valid criterion (see S Mac Liam [Ref. I P xiii]) - however it is viewed by the students. This was the problem faced by the NCCA; its response, though helpful in some aspects, is vulnerable to the charge of yielding to majority interest and bias, if not, worse, to short-term objectives of questionable logic. By rationalizing the syllabus (rather than reforming the curriculum, which would have been infinitely more sensitive to questions about the *ultimate* aims of the programme) and, *de facto*, opting for the least common denominator which might reconcile the interests of the former Syllabus A and B warring factions, a specious compromise was found which accommodated all but one of the concerns noted above (No v above), arguably the most important long-term one. But it was also to introduce, under the benign guise of a commitment to performance, an arguably sham element which even in 1995 (the debate being reviewed) was listed as an additional pressure which teachers found unacceptable.[95] This massive shift in emphasis in the content and methodology of senior cycle music has produced a significant upsurge in takers for the subject, not to be disavowed. But it has left its mark in opening up a new and particularly debilitating fissure in the continuum, disadvantaging potential third-level music students who should have at least equal rights, in their expectations from general education, with their peer group in other subject areas, whatever about the challengeable NCCA disclaimer as to accepting no responsibility for the meeting of those expectations. This restatement of the case is necessary because it was naturally invoked by the debate in question.

If the progress made, however flawed, is to be conserved without loss of credibility as the epochal step it might claim to be, it can be tolerated only if the one major drawback (No v above) is addressed. But the interests of the genuine performance stream and the fracture in the third-level continuum must be separately considered in the context of their idiosyncratic dissonances with the new dispensation. To use an expression borrowed from Marie McCarthy, 'innovation needs to outweigh tradition' in approaching solutions of such crucial importance.

1. The ideal would be to offer a parallel option in Leaving Certificate, which would redress the specialism balance vis-à-vis other groups of subjects (this is referred to in Ms Kerin's analysis). Considering the statistic she quotes of an average of 3 students per school taking LC in music, the provision of such a specialism would not involve a major shift in emphasis for teachers and would offer professional challenges in their work, for those seeking them. The specialism (see review of Sean Man Liam's paper Ref. I P xiii) should, in equity, cover composing, performance and musicology (appraising).

2. Should the above option not be feasible as potentially too sparse in uptake, the conceptually more difficult choice (for the Dept/NCCA caucus) would be to provide for it outside the school ambience. This has real resonance in the introduction of the 'rural school bus' idea of the 50s and 60s, which is with us to this day (based on the 'Mohammed and the mountain' theory). But difficulties with the principles involved might be advanced as a counterposition. If the grouping of subjects is accepted as tantamount to specialization (the language, science and maths interrelationships already referred to), surely the *case* for the extra music examination module is sustainable, whatever about the trumped-up objections, which do not even try to disguise the resource implications. The idea of designating (indeed even establishing) strategic centres of excellence to provide the tuition (in parallel with the school ideal outlined above) would

[95] The reporter being reviewed stated that 'with the demands of the new curriculum in the areas of composing, listening and performing, teachers and students are under pressure'. Elsewhere she cites 'difficulties in teaching performance skills at second level' as a reason for requesting the services of peripatetic teachers, financed (of course) by the Dept of Education, to assist in this task. At the other end of the spectrum, the writer was recently on an adjudication committee for the allocation of substantial third-level scholarship monies where one candidate for Leaving Certificate (hons!) in 2000, with no instrumental skills, is substituting "my 4 songs for my practical exam". Reference to the report on the Debate (Ref. I D ib) will confirm that very young children in primary school may be expected to accumulate a repertoire of as many as 20 songs in one year! The relativity here begs many questions.

be in the spirit of progressive education. It would involve some resourcing, of course, but the idea of removing the stigma of deprivation from some rural areas by establishing schools of music, or subsidizing embryo ones with the same general intention, is infinitely preferable to perpetuating the label of élitism, unjustly incurred in the first place. After all we are now living in Ireland of the third millennium! And lest there be any doubt about the significance of what is being proposed, it is a strategy (1) to provide in justice for genuine minority interest (as here defined in the context of the provisions of the 1995 White Paper); (2) to promote partnership in education between public and private (or at least semi-state or state-subsidized) providers; and (3) permit the syllabus revision to deliver its undoubted benefits without compromising the subject of music in its most essential needs as an ever-ripe liberalizing subject particularly suited to the realization of the highest ideals of the well-rounded education envisaged for the children of this millennium.

Ref. II D iic See Document 256 in Proceedings

Second Level Music Education in Ireland: Towards a True Continuum

Chair: Colm O Cléirigh
Reporter: Ms Blánaid Murphy
Panel: Professor David Elliott; Professor Marie McCarthy; Dr Kari Veblen

While this was a lively debate it did not, as the reporter commented, always keep the chosen topic in focus; the keyword - continuum- was often peripheralized. There appears to have been no significant introduction by the chairperson; the report therefore begins from the bilateral discussion stage.

1. The frustration of (second-level?) teachers was voiced in relation to the quotidian conflict in the classroom between idealism and pragmatism - actually implementing a curriculum.

2. All three panel members contributed critical opinions on the way the general music education programme can be structured. There was an implication in Dr Veblen's remarks (later confirmed by her) that two different age-based music programmes, with different agendas, operate in general music education in the US[96] and that they do not need to achieve continuity. Professor Elliott took this point up and singled out the higher age group (12 onwards) activity of performing in bands (with a minuscule repertoire learned in a single year) with a competition mentality; he could not however deny its overwhelming popularity. He deplored this naïve and limited approach to musicianship (see Elliott for details – Ref. II P viii) and claimed that it confused the ideas of performance and general music education as a cognate pair in favour of an élitist view of performing. Obviously neither of these approaches obtains in Ireland (nor is it desirable) but Professor McCarthy, speaking from an Irish point of view, suggested that we are under-structured in our approach.

3. The shortcomings in the Irish second-level music education dispensation were discussed and many of the concerns that had surfaced elsewhere during MEND received copious confirmation. Among these were:

[96] I t should be remembered that (music) education in the US is not federally controlled as to philosophy, structure or content. Since the initiative in education is strictly ordered on a state by state basis, any generalizations should be treated with caution. It is, however, generally true across most of the US that the band movement is a dominant force and well supported by administration, teachers (with some reservations), parents and students.

a. The unsatisfactory mode of deciding on curriculum matters. The membership of the ministerial committee is decided by the minister and is only minimally democratic.[97]

b. The basic philosphy of how to pitch the levels of instruction and expected standards of achievement has lacked clarity. In particular it is unclear whether music in general education is intended for enjoyment or achievement (implying that these two criteria are incompatible?) A by-product of this is that there has been a tendency to discourage apparently disinterested students from taking music rather then inquiring into the reasons for their lack of interest. The other side of this coin emerged in a complaint that the numbers taking the Leaving Certificate course in music is very low; this was attributed to the overriding belief amongst students that music is a difficult subject (for earning university credits) and should only be taken by students aiming for a career in music. Mr Mac Liam (chairman of the NCCA music sub-committee) confirmed that the latest approach to general music education is fully to involve all who opt for it and that the level is aimed at the average rather than the talented student; this should boost numbers. Professor McCarthy, in endorsing this, made a plea for developing other qualities (as, for example, personality and leadership) through the general music programme.

c. Mr MacLiam admitted that there is a negative effect in relating the general music programme to the issue of the exit examination (LC) and university credits, but claimed that much good ensemble (non-examination) work is being done in the schools, which goes unnoticed but should receive greater recognition.

d. The question of the inadequacy of training for teachers who are expected to teach the music programme (in primary schools?) was raised (see *Deaf Ears?*). A proposal was made that there should be music teacher liaison groups bridging the primary-second level divide with the aim of achieving continuum in the curriculum (see McCarthy – Ref. III P vii).

4. Mr MacLiam dealt with the difficulty of catering, within one syllabus, for the whole spectrum of ability and interest. This, of course (as noted elsewhere - see analysis of MacLiam – Ref. I P xiii) *is* a continuum issue. The Heneghan/White proposal (again see MacLiam Ref. I P xiii) that an applied vocational option be provided in the LC syllabus as a second subject (such as is the norm in the sciences [physics/biology/ chemistry] and in language) received favourable mention.

5. Professor Elliott, provocatively taking a contrary view from that expressed by Professor Colwell (See Colwell Ref. III P ix) in relation to examinations and their *usefulness* as a instrument of power over the curriculum, suggested idealistically that the curriculum should be typified by a natural teaching/learning engagement between teacher and student. In such a scenario, assessment by outside agencies should not be necessary; if teachers are trusted (as they should be) assessment should be a simple matter, involving only the teacher. This is, of course, also contrary to the views expressed by other American philosophers (especially Lehman and Colwell) that once national standards (National Curriculum in Ireland) are set out they make no sense unless there is an assessment /evaluation feedback to test them; such assessments should be conducted most logically by an independent agency, according to agreed standards, if they are to be reliable.

[97] This is something of a misrepresentation at the debate. Interested parties (such as teachers' unions) are asked to nominate representatives; direct ministerial nominations are minimized. There is a consultation and invited submission mechanism which is faithfully followed but is very often treated with apathy. But it seems that the method of representation could be re-examined with benefit.

6. There was some disagreement between the main speakers on the question of an articulated curriculum. David Elliott, quoting from his own book (Music Matters p 243-248- see also Elliott Ref. II P viii) put forward the view that the curriculum must arise from a considered and reliable philosophical stand on music education as such and not follow the structure-of-discipline approach (also philosophically-based - circa 1949) which relates music to what may only be appropriate for other subjects (such as math/science). Professor McCarthy endorsed this view but Mr Mac Liam maintained that the music curriculum must balance that in other subjects and therefore be cognate in approach.

7. An unidentified speaker proposed that music education in schools should cater for the majority and that minority specialized interests were élitist by definition and should therefore be discounted. This, of course, runs contrary to most mature music education philosophy and does not fit with Mr MacLiam's proposals, although, as noted elsewhere (see MacLiam Ref. I P xiii), neither does he guarantee that senior cycle music in secondary schools caters any longer for the aspirations of the career-minded musician.

8. Another bone of contention raised was the issue of the lack of recognition given to music teachers in Ireland by way of inducements and credits in relation to voluntary attendance at courses aimed at enhancing their professional skills. It was confirmed that the situation in the US is much more favourable to teachers in this respect.

9. Perhaps the most penetrating observation on the proceedings came form the reporter herself when, in praising Professor Elliott's idealism, she concluded that the work force to operate such an idealistic approach would have to be very sophisticated indeed. This, the nub of the matter, is listed as a barrier to the adoption of Elliott's philosophy of music education in the analysis of his presentation (see Elliott - Ref II P viii).

Recommendations

1. Apparent lack of interest by students in the music programme should not be used as an excuse for encouraging them to abandon the subject. A campaign should be launched to eradicate the perception that music is a *difficult* subject.

2. Adequate pre-service and in-service backup should be provided, especially for general class teachers expected to teach the revised music curricula.

3. Music teachers in schools should be afforded greater inducements and recognition in relation to courses attended to upgrade their skills.

4. Teacher liaison groups, bridging the primary-second level divide, with the aim of achieving continuum in the curriculum, should be established.

5. The vocational option (second full-credit music subject) should be reconsidered for LC by NCCA to enhance the career path options for music students.

Ref. 2 II D ib See Document 252 in Proceedings

Pre-School and Primary Education. The First and Critical Testing Ground for Philosophy of Music Education in Action.

Chair: Ms Gabrielle McCann
Reporter: Mr Christopher Kinder
Panel: Professor Marie McCarthy; Ms Dorothy Straub; Dr Kari Veblen

This was a well-attended debate, more than half of the attendance comprising school music teachers. The Chairperson came well-prepared and set the tone of the debate by provocative suggestions as to how the discussion might proceed. These included:

1. Encouraging spontaneous musical responses from children.

2. Serious discrepancies between primary and second-level syllabi.

3. Hopes for the revision of the primary school curriculum, imminently expected (it did not appear until 1999).

4. Understaffing of the inspectorate.

5. Problems in the management of in-service and in-career development (see McCann – Ref. I P vi).

6. Lack of Music Advisory service for teachers (the introduction of Education Centres throughout the country presumably addresses this lacuna).

The outcomes from the debate were as follows:

1. The discussion immediately focused on the class teacher/specialist debate in relation to teaching music in primary (child-centred) education. An authoritative intervention by the chairman of the NCCA music committee seemed to strike an acceptable compromise in suggesting that up to 3rd class (c 9 yrs) a non-specialist teacher should be able to cope adequately, but thereafter a more systematic approach (implying some specialist intervention) would be more appropriate. There was also a suggestion from the floor that some outreach into the community to use readily available specialisms (parents /private teachers/ community ensembles. See Colwell – Ref. II P ix and Abeles Ref. III P ii) should be considered. The importance of a musical environment in the home was emphasized, as was the need to incorporate movement in all musical activities from the earliest age.

2. A proposal was made that funding for music between primary and second-level should be addressed to establish a more meaningful distribution, considering that the primary stage is when children are at their most impressionable and is likely to be confirmed as the mandatory music education period.

3. The ascendancy of singing as the prime musical activity at primary level was confirmed. In this context it was proposed that music (ability to sing) should again be seen as an essential competence in the recruitment of teachers. This, of course, should eventually follow naturally from an improved music dispensation in the schooling system – as a long-term outcome.

4. A suggestion that greater access by students to experiences in the other arts was well received. It was commented on by one well-connected speaker that this should be facilitated by the provisions of the White Paper (on Education Reform) but that some initiative by interested parties (parents/ teachers et al) would be helpful in ensuring that these benefits were made available.

5. The dilemma as to whether curriculum should be designed around the potential of teachers or what students are capable of achieving was discussed. The solution was left open but it seems that the remedy lies within the recruitment of and course content for suitable candidates for teacher training.

6. Professor McCarthy summed up on the question of the ascendancy of the vocal approach, citing the choral tradition which is part of the Irish heritage in schooling. But she criticized the system in that it has not adequately provided for maximizing the use of such specialisms (in music) as exist and as are produced within the teacher training colleges. Professor McCarthy also endorsed the view that initiatives to bring about change (as, for example, in the provision of an advisory service for music teachers and national co-ordination of such services as are available) should come from 'grass roots' sources, stimulated by the expressed dissatisfaction, with current provision, amongst teachers in schools where the needs are most felt.

Recommendations

1. The ability to sing being essential for any music educator at any level, but especially at the pre-school and primary stages of education, that this should be taken into account in recruitment procedures for primary school teacher training while child-centred education remains the norm in Ireland.

2. That (self)-confidence in teachers be identified and fostered at selection, pre-service and in-service stages of a teacher's career.

3. That curriculum development should take progress on the above two concerns into account when programmes of study at <u>all</u> stages are being devised.

4. That the possible provision of specialist teachers for music at the early stages under discussion needs further consultation.

5. That the general public needs to be continually reminded of the unique nature and contribution to quality education of learning in the Arts field, and particularly of the 'transfer' value of music education.

6. That the benefits of outreach into the community and of partnerships in education should be investigated for primary level applications.

7. That the provision of an advisory service for music teachers, and co-ordination, on a national basis, of such services as are available should be implemented.

Third-Level Music Education

This topic is covered in Section 18.7 of the Agenda/Analysis (see below).

18.2.2 Music in the Community

Ref. I P v See Document 105 in Proceedings

Private Enterprise as an Antidote to Regional Inequality in Music Education
Mr Aidan O'Carroll

Music in the Community is featured in Aidan O'Carroll's paper, though the subject has much wider implications. Mr O Carroll gives a convincing account of the entrepreneurial acumen behind the establishment, growth and survival of the Kerry School of Music, the largest and fastest growing provincial (non-urban)/rural music education facility in the state. In this the paper has paradigmatic significance. In the two decades since its establishment in 1980 the School has a proud record of having brought a wide range of performing arts activities to the town of Tralee and to a number of strategically placed outreach centres in the county of Kerry. The School is a company limited by guarantee with no share capital, and it also qualifies for charitable status under the provisions of Section 32 of the Finance Act. All of this is extremely laudable but tends only to expose and highlight, by simple inference, the dilemma adverted to in the *Deaf Ears?* Report and again in the PIANO Report of 1997 concerning the overwhelming evidence of unequal access to the arts in Ireland. The self-financing policy of the School, to which Mr O'Carroll refers with some pride, may be evidence of the related advantages of autonomy which the School enjoys, or it may just be nothing more than making a virtue of necessity. The reality is that if the School had not travelled the course it did it, sadly, would not have survived. And the up-beat predictions of further development, contained in his ambitious manifesto and based on the acquisition of the School's new premises, have been slow to develop; this is simply because of the difficulty of operating in a situation where there is a major dependence for self-financing on the fee structure, by whatever means it is managed in practice, and on voluntary sponsorship, however successfully promoted. But Mr O'Carroll himself pinpoints the essence and the inherent fragility of his prototypical position by his reference to a 'three-pronged equation'. This defines the intimate correlation between the ideas of private enterprise (and autonomy), the cost of providing the service (and the need to balance the budget, at all costs, to survive) and the notion of artistic standards (and élitism). Realistically the only solution to this quasi-conundrum lies in the intervention of state subsidies.

The case of the Kerry School of Music, though not typical (simply because it is better off than most other such enterprises in rural Ireland), acts as a model which reflects, by incipient re-enactment, the history of the activities of the vocational education committees in the cities of Cork, Dublin and Limerick at the turn of the last century. It is to be hoped that the resplendent development of these institutions, notably in the past thirty or forty years (although they had their origins in the nineteenth century under the cherished commitment to equal access) will not be denied the provinces now that there are such encouraging signs of public and private initiative such as the Kerry School exemplifies.

It should be recorded here that the Arts Council commissioned a report in 1996/97, to gather information on, and to fashion a profile of private music school activities in rural Ireland. The report, eventually entitled ***Listening Ears?*** (acknowledging its connection to the *Deaf Ears?* Report) by its author, Helen Phelan, was, curiously, never published. It is not for this writer to disclose sensitive specifics, though the report itself was scrupulous in observing anonymity. It is, however, easy to conclude that there is an obvious demand for the kind of tuition in practical music-making which the private sector provides (while the general education system does not) but that the enforced shoe-string

policies of private enterprise are producing the characteristic outcomes of derisory earnings for the professionals involved and the still only aspiring standards which the workings of the employment market inevitably deliver under such inimical conditions. Suffice it to say that the ***Listening Ears?*** Report, if published, would make further depressing reading.

Recommendations

(O'Carroll/Phelan), which closely mirror those of the PIANO Report, and which are hereby endorsed, call, *inter alia*, for:

1. Advice, support and financial assistance, as primary needs for the development of private schools of music.

2. Subsidization of Community Arts Centres.

3. Dialogue on the setting up of models of interaction between the providers of general school music education (typically the Dept of Education), public and private schools of music and the larger community of musicians and music-making (for a very relevant treatment of this topic see Professor Harold Abeles's paper [Ref. III P ii]).

4. Collaboration with the Music Education National Forum (the sequel to MEND) towards research into the implications of the implementation of the recommendations of *Listening Ears?*

18.2.3 Private Enterprise and Semi-State Provision

Ref. I D iib See Document 155 in Proceedings

The 'Non-State' Sector. Private Enterprise and Community Activity in the Promotion of Music as Educational Process.

Chair: Mr Ian Fox (Freelance Broadcaster)
Reporter: Ms Bernadette Cleary (Midland Arts)

This debate was to become a clearing ground for further statements of how the national system of music education, as contributed to by the private sector in this case, continues to confirm the bleak findings of the *Deaf Ears?* Report. While there was much praise for entrepreneurship (notably in the Band Movement) and its achievements against impossible resource restrictions, such success as was reported had to be measured against the lack of a coherent national policy which could structure and co-ordinate the considerable amount of goodwill and work potential that was available. The reporter, Bernadette Cleary (Midlands VEC Arts Officer) had a personal triumph in keeping the focus on provincial activities in music, these accounting for the bulk of private enterprise initiatives.

The virtual demise of the peripatetic scheme of semi-state-dependent instrumental music teaching in the Midlands was set against the rapid growth of the Kerry School of Music, which was cited as a model of how private enterprise and indomitable commitment could lead to real success. But this was not seen as a substitute, for all time, for state interventions or genuine collaborative effort. Unwavering support for the continuing reappraisal of school music education as the staple source of musical experience was given; current trends in the Junior Certificate and Leaving Certificate in relation to performance were welcomed *per se* but also as a means of encouraging liaisons between the private and public sectors. The possibly enlarged involvement of radio in the campaign for better-

informed countrywide music listenership was stressed as a freely available and powerful means of general access.

The growth and success of the Band Movement in Ireland came under scrutiny as one major collective community initiative worthy of state support as ministering to the 'centrality of performance' emphasis in the JC and LC syllabus revision. The problems of the Band Movement that could be overcome by state subsidy were listed as:

1. The desirability of having the highest professional standards of teaching and avoiding the recycling of faulty techniques characteristic of the intrinsically flawed monitorial system.

2. The provision of instrument banks (see Aidan O Carroll – Ref. I P v)

The impoverished state of music education provision in Ireland was cited as a probable cause of poor availability of expertly trained music teachers (for the Band Movement) - creating a vicious circle.

The need for freely available in-service training over the spectrum of music education (including performance) was stressed. The entrpreneurial work of the European Piano Teachers' Association (EPTA) and the European String Teachers' Association (ESTA) was commended as contributing significantly to the relief of the problem of keeping established teachers in contact with innovatory method. All of these concerns were stated in the context of the need for strategic planning to overcome regional inequality.

The following measures were listed as capable of contributing to a better and more equitable future for music education in Ireland:

1. Balance between the entrepreneurship of private enterprise, the autonomy of music education agencies resulting from it and non-interventionist and non-threatening state subventions to assist and encourage that work.

2. Formal recognition of the contribution to the ideals of music education by the Band Movement over a range of musical activities and using the committed services of private teachers.

3. The setting up of formal communication systems to encourage networking between different agencies of music education.

4. Possibilities should be explored to enlist the hidden artistic aid of commercially successful Irish international music/art performance (example *Riverdance*) in popularizing music amongst the young. The virtuoso example of this strategy in a direct advocacy and politically effective way was the setting up of the Music Education Coalition in the United States, eventually forcing the federal government to reappraise and drastically modify its Goals 2000 manifesto on Education to include the arts (see Dorothy Straub [Ref. II P ix] and Paul Lehman [Ref. III P iii])

5. Encouragement of all measures to ensure that the music education system is self sustaining and regenerative. This idea should be compared with the review material covering Seán MacLiam's paper (Leaving Certificate Syllabus Review Ref. I P xiii). It is understandable, in a regional sense, that this idea should be extended to the encouragement of graduate teachers to return to their home base to contribute to the regenerative cycle in a very specific way.

6. The imaginative use of the media in collaborative exercises to promote music education and to reach a wider audience through the music itself.

7. Suitable emphasis on professional rather than purely vocational approaches, on 'education' over 'training' . . . 'adding reflectiveness to effectiveness' in teacher performance (see Mary Lennon on Music Teacher Education Ref. I P xiv)

Finally the group considered the contribution which a Music Education National Forum could make in the current reawakening of a reforming spirit in Irish music education and gave it unanimous support, defining the many advantages that could accrue from its establishment.

18.2.4 Materials for Music Education

Ref. I P ii See Document 102 in Proceedings

Listening as Quintessential Key to Musicianship.
Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple School)

This paper is reviewed in the Interim Report of Phase I (see Appendices Document 605). The **Recommendations** from Dr Bradshaw's paper are as follows:

1. The need to construct an unbroken continuum from Kindergarten to Tertiary level music education

2. The need for specific academic scholarship in the sphere of music education

3. To emphasize the rôle, preservation and dissemination of Irish folksong within Irish society.

4. The establishment of a tangible artistic link between the future musical culture of Ireland and its historic past.

5. The need to develop methods and materials which are student-centred and born of research within the classroom.

6. The need to encourage our best composers/artists to write suitable contemporary materials for children.

All these aspirations highlight the need to consider the lack of a realistic means of introducing new forms of research, methods and materials into Irish Music Education. This lack of a suitable academic structure has profound implications for any future deliberations on music education in Ireland.

18.3 Continuum in Music Education

Ref. I D ic See Document 153 in Proceedings

The Fractured Continuum in Music Education

Chair: Ms Cáit Cooper
Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ó Cuinneagáin (DIT)

This was one of the more lively debates. One of its most remarkable features was the way in which the provisions of the 1995 White Paper were used to signpost Government promises in relation to arts education. Because of this method the parameters laid down opened the way for copious confirmation of the content of Gabrielle McCann's paper (Ref. I P vi); this cross referencing feature is very encouraging as indicating an awareness of current affairs in relation to music education and a meeting of minds. The debate proceeded from a definition of continuum, which was another positive element. And the definition was used to draw attention to the fact that the term continuum is applicable to a much wider area of music education than merely that of the troublesome primary/secondary fracture identified in the *Deaf Ears?* Report. Other manifestations of the problem were noted in (1) the lack of continuum in implementing the 'comprehensive' view of teacher training for professionalism as embodying undergraduate, induction and extended in-service training; (2) the internal continuum of teaching in primary schools where class-teacher expertise is inadequate and specialist help is unavailable; and (3) poor communication between primary and second-level teachers. The lack of a specific policy in the White Paper on primary/second-level continuum was noted with regret.

Several informal strategies were cited for improving the quality of music teaching in primary schools and, indeed, across the transition to secondary. These included informal collaborations between primary and secondary teachers on the same campus; informal class-sharing arrangements between pairs of teachers with complementary skills; monitorial systems using transition year students with musical skills; on-site in-service modules for primary teachers using BEd graduates with music specialisms to provide the training, servicing perhaps three schools as (part of) their teaching load. The fertility of these suggestions, all capable of implementation by imaginative managers and/or with the agreement of the Dept of Education, illustrated what could be done where sympathetic attitudes obtain. While the use of specialist tuition, as opposed to the child-centred model currently in operation, was supported with caution, the loss of crossover effects and other disadvantages were cited as a counterbalance. The meeting endorsed the idea of primary education in music being non-specialist and general, reserving specialist modules for second-level consideration. There was some disagreement about the flawed ideology of An Curaclam Nua (1971) as against the difficulties in its implementation, but all looked forward to the provisions of the planned revision of the primary syllabus (expected 1998/99).

The delegates at this debate recommended that teachers be watchful that strategies (as e.g. inimical management; colleague attitudes; parent pressures) aimed at isolating students from musical experiences in school should be challenged. The curriculum 'rights' for music were restated. Government's affirmation in the White Paper of the centrality of the Arts, particularly during the period of compulsory schooling, was welcomed, in spite of the fact that the statement (quoted) merely cited the extrinsic benefits. The desirability of teachers acting in an advocacy rôle for better music education provision was also recommended (see Abeles Ref. III P ii and McCarthy Ref. III P vii for further treatment of this topic). There was again (see The Listening Process Ref. I D ii) unstinting praise for Dr Bradshaw's teaching materials and a plea for Dept of Education funding to publish the entire series.

Negative features about the current situation were noted

1. Insufficient funding for music by the Dept of Education
2. Over-emphasis on pop music in the curriculum
3. Loss of contact with hymn-singing and folk tradition
4. Insufficient time for music in teacher training
5. Inadequate teacher in-service provision
6. Inadequate resources for teaching music, textbooks heading the list.

Ref. II D iva See Document 260 in Proceedings

Continuum in Music Education Curriculum: A *Sine qua Non*

Chair: Mr Aidan O'Carroll
Reporter: Ms Siobhán Kilkelly
Panel: Professor Richard Colwell; Professor Ramon Santos

This debate was remarkably well focused on its subject and was extremely well reported. Continuum, or the lack of it, in music education was identified as the main manifestation of malaise in the Irish school-music education programme, as documented in the 1985 *Deaf Ears?* Report.

The discussion began by confirming the aspiration nature of continuum, even at its best, but also the failures in Irish school music education - failures which were correlated with teacher capability, rather than attributed to teacher training and the time constraints that prevent a more thorough and comprehensive music course being possible for child-based training, which currently loads trainee teachers with a too stressful array of subjects. On the ground reporting at the debate confirmed the thinly-spread occurrence of even minimally satisfactory music experiences for children in primary education, followed by the confusion at second level where teachers are confronted, typically, with such a wide and mostly deprived spectrum of musical competence that the only feasible course open is to go back to basics. It was suggested, particularly in the context of revisions to the various syllabi currently in progress, that some form of assessment should be mandatory at lower levels to ensure, first that teachers were being given the competencies required to teach the subject, and secondly that the aspirational curriculum was being implemented and achieved; this, it was felt, would achieve much in normalizing the currently variable standard emerging from primary education and facilitate a more professional approach to second-level curriculum development and implementation. In other words accountability was considered to be a *sine qua non*, if consistent standards could be hoped for or achieved.

A token query was raised as to whether a break (in continuum) is absolutely necessary in the educational system at age 12 (approx.) but, rather more importantly and pragmatically, the question of addressing its shortcomings and searching out bridging strategies was considered to have more potential for amelioration. The still provisional response from the Dept of Education in planning for the establishment of autonomous Regional Education Boards (Education Centres?) was welcomed as establishing more intimate communication between teachers and advisory services. It was strongly confirmed by the meeting that an overview of the (music) system is called for - linking the curriculum content for the three main phases - Primary, Junior Cycle and Senior Cycle at Second-level. There was little confidence that current provisions can achieve a continuum since they were sequenced incorrectly in the curriculum revision mechanisms, whatever about assurances (see Ref. II D iiib) that a strategy of educational continuity is being applied.

Strategies for establishing continuum were discussed and followed along the lines that were subsequently invoked in Professor McCarthy's treatment of the topic at MEND Phase III (see McCarthy Ref. III P vii; Colwell Ref. II P ix but also Ref. II D ib). These must be seen against the background of considerable difference of opinion as to whether music should be taught in primary school by specialists, or not; there are, however, certain 'cosmetic' ways of hybridizing the two approaches which should be considered. The suggestions from this debate included:

1. The encouragement of teacher trainees with some prior achievement in music to take a specialization in music. Chris Kinder's suggestion (Ref. II D iic) that extra credits should be obtainable for enhancing that specialization might be used in conjunction with this to offer further incentives.

2. The availability of in-service courses on a regular basis. This seems an obvious device but, clearly, the frequency of its occurrence as a suggestion indicates that this is not happening satisfactorily.

3. The employment of music specialists in a *visiting* capacity. This has the advantage of being only minimally threatening to the child-centred concept. It could, however, also act as an advance warning system as to the state of music education in particular settings, and facilitate timely remedial action. A variation of this strategy came in the form of a visiting specialist having responsibility for a definite number of specified schools (but only in an advisory capacity, to assist or supplement the efforts of the class teacher).

4. The appointment of a co-ordinator to oversee and make recommendations on the continuum aspects of music education between primary and second-level schools.

5. The preferred solution put forward by the delegates was for a professional arrangement whereby a peripatetic specialist music teacher would be employed by a number of collaborating schools. This must be seen, however, in the context of opposition from the supporters of a pure child-centred approach where the class teacher has sole responsibility; this issue is thoroughly dealt with in Professor Colwell's official paper (See Colwell Ref. II P ix).

Professor Colwell's suggestion that partnerships be set up with the community was well received (see Colwell Ref. II P ix but also Abeles Ref. III P ii). This is a strategy which is also treated as a major contributing factor to a successful music education system in Professor McCarthy's paper on Continuum (McCarthy Ref. III P vii). The potential, typically, of the Kerry School of Music in establishing this outreach characteristic was cited as worthy of consideration by the authorities in any enterprising or creative approach to the problems of continuum in music education.

A wide range of MEND issues was touched upon at this stage, and could be easily linked with the continuum issue as being one that enquires into strategies to make music more available and with fewer discontinuities and ensures, by whatever means, that these strategies are applied where feasible. These are:

1. The facilitation of private enterprise (as for example private instrumental teachers) to contribute to the overall school profile of music education.

2. The more copious provision of in-service courses and a well publicized information service (such as a freephone line) to ensure that information on musical discourse at large is freely available.

3. Working towards a more democratic way of making quality music education available so that the tag of élitism, still in vogue as a criticism of music education, may be banished from public perception (see Colwell Ref. II P ix).

Recommendations

1. Some form of assessment procedures should be adopted in primary school music education to ensure, i) that teachers have satisfactory competence; ii) that the curriculum is being implemented; iii) that results are being obtained; and iv) that some measure of uniformity in what primary school children take into second-level education is being achieved. This is seen as a necessary form of accountability.

2. The setting up of Regional Education Boards (Education Centres) should proceed apace.

3. There should be an official initiative to obtain an accurate overview of how the continuum in music education, as between the implemented curriculum/syllabus of the three main subdivisions (Primary, JC and LC), is being achieved. A co-ordinator of continuum aspects of music education should be appointed.

4. Music specialism by trainee primary teachers should be actively encouraged where there is evidence of prior achievement or native talent. [The desirability of enticements to encourage teachers to take skill-enhancing in-service or other courses leading to certification is implicit in this recommendation)

5. The issue of whether music should be taught in primary schools by specialists or by class teachers (or by some hybrid method) should remain actively on the agenda for music education.

6. In service courses for teachers should be more regular and better publicized.

7. A freephone information service to deal with matters of music education should be available.

8. Outreach programmes and a more integrated involvement of community expertise in school music should be planned into educational effort.

9. A campaign to eradicate the élitism tag from music education should be mounted, but this objective would be greatly facilitated by a more democratic availability and accessibility of quality music education in all schools, as envisaged in the revised curricula.

Ref. III P vii See Document 307 in Proceedings

The Establishment of a Primary-Secondary Continuum in Irish Music Education
Dr Marie McCarthy, Associate Professor, Music Education, School of Music, University of Maryland at College Park (USA)

Professor McCarthy was an outstandingly pivotal participant in the proceedings of MEND. Although her work is mainly in the United States (as a music educator with wide experience in and responsibility for the training of school music teachers) she received her undergraduate training in Ireland; she has a profound knowledge, from her own research, of the Irish music education scene[98], a real and very obvious asset in her presentations for MEND. She has published widely, and has important editorial experience in music education. Her connections with ISME, as the compiler of its

[98] Professor McCarthy's book *Passing it on: The Transmission of Music in Irish Culture* (Cork, Ireland; Cork University Press, 1999) is an in-depth study of the interaction of heritage and musical innovation in shaping the nation's cultural identity. It traces developments in Irish music education, formal and informal, from its earliest awakenings to the present day.

history, and her collaborations, in philosophical criticism with David Elliott and others, and in music of the world's cultures with Patricia Shehan Campbell, all testify to a catholic exposure in matters of contemporary thinking on music education. Dr McCarthy's re-invitation to present at the final phase of MEND resulted from the enthusiasm generated by her contribution to Phase II. She is arguably the first scholar actually to set herself the task of laying out a programme for reform directly and specifically linked to a troublesome feature (continuum) within the structure of Irish general music education and can be seen as a pioneer of the evolving work which MEND initiated.

Dr McCarthy began her address by endorsing one of the basic tenets of the MEND rationale (inherited from the *Deaf Ears?* Report); in short, she focused on **school music education as the prime vehicle of reform** and stressed the need to 'get it right' at primary level, most particularly to establish an effective continuity across the primary/secondary divide. In a short comparative survey of the *differences* between the parameters of primary and second-level music education in Ireland she depicted a scenario in which a fractured continuum seems almost to have been inevitable. In passing, she delves into the documented debate centring on the 1995 White Paper on Education, contrasting an earlier narrowness of view (in disproportionate concerns with the economy and the labour market) with more humanistic ones of undertakings to promote continuum in the arts curriculum as between primary and second level education. She anchors her vision for continuum in two irreducible *active* components:

1. The pivotal role of teachers

2. The interface with the community and the culture at large.

In relation to 2. above, it is no digression to draw attention to the fact that perusal of the documentation of Phase III of MEND (especially the formal papers) reveals an overriding concern with the *nature* of musical experience, its overwhelming and quintessential plurality, the diversity of educational views in relation to it and the ongoing search for ways of accommodating that plurality without loss of educational integrity in formal circles. There is a growing fear, now being openly articulated as a kind of *fin de siècle* challenge to the new Millennium, that the transmission of cultural values in formal education may be insufficiently sensitive to, and even culpably dismissive of, the multi-dimensional processes of informal musical experience in the real world. Sir Frank Callaway's reminiscences of Grainger (Ref. III K), Keith Swanwick's comments on Reimer and Elliott (Ref. III P iv), and Marie McCarthy's own references (Ref. II P vii) to other views (Merriam and Fowler) are all redolent of this commanding philosophical dilemma. And Dr McCarthy brings the authority of personal research to her conviction that the Irish version of this cleavage poses the problem of establishing links of understanding between formal education and a socially-grounded tradition in which musical influences outside of school have dominated and are still to be reckoned with; this understanding, she asserts, is a prerequisite to the establishment of that effective continuum which she believes to be 'the backbone of music education for the population at large.'

In this paper attention is drawn to the many possibilities for continuum fracture in the system, none of which can be treated lightly. In this context it is difficult fully to reconcile Dr McCarthy's certainty about the crucial role of teachers in establishing continuum - with her minor deprioritization of the second/third-level discontinuity when it is viewed as a root cause of inhibiting the flow, however small in the first place, of candidates into higher level music education. Paul Lehman, when questioned on this topic, recommended that reform should proceed on all fronts simultaneously. Perhaps it is a fact that the problem with a lower Leaving Certificate standard in music is proportionately less threatening to potential (child-centred) primary teachers (than to any of the specialist music streams); this therefore paradoxically shifts the gravity of the break in continuum, where it exists, back to the primary/second-level case. Marie McCarthy's proposed solution is a model of rational confrontation of the identified problems, fuelled by logic and experience. She re-orders these areas of concern with a consistency which focuses each on its ***teacher training*** aspects, thereby endorsing yet another of the MEND findings. And it is interesting and instructive too to compare this paper with that of Professor Harold Abeles (Ref. III P ii) for comparability in stating the

essentials in teacher training as an ongoing multi-dimensional professional commitment, in which three key considerations are essential prerequisites to the effective maintenance of continuum at any level. They are Curriculum Development, Music Teacher Education and Support System.

The importance of a philosophically-based mission statement (the absolute fundamental building bloc of any curriculum) which assumes music to invite a lifelong commitment to participation and learning, is stressed; this embodies, naturally, the idea of continuum, not only within the school system itself but with music in all its societal forms as a life force. Here Dr McCarthy is sharing in the concern about the reconciliation, within education, of the many musical genres and activities which come under scrutiny when music is considered as process. And she revisits this notion several times. In philosophical terms, therefore, she envisions ideally a consensus amongst teachers on essentials. Considering even the relatively narrow spectrum of the Reimer-Elliott debate, which assumed such importance during the MEND debates, and the seemingly irreconcilable differences between the two philosophies and the protagonists themselves, Dr McCarthy is understandably reticent about stating music-specific points of agreement. She is content to stress an 'Infants to Leaving Certificate' mentality (for the Irish case, see also the Conclusions in Bradshaw (Ref. I P ii). Dr Bradshaw calls for 'the need to construct an unbroken academic continuum from Kindergarten to Tertiary level music education), the need for teachers to cultivate the ability to articulate their views convincingly (a Reimer/Abeles priority) and the natural outcome of that - the powers of advocacy. This is in line with the MEND finding that **philosophy is barren in the absence of a communication system to inculcate its tenets effectively**. In particular it is stressed in the paper that philosophy should have breadth of vision and applicability across the whole spectrum of interrelated music education activities; it should not be susceptible to the damaging effects of artificial structural dichotomy such as is exemplified by the Irish system, with, apparently, markedly different rationales for its primary and second-level dispensations. These are dealt with in detail by Dr McCarthy. She asks pertinently whether, to compensate for the mutual and theoretical isolation of the activities of combined area-specific (JC, LC. Primary et al) curriculum and syllabus-drafting committees from one another, provision was made for appropriate common representation; this would have meant having primary teachers on the Junior Certificate committee, and vice versa, and so on up to higher levels. Examples are given from the British system (Four Key Stages) and from the American (Kindergarten to year #4; #5 - #8; #9 to #12) to show not only how uniformity of approach was inbuilt but how it avoided discontinuity at any of the crucial transitional stages.

When Dr McCarthy deals with curricular organization she exposes the nerve centre of all music education debate, and the reality that agreement between music educators is depressingly remote on some fundamental issues. It is less a question of basic philosophy than of implementation. Within the Absolute Expressionist lobby which currently accounts for the majority and seems, when stretched, happily to accommodate the widest spectrum of ideas as to how music works as a uniquely human phenomenon, there is, arguably, agreement on the value of music - but controversy on the sources of that value and on modes of transmission. Thus while there is much internal consistency in the philosophies that have earned the serious attentions of music educators, their differences, and the conflicts arising from them, are due to the divergent priorities they identify and espouse and the comprehensiveness (or otherwise) of their inclusion as acceptable musical practices. According to Clive Bell: "A subject has many structures at once. Different experts are aware of different fundamental principles" (David Elliott, *Music Matters*, p 247). One of the perceived major sticking points - that which has truly dichotomized music education along the axis of music as art and definitions of aesthetic experience[99] - is long overdue for reappraisal as to whether there is a rationale which can accommodate virtually all musics (see the rationalization of the Reimer/Elliott confrontation), and how it can be mitigated to reconcile the notions of formal and informal

[99] For one comprehensive treatment of this subject the reader is referred to R.G. Collingwood, *The Principles of Art*. (London and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958). This treatise deals admirably with the question of the functions of art (as introduced by Dr McCarthy in this section on Curriculum Organization) and gratuitously confronts the ongoing problem as to the importance of non-artistic pursuits as worthy vehicles in formal music education

participation in manifold musical experiences. Much of this conflict and its potential solutions hang on questions of definition (as often culpably ambiguous as pernickety over nuance). One of these controversial areas is that of skill; another relates to performance. When these, as examples, are being advanced beyond their objective phases to the more private and subjective areas where attitudes, judgement and values in maturing students are being influenced, the music education strategists have a dilemma in responding to a confusing plethora of philosophical advice as to how to proceed. This is a scene which, on the one hand is attributed to flawed and outmoded approaches to music education (as exemplified by the American models since the end of World War II); on the other it has invited and spawned novel, interesting and promising theories of reform, which, however, are as yet unproved in practice and daunting to ponder in the sophistication of their psychology and their painstakingly verbalized expositions. Whether the time is ripe for the iconoclastic setting aside of the older models is questionable; institutions of long standing (the work of the Music Educators National Conference [MENC] in the US, as described by Paul Lehman, is an outstanding example) do not crumble so easily.

Dr McCarthy seems in danger of becoming embroiled in this highly complex area of conflict when she deals with Curriculum Organization. She clearly makes the point that commonality of aims and objectives facilitate the establishment of continuum. Already there is support for these verbalized concepts, which might then proceed through the arguably logical sequence of specifying and organizing learning activities and developing means of evaluation in relation to the objectives; but Dr McCarthy has some reservations about the continuing applicability of this fully-developed technical-rational Tylerian model and its derivatives attributed to Bruner, Phoenix *et al*. Instead she suggests for consideration the currently more fashionable approach to music education which takes into account the ***functions of music.*** Two closely related conceptual models, promoted separately by Alan Merriam and Charles Fowler, are offered. They are attractively stated and non-prescriptive, placing great confidence in and responsibility on teachers in application. But they also introduce a healthy break with the absolutist view of the *sui generis* nature of pleasure in musical experience, and also diverge significantly from the monogenetic aesthetic theory of musical discourse[100]. However they simultaneously recognize that certain functions of music are only extrinsically beneficial (i.e. not intrinsic to music itself as a subject - as for example, physical response [Merriam] or To Tell the Story of Our Lives [Fowler]) while music itself is essentially different from all other school subjects and should not/cannot be conceptually verbalized in the same way. Dr McCarthy goes on to offer Elliott's theories for consideration. In this *praxial* view the Tyler/Bruner and indeed the Reimer models are rejected and with them the structure-of-disciplines conceptual verbalized approach, on the basis that music-making (performance) is the central activity in music education, that it is enabled by musicianship (see the Bradshaw paper [Ref. I P ii]) which is procedural in nature and 'epistemologically prior to verbal conceptualization'. The Elliott philosophy is discussed at length elsewhere in this report. Suffice it to say, at this point, that it is itself bedevilled with the verbalization which it repudiates, over-professionalizes the average teacher as much as it claims that other methods deprofessionalize him (see Elliott *Music Matters*, p246) and has to struggle for acceptance of its passionately-developed rationale because of an inaccessible and sometimes arcane sophistication of presentation. That is not to disavow it. David Elliott's 'new' philosophy of music education is impressively cognitive and a force to be reckoned with, if only in its serious challenges to revered authority in matters of music education and demands that it be re-appraised; but it needs the advocacy of simpler statement if it is to prevail or even to be seriously studied by trainee teachers who are, after all, the target implementers. While Professor McCarthy seems drawn to Elliott's ideas, (which she sees, *inter alia*, as having the eclecticism to have absorbed the Merriam/Fowler functional variants which she commends), but believes the Tyler/Bruner models to be candidates for superannuation, she does not attempt to pontificate infallibly. Her simple demand that curriculum be organized with continuum in mind therefore stands, whatever the underlying philosophy informing it. She also stresses that the fostering of continuum is aided by clear articulation, initiated at national level, of the principles involved; here again a MEND finding is being endorsed in the suggestion that there must be

[100] See Collingwood, *Principles of Art* for a full treatment of this notion.

a coherent line of communication for the fruits of philosophical travail to percolate effectively to those who are at the cutting edge of the process of education, namely the teachers.

Dr McCarthy proceeds to isolate problems which negatively affect the training of music teachers - her priority enabling force in the establishment and maintenance of continuum. She adverts to the long-standing educational argument as to whether music in primary schools should or should not be taught by specialists. With abundant pragmatism and imaginative compromise she seeks to annex the advantages of expertise without sacrificing the perceived stability of the child-centred approach as practised in Irish primary education. In challenging the claim (MEND I and II) that trainee primary teachers are disproportionately disadvantaged in the amount of music pedagogy/methods that they receive, she recommends rather that candidates for primary teaching should be screened for evidence of musicality (natural or acquired) and that this potential should then be encouraged and built upon in training colleges to produce a natural corpus of expertise; this would be in line with and facilitate the idea that the classroom teacher should be supported, without being replaced, by specialization - in this case either directly acquired during training or provided by an immediate colleague. Without advancing the typical American dual (instrumental/general vocal) system of specialist teaching as a model for emulation, Dr McCarthy calls for considered changes in music teacher education across the primary and secondary cohorts but, in particular, she sees more potential in attempting to make second-level teachers more aware of the basic methods of their primary colleagues. Here Dr McCarthy makes her most perceptive observation in decrying the virtual pedagogical isolation of general music education practitioners on the basis of which area they serve; and she does not limit her criticism to the disadvantages visited on classroom teachers. She believes (and cites compelling empirical evidence to support her view) that mutual misunderstandings and misperceptions are rife not only amongst the teachers on either side of the continuum fracture but, she argues logically, amongst the trainers of the trainers. This concern could easily be extended to highlight other cases of desirable continuum which are equally problematic; these include the well-known tensions between academic and practical musicians, between teachers of performance skills and teachers of musicianship (viewed here, though not pejoratively, as a complementary ancillary study), between class teaching and the one-to-one method. These dichotomies are targeted as a MEND finding, which calls for improved relationships. Dr McCarthy's recommendation provides one pathway to such a development. Her support for a forum for music education as a prime means of lubricating this process comes as no surprise; and she defines a wide spectrum of activities (leading to better information, better understandings and a more vital awareness of the benefits of continuum) that might be accommodated within such an association of generally like-minded music educators.

Professor McCarthy completes her proposed schema with a pragmatic return to the idea of a teacher support system which centres on joint in-service training for primary/secondary teachers and the eventual production of teaching materials specifically related to the Irish context ('a graded, sequential general music textbook series to bridge the primary secondary curriculum'). It is interesting that the lack of indigenous materials was one of the strongest deficiencies in Irish general music education identified at MEND Phase I (See Bradshaw Ref. I P ii). Far from feeling deprofessionalized by the provision of such a crutch (David Elliott's contention), it seems that Irish music educators would welcome it as a useful resource; and Dr McCarthy agrees.

Ref. III D iva See Document 357 in Proceedings

The Continuum in Music Education: Satisfying Basic Principles in Irish Schools.
The Search for Suitable Teaching Materials.

Chair: Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple Comprehensive School, Dublin) Reporter: Ms Gabrielle McCann (Dept of Higher Education and Research, Trinity College, Dublin)
Panel: Professor Harold Abeles; Professor Marie McCarthy; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Dr Kari Veblen

This debate, timed at the very end of MEND, had an implanted resonance in its title which connected it with the stimulus for MEND, namely that of the *Deaf Ears?* Report (1985) and its identification of the lack of a continuum between primary and second-level music education in Ireland as the root cause of many of the difficulties besetting school music teaching. The debate was obviously well chaired as a great deal of useful comment accrued; the presentation of the report in an itemized rather than a narrative form was also effective. There is a reference to a tendency to usurp the preordained course of the discussion and to concentrate instead on a spontaneous response to Professor White's lecture, which had just preceded it. In the event, since the lecture, again strategically placed, turned out to be not only provocative but a challenging pendant to the extensively treated Reimer/Elliott philosophical confrontation, it seemed unexceptionable that some impromptu comment should have been recorded at this convergence meeting, which indeed it turned out to be. Many of the points raised were reported in the form of useful recommendations for courses of action.

The debate proper was directed along one avenue of enquiry: "In the light of the debate so far, if Irish [music] Education were to be surveyed now what would be of most immediate help?"

It is not really quite clear whether the panel responses were of a 'green field' *ab initio* nature or a comment on the initiative itself as far as the panellists were personally informed as to its progress. The comments made can therefore be subdivided for response. The question of a 'clear articulation of what is happening now' and that of 'a central body to co-ordinate' (Forum for Music Education) were palpably signalled in the agenda of MEND from the beginning (Items #2 and #8 of the agenda); these items were ultimately in the hands of the delegates to deal with effectively. Only perusal of the MEND documentation, which had been generally circulated to all delegates at that point, would establish whether these concerns had indeed been accorded the attention that was their due. All the panellists were, of course, aware that the Forum had been established but two days before the debate session in question. The conduct of 'surveys of different populations in different areas' (the nature or the potential use/value of these surveys was not specified) would devolve on the Forum as indeed would the setting up of an Information Network. This latter concern was signalled as a recommendation from several of the debate sessions and the question of resources was also prioritized with almost as much urgency as the provision of adequate and relevant in-service courses for school teachers. As to the 'lack of communication between MEND and the teachers "out there" this seems to be incongruous in the context of the question posed by the chairman (see verbatim report below). However, on a point of information, the conduct of MEND was undertaken by a staff of two, the organizer and a very junior though efficient assistant. Every effort was made to disseminate information through every known channel and agency of music education, even resorting at times to person-by-person telephoning. The attendance at MEND was encouragingly representative (including satisfactory presence from the provinces). If there were failures or inadequacies, the criticism must be acknowledged, but it was not for want of trying. Lack of communication is a facile carp, which can often stand proxy for the more insidious problem of apathy. However, effective communication is implicit in the call for an Information Service, which it would be the concern of the Forum to put in place.

The response from the floor (in a sense a grass-root response) that 'remediation at primary level is absolutely urgent' is redolent of the legacy of concern first brought to light by the *Deaf Ears?* Report.

This concern surfaced with painful regularity at the debate sessions of MEND and many recommendations in relation to it were recorded, particularly as related to in-service training. This is a complex question which is overshadowed by the arguable inflexibility in the policy of child-centred primary education and the reluctance, for whatever reason, to consider the importation of specialist music services to supplement teaching or to provide advisory capacity. There are compelling arguments on both sides, disregarding the less worthy opposition to specialists on the grounds of cost, and this debate seemed to show an awareness of the downside of specialism (see Colwell - Ref. II P ix) engendering caution in calling for it. However, it endorsed the call for better, relevant and timely in-service injections to the system. It must also be borne in mind that, since the conclusion of the public phase of MEND but obviously predating the issue of this report, the manifold and elaborate revisions in curriculum, including music, for primary schools has been promulgated with the promise of a highly organized network of support to ensure, over a period, that the curriculum can be not just implemented and taught but *delivered* as to its aims and objectives. It is interesting that an unrecorded proposal by Dr Spratt (Director, School of Music of the Cork Institute of Technology) to the Music Education National Forum in May 1997 - that the provision of a satisfactory primary school music education for all children is 'the' priority issue in Irish music education - was deferred pending progress on the revised primary music curriculum document then considered imminent. The proposal has since been revisited as part of the proceedings of the Forum for Music initiated by the University of Limerick (Spring 2000). There is obvious concurrence on the importance of this issue, as demonstrated by the concerns of the delegates at this debate.

The diversion to consider Professor White's paper was understandable considering the power and eloquence which characterized it. Since it held up the mirror to the inner self of western-art-music-trained and -orientated musicians it was surprising for the writer to find a panel gut-reaction (it 'cannot resonate with most of us') of such considered political correctness. The lecture in question must be regarded as one of the key statements (personal and provocative as it was) presented at MEND[101]. It is dealt with appropriately in its proper place within the report (See White – Ref. III P viii). Most of the panel comments are covered in the analytical appraisal of Professor White's paper and that of the papers and other reviews that are germane, especially those in the Reimer/Elliott section (*qv*). In particular the argument against the propriety and feasibility of judgement in an inter-genre context is probed and ultimately challenged, without unequivocally supporting Professor White's thesis, it might be added. Perhaps the most telling contribution from the panel is that which asserts that 'balance is important in curriculum - also Relevance, Accountability, Teachability and Universality'. This opens up the whole question of multiculturalism (including, correctly, the place of pop music within that rubric, the substance of Professor White's attack) to the levelling process by which judgement and valuing (two of the sacred cows of educational practice), when impartially applied, can achieve compromise, consensus and even agreement (See Reimer *Philosophy*. 1989, p.140 et seq.)

The reversion to the strict business of the debate as defined in the title, was reported in an itemized list which consisted mainly of recommendations; these will be rationalized and presented under that heading at the end of this appraisal. However, few of the separate observations recorded demand comment. The group warned against the kind of complacency or apathy by which some educators abdicate their pedagogical responsibilities by "identifying the mote in their brother's eye". There was an implication that the problems of second-level music education cannot be blamed solely on the fractured continuum or described as a cumulative effect arising from a troubled and non-achieving primary sector. For the second time in MEND proceedings (see also Colwell - Ref. II P ix) the role of parents in music education was highlighted. This highly effective political force which, typically, is the stimulus and support behind many of the most significant personal and cumulative achievements in music education, is often underplayed in philosophical pronouncements which are untouched by

[101] It should again be recorded that Professor White's paper was submitted to the College Music Symposium. Journal of the College Music Society, Volume 39 (1998): pp 47-79, attracting responses from two of the most distinguished living contributors to music education philosophy - Bennett Reimer and David Elliott (with collaborator Kari Veblen). The reviews are discussed in this report.

psychological considerations. Potential parent input to coalitions and advocacy campaigns should not be underestimated. On the question of the participation of private teachers in MEND it should be noted that approaches were made to the European Piano Teachers' Association, the European String Teachers' Association, the Wind Band Movement and the Suzuki Society to secure their support and encourage the attendance of their members. In the event all were represented at MEND and at the Forum.

Recommendations

1. MEND and its follow-on activities, notably the Music Education National Forum, however organized, should lead to the following being addressed:

    a. The re-articulation of the current state of music education in Ireland (see Agenda Item #2).

    b. The establishment of an Information Network on matters germane to music education.

    c. The conduct of suitable surveys aimed at the achievement of item a) above.

2. Remediation at Primary Level is absolutely urgent.

3. In-service work conducted <u>in primary schools</u> should be considered.

4. Philosophies of music education based on extra-musical considerations should be viewed with caution.

5. Creativity as a pedagogical strategy should be re-appraised as to its applicability and effectiveness.

6. Graded textbooks and, in particular, indigenous materials purpose-designed for Irish schools should be made available.

7. The participation of private music teachers in the follow-on to MEND should be actively canvassed, if this has not already been done.

8. Grade Examinations (performance?) should be compared for suitability on an ongoing basis.

18.4 Performance

18.4.1 Performance and Élitism

Ref. I D iiib See Document 158 in Proceedings

The Centrality of Performance and the Élitism Stigma. Towards a Reconciliation

Chair: Mr Niall Doyle (Music Network)
Reporter: Ms Elizabeth Fuller (Newpark Music Centre)

The substance of this debate was very succinctly reported by Ms Fuller. In particular it highlights the reinforcing power of repetition, not to be underestimated, as showing that there is a consistency from MEND output in targeting certain areas of deprivation as innately discriminatory. The chairman singled out a limited number of areas for discussion and managed to establish some focus on each.

The meeting gave a sense of a subconsciously progressive mentality in occluding the sources of responsibility for performance as between schools and private enterprise; its view was that performance should be equally encouraged in all areas of music education. It established, by some innovative collective thinking, the correlation between performance studies and the mores of the middle classes, the socio-economic barrier as feeding the high-/mass-culture dichotomy, in turn effecting negative attitudes to some music based on ignorance of the subject and facile charges of élitism.

The meeting engaged the nexus of performance in primary schools, the class teacher/specialist approach and the peripatetic solution. There was a close parallel between thinking here and that expounded at the Continuum debate the previous day (Ref. I D ic). Pragmatism won the day in reserving options between peripatetic activity (a ready solution and one with a history of effective input while denying the child-centred principle) and a classroom teacher approach, 'upgraded' by appropriate pre-service training and in-service support. This thinking also ties in very well with Gabrielle McCann's lecture (Ref. I P vi).

The question of talent education was treated with astuteness and sensitivity; there seemed to be a determination, i) not to tie it down unambiguously to performance training; ii) to see the need to nurture talent to be as comfortably addressed in school education as in private hands; and iii) to secure special treatment (aimed at nurturing talent rather than favouring the person) which could be applied without incurring the tag of élitism. In this regard the advocacy of music, seeking to deconstruct socio/economic and geographical barriers, by collaborations which bring educational and private enterprise initiatives together (Music Network, radio schemes, orchestral tours etc.) was wholeheartedly endorsed. This idea is developed even more imaginatively in Harold Abeles's lecture (Ref. III P ii)

Finally, the meeting reached consensus on ideas that:

1. Performance is a right for those who seek to claim that right

2. It follows that there should be equality of access

3. School music should be monitored to ensure that the delivered curriculum matches the intended one in performance (as in other areas)

4. The higher profile for performance in JC and LC syllabi is to be welcomed

5. Training in performance should, typically, be by 'classical' means, as being the most highly developed and readily adaptable to most if not all genres of music-making.

6. The responsibility for the promotion of performance in the community rests with both public and private initiatives.

Ref. II D ic See Document 253 in Proceedings

Performance: Definitions and Strategies to Empower a Universal Faculty

Chair: Dr Patrick Devine
Reporter: Mr Mel Mercier
Panel: Dr David Elliott; Dr Janet Ritterman; Dr Terri Sundberg

Owing to a misunderstanding Mr Mercier was unable to attend MEND Phase II. A substitution made at short notice did not work satisfactorily. The debate is therefore not reported.

Ref. III D iiib See Document 356 in Proceedings

Making Music. Performance as Dominating Element in Music Education.
A Realistic Approach to the Definition and Challenge of Performance at Competent, Proficient and Artistic Levels.

Chair: Ms Marian Doherty (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)
Reporter: Mr Pádhraic Ocuinneagáin (Course Tutor [Performance] DIT [Adelaide Rd])
Panel: Professor Harold Abeles; Sir Frank Callaway; Professor Paul Lehman; Professor Harry White

There appears to have been a persistent recurrence of late starts at MEND III, which shortened the time available for debates and, in consequence, limited the output of ideas. This debate (and again it should be noted that it was expected to have converging qualities in terms of derivable recommendations) fell victim to paucity of time, only 45 minutes being available.

The central place of performance in musical discourse was affirmed from the very beginning and became the touchstone for all that followed. It was felt that **far too little has been and is being done in Ireland, in official national terms, to promote performance**, as an aspiration, at an acceptable level, in spite of which there is creditable achievement in evidence as a result of much dedicated effort by individuals.

It was obviously very helpful to have had Professor Lehman on the panel, as his experience, not only in being a party to the drafting of the national standards for music (content) in the US, but in being associated also with their wider context as definitions of 'opportunity to learn' (OTL), was invaluable in focusing on the resource issue (see Lehman – Ref. III P iii). Professor Lehman's contention is that standards (the published curriculum in the Irish context) provide a basis for 'claiming needed resources'. This does not seem to have worked in Ireland, as the complaints of the delegates clearly indicated. It is interesting that the targets under discussion were the very modest ones of performance possibilities at *classroom* level. This again touched significantly on the area of teacher specialization and had the potential to expose the enormity of the neglect of performance, which has left Ireland with 'an inferiority complex in the performance area [which] will continue'. Although it does not seem to have been articulated as such (for possible reasons of time constraints at the debate), the idea of performance eventually brings to the fore the idea of learner specialization (even élitism), since to perform with any level of competence (the levels are described variously as basic/competent,

proficient and advanced/artistic) presupposes an enabling combination from such parameters as talent, interest, effort, commitment, consistency, concentration, care, time and physical resources. The possibility of a happy coincidence of these enablers in the typical school situation in Ireland is very remote, if indeed it is ever possible. It was stated, as a truism, at the debate, that performance standards are simply not possible with teachers who have no expertise in the area; this is the typical provision in Ireland where specialists are not provided in primary schools and we are still in the grips of a seemingly inflexible child-centred philosophy which, in spite of its merits (if they are not just a specious argument for cost-effective education), has served music badly. The meeting called for the provision of such specialists, at least in the areas of singing and basic wind (recorder). It should be the first line of attack to have a sympathetic review of this (child-centred) policy in the case of music, taking into account, however, the undoubted need to balance arguments with formidable counterpositions. As a single issue, performance throws down the gauntlet to the system. It must be accommodated if music is to be a healthy dispensation but it must also be defined as to what counts as performance, what is expected, and what is achievable in school contexts. If the definition of performance is honestly formulated and fails to fit the template of what schools can accomplish, then some other way must be found to promote it, even if it falls back on parental outlay. This is a nettle that has not been grasped in Ireland and it has left a gaping discontinuity between school capability and the requirements for freshmen in performance at third level, denying a sizeable minority of young potential professionals of the basic opportunities at a critical age. The reliably promulgated situation in the US is that, notionally, all students are offered performance and that about 15% take up the option, leaving the residue (voluntarily) to a fate which has led Bennett Reimer to claim that 85% of American children have an unsatisfactory exposure to musical experiences. The two systems are undoubtedly dissimilar (and it is, or has been up to now, a question of fiscal resources) but circumstances are changing dramatically and the time is surely ripe for a reappraisal of the performance issue in Ireland.

The very crucial issue of advocacy ('the benefits of music must be sold to parents') came up in passing. If we are to heed the admonitions of our American colleagues, advocacy is primarily a professional matter and calls for leadership skills and special training if it is to have any hope of being effective. But it is also aided by knowledge and the ability of music educators who are sufficiently aware philosophically to make the case. The advocacy issue contains, within it, that of resources. Professor Lehman indicated that the OTL standards became a political casualty in the US but insisted on their importance in matching content standards to such considerations as curriculum, scheduling, staffing, materials, equipment and facilities to implement the standards (curriculum). This is a useful fleshing out of the rather stark statement coming from the debate. In fact it seems that a raft of freely available publications prepared by the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC) in the US were being defined by the delegates as answering to the need in Ireland to prepare a case for resourcing music education more effectively.

Again on the question of advocacy, and in relation to lobbying politicians, the meeting confirmed its confidence that the National Forum for Music Education, established at MEND III, was the body most likely to succeed. It was stressed that the forum should make every effort to engage as wide a representation as possible from the music education lobby and that its existence should be publicized countrywide.

The delegates drew particular attention to the excellent work of the Band Movement in Ireland and recommended that it should be supported on the grounds of the number of professional musicians who have used it as an avenue for their first exposure to performing activities but also because of its democratization of performance opportunity throughout Ireland.

Recommendations

1. The need for specialist teachers to promote a healthy performance tradition in Ireland should be considered as an exceptional matter within the wider issue of child-centred education.

2. The Music Educators' National Conference (MENC - US) publications on such matters as advocacy and standards for music education (content, achievement, opportunity to learn, teacher training) should be examined to test their applicability to Irish circumstances.

3. In the context of promoting a healthier dispensation for performance training, there is a need for a National Forum for Music Education (as recently established), which should draw its membership from the widest representation of music education interests.

4. The contribution of the Band Movement in Ireland was acknowledged with a plea that it be supported from public funds.

18.4.2 Specialization

Ref. I P vii See Document 107 in Proceedings

Specialization in Music Education
Mr Shane Brennan (St Finian's Schola Cantorum)

Revisiting Shane Brennan's Phase I paper in the light of all that the subsequent phases of MEND revealed was a rewarding exercise. The notion of early specialism in music education (or rather its narrower context of a performing specialism) was one that needed to be addressed during MEND. Mr Brennan's experience across a broad spectrum was an obvious target for exposition and analysis. Here is a touching soliloquy from a sensitive musician searching assiduously for the ultimate meaning of music as the life-force he perceives it to be; and he is searching too to define the parameters of a music education system which will best serve its needs. While he does not quite damn specialism with faint praise he is scrupulously conscious of a duty to rescue single-minded commitment to solo instrumental prowess from its own excesses and intensity; he has difficulty with uncontrolled competitiveness and 'killer instinct' and the disregard for personal development which they encapsulate and encourage. As a result of analytical immersion in the MEND dialogue for a number of years, it came as no surprise to the writer that Mr Brennan closed ranks with the supporters of holistic well-rounded education. In the context of the study and proliferation of music being truly within the humanities it seems that specialism must be tempered with liberalism as much as deprivation needs the same kind of sustenance, albeit at a more rudimentary level; only in this way can an interface be constructed and understandings fostered which feed 'the heart of "real music", which is essentially all about "community" and "communication"'.

Although vainglorious virtuosity is offensive to a person of his refined sensibilities, Shane Brennan is very conscious and supportive of the excitement which pyrotechnical display, suitably committed to artistic ideals, can arouse; he is therefore making a case for that which specialism at his best can achieve. With intuitive accuracy he contributes to, as much as he endorses, the elemental finding of MEND itself - that Irish music education should be informed by a considered philosphy in all its constituencies. Crucial to the implementation of a curriculum based on such a philosophy should be, in Mr Brennan's view, a general adherence to a model of music education such as that suggested by Keith Swanwick's CLASP (**C**omposing, **L**iterature, **A**udition, **S**kills, **P**erformance) mnemonic. Within

this model Mr Brennan singles out listening as of paramount importance (see also Professor Whites paper – Ref. III P viii and the Reimer/Elliott analysis and rationalization), citing the appreciation of subtlety in rhythmic nuance as one of its benefits. The whole thrust of his approach to music education is one of holism and refinement, his unstinting praise for the work of Dr Albert Bradshaw in producing comprehensive educational material 'stupendous in its breadth of vision and imagination . . . everything drawn from the folk traditions of Ireland' confirming a pragmatic stance which is neither multi-cultural nor supportive of deconstructing the high/pop cultural dichotomy which is of such abiding concern to modern music education strategists (see Bennett Reimer's response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness*).

There is an interesting suggestion implicit in Mr Brennan's concerns, about the dangers of premature specialization, that in democratizing the specialist curriculum along the axis of his own articulated trouble-shooting discoveries, a paradigm for general (school) music education could take shape. It is the writer's view that Mr Brennan's admirably detached account of music education from the unusual perspective of so-called élitist provision, and in spite of a certain traditionalism and conservatism, could have much to contribute to general theory as to what, in fundamental principle, constitutes a balanced curriculum which is generally applicable - a concern that has been highlighted in many of the contributions to MEND Phase I.

Ref. I P xi See Document 111 in Proceedings

The Growing Ascendancy of Performance in Music Education Contexts
Mr William Halpin (DIT)

Mr Halpin's paper is important in two respects. He gives a comprehensive description of the burgeoning interest in performance within the community and serviced *by* the community (and there are few more qualified than he, who is so involved, to testify to its success). The apparently cost-effective movement, residing largely in band and other large ensemble activities (see the debate on the Non-State Sector – Ref. I D iia), is an interesting exercise in mass education of a utilitarian nature which celebrates music-making in its functional, processual and social aspects, placing it beside the contributions (where available) of the schools of music as a real dimension in the national framework. Mr Halpin does not see it as a pragmatic substitute for the more comprehensively disciplined services of the established institutions (one senses that he views them as complementary) but he offers the information as evidence of public disenchantment with and response to the lack of a National Plan for the encouragement of active music-making (see also Dr Benson's plea in the introduction to the *Deaf Ears?* 1985 Report). He is gratuitously, but unintentionally, suggesting yet another model for collaboration within general music education programmes when the full consequences of the performance modules in the Revised Leaving Certificate Syllabus are felt, and the inherent perceptual weakness revealed. But Mr Halpin is obviously thinking in terms of burgeoning standards as well, and offers compelling evidence to convince, at Government level, that the country at large should be equitably provided with the facilities for the study of practical music, even at a price to the learners. After all, 'semi-élitism' as a socio-economic possibility is better than no facilities and no subsidies.

When Mr Halpin comes to deal with third-level performance his rationale seems to be on less secure ground. He accurately divines the arrival of the second (post-establishment) phase in the administration of wholetime third-level courses and the 'time management' problems that now confront performance majors. He does battle with the duty to support the idea of academic underpinning of practical modules but he is clearly unhappy with the inroads made on precious practice time. His suggested compromise, in terms of limiting time on academic and other non-performing modules to absolute essentials, stressing quality over quantity, would be plausible (or at least worthy of consideration) in a perfectly-adjusted world, or one committed to the simpler ideals of a well rounded musical education. But because we are living in an ambience of merciless trends towards over-specialization, the problem is a commanding one to which there are no ready answers. It may be consoling and salutary to remind Mr Halpin that performers of real distinction are, typically,

those who also shine in musically academic pursuits and who can take the endemic pressures of overloaded curricula in their stride. On the other hand, the more modest achievers, who are typically grateful to have qualified for a performer's course in the first place, while reluctantly accepting that their career destinations may lie eventually in teaching, need all the ancillary educational benefits they can tolerate in order to succeed in their future careers as confident transmitters of relevantly-informed musical education. And in a lifetime of music-making, the typical four-year duration of a wholetime course, with the attendant frustration of marginally limited practice time, can be a useful exercise in time management and, for those lucky enough to have the talent and the opportunity, perhaps the only chance they will have to acquire the other basic skills that must suffice without recharge through a subsequent career. The possible courses of action to mediate in this dilemma are all in the nature of compromise. In the end it will be up to the institutions themselves to develop the best compromise which will take account of the adaptability of the course qualification to social perceptions of relative value, to market forces and to the realistic profile of expectations for the *collective* student cohorts.

Ref. II D ivc See Document 262 in Proceedings

Specialization in Music Education: The Illusion of Real Choices

Chair: Professor Gerard Gillen
Reporter: Mr David Brophy
Panel: Prof David Elliott; Ms Dorothy Straub; Dr Terri Sundberg

The debate on specialization was thoughtfully introduced and enthusiastically reported. The chairman took an interestingly literal meaning from the title and invited comment on the possibilities of specialization in areas other than performance, thereby extending the debate potentially into valid areas not envisaged in the drafting of the programme.

Professor Elliott made a challenging suggestion in considering performance together with aural skills (listening) and composition as an integrated *specialization*, citing such examples as progression from more junior to higher levels of ensemble performance (bands/ orchestras/ choirs) as a valid concept of increasing specialization. At this stage in the debate the understanding of specialization was that of access to specialist teaching at whatever level. The differences between Ireland and the American scene (that most familiar to the panellists) is profound in this respect. The fact that specialization is, by its nature, cost-intensive was used to point the context that the general music education programme in Ireland is typically singing-orientated, simply because this mode is cost effective and not, as was cynically commented upon, because it is also the most natural and effective. The debate did, in a rather circuitous way establish that, in Ireland, the idea of specialization (extra involvement of and extra services available to those with talent or interest) was not the norm within the general education system, which merely reflected the minimized provisions of the Department's mandate to provide *music education*; specialization normally depends on extramural services and the ability to pay. Ms Straub, with her copious experience in the advocacy campaign for better music education in the US, made the common sense comment that the situation obtaining in music education, if it is unsatisfactory, cannot be solved by department administrators (Ministry) dealing with general education or by the general public either, simply because these agencies do not have the knowledge or experience to make informed judgements on what is required before implementation. The point she seems to have been making relates to the need for advocacy promoted by the music educators themselves, and probably, as an extension to that, the existence of a forum with vibrant leadership and relevant expertise/ training in advocacy.

The meeting, following the trend of many of the debates at MEND, reconfirmed the need to **concentrate on providing an excellent curriculum for primary schools**, one that is generally available and fully accessible. If fundamental levels of input were secure, the rest would follow, including the facilitation of increasing specialization by whatever definition. The perennial question of specialist versus classroom teacher as achieving the best in relation to the overall aims of education

was well aired. There is always a predictable tendency amongst music educators to show a preference for the specialist method, even at rudimentary levels, but it must be realized that this cuts across the seemingly sacrosanct principle of educational containment within the capability of the class teacher as the ideal child-centred method of transmission. (This topic was treated copiously at MEND [see Colwell – Ref. II P ix and McCarthy – Ref. II P vii] and is best formulated into a recommendation that it should remain as a priority item on the music education agenda.) Ms Straub extolled the idea of setting up pilot schemes to demonstrate the effectiveness and benefits of particular approaches to the mechanisms of music education, on the understanding that 'word gets around', leading to wider adoption of ideas that have been demonstrated to be working successfully; music could benefit greatly from this approach.

Another ploy that has been shown to work in America in relation to boosting performance as a quasi-specialization in schools, according to Dr Sundberg, is the band movement. (Note that it has been reported elsewhere that this movement in Ireland is, happily, gaining ground and establishing a community presence in the music education scene. See Ref. III D iiib and I P ix.) Dr Sundberg traced its origin and success to its main function in supporting sports activities (an advantage not shared by other ensembles such as choral or orchestral activities) and offered it as a device to engage the very crucial support of parents for the school music programme in its wider contexts. The point was made, however, that there is an advantage of scale, *inter alia*, in favour of the US in organizing such activities.

The meeting closed with re-confirmation by the chairman that priorities in Irish music education should be the primary curriculum and the human resources (specialists) to make it an effective programme.

Recommendations

1. Advocacy for music education must come, in the first instance, from informed music educators.

2. The priority in Irish music education is a thorough and effective scheme for primary schools.

3. The question of specialist teaching at primary level is one that should remain on the agenda for music education until it is satisfactorily solved.

4. The use of pilot schemes to test the efficacy of new and ongoing ideas on music education should be resorted to.

5. The band movement, as providing an element of specialization in performance, as a bridging device into the community and as a ploy to muster the support of parents for the school music programme in its widest contexts, should be encouraged.

18.4.3 Music Schools

Ref. I P xii See Document 112 in Proceedings

The Rôle of the Music School
Dr Ita Beausang (DIT)

The original and commissioned subject-matter of this paper was to have been a survey of standard-setting and musical achievement as reflected prototypically in the work of the small number of well-established music schools in the state. Dr Beausang's subtle but intelligent shift in emphasis suited her personal style and succeeded in responding to the original brief in an effective and non-confrontational way. Her factual and entertaining account of the evolution of music schools and performance teaching in Ireland amounted in the end to a useful mapping exercise which exposed the dearth of structured practical music training in the northern half of the Republic. It is interesting that although Dr Beausang could not accurately have anticipated the findings of the 1997 Arts Council survey into this area, its unpublished report (Phelan, *Listening Ears?*) was to confirm her generalization and lead to an urgent recommendation (see also the 1997 *PIANO* report commissioned by the Minister for Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht) that this lacuna be addressed. In a modern European society it is unacceptable, in comparative terms, that most of the country should have had to survive for so long without music schools. It is to be noted that, mostly through private enterprise, the provinces, notably South Leinster and Munster, are, through local provision with varying degrees of sophistication and financing, drawing attention to the need for state-sponsored initiatives at strategic locations to counter the legitimate charge of inequity.

Dr Beausang neatly summarizes the evolving practico-academic sophistication of the musical training provided typically at second-level but leading to quasi third-level achievement in Ireland's music schools. This led to the third-level aspiration and the eventual development of a range of professionally recognized whole time courses. The cogency and the delicate inference of Dr Beausang's arguments prevail. By drawing attention to the tensions that developed when third-level courses were evolving as a direct result of second level over-achievement, she confirmed the notion of their intimate interrelationship, and their absolute inter-dependence as music education is currently structured in Ireland. That is not to say that it is not ripe for some rationalization in the light of the recent announcement of the establishment of a National Academy for the Performing Arts but it does warn against premature fragmentation and a further negative burden of continuum fracture. Dr Beausang is supplicatory in recommending that the traditional balance, in holistic terms, between academic and practical content in performance-based wholetime courses, a direct reflection of their evolutionary path from upgraded second-level experiences, be maintained.

Finally, Dr Beausang looks to the future of music schools, and with admirable economy of words, declares her views purposefully as to their continuing role and growth prospects in three important areas of general concern

1. Music education in Ireland is ripe for continuing trends in thoughtful pedagogy where the largely intuitive approaches of the past are being fertilized and enhanced in effectiveness and professionality by more rational and analytical means of transmission.

2. In historical perspective (as witness the work of the Vocational Education Committees in Ireland) the perception of the music school as a haven for the privileged and the élite was never a just one; but it is now an anachronism. Dr Beausang's call for an equitable state-subsidized/sponsored structured system of practical musical training countrywide is direct and, by definition, a rallying cry for the final relegation of the inappropriate shibboleth of élitism.

3. Concerns as to the working of the (then -1994) proposed new Leaving Certificate music syllabus centred on the delivery of the performance programme (see Mac Liam - Ref. I P xiii for extensive coverage of this topic). Dr Beausang adverts to the pressures which this

feature augurs for many academically-trained teachers, and looks to the establishment of music schools countrywide and the implicit scope for fruitful collaborations which this would facilitate.

Recommendations

1. Urgent consideration should be given to the establishment of an equitable state-subsidized/sponsored structured system of practical musical training countrywide.

2. The balance of academic and practical components in performance-based wholetime music courses is crucial and should be maintained

3. In the extended programme for teacher training as envisaged in the 1995 White Paper on Education (see also McCann - Ref. I P vi) research-based modules for the inculcation of professional competences as outlined in Lennon (Ref. I P xiv) should be considered for inclusion.

4. There is scope for collaboration on the Leaving Certificate performance component between schools and the envisaged countrywide network of practical music provision (see Recommendation 1. above). This should be investigated at the appropriate time.

18.4.4 Performance in Third Level

Ref. I P xv See Document 115 in Proceedings

Performance in Context as a Component in Balanced Third-Level Education
Professor Gerard Gillen (St Patrick's College, Maynooth)

In reviewing Professor Gillen's contribution to Phase I of MEND in the aftermath of the culminating phase, very little needs to be added to the appraisal of 1996. In a characteristically stylish presentation, obviously coloured by his own outstanding eclecticism as both distinguished performer and eminent academic, Professor Gillen offers a very rational, convincing and admirably unbiased portrayal of the centrality of performance in all musical discourse, but shows how its rôle in third level education can vary according to circumstances. He sketches the spectrum, from the 'committed executant who finds any other form of discipline uncongenial' to the more modest candidate whose standard 'emphasizes quality and musicality rather than dexterity'.

Professor Gillen is comfortable with the current university model which has moved away from 'disciplines that could only with sophistry be related to the practice of the great composer [Bach] whose name was invoked so much more often than his processes of thought' to technical disciplines which are 'rightly in [his] opinion studied in most university departments but are no longer regarded as the central justification for our existence'. How aptly he describes current trends! This sets the scene for third-level education infused with real performance in context. Professor Gillen's ideas are so prudently flexible and attractive that they remove from focus the more obsessive and vainglorious aspects of performance, giving it instead a non-threatening, because non-competitive, character that is fully adaptable to a wide variety of interesting and highly relevant applications. He wisely views the undergraduate high-flier performer as better directed towards non-university third-level education (see Halpin – Ref. I P xi), in the first place, but stakes a claim to refocus him on more balanced practico-academic fare at post-graduate level, citing the outstanding success and uptake of the Maynooth master's degree in performance and interpretation as an example. Apart from the rare occurrence of real performing flair (with its attendant problems), Professor Gillen's advocacy of performance as a

component in a balanced musical education (or, alternatively, the indispensability of ancillary studies to complement performance) suggests a paradigm which could well be applicable right across the spectrum of music education, assuming the availability of teachers to apply it. His generous acknowledgement of the indispensable practical skills imported into universities from other institutions is a heartening sign of a new mutual respect which ensures that the advantages of collaboration are appreciated and not taken for granted.

Ref. I P xvi See Document 116 in Proceedings

Mandatory Performance in Third-Level as Enabler in Music Education at Lower Levels
Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College)

In addressing the question of the eventual applicability of performance studies and skills acquired at third level to teaching in the general music programme in schools (as one avenue of usefulness), Dr Sweeney inadvertently raises some interesting side issues which throw light on the whole performance quandary. Performance is the central enabling act of musical experience; performance is with us, not only by public mandate (however questionably based), but also without a single objection from a music educator at MEND (not even from Harry White! [*qv*]). It is, of course, a vast subject with a bewildering spectrum of proficiencies and as varied a litany of difficulties in the acquisition of its associated skills - and Dr Sweeney is obviously well aware of this. Nor does he demur at its imposition as a mandatory skill in third-level music education . . . and he is at pains to explain its usefulness, together with literacy, in accessing the music behind the score (in a western music context). And why then, it might be asked, should it be denied the amateur if it is so candidly admitted as indispensable in higher education? And if we accept that the problems of literacy (see Gillen – Ref. I P xv) are as daunting to confront as those of skill in performance, is it any wonder that the demands of enlightened listening (Professor White's concern), even in these days of virtually perfect reproduction and complete accessibility, are so constantly impeded. Are we locked into a vicious circle defining bland performance, simply because that is the way those who do want it would have it, even at the price of mediocrity? The case has been made many times, in this writer's commentary, that the daunting scope of activities defined, in educational terms, as composing, performing and listening, must be rationalized (if not made flexible in its emphasis in specific cases) to allow real rather than sham notions of human capability to find a truly fructifying balance in each individual's participation in musical discourse.

The control of the performance issue is one of the most pressing of all concerns for music educators - how to let the majority sample its lotus-like delights while retaining the power to reclaim them, at the appropriate juncture, for immersion in the other items on the menu of a well rounded musical education, to which Dr Sweeney is committed. He does not raise the performance issue in these terms but it is lurking in his search for ideal music education which stresses the relevance of third-level provision in the whole regenerative cycle; on the other hand he makes a sustainable argument, in passing, for another function of third-level music as a route to personal development, an aspect sometimes forgotten by educators in their preoccupation with imparting knowledge and skills. In validating serious performance studies, with achievable goals for the majority of students, he does not play down the resource implications, and adds his name to the list of supporters for the idea of collaboration between institutions in optimizing the uses of scarce resources (for performance in this case). Dr Sweeney speaks out of familiarity with these burning questions of the interdependencies between levels of music education. It is heartening to find in the features of the course he leads (at the Waterford IT) an integrity of intention and a deep concern that its graduates can take their place as worthy contributors to a constantly-evolving system.

18.4.5 Professional Training in Performance (including a National Academy for the Performing Arts)

See Ritterman (Ref. II P iv) in Section 18.7.4 below.

18.5 Assessment

Learning is the residue of experience; it is what remains with us when an activity is over, the skills and understanding we take away.

Keith Swanwick
MEND Phase III Nov 1996

18.5.1 General Comments on Assessment

Ref. III D iib See Document 354 in Proceedings

Towards a Balanced Perspective on Assessment in Music Education.
The Compatibility of Music with Other Standard-Setting Subjects.
The True Aims of Assessment and Evaluation.

Chair: Seán MacLiam (St Patrick's College, Drumcondra; Chairman NCCA Review Group [music])
Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin (Post-Primary Music Teachers' Association; Second-Level Teacher)
Panel: Prof. Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin; Prof. Patricia Shehan Campbell; Prof. Keith Swanwick

Considering the consensus on the need for assessment in music education that recurred on many occasions at the MEND meetings, this debate reaffirmed it, without dissension, as a fundamental principle. In particular the case for assessment was, initially, strongly made by Professor Colwell (see Colwell – Ref. II P ix) though it was always implicit in the presentations and debates concerning the Leaving Certificate (see MacLiam – Ref. I P xiii but also I D iv and II D iiib). It was handsomely supplemented by Professor Swanwick's exhaustive treatment of the subject at his Phase III presentation and received further endorsement in Professor Lehman's paper on National Standards when he went so far as to name "assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for music education in the coming decade'. (See Swanwick – Ref. III P iv and Lehman - Ref. III P iii) Nor should we be deflected from its importance by Professor Elliott's appearing to question 'the need for assessment at all' (see Ref. II D iiib and, again, Lehman- Ref. III P iii); after all, he did concur with the idea of multiple means and seemed, rather, to be asserting that assessment should be true to its purpose and that that purpose should be fully understood. So we can take it that assessment is here to stay. The question is how best to apply it and to define its operating parameters.

[It should be mentioned that a token intervention by students took place at this point; without querying the legitimacy of the points they were making (which concerned facilities for third-level performing students and the need for a fully equipped music conservatory in Ireland), the interruption was irrelevant to the topic under discussion. The presence of these students was nevertheless a bonus, which served its purpose later in the proceedings]

During the course of the debate the various forms of assessment were considered and compared. Professor Swanwick stressed the relevance of assessment, calling for the best criteria which, to be true to their aim, must assess the music, not its peripheral aspects. The less formal aspect of assessment is that which is inherent in and a prerequisite to effective teacher response to students' needs. But the more formal means such as diagnostic/formative (an interactive process) and terminal/summative also have their place in the scheme. The real problem with assessment, according to Professor Swanwick, arises with the conversion of the results into grades and marks. It is highly recommended that the reader should consider this report and analysis in conjunction with Professor Lehman's admirable treatment of national standards (a basis for curriculum) and their interdependence with assessment as a tool of effective implementation (see Ref. III P iii). He gives exhaustive justification for the process.

Different approaches to assessment (in the case considered the assessment, or analysis, of musical materials, rather than of student achievement) were considered. Several panel members cautioned against becoming locked into method that might not always be appropriate, such as judging one genre of music by the standards applicable only to another (this concern is dealt with from opposing points of view by Professor Elliott [Ref. II P viii] and Professor White [Ref. III P viii]). The commanding criterion here is relevance to the music itself and avoidance of peripheral issues (such as notation rather than the nuance and style appropriate to the performance - the living music). Professor Ó Súilleabháin related this tendency to the difference between performing the music itself and talking about performance, conceding that both have a valid input to the level of excellence achieved but asserting that the music itself is the prime generator of the performance. He also confirmed that traditional musicians are constantly assessing themselves, by whatever standards, and that this is an artistically healthy if not indispensable pursuit.

The chairman noted that continuous assessment, when used expertly, has the advantage of regulating the ongoing learning process. Breda O'Shea concurred in defining the advantages of (continuous) assessment as a means to 1) inform the learner, 2) inform the teacher, and 3) inform the curriculum

The meeting concluded with further definitions of what assessment involves and the different kinds of assessment (auto-, peer-, teacher-, summative, continuous, by criteria, etc.), each with its appropriate spectrum of applicability:

Professor Swanwick, in stressing the absolute need for assessment in formal education contexts extracted two guidelines for proceeding which are:

1. Prior consideration of the way to assess

2. Clarity on the purpose of the assessment

Recommendations

1. Assessment is a *sine qua non* in education. It should remain as an agenda item so that its guiding parameters can be subjected to continuous refinement.

2. Assessment should proceed only after prior critical appraisal of the purpose to be served and of the means to be employed.

18.5.2 Assessment in the National Curriculum (UK)

Ref. III P iv See Document 304 in Proceedings

Problems and Possibilities in Assessing Musical Progression
Keith Swanwick, Professor of Music Education, Institute of Education, University of London

Professor Swanwick has been an inspirational consultant in Irish music education affairs for many years. He continues to publish regularly and his numerous studies related to music education philosophy have been profoundly influential in charting the progress of reform in recent years, especially in these islands. He is respected for the clarity of his thinking and outspoken defence of his stances, particularly at the level of suggesting, if not asserting, the absolute fundamental parameters of music education. Because of his involvement in the drafting of the National Curriculum in the United Kingdom over the past decade, and his deeply analytical approach to all of its nuance, he was an obvious choice of speaker to give an overview of current thinking on ***assessment*** in general music education, a highly controversial topic in any case, but one that seems to have suffered more than

most in the matter of paucity of clear definition and of reliability of outcomes. The subject is also significantly commented on in the papers by Richard Colwell, David Elliott and Paul Lehman, all attesting to the need for assessment in the first place but stressing different aspects (see Colwell - Ref. II P ix; Elliott - Ref. II P viii; Lehman - Ref. III P iii). Professor Swanwick's brief, as defined by himself in the course of the delivery of his paper, was to examine the psychological and philosophical implications of the subject and to offer comment on the inherent flaws in the methodologies currently in use in the UK.

Professor Swanwick is well known for his willingness to tackle difficult subjects harbouring unexpected ramification. This may account for the fact that he belongs to that category of scholar whose work can be more profitably subjected to repeated perusal of the printed version than listened to. The paper under review did not make for easy reading; it seemed, as first examined, uncharacteristically discursive and arcane from one whose approach is normally so focused. But it handsomely repaid multiple re-readings and, in its discursive way, touched usefully on many aspects of music education outside but related to assessment, the main topic. It is the writer's view that the general impact of the spoken version of this paper could not have had the desired effect; it is hoped that the re-ordering and clarification of the main ideas attempted here, without any claim to have totally demystified Professor Swanwick's involved thought processes on this occasion, may achieve some convergence.

Professor Swanwick stresses from the outset that formal assessment constitutes only a small part (a controlling mechanism and almost a necessary evil at that) within the processes of institutionalized music education. The broader constituency of musical experiences is facilitated by many points of access, to some of which formal means may be foreign and even be inimical. He is committed to the recognition, accommodation and reconciliation of this plurality within the formal curriculum. He is concerned lest the processes of formal education 'become a closed system that leaves behind, or gets left behind, ideas and events in the wider world. . . . This is true [also] for student assessment''

Professor Swanwick's digression (a temptation he could scarcely have been expected to resist) to comment on the Reimer/Elliott debate seems to have been ill-advised in that it does not convincingly establish a third voice with lucidity. His opening statement that 'the aesthetic is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the artistic' is meaningless in the absence of definition; Collingwood asserts that 'aesthetic theory is the theory not of beauty but of art'.[102] At an empirical level his rejection, on the authority of Herbert Gans, of the simple but familiar cleavage of mass and high cultures encourages him to redefine the place of music in social evolution. He considers music to be a system of discourse fundamentally anchored in a holistic activity in which psychomotor, affective and cognitive components play their part in allowing individuals to make their unique contributions to a 'conversation', which is the inheritance of an evolving civilization. (This definition obviously made an impact as it was subsequently referred to as significant, at one of the debates, by Professor Ó Súilleabháin.) Swanwick may have enlarged the definitive view of what the function of music is in this 'conversation' metaphor; it seems insufficient to justify his rejection of philosophies of aesthetic education or of music education based on performance teaching but his observations are nonetheless thought-provoking. Education, including formal education, is the enabler which provides the skills to interact characteristically with the social environment - 'an initiation into the skill and partnership of this conversation'. To be fair to Reimer and Elliott (*qv*) it is difficult to see how a deeper study of their philosophies could find them at odds with this esoteric, though all-embracing, definition of the nature of music and the aims of music education, especially if their sincere views of music education philosophy as an *evolving* discipline are taken into account. Nor would either cavil at the need for recognition of the 'plurality of musical discourse'. Swanwick is peremptory in demanding that access to this conversation, this faculty, whatever its source and wherever it leads, must be part of the experience of students in formal education. 'There has to be a radical re-thinking of how time and resources are used' to achieve this; there is more than a hint here of the MEND finding which stresses the crucial nature of time management in music education. The question of time-management and the

[102] R.G. Collingwood, *The Principles of Art*, p. 41

capability of time allocations to accommodate curricular demands cropped up in several of the formal presentations at MEND, notably in that of Professor Shehan Campbell. Swanwick ends his introduction with the plea that '(T)here has to be a recognition of the plurality of musical discourse'. He seems to be aligning himself philosophically with the multiculturalists here, although he does not develop the point.

When Professor Swanwick finally turns to the problems of assessment there is a significant harvest of pertinent ideas. Like Paul Lehman (Ref./ II P iii), he quickly establishes the nexus which relates philosophy/curriculum/standards, resources and political advocacy. Activities are not sufficient; there must be measurable outcomes to prove that the activities are reaching the targets set; clearly this is redolent of a political/resource agenda. Assessment therefore becomes necessary; there seems to be no other convincing way, and it must logically both relate to and distinguish between activities and outcomes. A *national* curriculum by its very title suggests political interventions with all their potentially tiresome trappings and paraphernalia. The bureaucratic machine grinds into action and it is no longer a case of taking Paul Lehman's words (or the teachers') on trust that 'kids can do all of the things called for in the standards (curriculum) if their schools will give music teachers a chance to teach them'. The learning/understanding outcomes of what they do just *must* be measurable and formally measured, both incrementally and summatively; certainly this seems to be the case in the UK. The prospect of this activity in itself almost deprioritizing the associated learning process is very real, as evidenced by the copious complaints of teachers in the British system; but even if such overriding bureaucratic importance is assumed in relation to it, the assessment itself (and the associated teaching) should be as effective as possible and have priority.

Professor Swanwick seems, therefore, rightly concerned lest assessment should over-proliferate and become an end in itself or acquire functions which are extrinsic to those of optimizing the teaching/learning experience. For authentic assessment he applies the criteria of validity - and reliability to maximize uniformity of reporting from one situation to another, other things (such as activities and materials) being the same. His simple definitions here are uncomfortably idealistic, however, and somewhat aspirational in practice. Validity requires that musical work be assessed *musically* (there is more than a hint of unquantifiable subjectivity here) while reliability ensures that results are consistent between assessors and over time, this presupposing some kind of moderating agency, which is not mentioned. He homes in on the crucial functional differences between interim and summative assessments and the dangers of official assessment models which confuse these functions; he claims that this is already a problem with the implementation of the National Curriculum assessment procedures in Britain (see Ref. II D iib above for further comment on this aspect). And he goes on to identify/name three areas of confusion which obfuscate the essential information that should flow from documented assessments, thereby invalidating them. These are 1) the fallacious assumption of interchangeability between the terms *activities* and *outcomes* as applied to the attainment targets (composing, performing and appraising); 2) the lack of precision, in the phraseology of progression, in tying down a common understanding of what progression actually is in any of the modes (psycho-motor, affective, cognitive); 3) the failure, referred to above, to discriminate between interim and summative assessments, which differ as to the relevance and relative importance of *quality, complexity* and *range* in drawing them up.

What emerges from a detailed study of Professor Swanwick's paper is the potential complexity of the topic, as evidenced by the number of variables, compounded by additional variations in definition between the published National Curricula in the UK, and the embodied levels of subjectivity in their manipulation, making it small wonder that problems have arisen based on the difficulty in establishing a manageable conceptualization in the first place and the assumption that all teachers can apply the routines uniformly and expertly to achieve a reliable collective profile. The following is one listing (with comments) of the variables (explicit, implicit or inconclusively treated in Professor Swanwick's paper) which might suggest how they could interact with one another and point up the difficulties of dealing with such a comprehensive matrix of ideas

1. Assessment itself may be undertaken in 'settings from the informal personal choice to formalized reporting [as against examining?] and all the apparatus of grades and marking schemes'.

2. Assessment may have many functions such as facilitating accountability (resource implications); providing information (for students, parents, teachers, ease of interchangeability, classification and streaming); being an aid to standardization, comparability and progression; as an incentive; being a component in a credit system between subjects. The reader is also referred to Professor Lehman's treatment of the same topic in the context of National Standards in the US (See Lehman - Ref. III P iii)

3. Assessment can be a logical final step in the sequence (cycle) leading from philosophical principles through standards (again see Paul Lehman's paper - Ref. III P iii), curriculum, syllabus, choice of materials and methodology (any of which can be prescriptive or liberal) to reappraisal and reform.

4. Assessment may be continuous, interim, summative, examination-based, specialist-based (external examiner), teacher-based (internal), class-based, individual-based, with or without notified results. It should be relevant to the circumstances, which can vary considerably.

5. Musical attainment targets for assessment (by Swanwick definition these are the activities themselves) are *minimally* two-fold (making and appraising music), *practically* three-fold (composing, performing and listening /appraising) but capable of expansion into a multiplicity of activities and their outcomes. Assessment must measure outcomes in relation to the corresponding activities.

There is nothing exceptionable in the need to include the components of ***quality, complexity and range*** in building up an assessment profile, but they are not of a kind. Quality, which is the commanding issue in assessment, is value-laden, humanistic and subjective to a degree. In Professor Swanwick's admirable rationalization it is the only parameter to which an ultimate grading (mark) is applied; in an ideal deconfused situation (as between interim and summative assessment) the 'weighted' mark should eventually (by synthesis of the individual gradings over time and 'outcome from activity') correspond unambiguously to the verbalized gradings of 'working towards', 'achieving', 'working beyond' and 'exceptional performance' (in the British system), or some such continuum. It must be assumed that Professor Swanwich also has it in mind that these verbalized descriptions should be used only for End of Key Stage assessments, where cumulative performance is being recorded. Quality is not, and should not be used as, a measure of standard and vice versa; confusion over this has become one of the classical dilemmas of music education assessment. Presumably the question of standard can be dealt with by the Keystage Graded Programmes of Study (UK) or National Standards/Curriculum (US/Ireland) when dealing with the specifics (teaching materials *inter alia*) of activities. These pre-assessment-based definitions of activities and aspirational outcomes (published/implemented curriculum as against delivered curriculum) should specify the non-value dimensions of complexity and range in the musical activities entered into. There must be a correlation here between the level of prescription (or the lack of it) and the clarity (or ambiguity) in standards perceived as reached. The assessment of quality in itself, independently of standard, can always be valid but it cannot always be taken as an indication of the presence of something (complexity or range) that is not there because it has not been unambiguously defined/demanded in the first place; in fact, single pronouncements on quality need not take either complexity or range into account. This is clear from Swanwick's treatment of the subject.

To return to Professor Swanwick's argument, there are grounds for criticism and confusion when he claims that 'so-called *musical attainment* targets - composing, performing and appraising - are of course mainly bundles of activities, they tell us in general terms what pupils will be doing'; perhaps the phraseology comes form the documentation of the School Curriculum and Assessment Board

(SCAA) but it *seems* rather to emanate from Professor Swanwick himself. Targets seem, to the writer, semantically closer to outcomes, so the confusion is not surprising. The SCAA, treating attainment as outcome-related, demands 'pupil understanding' (the learning residue) as an index of that outcome. It seems fatuous for Professor Swanwick to suggest that assessment must take into account the doing *and* the learning; for surely if the learning outcome is on target (or not) it tells us most of what we need to know about the doing, since the two should be in a close mirroring relationship. But if we add another significant variable - learning 'talent' - to the equation, the assessment procedure produces an occluded profile as to cause and effect. Professor Swanwick is right, it seems, when he describes this obsession with regular formal assessment and an over prescriptive methodology (a flawed one too, in his view) as 'over-egging the curriculum pudding'. It is interesting to compare this situation with two other systems, relevant to the discussion - those in Ireland and the US. In the United States, for reasons of state autonomy built robustly into the federal system, there is no *national* curriculum but, as we in Ireland know from MEND, there are now national standards which by their own advocacy, aided by a multi-tiered strategic sequence, are seeking support nation-wide, state-by-state. There is an understanding that the conventional composing/performing /appraising components (or some convenient semantic variation of these basic activities to satisfy the pedants) are present. There is no mandatory curriculum, no methodology; the standards, if embraced, provide the expected outcomes and so a guide for assessment. But informal continuous assessment seems to be the norm and there is no evidence of the highly formalized documented procedures with which Britain is over-burdening its curriculum. In Ireland there is a national curriculum, now in three phases, with freedom of methodological approach and a liberal approach to assessment, which becomes formal only in the two terminal examinations (Junior Certificate and Leaving Certificate) for those who opt for the subject in the first place (and there is a large element of option in the uptake). The only mandatory curriculum is in primary education where assessment is played down. The differences between the three systems are considerable, indicating that assessment, although there is general agreement as to its indispensability if there is to be a proved pattern of real learning, is subject more to disagreement than characterized by consensus as to its methodology. So what have we to learn from Britain - more particularly, to what extent should we be swayed by Professor Swanwick's restatement of the way Britain should assess?

The very subjectivity of music itself and the musical experience that results from it must spill over, in education, into its assessment contexts, if only from the fact that the assessors themselves must be guided by their own subjective response to the student work that is to be assessed. But it has always been a matter of no small wonder that in this subjective exercise there *is* so much unanimity (The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, for example, boasts that, with the vigilance of its moderators and the training of its examiners - all specialists - its results are in agreement to approximately 1% in practical examinations - a notable achievement). But there is always the danger that assessment will fall into the subjectivity trap and dispense with its objective components. It seems appropriate to objectify as far as it is possible and Professor Swanwick goes a long way in spelling out this process in his model, even if he does not so describe it. The scope of music to metamorphose artistically is so great in the manipulation by musicians of its materials in any of the activities (composing, performing, listening/appraising) that it really is impossible to tie it down unambiguously to accommodate the processes of assessment, which, after all, only act as a means to an end, not to be confused with the priority activity of providing the musical experiences in the first place. This apparently is what thwarted the architects of the British National Curricula when they sought phraseology to 'pin down the idea of progression', to specify 'progressively more demanding' activities, the process which Professor Swanwick attacks as inappropriate. 'Such language is too imprecise and spuriously quantitative to be the basis of any assessment model. Worse, it would seem to condemn music that is not complex to the category of "working towards" rather than achieving'. In choosing the example of the Slow Movement (Andante in D major) from Schubert's A major Sonata (D 664) to illustrate this point Professor Swanwick is in danger of being hoist with his own petard when he seems to assume it to be 'music that is not complex'[103].

[103] The Schubert Sonatas are recognized in pianistic circles as notoriously difficult to interpret. Invoking the model for interpretation advanced by the writer (Heneghan, *The Interpretation of Music - A Study in Perception,*

Assuming that in music, by its very nature, the subjective is hierarchically more dominant than the objective, without understating the importance of either, Professor Swanwick's logical approach in reducing assessment of all kinds, whether continuous (interim) or terminal, largely to the application of objective criteria, is nevertheless admirable and pragmatic, even though it does not fully define a modus operandi for the subjective element (it does not replace the imprecise phraseology of the curricular documents in this regard). Nor is he concerned that

> the idea that objects of beauty, as well as their creation and appreciation, are subject to scientific scrutiny, appears abhorrent to most people. … There exists a fear that clumsy handling might crush the butterfly's wings, an idea that analysis may destroy what it is intending to study[104]

His clearly articulated two-tier methodological approach (see below) also avoids the pejorative debit system of measuring all progress in relation to the End of Key Stage expectations. In the ultimate the subjectivity issue, if it is confronted in relation to the whole system of music education, whether considered from the teaching/learning perspective or from its secondary aspect of assessment, seems to point towards the desirability of having the subject taught and assessed by specialists, a major issue in music education which was well aired at MEND as a dilemma in Irish child-centred education, but which was outside the professor's brief on this occasion.

Although the terminology used by Professor Swanwick really presupposes absolute familiarity with the 'jargon' of the British system (what, for example, does the 'best fit' criterion actually mean?) the following seems, to the writer, to be the essence of his criticisms and his suggestions for a more meaningful way forward:

1. While progressing towards the End of Key Stage, assessment should be used 'to inform teaching and learning'.

2. Quality, Complexity and Range are implicated in assessment.

3. As discussed above, the ideas of complexity and range are separate from quality, different in kind, bear upon the planning of classroom activities, and are important in cumulative rather than in 'spot' assessment.

4. In single instances of assessment what is important is musical understanding or quality. From that follows teacher response and a record of the encounter. Only later comes the identification of a pattern to these cumulative observations. Again note that the subjective element is being defined here as paramount (suggesting specialist involvement).

Expression and Symbol [Dublin, Trinity College and Dublin Institute of Technology, 1990. Unpublished Thesis), the movement in question is demanding in terms of all five of the criteria - Sound (quality), Technique (Control), Imagination, Communication (Gesture) and Knowledge. The movement contains, *inter alia*, large hand stretches, subtle examples of 'finger pedal' and voicing, unusual structural features such as phrase diminution and canonic treatment, tricky rhythmic changes, notational idiosyncrasies characteristic of Schubert, wide leaps and ornamentation. Of course Professor Swanwick is right in alluding to the failure of the curricular documents to pin down progression and establish foolproof assessment possibilities. But it has led him, inadvertently, through the Schubert, to the real nub of the problem, namely the subjectivity issue and, eventually, the difficulty in appending the quality stamp (either in the music itself or in the performance, which, in the case chosen, is performance -related) which is at the heart, and rightly so, of his comprehensive assessment at the End of Key Stage. Professor Swanwick accurately divines that the greater the subjectivity basis in the assessment, of which the Schubert is, of course, a characteristic example, the more difficult and specialized the assessment becomes.

[104] H.J.Eysenck, "The Psychology of Aesthetics," in *Sense and Nonsense in Psychology*, (Hamondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd,1957),308

5. Professor Swanwick now proceeds to define the parameters of musical understanding in four layers:

   a. Control of sound materials

   b. Control of expressive character

   c. Control of form

   d. Awareness of musical/cultural value and all that flows from that.

   Note here that the components are largely and alternately objective and subjective in significance. The writer suggests that, in considering the artistic hierarchy suggested above (subjective having more weight than objective considerations), the control of form might be more accessible than control of expressive character (depending on how these criteria are ultimately defined), though Professor Swanwick defends his hierarchy by asserting that 'musical form depends on having expressive elements that can be brought into structural relationships'. This, in the writer's view, could be challenged as not being applicable to all cases; in other words expressive elements may only be fully released when structural elements are already clearly understood and delineated. But the model is, withal, well thought out and articulated.

   Swanwick prefers to apply these criteria broadly rather than tying the assessment procedures down to such prescriptive identification of work as using single, alternating and/or developmental ideas (see British documentation, referred to by Prof. Swanwick, for details). Here again he seems to be assuming a certain sophistication in teacher knowledge that may not be there, whereas the National Curriculum, in the phraseology to which he takes exception, may merely be attempting to provide guidelines for the harassed or less than competent teacher - a problem that would be very real in Irish primary education if manifold assessment were to be mandatory. Again, although Swanwick's fourth criterion, related to the progressive manifestations of the way students come to value music, is an attractive concept and would certainly be gratifying to teachers to apply in an overall observation, it seems to be superfluous (and not just a matter explicitly excluded from National Curriculum considerations), since if the first three criteria are satisfied to a greater or lesser extent, they should give a measure of student valuing. It seems inconceivable that a student who could manipulate sound materials, structure and form in an expressive way might not also value music.

6. Using the above criteria, individual examples of student work in any of the 'musical attainment targets' can be assessed and marked. But the subjective element remains, in the choice of mark allocated. Because of the common basis and the comprehensiveness of the criteria Swanwick argues that the assessment should then be reliable and valid. While this is acceptable for a closed system of teacher assessment, it is questionable as to how reliable it would be if these assessments were compared across a spectrum with the intervention of independent specialist examiners at this stage of progress in the implementation of the National Curriculum.

7. Range can only be acquired over time. Its importance is underlined at the end of Key Stage assessment but it is also significant in influencing 'curricular activity along the way'.

8. Complexity relates to the level (standard?) of the assignment but also to the response of the student to the task in hand in particular cases. Presumably this, in individual assessments of work, is simply a matter for the competent teacher/assessor to judge.

9. Complexity and Range are valid criteria, not to be applied to all cases of 'spot'/interim assessment but only as appropriate to the task in hand. They are, however important in converting a profile to a summative grade.

   Professor Swanwick proceeds to show how this systematic procedure can lead to a simple statement of student performance across the assessment dimensions (composing, performing, appraising), encapsulating information on Quality, Range and Complexity and relating all to End of Key Stage Descriptions, however defined. Above all teachers must be credited with common sense in giving the correct priority to the significance and importance of complexity and range in particular instances. Professor Swanwick returns to his starting point in insisting that, in the ultimate, what counts is quality or musical understanding, reaffirming yet again the subjectivity of the exercise without overcoming the difficulty facing the non-specialist, whether teacher or assessor.

10. 'Formal assessment . . . [is] a very small part of education.' This statement must be compared with that of Professor Lehman (See Lehman – Ref. III P iii) who stated that "I see assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for music education in the coming decade." Perhaps these views can be seen as more compatible if the importance of assessment is asserted but only as a means to an end; it appears that without it standards are compromised, if indeed they are not actually unattainable in terms of the delivered curriculum matching the intended/implemented one. Professor Swanwick draws on his own (and other) philosophical writings to establish his personal perspective on formal education and the place of formal assessment within it. Music education in schools should critically explore musical procedures with the breadth of an inter-cultural approach; it should create and sustain musical events in the community in which people can choose (or not) to be involved. Restrictive and coterie conceptions of the nature and value of music can feed prejudice, which should be guarded against. 'Music is, in the best sense of the term, recreational, helping us and our cultures to become renewed, transformed'. Using the words of Margaret Mead, 'who was also worried about the separation of education from the world of communities outside of institutions': "the belief in education as an instrument for the creation of new human values . . . the use of education for unknown ends," Professor Swanwick makes a valedictory allusion to the philosophies of Reimer and Elliott - the one with its emphasis on response and openness contributing to the dispersion of conceptual confusion and perhaps now a paradigm that 'could be laid aside', the other an attempt to construct a 'monolithic performance tradition' which is inimical to the promotion of 'diverse educational settings of which school will be but one and formal assessment but a small part of its evaluation'. These are compelling words which are in resonance with much of the wisdom evinced by the MEND proceedings, in which awareness of the diversity of musical experience and the need for bridges of mutual understanding to be built between formal education and the communities it serves are urged upon those who wish to promote music education (and indeed education in the general sense) at its most relevant and productive in humanistic terms.

    It is tempting to speculate here as to whether, or not, failures in the Irish music education system are attributable to mismanagement or misunderstanding of the assessment issue and its significance. In one sense it seems a blessing that we are not unduly burdened with a system, such as that currently obtaining in Britain, which is over-prescriptive, palpably imprecise and self-defeating in terms of the amount of time alone that its application seems to demand. In another it is arguable that such formal assessment as we have is not sufficiently attuned to what assessment really is supposed to achieve in terms of quality and musical understanding. Professor Swanwick's honest frustration at the confusion within the British system may not be taken as a call to abandon its processes. Rather is it a warning that if we decide in Ireland to modify our approach, we should

ensure that assessment is true to its purpose (that we are clear on what that purpose is) and that it is motivated by what is right for the musical ends of the exercise.

Recommendations

1. 'There has to be a radical rethinking of how time and resources are used [in music education]. . . . There has to be a recognition of the plurality of musical discourse'.

2. 'Assessment must be true to whatever form music takes'.

3. 'Assessment is not so problematic until it is formalized'.

4. In assessment a clear distinction must be made between activities and outcomes.

5. The phraseology used in the definition of assessment procedures, especially that relating to progression, must be precise.

6. The applicability of the criteria of quality, complexity and range must be relevant to the case in point, especially when interim/'spot' and summative assessments are being made.

7. Assessment must measure outcomes in relation to the corresponding activities.

8. Quality, complexity and range are relevant in building up an assessment profile, but they are not of a kind.

9. Quality or evidence of musical understanding is the most desirable finding of an assessment procedure. A statement of quality, when marked conventionally and combined with supplementary information on complexity and range within the work being assessed may then lead to verbalized gradings of 'working towards', 'achieving', 'working beyond' and 'exceptional performance' (in the summative statements of the British system), or to some such continuum. Quality is not, and should not be used as, a measure of standard, and vice versa.

10. A clear distinction should be made between 'assessments that are regular, held at short intervals, and cumulative' and the synthesis of these assessments which constitute an End of Key Stage (terminal) statement.

11. Standard can be dealt with by the Keystage Graded Programmes of Study (UK) or National Standards/ Curriculum (US/Ireland) when dealing with the specifics (teaching materials *inter alia*) of activities ('so-called *musical attainment* targets - composing, performing and appraising - are of course mainly bundles of activities, they tell us in general terms what pupils will be doing').

12. Standards, if embraced (see Lehman – Ref. III P iii), provide a statement of expected outcomes and so are a guide for assessment.

13. Range must be built into the curricular activities; it can only be acquired over time. Its importance is underlined at the end of Key Stage assessment but it is also significant in influencing 'curricular activity along the way'.

14. Complexity, which is another prerequisite in defining a satisfactory curriculum, relates to the level (standard?) of the assignment but also may be a premature outcome of the response of a gifted student to the task in hand in particular cases. Presumably this, in

individual assessments of work, is simply a matter for the competent teacher assessor to judge on a yes/no basis.

15. Complexity and Range are valid criteria, not to be applied to all cases of 'spot'/interim assessment but only as appropriate to the task in hand. They are, however important in converting a profile to a summative grade.

18.5.3 The Leaving Certificate Crisis

Ref. I P xiii See Document 113 in Proceedings

The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision as Ongoing Vehicle for Change in Attitudes to Music Education in Ireland
(Modified Title: The Proposed New Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus: Perspectives and Attitudes)
Mr Seán MacLiam (NCCA and St Patrick's College, Drumcondra)

This paper was reviewed in the Interim Report Phase I (*qv*) in a highly critical way, . . . but not, it might be added, as a personal attack on Seán MacLiam; it was copiously acknowledged and predicted that his brief - the vindication of a rationale for the proposals for a new Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus - was likely to become, in the perception of some delegates, the bête noire within the MEND proceedings. It is not necessary to recapitulate the counterpositions advanced in the review (*qv* in Interim Report of Phase I). However, considering the seminal importance of this issue, it is considered appropriate to make some further comments on it at this culminatory analytical stage.

In contemporary Ireland it is arguable that the most crucial educational juncture is that defined within the Leaving Certificate 'mentality'. Considering that the majority of Irish second-level senior cycle students aspire to third level education, there is, for them, an ineluctable connection between their aspiration and this summative second-level examination. There is, thus, cause for concern at an official disclaimer which states that 'although not primarily designed as such, the Leaving Certificate is used extensively as a measure to access Higher Education and the professions'. It would seem educationally unsafe, considering the bias (of numbers and perception), not to take the correlation into account as a prime concern, since secondary education is no longer a culmination for the majority, but is part of a continuum and an ongoing process - a means to an end; certainly the majority see it that way. And it is surely not unreasonable to expect that in curriculum development for second level education, its place and function within the national education matrix would be seriously taken into account; an insular policy denying lateral accountability cannot be taken seriously. With a so-called minority subject like music this is, of course, a crucial consideration. There was no reason to suppose that the 1995 White Paper on Education excluded the arts (and music amongst them) from parity of treatment; on the contrary its pronouncements were uniformly encouraging and provisive. It is particularly positive in its plans for the training of trainers. The concurrent (i.e. NCCA deliberations and White Paper, both ongoing in1995) challenge was, as was also articulated in the MEND manifesto, critically to examine the interpenetrations of one component with another in the total education system. There is, therefore, good reason to scrutinize the official NCCA Course Committee position for inconsistency, in the light of a flat denial that Leaving Certificate Music, as provided for in the revised syllabus, any longer aspires to facilitating a secure transition to third level studies in the subject for those with creditable results. It seems, on the face of it, that the provisions for music are, in some way, discriminatory against the wider educational interests and well-being of the subject itself seen in artistic terms; and this is all the more insidious, coming as it does from a group notional sympathetic to the overall interests of music, and sincerely so too, because it is being claimed that the revision will be more equitable and will benefit the majority. If school leavers exploit music as a 'soft touch' subject in the competition for university entrance credits (and who can blame them?) and if music educators are prepared to accommodate this mutually-fulfilling strategy by admitting,

conniving at and tolerating lower standards in the interests of satisfying statistics and swelling the official ranks for music in schools (both spurious aims), the tactic should be exposed for what it is and honestly acknowledged. Such a hidden agenda, if it exists, is a far cry from the pious aspiration of doing something for music as an intrinsically different experience in knowing, as it is ridiculously hypocritical to accuse third level institutions of maintaining unrealistic expectations of standard in order to fill *their* ranks with high calibre candidates. This ambivalence as to the function of music in education in a school context is unnerving; and it is a magisterial dismissal of the NCCA's axiomatic responsibility - either positively to lend support to other avenues and challenges for those who are disfranchised by the revised syllabus (candidates definable by the former Syllabus B, and/or those aspiring to music professionally) or, negatively and minimally, not to ignore their indispensability in the overall music education enterprise, as seems to be the case. At a time when fruitful collaborations between music teachers of all specialisms should be encouraged in the spirit of the White Paper, the current situation of total dichotomy, if worse is unimaginable, cannot be acceptable. Young musically-talented people will be alienated from considering the professional prospects of music if the lower standards typical of the new system prevail as a yardstick against which to measure the profession at its novice stage.

While no case is being advanced against the fundamental principles on which the curricular statements themselves are based there are serious contextual issues to be faced if the implementation procedures and the outcomes, or the delivered curriculum, are to be compatible with resourcing (especially the *continuity* of competent teaching expertise) to achieve the overall objectives. Semantically the curricular statements suggest that music as process is now in the ascendancy; naïvely interpreted this means a further watering down of composing and listening activities to make room for performing, which is notoriously greedy in terms of its time demands. Since the overall time-slot remains the same and since the former Syllabus B option for performers has been virtually ostracized because it offends some quaint sensibility as to its highlighting denial of the 'equity of free individual tuition', the standards across the whole spectrum of achievement targets must fall; it could not be otherwise. Acquiescence in the idea that music as a single subject should consider itself lucky to be recognized in the curriculum at all, and be satisfied with its time allocation, is so in-bred and total that to plead for more time is never considered an option. The time is ripe for advancing a case, subtle and inoffensive in its nuance, for this option. The argument for denying the subject a degree of specialization, on the grounds advanced by Seán MacLiam, is simply insupportable when it is compared with the *time* allocations to mathematics, language and the sciences. How is specialization defined(?); surely there must be a correlation to time spent? And the rejection of the so-called two-tier approach (a contrived definition) is equally spurious. It was never suggested that the activities of *making music* (composing and performing) should be artificially separated from *listening* and *appraising* in separate modules. What was proposed (to the Syllabus Committee in 1994) was a limited double credit, in the sense of being limited for credit to third-level candidates in the arts, and based on *additional work* as an elective in one of the three core areas, without in any way encroaching on the provision of the general syllabus or overlapping with it. Such a proposal could function without incurring any of the problems anticipated by Seán MacLiam.

1. It would encourage beneficial participation from other areas of legitimate second-level activity (a crossover facility and strategy wholly endorsed in many high-profile Government-sponsored educational reports in Ireland).

2. It would challenge the growing number of new generation second-level school music teachers (with advanced skills across the full spectrum of composing, performing and listening); indeed it would encourage candidature for courses which are producing such teachers, all to the progressive advantage of music education. Problems with timetabling and the teaching of the expanded syllabus options, concurrently, are in the nature of a red herring. Where there is a will there is a way; it is the story of much music education in Ireland.

3. The resource implications are invalid if the relationship of music to other subjects in the school curriculum (see Terms of Reference of the Course Committee for Music) can be invoked as a multilaterally democratic expectation.

4. Difficulties of equity would not arise. Music as an elective subject would be accessible, by whatever mechanisms were put in place (including an option within the school itself) to all students, with a suitable background in *general* education, who were prepared to make the necessary further investment of time and application. It would be no different from any other subject in this regard except that it would, intrinsically, be only an elective. Consider a student without a specific language in Junior Certificate essaying to take it at Senior Level as a case in point.

5. The question of the option being available only with privately acquired tuition need not apply with school based options in place as outlined above. The legal implications were never tested in the case of the Syllabus B and all its antecedents. But the provisions worked admirably in practice even to the extent of the Department of Education accepting higher standard non-syllabus repertoire in the practical examination; it was just that it (the Dept) was never forced to give official recognition to the accommodation, while those facilitated had no vested interest in challenging the practice. The question of the generosity of the Dept of Education in finding mechanisms to recognize private or semi-state benign interventions, if not to encourage and enter into fruitful liaisons in relation to them, is long overdue for constructive enquiry and is not seen as beyond the scope of the 1995 White Paper to have implied.

In relation to the LC syllabus revision, it is given to understand that active (praxial) rather than passive approaches are favoured - learning *how* rather than learning *about* - experiential (psycho-motor and affective) over purely cognitive involvement. The processual is a respected mode of accumulating artistic experience if expertly guided and has compelling philosophical advocacy in context. But it is by no means a 'soft touch' and calls for sophisticated skills in teaching if it is to produce credible standards, which presumably are called for by the very presence of assessment procedures, especially when they are so critically tied to third-level entry. The syllabus goes on to stress that musical learning will be explored creatively in a totally integrated approach to the development of musicality (a dangerously indeterminate word) by active involvement in performing, composing and listening [listed, perhaps with Freudian inadvertence, in that order].

The inevitable, intended and virtual effect of this methodology is to stress the centrality of performance, which has become the most divisive issue in music (general) education philosophy and practice in global terms. This aspect will be dealt with in detail under Agenda Item I - Philosophy (*qv*). For the purposes of this section suffice it to say that rival factions (and this is typically a North American problem) split along the lines of Music Education as Aesthetic Education (spuriously accused of malignantly creating the further dichotomy of cohorts of scarcely literate performers side by side with verbally articulate listeners) . . . and music as process, stressing performance as overriding vehicle, but including various related approaches dealing with the functions of music. Acceptance of any one of these (i.e. excluding the eclectic hybrid as an option) should be approached with the utmost caution, in the writer's view, taking into account the rationale contained in Section 19 (Rationalization – Towards a Contextual Philosophy). Not all students want to be performers (or rather want to give it the time). A dry-as-dust course stressing the passive side of music in rudiments and listening is clearly outmoded, in Ireland as elsewhere, and has contributed to the subject unpopularity noted in Seán MacLiam's paper. The processual approach, which is central to the new syllabus, has its attractions (one of them being, in the current Irish case, that it purports to set achievable targets 'pitched at the achievement level of those being taught fully in non-specialist classroom situations') but its common denominator aspects, particularly relating to the lower overall standards, are a disincentive to the crucial high-fliers who are the most likely to enter the profession (and therefore to be critical to the well-being of music as a school subject in the future). This is the crux of the matter and the NCCA revision, well intentioned as it may have been, is curiously

insensitive to the serious long-term effects of this inescapable fact. If the NCCA Subject Course Committee is as concerned about equity as it professes to be (and there is no reason for doubting this) it should have viewed this responsibility in the widest context of:

1. Fairness to the majority in providing a course which is accessible to and enjoyable for a wide range of students, from different musical backgrounds. This is, of course, a duty, as it is a democratic principle.

2. Fairness to minority interests, which are crucial in this case. The 1995 White Paper is supportive of this aspect.

3. Fairness to the long-term prospects of the subject itself by encouraging (not disadvantaging) and facilitating candidature for third-level music study.

4. Providing a range of options which achieves 2. and 3. above without compromising delicate balances and other long-standing and legitimate educational demands, such as the critical interrelationship between time spent, standard achievable, university credits and the popularity of the subject in senior cycle second-level education.

It is recommended that an expansion of the steps so far taken, by reconsidering the rationale for the introduction of a limited double credit would go a long way towards a viable solution to the problem as here identified. It would

1. Side-step some of the drawbacks incurred by adopting any one of the current philosophical orientations exclusively to inform a single stream provision.

2. Encourage liaisons and reduce tensions between all the providers of music education while recognizing their legitimate claims.

3. Open the way for evolving improvements in the availability of and prospects for performance, while promoting healthy pre-third-level involvement in musicological (listening) and other academic pursuits in music at a post-rudimentary standard showing convincing progression from Junior Certificate level. Again comparison with favoured core subjects (Mathematics, Language, the Sciences) as to their being definable in specialist terms is the appropriate criterion, under which the NCCA argument breaks down.

Recommendations

1. That the provisions of the 1995 White Paper on Education be implemented in full in relation to music education.

2. That Government take into account the inhibiting effect of the revised Leaving Certificate Syllabus on candidature for music at third level.

3. That the NCCA reappraise the case for the introduction of a limited double credit module in Leaving Certificate music on the basis of the rationale (restated).

4. That mechanisms be explored to improve communication and collaboration between the providers of music education in second-level contexts (in school and extramural), especially between general and specialist interests, to the ultimate benefit of the national infrastructure for music education

Ref. I D iva See Document 160 in Proceedings

The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision

Chair: Ms Louise O'Connell (Post Primary Music Teachers' Association)
Reporter: Ms Anne Leahy (DIT)

This debate session, while it raised many of the familiar problems associated with the transition from the old to the revised Leaving Certificate Syllabus, offering valuable corroboration of shared feelings amongst teachers (in particular), also, on occasion, touched a new nerve centre, remarkably without the benefits of hindsight to guide it to these discoveries. Such information is particularly useful in analysis as evidence of coming events casting their shadows.

In a brief reappraisal of the outgoing (LC) syllabus there was not a single element singled out for favourable comment; this, of course, has some significance, the full extent of which, however, did not flow from the discussion. The syllabus was viewed as uninspiring, too difficult and very negative in generating interest in music as an option for examination. It is surely a relevant commentary on the syllabus itself that its very title ties it to an examination mentality, which itself is not a promising opening gambit for a curriculum which aims to promote a subject for its *sui generis* benefits. It was in fact confirmed by this meeting that music as a subject is viewed generally only as to its prospects for examination results (university entrance), while its benefits as a liberalizing and refining influence, valuable in later life, were being largely ignored; this in itself is valuable information as a fundamental parameter for analysis. Much discussion centred on the mechanisms for examination and the policy of referring to statistical norms in the allocation of all grades, paradoxically producing a disturbingly large and uncharacteristic swing in music results from year to year. Clearly it was not unreasonable to ask, as it is of such profound professional importance to teachers, that subject content, time allocations to the subject, comparability with other subjects as to what is achievable, examination norms, standards and, above all, clarity of information on all of the above, should form a guiding nexus underpinning their prospects fairly. **The appropriate NCCA authority at this stage confirmed that the work of curriculum development is continuous and ongoing in committee and that the embodied process of consultation can effect revision from time to time. This too is crucially important.**

An important comment raised at this meeting concerned a claim that in the UK a specialist option allowing for supplementary work in music is available. This is tantamount to the suggestion for a double credit option in music (for music students), made to and rejected by the NCCA course committee; the introduction of such an option would facilitate all students in predetermining their own level of involvement in music, would guarantee that standards were realistic and achievable across the board, and would circumvent the problem of a minority subject syllabus being artificially constrained, with no hope of success, into an adaptability to all expectations. The option is discussed in greater detail in the reviews of Sean MacLiam's paper on the LC Syllabus Revision (Ref. I P xiii) but it is also endorsed by Professor Harry White in his paper (Ref. III P viii). The meeting went into some detail on the desirability of a specialism option for practical music (performing), but the discussion arose from a difference of opinion as to how schools might cope with the wider demands of the syllabus in the context of results achievable. Clearly the question of an overloaded curriculum in music and the need to modify it pragmatically was the burning question, although, obviously, in the time allocation for the debate, the full complexity of the problem could not be addressed. However, there was a plethora of revealing information released as to the *realities* of the LC practical component, the *real* example being given as between the demands (if not the merits) of a Bach Prelude and Fugue and those of a pop song, like not being compared with like. This issue, which truly complicates the whole rationale of the syllabus requirements (whether considering the old syllabus or, now, the revision; and it has resonances, too, in Eric Sweeney's lecture on Mandatory Performance in Third Level, [Ref. I P xvi]), can only be reconciled by opting for the lower standard of interpretative skill as the norm. But, *de facto*, this undervalues the 'over-achiever' (in grades awarded too, it seems) on the culpably dismissive policy that what is not learned in the classroom has no real relevance or

claim, even if that considerable investment of educational time has very real significance for that student's very predictable interest in progressing to third level study in music. The hermetically-sealed LC syllabus as being impregnable against the legitimate logic of educational accommodations of merit and the expectations, if not the rights, of the minority, as of the individual, is tiresome; but that is not to disavow continuing efforts to invoke the democratic process and plead for review in the light of further advocacy material being available.

Although they could not have been presented as closely reasoned arguments, many of the concerns which had subsequently to be addressed by the NCCA Syllabus Committee were adequately aired during this debate. It is to be hoped that Seán MacLiam's assurances that curriculum development is continuous, and that unresolved difficulties can be reopened for discussion, are not relying solely on the hope that it is so difficult to change what is decreed that most would find the challenge potentially unrewarding.

Ref. II D iiib See Document 258 in Proceedings

The Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus Dilemma: Assessment with Multiple Aims

Chair: Seán MacLiam
Reporter: Ms Marita Kerin
Panel: Prof. David Elliott; Prof. Marie McCarthy; Ms Dorothy Straub

This debate provided another interesting example of how a somewhat elliptically, though purposefully, phrased title might serve to elicit a wide spectrum of interpretative possibilities. The policy of leaving the choice from the suggested agenda (provided for each debate) to the chairperson resulted, in this case, in one of the issues (perhaps the most contentious one) being lost; the question of how the Leaving Certificate examination, as a summative assessment of musical achievement, could be rescued from the university credit race and restored to its function of providing, with evidence, formative and valuable musical experience *per se* was never satisfactorily addressed. Nor was the dilemma for career-oriented music students in finding the new syllabus inadequate to *their* needs considered either. The chairperson cannot be charged with this omission; there is copious evidence, in this well-reported session, of attempts by the chairperson, himself deeply involved in Leaving Certificate issues, to keep the proceedings focused on the issues implied by the title of the debate. In fact, the chairperson, in this instance, prepared the ground very succinctly by giving a useful overview of the revised LC syllabus itself. His opening questions - "Are we trying to do too much in the music syllabus" and "Are we trying to assess too much" were promising and immediately challenging.

The following extracts the salient points of the responses:

1. Professor Elliott, following the ideology developed in his book (*Music Matters* - see Elliott - Ref. II P viii), and commented on in the report on another debate (Ref. II D iic), in which he champions the idea of *trusting* teachers to do their job (including that of assessment of students), queried the need for 'assessment at all' (*sic* in the report). Presumably he was referring to and decrying the notion of elaborately structured assessment, externally controlled according to the stated aims, objectives and implementation of a curriculum. (Compare the contrary views of both Lehman and Colwell on this issue [Ref. II P ix and III P iii]; this provocative stance by Elliott, based on his own elaborately stated dogma, cannot be dismissed without a fuller consideration of the substance of his book, but it seems to be too dangerously idealistic, and certainly out-of-step with the global norms of music education, and of the Irish system in particular. Seán MacLiam made this clear in a counter-challenge). And Professor Elliott seems partly hoist with his own petard when he comments that this method is unacceptable for university entrance in the US when special entrance examinations have

to be put in place to select candidates for third-level music courses. Perhaps he is underplaying (or emphasizing) the lack of continuity between second and third level music education in North America, a dilemma which is comprehensively treated in this report (see MacLiam - Ref. I P xiii) and which led Professor White (Ref. III P viii) to draw attention to the fact that in North America many universities are forced to provide remedial music education in rudiments for freshmen.

2. Professor McCarthy outlined the differences in approach in assessing formatively and summatively (cumulatively. See also Swanwick on Assessment – Ref. II P iv) and recommended that continuous assessment might eventually form part of the Irish system (Professor Colwell also comments on the remedial irretrievability of a situation which is judged, as is the LC, on an exit examination only – Ref. II P ix). Ms Straub confirmed that the norm in the US school system is teacher continuous assessment without the intervention of external agencies but she did not express total satisfaction with the results of this approach.

3. As to what is assessed, and in relation to Seán MacLiam's opening question as to whether we in Ireland are trying to do too much, it was additionally confirmed that composition is not generally taught in schools in the US; it is not clear whether Professor Elliott and Ms Straub understood exactly what is meant by the term *composition* as applied to school music education in these islands. Performance is assessed only in US high schools with a dedicated music specialization (music schools). It appears that the approach to assessment in schools in the US is far more liberal and haphazard than in Ireland; but it is dangerous to generalize in the case of the US where systems change from state to state, although this was offset, in this case, by the pronouncements of Ms Starub, who, after all, had been a recent president of MENC and had, within her brief, an obligation to take an *overview* of the American system.

4. The controversial area of listening, as an activity and in its assessment aspects, was then treated. Professor Elliott was adamant that listening is about (musical) perception and not about recognition, and recommended that listening and performing be taught together, in other words that listening should be a stimulation arising critically from one's own performance. This led predictably to a mini-statement of some of the principles developed in Professor Elliott's book, referred to above. There seemed to be some misunderstanding of Professor Elliott's stressing *multiple* means of assessment, on the one hand, and listening through performance (only) on the other. But his citing an instance that to teach a practical skill (football was used as an example) one should not use a video . . . on reflection seems to support the idea, arguably contrary to his own, that multiple means are, after all, the most comprehensively productive of the best results. There is merit, of course, in Professor Elliott's claim that performance is not just a skill; it is a way of thinking, as indeed listening is. Seán MacLiam's assurances that we do, in Ireland, integrate performing with listening were received with some scepticism by Ms McCann, who described it as an aspiration, not a practice. Professor Elliott seemed to be treading a fine line when he recommended *guided* listening as a strategy over mere 'recognition' listening to records, to which he is opposed on principle as redolent of (to him) an outmoded method reputedly championed by the Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE) movement in the US (see the Elliott/ Reimer analysis - Refs. II P vii and IIP iii). In a general sense, on the topic of assessment, there were concessions on both sides, Professor Elliott recognizing the merits of our examination-based approach while his own curriculum-driven education was admired for its idealism.

5. In brief, Professor Elliott endorsed the whole thrust of MEND Phase II by reminding the delegates that a fundamental requirement in music education is a closely reasoned philosophy (including coverage of modes of assessment). He also made a plea for multiple assessment measures, as did Professor McCarthy in stressing that 'pencil and

paper' testing is not the only way, as indeed it may not always be the most relevant, informative or effective.

Recommendations

1. Assessment being recognized as a complex area, and one on which there is considerable diversity of opinion as to how it should be conducted, it is advisable that it (assessment) should be kept on the agenda as an area of (music) education which should be kept under constant review, responding to ongoing research results.

2. The listening function, being the most central and fundamental in all music education, should also be kept under constant review, with particular focus on its true characteristics (creatively/aesthetically perceptual rather than recognizory; listening *to* rather than listening *for*). The idea of listening through performance is the most authentic and challenging of musical activities and should be encouraged, fostered and appropriately tested where possible.

3. Assessment methodology should proceed from and be a component of a carefully conceived philosphy of music (see Swanwick – Ref. III P iv).

18.5.4 National Standards (USA)

Ref. III P iii See Document 303 in Proceedings

National Standards and the Realities of Achievement in Music Education
Paul R. Lehman (Professor of Music, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Past President, Music Educators National Conference (USA). Chair, Music Standards Task Force.)

Music exalts the human spirit. It enhances the quality of life. Music is vitamin M. It's a chocolate chip in the cookie of life. . . .The only question . . . is whether we want to limit access to music to those who can afford it or whether we want to make it available to all of our citizens to enjoy. I think the answer is clear.

PAUL LEHMAN

MEND Phase III Nov 1996

The evidence of a distinguished career in music education contained in the above short CV of Paul Lehman was amply reflected in a presentation of penetrating focus, which unerringly targeted and treated the dilemmas, in general music education, which are readily recognizable as transferable from one educational system to another in western civilization. And Professor Lehman's paper convincingly and reassuringly played down, almost to the point of irrelevance to the case in point, the apparent differences between Music Education in the US and in Ireland; this might be claimed to weaken the applicability of some of his copious recommendations, when viewed in context through a lens more revealing of innate differences, though the writer remains convinced of his instinctive definition of universal, and therefore shared, concerns. In the analysis, therefore, the recommendations proved to be unexceptionable in an Irish context. But here was a submission notably pertinent to a multiplicity of the (interrelated) Irish music education issues which MEND sought to expose as also essentially interdependent. Professor Lehman came highly recommended by his peers in the US and proved to be thoroughly conversant with the widest spectrum of music education affairs. Deceptively quiet and unassuming, he delivered a powerfully coherent account of

his topic (National Standards) in a way which not only addressed its manifold relevance to the MEND agenda but maximized the elements of practicality, pragmatism and sheer common-sense. It became self-evident as he progressed that he has had his finger sensitively and perceptively on the pulse of music education during his entire career. In summary his talk, which struck an admirable balance between moderation and decisiveness, championed democratic principles in the building of consensus amongst educators, stressing the potential of frequent micro-effort to transmute into macro-structures.

This paper, perhaps more than any other by a non-national (but see also Colwell – Ref. II P ix - for a comparable effort), really did address the Irish problem. It took the MEND agenda and touched, briefly but effectively, on a wide range of its identified issues. These included performance, in the context of the practico/academic divide in music education, and the need for a balanced approach to this major issue, leadership in music education, curriculum development, the time trap, the interrelationship of assessment and standards and its implications for teacher training, resources, and accountability in education. These were all reconciled within the main thrust of his argument, which was a defence of national standards and their ineluctable implications for assessment as a tool of education. The presentation in this latter context should be compared with Professor Swanwick's, as an arguable shortfall of total complementarity between their views is detectable - and understandable too in the sense that Professor Swanwick's topic of assessment *per se* invited a wider exposé of the inherent dangers, which it was not Professor Lehman's brief to reconcile. Finally, Paul Lehman attacked and debunked several of the common misunderstandings about the role of music education (such as treating it as pure entertainment or seeing it, in the general sense, as educating audiences), and mounted an admirable case for the benefits of coalitions for action leading to political advocacy (but see Colwell - Ref. II P ix - for a cautionary counterposition on this issue), and the desirability of having a suitable forum for music education.

It is arguable that Dr Lehman's entrepreneurial skills made him one of the prime architects of the successful campaign to have the arts enshrined as an equal partner in the American curriculum for which the Goals 2000 Education Act is the enabler. But he is not blind to the fact that their inclusion, necessary though insufficient in itself, is but the beginning of the battle for resourcing; we have much to learn from his dialectic mastery though it may be bordering on the cynical to ponder that we in Ireland have had a national curriculum for some 70 years and are still embroiled in the same conflict. Paul Lehman's strength lies in a powerfully organized mind, the lateral thinking and logic to make the right connections and to construct a matrix of compelling rationality. His presentation is significant therefore, in responding to the stated aspiration of MEND Phase III, in suggesting strategies for action - leading towards solutions - and based on the ongoing success of the American campaign for education in the arts which was spearheaded by the epochal report *Growing Up Complete - The Imperative for Music Education*[105]. He must be credited with having recommended that the point of access to a perceptually flawed system for a would-be idealistic reforming agent (MEND?) is not specific but general. We must attack on all fronts simultaneously in seeking resourcing, an ultimate aim; but for him the core of the nexus rests in the inseparably bound issues of standards and assessment. Unexpectedly provocative but decisive is the anchoring statement of his philosphy. **"I see assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for music education in the coming decade,"** he says; could anything be more clearly stated? It is taken as the starting point of this brief analysis.

Paul Lehman recalls asking a distinguished colleague, as early as 1991, for advice as to a strategy to establish the arts on the nation's education agenda. "That's simple," he was told. "You have to develop a set of standards like those developed by the National Council of Teachers of

[105] The report, issued in 1991, by the National Commission for Music Education called upon "all who care about education to destroy, once and for all, the myth that education in music and the other arts is mere 'curricular icing' . . . and to insist that instruction in music and the other arts be re-established as basic to education, not only by virtue of their intrinsic worth, but because they are fundamental to what it means to be an educated person"

Mathematics".[106] From that counsel, and from his acceptance of it, he developed his own rationale, which transmuted itself, through his advocacy with the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC), into the National Standards, over a very busy and active period of little more than two years.[107] What Lehman claims for the exercise is that it achieved a hard-won concentration of a 'staggering diversity of opinions' into a consensus not just confined to music educators themselves but including all the parties to the Commission appointed by the National Coalition for Music Education in the US. As a result of commendably wide consultation "the thoroughness and the inclusiveness of the elaborate consensus-building process by which the national standards were developed give them a legitimacy and a credibility that's lacking in efforts that have been more centralized, more hurried, or less committed to outreach." **In effect Dr Lehman presented a superb example of collaboration amongst groups of similar interest, acting under circumstances in which a threat to their common ideals acted powerfully in quickly consolidating areas of agreement. If only such a mentality were to crystallize in Ireland! Surely this exercise could be seen as having defined the prototype, even larger in scope than that of MENC itself, of a pressure group which embodies mission, structure, agenda . . . . in essence a model for the Forum for Music Education prefigured in the MEND Agenda as drawn up by the delegates themselves?** In line with another crucial finding of MEND it should be stressed that the model need not be prescriptive; it should not necessarily be copied but, rather, it should be *contextualized* to fit Irish circumstances.

Professor Lehman is quick to point out also that the Standards themselves are merely a model, but the fact that they exist changes the whole attitude to music education across the widest educational and political arena; in other words there is something to agree or disagree with and, in the American case, to be implemented or not when appraised. But the appraisal is foreshadowed and responses are inescapable; this is a healthy situation and infinitely preferable to policies of *laissez faire* or inactivity. And he goes on to show how the standards affect the whole enterprise of music education. They are, inevitably, ambitious in invoking the best current practices (and they should be, of course, demonstrable in practice), rather than validating the *status quo*. The standards may be seen as guidelines in which outcomes or expectations are specified rather than the activities that lead to them (Professor Swanwick also develops this point. See Swanwick – Ref. III P iv).

It is perhaps slightly begging the question for Professor Lehman to suggest that, "in the US, the Standards represent the closest thing [they] have to a statement of philosophy, so the discussion there takes the form of how to implement the Standards." It is, however, an inviting speculation to advert to the mutual reinforcement of philosophy and practice. And the urgent consideration of practices is demanded by the controlling standards, as are the choices in balancing the arts (doing) and humanities (knowing) approaches to Music Education. There are implications for teacher training at all stages and, most importantly of all, there is the inevitable investigation of the most effective way of measuring outcomes. Assessment can be, of course, a somewhat controversial notion in art education where subjectivity and transcendental experience can be a dimension (see also Swanwick - Ref. II P iv). Paul Lehman, while admitting our inability fully and unambiguously to assess the most intangible and exalted qualities of musicianship, dismisses as evasive, and threatening to the viability of the subject in education, any reluctance to "do the things that are possible on the grounds that some things

[106] The colleague was the Director of the State Education Assessment Centre of the Council of Chief State School Officers. The Standards referred to were *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Subjects.*

[107] The basic document is contained on one page as follows:

The American National Standards (1992-1994)

Music Content Standards

1. Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music
2. Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music
3. Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments
4. Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines
5. Reading and notating music
6. Listening to, analysing, and describing music
7. Evaluating music and music performance
8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts
9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture

are impossible." He believes very firmly in using the objective approach where it is possible and helpful as indeed, at the other end of spectrum, he seeks to establish the subject of music in education as comprising much more than a vehicle of mere entertainment.

Paul Lehman summarizes his presentation by suggesting that we approach our problem, comparable to that faced by music educators in the US in 1991, by developing our own statement of what it is that we want the young people of Ireland to know and be able to do in music; this is, of course, a basic philosophical stance which was endorsed by all the speakers at MEND whose speciality was in the philosophical field. And in this context it is interesting to compare the American National Standards with similar aspirational outcomes specified in the Curricula for Schools developed by the NCCA in Ireland. But these statements need to be enlarged and supplemented, by other agencies, to deliver a comprehensive manifesto as to the outcomes we expect across the whole spectrum of music education. As will be seen in the outcomes (recommendations) from this report, the question of Performance, its place in music education and its treatment in the overall spectrum of current and past dispensation in Ireland, exposes a major lacuna in Irish thinking which has to be addressed as to the flawed philosophical stance which ignores its claims to be the driving force on which all music education depends. And in the end, performance too will have to be judged on the standards reached right across the spectrum; and standards, in turn, are attained realistically only when assessment is part of the scheme. When considered rationally as to its embodied advantages, it seems that assessment as a tool in music education, if managed with skill, has too much to offer, by way of boosting the credibility of the subject, to be easily dispensed with. Paul Lehman's justifying summary of the benefits accruing from standards and assessment, as respectively signalling and measuring musical outcomes, is compelling as a possible approach to music education. If the obvious comparability of a national curriculum in Ireland (containing a statement of aims and objectives, including standards of achievement and outcomes) and National Standards in the US (as representing the nearest approach to a national curriculum, and as a statement of aspirational standards) is accepted, the advocacy value of Lehman's list of benefits is undeniable. Here they are:

A statement of standards

1. Emphasizes, typically, children's rather than adults' needs. Takes the spotlight off less worthy reasons for promoting music education and focuses on learners. And it is more challenging to specify outcomes (explicit statements of what students should know and be able to do) than to dilute the potential for real achievement by merely specifying activities that can be easily manipulated into vehicles devoid of goal-directed effort, leading eventually to mediocrity.

2. Provides a basis for focusing effort. Brings manifold benefits to structuring the educational effort and achieving complementarity between the elements. The curriculum can evolve from an unambiguous statement of aims and objectives which are centred in outcomes. Teacher education can be modelled on the curriculum to be achieved and assessment can be planned not only as to what is to be assessed but as to how it is to be measured - simply because the goals are specific.

3. Clarifies expectations. Promotes a better understanding between teachers - the facilitators, on the one hand - and administrators, parents and students on the other. In an ambience of such openness, responsibilities are easier to define and accountability more securely anchored.

4. Promotes uniformity and fairness in expectations by levelling differences in the expected outcomes, from the general programme, based on unacceptable socio-economic factors.

5. Moves music beyond entertainment. The perception that music is different, in the sense that it is an expendable activity unworthy of ranking with other subjects that inculcate *useful* knowledge and skills, is still pervasive. A statement of standards (for music),

similar in educational gravitas and intent to those for other subjects, affects attitudes and concentrates effort towards more mature self-expectation.

6. Provide a basis for claiming needed resources. In spite of a poor record in Ireland on this issue, it still must be noted that each revision of curriculum/syllabus (as for example the very significant educational reforms undertaken in the 90s and now virtually complete, except for its long-term implementation and outcomes) brings with it renewed promises that resources to match the aspiration of the revision will be provided. Music is no exception in this regard and is further singled out for favourable treatment in the terms of the 1995 White Paper on Education. Assurances have been given that in-service training and other facilities, re-identified during MEND, will be abundantly provided. It is up to the music lobbyists (Forum?) to ensure that these promises are honoured. Professor Lehman is correct in suggesting that there is a real correlation between adopted standards (especially so in the case of a promulgated national curriculum) and government obligations to provide the resources to achieve the stated aims.

7. Provide a basis for insisting on qualified teachers. This claim is borne out by the flurry of departmental activity, even in music, that has accompanied the issue of the new syllabi in Ireland. The emphasis is yet again, though perhaps only in theory, no longer on what teachers can achieve with the expertise they have accumulated from their training and career experience, but rather on what students must know and be able to do at key stages of each course in question. This highlights the quintessential importance of assessment and its methodology; without assessment there is diminished accountability, placing the good intentions of the primary curriculum under strain and inviting the kind of outcomes that the *Deaf Ears?* Report lamented. As the debate materials from MEND were sifted it did not prove possible to report unanimity on the question of whether or not music in primary schools should be taught by specialists. Lehman's wisdom is very germane to this issue. He claims, with sound logic, that since the standards (curricula) specify outcomes, the class-teacher versus specialist dilemma is bypassed. Departmental strategists, in consultation no doubt with the music education lobbyists, must be accountable for the *outcomes* and reach an accommodation (and there is a plethora of compromises and hybrids available from MEND as to the use of specialist services) which will satisfactorily deliver the curriculum. The problem remains, of course, between the authors of the syllabus/curriculum and the interpreters of its demands, to ensure that those demands, in terms of achievement at each key stage and the much publicized criterion of continuity between stages (which should include the now crucial and controversial transition from second- to third-level) are met and that they achieve the global aims of the music education programme. As Lehman so succinctly puts it: 'what counts is the results'. Clearly we are at the beginning of a new dispensation in Ireland. The aims/standards should be clear; only time will tell whether they are capable of being diluted into a travesty that perpetuates mediocrity, or whether they are met by placing the appropriate resources in the hands of teachers. It is interesting, incidentally, to note that there is no agreement or uniformity of practice in the US either as to how primary education should be delivered. Both systems are in use (i.e. class-teacher and specialist) but there is a very significant cohort of specialist teachers evident.

8. Provide a basis for assessing music learning. It can be affirmed that there was nothing but support at MEND for the need to assess the outcomes of music education. The issue was considered by Professors Colwell and Elliott, *inter alia,* and by Professor Swanwick as a specific topic. The reader is referred to the relevant papers and analysis (Colwell - Ref. II P ix; Elliott - Ref. II P viii; and Swanwick - Ref. III P iv). The idea of assessment lacks substance if it is unrelated to expectations, which in turn are less than meaningful if they cannot be related to a standard for a particular system. The converse also applies; standards are fatuous if performance is not measured against them.

9. Provide a vision for education. This is self-evident from the above. It has already been stated that judgement and valuing are the untouchable cornerstones of the educational edifice. And the relationship between standards (however defined), expectations and assessment is axiomatic. In the final analysis it is the unambiguous definition and setting of standards that fuels the whole process, stimulates effort and inspires confidence that the processes of education are not undermined by specious notions of equality.

1. Seek the views and suggestions of natural allies, in the arts and in education, who are likely to share the aspirations of music education.

2. The inseparability of standards and assessment should be borne in mind when setting educational targets.

3. The establishment in Ireland of the Music Education National Forum was welcomed. It should now proceed to the drafting of a mission statement, the establishment of an executive/administrative structure, and the setting of an agenda.

4. The setting of standards in education invites appraisal (of their content) and response. Standard setting is therefore a powerful political tool. A statement of standards, as expected outcomes in education, should form part of the curriculum manifesto.

5. Standards should be ambitious in invoking the best current practices (and they should be, of course, demonstrable in practice), rather than validating the *status quo*. Standards should be seen as guidelines in which outcomes or expectations are specified rather than the activities that lead to them (Professor Swanwick also develops this point. See Swanwick - Ref. III P iv).

6. Music education should involve a balanced content of 'doing' and 'knowing'.

7. The implications of the curriculum (standards) for teacher training must be treated seriously.

8. In assessment it is necessary to establish what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and (what is) the most effective methodology to use in the process.

9. Music should not be seen in education merely as a vehicle for entertainment.

10. Beware of reluctance to 'do the things that are possible on the grounds that some things are impossible'

11. Advocacy Material for the adoption of Standards (and Assessment) should be prepared. A statement of standards

    a. Emphasizes, typically, children's rather than adults' needs.

    b. Provides a basis for focusing effort.

    c. Clarifies expectations.

    d. Promotes uniformity and fairness in expectations

    e. Moves music beyond entertainment.

    f. Provides a basis for claiming needed resources.

g. Provides a basis for insisting on qualified teachers.

h. Provides a basis for assessing music learning.

i. Provides a vision for education.

Ref. III D iia See Document 353 in Proceedings

The American National Standards as Aspiration. An Appraisal of their General Applicability

Chair: Dr Gareth Cox (Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick)
Reporter: Professor Deirdre Doyle (RIAM)

Owing to communication difficulties it proved impossible to elicit a report from this debate session.

18.6 National Culture, Biculturalism and Multiculturalism

18.6.1 A Note on Multiculturalism

The reader's indulgence should be sought, as indeed a disclaimer should be added, in relation to weakness of definition in a rapidly evolving, and, let it be said, destabilizing, area of music education concern - that of multiculturalism. In seeking to address the solicitude felt in Ireland that our own ancient indigenous island (folk or traditional) music has insufficient presence in the general education system, the MEND deliberations became ensnared in the much wider context of multiculturalism. It is not difficult to see how, in the contemporary climate of music education as received wisdom from current philosophical trends (see, for example, the Elliott/Reimer documentation), the two have become inseparably bound. And it is interesting at the outset to note that, in Ireland, as far as the quintessentially important musicological research base is concerned, the two have coalesced in the very structure of the first world music centre in the country, namely that in Limerick University.

The question of multiculturalism was treated copiously during the MEND deliberations, not only in relation to the number of invited papers specifically devoted to the subject but also as a result of much cross-reference to and from less specifically dedicated presentations. The initiative generated a substantial corpus of documentation. Copious readings of this material give a distinct impression, to the writer at least, and not just in relation to the Irish context, that multiculturalism has been visited precipitously and almost prematurely on an educational world not quite prepared for its inundating presence and self-generated urgency. In other words, clear definitions and clear policies leading to a consensus as to how the phenomenon of 'musics of the world's cultures' should be insinuated into education - especially *general* music education - are far from emerging, not to mention focusing with clear resolution. Certainly, if the Irish general education system is the centre of attention, it would be true to say that it is as yet untouched by the hysteria that seems to have been generated. But, let it be added, the implied breathing space is of limited duration. And this is not to insinuate that multiculturalism (by whatever definition) is not to be welcomed (after all it is the grandest of all manifestations of 'music as a diverse human practice') . . . but caution is urged. We must think calmly about it, yet also with an urgency that mirrors its inexorable incursions into curricular contexts in certain first-world countries, to be sure that any proposed involvement is seemly, relevant, educationally well-informed and pragmatic. And if relevance is convincing and pressing it must be viewed against the all-important subset, itself debatable as to its inclusions, of Ireland's 'primary music culture' in its broadest sense. A clear understanding of what that is must be a realistic concern of music educators (the commanding dilemma, as it should be the honest enquiry, of all general music education) before the circumferences are crossed into the ever-widening circles of Patricia Shehan Campbell's and Marie McCarthy's (*qv*) admirable model.

Reverting to the prime concern of MEND, which is proposed as the one demanding immediate enquiry in this context, we need to address the question of the current status in education of Irish folk or traditional music. In the writer's view this must invite comment from the widest constituency of musicians (of all persuasions), educators, researchers, culture-bearers, policy-makers, ethnomusicologists, curriculum strategists and specifically-dedicated 'world musics in education' devotees. But it is high time that our own dedicated research base and, in particular, Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin, be thoroughly involved in the promotion as a well-reasoned approach which will stand the scrutiny of a non-musically-oriented educational world beleaguered by rival claims on an endemically overloaded curriculum. The two topics (traditional music and multiculturalism) seem now to be inextricably related, by scholarly recognition; and, after all, multiculturalism is, paradoxically, itself an outgrowth of western culture and educational concern.

18.6.2 National Culture: Biculturalism versus Multiculturalism

Let it be clearly stated from the outset that the writer, and organizer of the MEND initiative, has a professional background almost exclusively in western art music. He therefore sought conscientiously to suffuse the debate with contributions from areas of musical discourse specifically different in emphasis from his own specialization. This was undertaken in the knowledge that 'musics of the world's cultures' have become of almost obsessive importance in the current global debate on music education. This is a result of radical reappraisal of a possible need to liberate the formal school experience from the perceived stranglehold of western music on the curricula in most first world countries. It was intuitively felt that Ireland, being neither multi-cultural nor multi-ethnic (in the generally understood sense in which her nearest neighbours east and west - the US and the UK - might be so classified) could well have a unique set of circumstances to deal with. Ireland has a rich tradition in the plenitude of its folk music, if that is not imprudently to juxtapose two words (folk and tradition) which are by no means simple in the nuance of their definition. And it would be a political and social oversimplification to speak only of western art music and traditional music as being the only two genres that need to be addressed in Irish music education. Furthermore the term national music, with its definite political overtones, is best avoided in the context of current music education; the term 'National' Culture was chosen as a pre-MEND agenda entry long before emotive responses were considered to be a threat. Treading warily in an ambience sensitive even as to definition, it was nevertheless decided to disturb the generally peaceful but essentially dichotomous coexistence of the literate and non-literate (formal/school and aural/oral/community) streams of music learning, in the belief that it was high time that they should be cross-fertilized. To stimulate lively presentations and debate, the idea of Ireland as currently being in need of bicultural rather that multi-cultural emphasis in its music education curricula was insinuated. More than a quarter of the presentations had significant connections with the theme, and there were four debates, illustrating that it was taken very seriously.

In the event it proved difficult to extract a conclusive skeleton for progress from the proceedings. The presentations of Professor Farhat and Mr Mercier, fascinating and edifying as they were in themselves, were so admirably detached but so redolent of a post-graduate mentality that they were refractory in yielding practical pointers to a future for multiculturalism in general education. Professor Santos sought conscientiously during preparation to keep contact with the Irish context, but did so by means of reflections on a more complex situation than ours - that of the hybrid indigenous multiculturalism of the Malay Archipelago (and the Philippines in particular). He presented a variety of material, in resonance with the contributions of other speakers, that could prove valuable in establishing principles on which to base a multicultural (or even a bicultural) approach to music education. In particular he dealt with at least three important aspects - authenticity, community base, and literacy/oracy - in a constructive way which minimized their dissonances and could facilitate their management within the norms of formal education. Dr Veblen, a non-national involved as a researcher in Irish traditional music, added interesting commentary from her unusual stance. She offered enlightening personal anecdote based on her observation of the transmission processes of a tradition which has been successfully passed on. She also gave evidence of how the music (and its musicians) have proved to be adaptable to change and how traditional music can benefit from technology, two aspects which attest to its readiness to be selectively absorbed within formal education while infusing it with its own enriching idiosyncratic corpus of oral/aural method. Dr Bradshaw's short presentation was insufficiently timetabled to allow him give more than a flavour of his work and its massive relevance to Irish folk music, not only in its dominating research base but as to the obvious suitability of his teaching material, so copiously praised at the debate sessions. His presentation must be considered one of the most promising as material for urgent further referral. Professor McCarthy's Phase II paper is important, and ambitious too, as laying out an admirably plausible prototype for Irish music education stressing community connections, collaboration and due acknowledgement of all musical genres which represents an advance on the ' of politics of recognition and tokenism . . . as a celebration of the musical wealth of the island'. She proposes a 'tripartite principle, beginning with the uniqueness of music at local and national levels; then moving in ever-widening circles to the related musics of Europe, and eventually embracing the musical practices that

are culturally and musically removed from the music of Ireland' That leaves Professors Patricia Shehan Campbell and Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin.

Professor Shehan Campbell is distinguished by total immersion in and infectious enthusiasm for her area of expertise - musics of the world's cultures. The force of her personality and the depth of her familiarity with the relevant educational materials, at their most accessible levels in general educational terms (it might be added), are such as to make all her presentations overwhelmingly absorbing and musically intimate. If only all teachers were as inspirational as she herself is, then there would be no difficulty in embracing her ideas on their face value. And she had obviously laced her contribution well with nostalgic reference to her own Irish roots, which in a sense, however minimally, de-energized the urgency of her multicultural message. But Dr Shehan Campbell, who generously made herself available for private consultation on several occasions on her own campus, was well aware of the current bicultural dominance in considering the Irish situation and was able to temper her otherwise idealistic commitment to total democracy of musics with a sympathetic understanding of the context. Her presence at the MEND deliberations was a bonus and her stance proved to be a valuable criterion against which current concerns in Ireland could be measured as to present and future relevance.

Professor Ó Súilleabháin's participation became a natural cynosure and it was expected, as it proved to be, that his fund of knowledge and his interpenetrating with the whole network of relevant activities would bring authoritative advice to bear on the aspiration of infusing formal music education in Ireland with an enlarged presence of music outside the definition of western art. His half-day seminar on traditional music, given as a separate pendant to MEND Phase I, was charismatic in its impact and the documentation clearly identified aspects that would have to be addressed to effect a smooth blend between the norms of traditional and formal method. Dr Ó Súilleabháin, clearly the front-runner in any enterprise to hybridize school experience with a strong strain drawn from traditional sources, was clearly excited at the prospect and the challenges involved and accepted a commission further to lay out a framework against which this task might be undertaken and accomplished. Unfortunately circumstances prevented him from producing that template in the documented form which he intended and which would have facilitated the assimilation of innovatory detail as a prerequisite to addressing the undoubted difficulties which would attend its imposition on or interaction with overloaded curricula. This framework document is currently being prepared by Professor Ó Súilleabháin as a MEND commission.[108] As a result of current incompleteness the first presentation by Dr Ó Súilleabháin had to be reviewed as a possible summative statement; in this context, in spite of the unquestionable value of much of the material, it raised too many issues without challenge, leaving them also without answers. The more recent review (also included below, but see also the covering footnote above) attempts to engage these areas of possible conflict.

One of the most valuable outcomes of the deliberations by the National Culture constituency of MEND was the way in which the intrinsic differences in its educational rationale and demands could be seen to interact with the corpus of other MEND ideas, in thought-provoking ways. Because traditional music in Ireland is only fairly recently in a vibrant and dynamic transitional stage, its folk past is near enough to relate to the ethnomusicological definition of the static unvarying character (authenticity) of 'primitive' musics, while it is adaptable and socially absorbing enough to transmute effortlessly into a popular definition; and its infiltration of the art/literacy field, aided by scholarship, research and composition (as indeed by entrepreneurship), has been securely effected and is already a matter of established fact and global celebration. This socially recognized versatility confers on it a flexibility as an educational tool, which should not be overlooked. It can act as a means of articulation

[108] Professor Ó'Súilleabháin suggested, in January 2000, that he might respond, in a structured interview situation, to two of his own colleagues at Limerick University - Niall Keegan and Sandra Joyce - to give his considered views on the topic he had agreed to address - *A Strategy for the Promotion of Traditional Music in Formal Music Education Contexts in Ireland*. It is fortuitous that the final report of MEND can now incorporate this material, without which a serious lacuna would have had to have been admitted in the treatment of this key area of the agenda.

between high and mass culture (see Swanwick - Ref. III P iv). Because it can adapt to literacy, and use it for its purposes without being stifled, it can comfortably retain its validly non-literate basic character and its liaison with established community practices (see McCarthy on Continuum - Ref. III P vii), or, as Professor Ó Súilleabháin puts it can 'generate . . . a marked increase in the relevance of "school music" to music outside the school walls'. Furthermore, the claim is advanced that its non-literacy base could be seen to remove it a step from the spheres of verbalization, of music as science and theory - encouraging ideas of creative performance, of listening *to* rather than listening *for*, and of music as process (see Elliott, *Music Matters* and Ref. II P viii) all very relevant to current Senior Cycle ideology in Irish music education. There is, of course, a downside and a price to pay; these are discussed in the review below of Professor Ó Súilleabháin's paper (Ref. I PD N).

18.6.3 National Culture - Review of Presentations and Debates

Ref. I P x See Document 110 in Proceedings

Multiculturalism as an Approach to Music Education
Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat (Trinity College, Dublin)

In reading and rereading Professor Farhat's paper one is constantly aware of admirable scholarly detachment and a refinement of thought which, nevertheless, place its subject matter squarely within the ambit of higher education. One corollary should be a statement of the mechanisms by which the fruits of multicultural research in music could infiltrate the general education system; but Professor Farhat does not choose that route, nor is he to be faulted on those grounds. The essay is an exercise in global sociology and anthropology, the latter an area very relevant to Professor Farhat's own educational and pedagogical background. As advocacy for the continuing pursuit of scholarly research into 'the musical culture of mankind, its common features, its differences, its varying aesthetics and social values' it is compelling in the context of pursuing the 'objective of a well balanced musical education'. But Professor Farhat's exposé of the work of ethnomusicologists, the awareness of the fascinating features of 'other' musics which diverge substantially from western norms and, finally, the more sophisticated and consciously contrived interactions between world cultures, seems unequivocally to argue against their suitability as inclusions in the *school* curriculum. It is the contrast between the staple demands of general music education, with its perennial time constraints, and the luxury of specialization, that is the significant parameter in curricular planning and Professor Farhat captures this nuance effortlessly. It would surely be considered bizarre, in general education, to burden general language studies with delvings into a multiplicity of exotic languages that ought to be learned to be even marginally understood. Professor Farhat's valedictory paragraph places this in perspective in a provocative way which challenges the multiculturalists who are more committed to a total revamp of curricular procedures to accommodate their demands.

'Needless to say, I do not propose that non-western musics should be taught in schools on a parity with western music. This is neither feasible nor desirable. . . . I believe that not only should third level music education aim at a more global understanding, but in time, with the availability of trained teachers, earlier schooling can also benefit from a wider musical outlook.' This was salutary advice to stimulate the further treatment of this topic at later phases of MEND.

Ref. I P ix See Document 109 in Proceedings

Looking at the Music of the World: A View from Ireland
Mr Mel Mercier (University College, Cork)

It is interesting how the significance of Mel Mercier's paper changed in the light of the progress of the MEND deliberations; it was first reviewed in the Interim Report of Phase I (*qv*). It must be further commended, on revision, as an admirably detached, scholarly and disciplined comment having relevance to an evolving movement by which music education, in countries dominated by western thought, is perceived as having a range of implications and responsibilities depending on the cultural and ethnic mixes in the cohorts of learners. And Mr Mercier takes an arguably neutral view on how this impacts on the bicultural dilemma in Ireland (if indeed it is only bicultural) as presented to the participants in MEND for discussion. The paper is attractive in being so agreeably non-confrontational.

Mr Mercier, in aligning himself largely with the distinguished scholarship of Bruno Nettl, succeeds, within the confines of a short but focused paper, in taking the reader through the various steps that define the beginnings, if not also the rationale, parameters and progress of the movement eventually devoted to the promotion of 'musics of the world's cultures' in education.

1. Cultural conquest of the non-western world (from 1800 onwards) exposed its music to western (largely European and North American) influences. But there was increasing interaction. The discipline of ethnomusicology, initially a phenomenon of western scholarship, emerged tentatively from the 1880s.

2. Music was regarded as potentially evolutionary, with western music as the most sophisticated and developed, and almost all other musics as stable/static, traditional, oral, old, anonymous and unchanging. Music as process was not recognized as having the significance that it now enjoys. The categorizations of music as primitive, folk, popular and art came into circulation and are still with us as a dilemma in education. No threat to the absolute supremacy of western art music would have been perceived at that stage. Literacy, the idea of melody supported by harmony with a somewhat subordinate role for rhythm, the tenets of Romanticism and post-Romanticism in Europe . . . these ideas defined the hierarchy without challenge, disenfranchising other musics, entrenching in western thought the idea of 'otherness'. There is another dichotomy being consolidated here - one which separates western culture, its offshoots and related folk music (popular western music [which is a separate culture], Afro-American music and folk music with related tonalities) from the more exotic musics that do not fit into such a category (notably the tribal music of Africa and much Asian music).

3. The phenomenon of interaction between world musics and western ideas was recognized from 1970 onwards as truly bilateral and significant. The dynamic nature of the process and its essential creativity introduced new strains, which precipitated the authenticity paradox, 'generating discussion on primary, secondary and other musics'. It also modified the ethnomusicological view as to stasis in non-western music, thereby apparently making it more interesting and more worthy of a democratic place in the matrix of musical discourse.

Mr Mercier suggests that by analysis of the spectrum of Irish traditional music, its cultural influences and interpretative nuances, we can reach a better understanding of the otherness of world musics, leading eventually to a reduction in mutual alienation. He leads us to a consideration of non-western music, with an openness to appreciate its strengths in improvisation, often using single melodic and rhythmic lines in a creative way which simultaneously celebrates the ideas of 'a vital, mutating organism. . . . an act of preservation and creation, both artefact and process' - a holistic claim.

Mr Mercier's elegant exposé is clinically detached from the workings of the music education dispensation in Ireland but, in the overall analysis of MEND, it has its undoubted uses, by anticipation, so to speak. It takes us part, but not all, of the way to an understanding of how the hyper-sophisticated discipline of ethnomusicology has empowered and driven an evolution which has popularized, in general as opposed to higher education, the idea of manifold exposure to music of the world's cultures. Awareness, scholarly interest, acceptance and democratic recognition (as against autocratic dismissal) are one part of the scenario; indiscriminate imposition, in an ambience of endemic curricular overload, or even supplantation of traditional (art) models by other musics (Professor White's equally legitimate concern) is quite another. Technology has shrunk the world and opened a window on the bewildering variety, *inter alia*, of human musical discourse. The management, not so much of the access of interested learners to the expanded palette of musical experience, but of the controlled access of these experiences, through the agency of educators, to the time, aural and mental space of learners is a claustrophobic problem in education which demands serious appraisal. There are, of course, versions and hybrids of the phenomenon that merit consideration in specific cases; the question that MEND raises is how these contexts fit the Irish case. Although Mr Mercier does not enter this arena, his paper provides a valuable introduction to the further varied consideration of this problem undertaken at MEND by a representative cross-section of educators committed to its resolution. Recommendations will accrue in considering the other papers.

Ref. I P/D N See Document 120 in Proceedings

Irish Traditional Music in Education
Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick)

Professor Ó Súilleabháin's paper must be seen in this culminatory (post-MEND III) review as incomplete in the context of the clarification of his ideas expected from the Phase III paper, for which he had, in the event, to substitute other material. He is a natural orator and characteristically, in relation to the music which he espouses, he seems most at ease in a highly imaginative and creative style of 'on the wing' rhetoric, in the delivery of which he is a virtuoso. In spite of the fact that his hard-copy paper, which was a drastic condensation of the ideas he expressed, and was a *third* attempt, so to speak, it raises many issues which, it is felt, would be authoritatively challenged in any bilateral engagement. That is not to say that Dr Ó Súilleabháin's paper is not brimming with fertile ideas; it may very well be that he intended to be provocative, which would also be in character, since he owns that some of his methods in education have been subversive in the sense of seeking to effect a much-needed redress of imbalance and 'red-tape' in educational thinking at third level. The tone of his lecture may be judged from his claim that 'while traditional music has suffered in the past, it is well capable of "doing unto others what was done unto you" - in the best sense of post-colonialism', though, in fairness to him, his invited response to the challenge of the integration of traditional music within the school system comes with due gravitas.

Professor Ó Súilleabháin is scrupulous about definition and his justification of the term *traditional* to mean precisely what the current debate was about was a promising and convincing start as emphasizing its oracy or non-literacy, thereby exposing immediately one of the dissonances between it and the norms of music education according to western cultural ideas. Less promising is his frontal attack on the primacy of music literacy as a false foundation for music education and the irrelevance of music notation in the performance of traditional music. It is as if he anticipates intractability rather than compromise. If musical discourse is to be broadened in education, as is envisaged in this exercise (MEND), it is as honest and ultimately fruitful to admit that literacy can be as disabling, in certain circumstances, to free creativity and interpretation as that non-literacy or illiteracy (a fine distinction) can be inhibiting to potentially unlimited repertoire expansion. That integrated music education should be thought of as favouring one or the other is not a helpful stance. After all the idea is not to impose traditional music, with its unassailable canons, on formal education, but to cross-fertilize two mentalities in a way which would encourage eclecticism. It seems reasonable to suggest, from the young learner's stance, that the literacy/non-literacy dichotomy is just an artificial barrier

that is ripe for deconstruction. If 'there is a very real danger that something spontaneous in the music will come under threat' it seems a stiff price to pay for preserving the *status quo* in addition to being very unflattering to the expressive potential of musicians outside the traditional scene. Dr Ó Súilleabháin is much more convincing when he cites the advantages of integration in 'higher student motivation, increased levels of musical creativity, and a marked increase in the relevance of "school music" to music outside the school walls', the latter being a commanding aspiration in contemporary music education psychology.

The traditional music culture, as it currently exists, is sharply divided on the question of authenticity. The critics of crossover forms are loud in their denunciation, especially in relation to commercial success, but their arguments ultimately seem specious and non-progressive. Although both Professors Ó Súilleabháin and Santos (*qv* - Ref. II P vi) are very much involved, as scholars and composers, in the promotion of cross-over forms, the arguments put forward by both, but particularly comprehensively by Ramon Santos, are compelling in dismissing the authenticity coterie as intrinsically sham. It is hardly a dissonance that should be imported into school music as an identified dichotomizing agent. Professor Ó Súilleabháin's summary that 'the "problem" can be turned to educational advantage by helping the student to focus attention on the idea and process of change within oral music' is positive

Dr Ó Súilleabháin offers little more than token approval or justification for the benefits of exposure of the school-going cohorts to music from other cultures. And he is inconclusive too on methods of practical teaching, validation of the teaching resource and the assessment of the outcomes. These are problems that would loom large in any integration programme. Judging from Dr Veblen's findings (Ref. II P vi)[109] the acquisition of performing skills in traditional music is no less dependent on the one-to-one mode of transmission than it is in so-called classical teaching. It is also notable that in spite of the community base there seems to be just as much cleavage between those who perform and those who just listen, the community idea deriving its attraction from the social quality of and involvement in the music; this can be characteristic of much ethnic music, though this may be an over-simplification. However the willing participation of audience purely as a celebration of the listening function is not to be disavowed in education; this is one of the most hotly-contested issues within the manifold operation of the MEND initiative and its reported sequels.

The section entitled Music, Musicology and Traditional Music in Ireland is difficult to relate to the more disciplined identification of the problems of integration which preceded it. The menacing attack (repeated verbatim at Phase III) on musicology as a discipline and the fist-shaking at institutions that 'can kill off the thing they seek to recognize by denying the source of music within the individual' seems somewhat incontinent and unfairly aimed in the absence of substantiation. It may be powerfully rhetorical to claim that 'music and musicology are not of equal significance. 'Music can exist without musicology. Musicology cannot exist without music'. To belittle the 'intelligencers of music' does not advance the cause of music one whit, nor can it be claimed that without them music would fare as well. We are not, as music educators, concerned with the mere *existence* of music but with its advancement in expressive and interpretative possibilities. Professor Ó Súilleabháin's outburst is from the heart, but, it seems, not from the head; it points up one of the fundamental findings of MEND - that we need a better mutual understanding and respect between the academic and practical streams of music educators. If it is as insecure as Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin, a true practico-academic educator, makes it sound, there is work to be done to modify such unnecessary and counter-productive attitudes. We are all aware of the stifling effects of unimaginative teaching and policies; so-called classical pedagogy has no monopoly in this respect. Dr Ó Súilleabháin, in his peroration, argues, as a pretender, against the implicit hierarchy which sets western art music on a precarious pinnacle. It is interesting that Professor White (as the '*bête noire'* musicologist – Ref. III P viii), not surprisingly, is worried about the same ascendancy, explicitly from the counterposition - the new-born threat to western art music in policies and attitudes in Irish (though not specifically

[109] The topic is engaged also in Marie McCarthy, *Passing It On: The Transmission of Music in Irish Culture* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1999)

traditional) music education. It is the writer's view that the comprehensive functions of the many warring factions are so different (and not just the music itself, as Harry White claims) that the argument seems futile and unproductive. One cannot compare the Eroica Symphony with a simple folk song, nor would the exercise prove anything about the intrinsic value of either or its power to reach the heart or the mind in propitious circumstances. In terms of MEND and its aspiration for Irish music education the principle of local democracy is being advanced in which the worth of each genre is being respected as a vital contribution to the educational store of every Irish child. There is little doubt that Professor Ó Súilleabháin will be in the forefront in defending his corner and that, in the context of the gratuitous invitation extended by MEND, he is assured not just of a fair hearing but of a sympathetic one too.

Ref. I D iiic See Document 159 in Proceedings

The Rôle of National Music and its Potential Multicultural Extensions.

Chair: Mr Seán Creamer (former Dept of Education Inspector)
Reporter: Ms Siobhán Kilkelly (DIT)

This was another example of succinct reporting. As an anticipation of some of the problems that might confront Professor Ó Súilleabháin in his presentation some three weeks later this was a highly focused discussion which raised and commented constructively on a number key issues, putting down clear markers for any unified and concerted effort to bridge the gap between community and school in relation to the inculcation of a healthy interest in traditional music, eventually across the spectrum of formal education. Nor were the associated difficulties played down or gainsaid.

The potential advantages of traditional music in education were identified:

1. A corpus of music that has vitality, individuality and an adaptability which could marry notions of authenticity with openness to fructifying change as a measure of broadly-based dynamism.

2. A norm in performance which, in formal education, could have transitional benefits in encouraging active music-making, a feature in evolving syllabi which is viewed as *difficult*.

The work of Maoin Cheoil an Chláir and of Comhaltas Ceoltóiri Éireann was acknowledged and identified as having key potential in any proposed developments. In particular the fairly recent attempt by Comhaltas Ceoltóiri Éireann to borrow from formal education practices and to set up a means of certifying and standardizing teaching expertise and practices was welcomed.

The difficulties in the way of a systematic development of modes of transmission were constructively confronted. They are:

1. The differences between the intrinsic oracy/auracy/non-literacy character of traditional music and the norms of formal music education. If the systems were to hybridize, even minimally, *both* would have to adapt to accommodate the newcomer without doing irreparable damage to its basic parameters of transmission. There would be a complementary payoff in sharpening the impact and learning potential of aural experience alongside modified literate method for the traditional modules. **It should be emphasized that the introduction of traditional music to formal education is not seen as superannuating or supplanting its community base for those who might wish to specialize or supplement their skills.**

2. The current and curious absence of a central policy for the promotion of national culture in school music education. A typical result of this is the unpredictability of a good experience in school simply because, at the moment, such exposures are at the discretion of the teacher, and dependent on the expertise, however minimal, of individuals.

3. Access to suitable materials is not easy. This was attributed variously to policies of non-sponsorship (Bradshaw); suitable publications being out of print (Ó hEeidhin); poor PR (An Gúm); insufficient research-based publications (although the Bradshaw experience, which is a recurring theme in MEND Phase I debates, raises questions as to attractiveness of this as a research topic if coupled to any hope of a lucrative sequel); the absence of a suitably dedicated textbook for schools.

4. Overloaded curricula. This difficulty is as applicable to the classroom situation in schools as it is, even more fundamentally, to teacher training, and is again exacerbated by the shortage of suitable materials.

5. The absence of a research base to underpin education at all levels. The need to work towards an option or specialism in traditional music at third-level and towards the creation of a base cohort of *bi*cultural graduates was highlighted. It is remarkable that Professor Ó Súilleabháin took up this very point (bicultural expertise), confirming that this prerequisite is now being actively addressed, especially in the post-graduate area. (See also the counter-arguments to David Elliott's claim that 'no musical practice is inherently better than any other'. This theme is developed copiously throughout all of the Elliott analysis. See under Contextual Philosophy Section 18.1.2)

The debate ended, as it began, in a constructive way, by re-emphasizing four crucial elements which need more focused attention if a campaign to familiarize the general education cohorts with values imported from traditional music is to be worthwhile. They are:

1. Better communication between interested groups.

2. Better physical resources.

3. The development of a relevant research base.

4. The active promotion of pilot schemes to test educational strategies.

Ref. II P ii See Document 202 in Proceedings

Irish Music Education and Irish Identity: A Concept Revisited
Dr Marie McCarthy (Associate Professor, Dept of Music Education, The University of Maryland [USA] at College Park)

Professor McCarthy's contribution to MEND at both Phases II and III had a pivotal significance, as has already been stated, not only in relation to her secure interactions with and highly respected contribution to the music education endeavours of 'this global village we live in', but in adding a distinguished voice to the debate and indeed an essential one - that of the diaspora. Her paper on Music and the Irish Identity was exhaustively reviewed in the Interim Report of MEND Phase II (*qv*). The substance of the paper is suffused with passion and urgency; it seems reprehensible to proceed from paraphrase to further condensation but the substantive message must be extracted.

Looming menacingly over Dr McCarthy's idealism and subtle agenda is the searching question and the doubt as to how valid it is to make any sanguine correlation - either as to contemporary ideas of

Irish identity being *musically* conditioned at all[110] or as to how far 'music education, while [being] culturally determined, is also determining' it. Perhaps that is the real problem she feels she is addressing. Both of Dr McCarthy's papers were rich in strategic suggestions for amelioration. But it is not always clear as to whether she is playing down the influences of western art and popular musics (in other words the high/mass cleavage) as contributing to the "wealth of Irish musical heritage'. After all Harry White (Ref. I P viii) comments on 'the fragile presence of western art music', at best, and 'an emphatic repudiation', at worst. But she is surely right when she borrows from the 1987 White Paper (*Access and Opportunity)* in stating that indeed 'the education system holds the key to future cultural and artistic development in Ireland'. This reliance on formal education as the basic building block, albeit conceptually externally collaborative in scope, is her basic premise, as indeed it is enshrined in the MEND rationale. Of particular value, as stressing the urgency of current concerns, is her concise encapsulation of their essence in the burning questions she poses:

> Now that those powerful [political and religious] agendas are no longer central to the mission of music in the schools, what has replaced them? . . . What pedagogical strategies and organization will be most appropriate for accommodating the two main streams of Irish music heritage - literacy-based art music and orally transmitted traditional music? Is this effort to develop bi-muscality enough? Is there a need, or indeed an obligation, to introduce students to musics beyond the national frontier?

Marie McCarthy impresses as a committed but broad-minded multiculturalist (in its generic meaning) as indeed she was right in identifying a certain ambiguity of definition in the MEND Phase I Report in this regard; the definition of what *Irish* music is, it seems, is forever to be obfuscated. She implies a strategy of multiple cross-fertilization when she speaks of *reconciliation* with the past by drawing on idioms from the rich Irish musical heritage (biculturalism), and of *interfacing* by incorporation of new sounds from abroad into indigenous traditions (multiculturalism).

In an interesting correlation with other contributions to MEND (especially those of Professors Ó Súilleabháin [Ref. I P/D N] and White [Ref. I P viii]) she notes the anachronism of musicological research in Ireland trailing music education practice, but she values the former for its 'vital connection to music education' and sees its late-come contributions as being crucial to the task of successful hybridization into an *interim* biculturalism - the task currently in hand. Above all Dr McCarthy believes that 'to know anything . . . we must know its effects. . . . To judge rightly of the present we must oppose it to the past,'[111] and recommends that negative perceptions from the past must now be superannuated in a new dispensation. These include the notion of music as being difficult (this cropped up several times in the debates at Phase I (Ref. I D iiia), the outmoded politico-religious agenda, and the spurious theory of musical dichotomy.[112]

Again and again Dr McCarthy returns to her 'assumption that the music education process is in some way related to the construction of Irishness, of an Irish identity, of a unique way of being, of a sense of self in the world'. This agenda establishes another crucial connection to that of MEND itself, in stressing the contextual philosophical approach to music education.[113] Her argument evolves from consideration of the 'uniqueness of each educational biography, as an individual story in the narrative of the nation', to the desirability of a two dimensional educational profile in which 'a vertical dimension focuses on Irish musical heritage, reconciling past and present - and a horizontal dimension . . . focuses on interfacing the local with the global.'

---

[110] Harry White is quoted in Dr McCarthy's paper as saying that "Music does not form much (if any) part of the vigorous discourse which preoccupies thinkers in their assessments of the condition of being Irish and of Ireland"

[111] Samuel Johnson The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia (1759), ch. xxx

[112] Janácek said 'there is no such thing as tone-deafness . . . only trained and untrained ears"

[113] See Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a universal philosophy of music education?*, (International Journal of Music Education Number 29 1997) pp 4-20

Again, without defining unambiguously the musical content of the educational model she inexorably constructs (though it is assumed to be as inclusive as the opportunity of the moment accommodates), Dr McCarthy proceeds to suggest how collaborations between *music* schools (assuming, somewhat prematurely, that they exist!) and community can enable children to develop a *sense of place* by experiencing the wealth of local musical traditions. She goes on to propose that such collaborations should extend to fructifying liaisons between music schools and general schools. This leads her to the core requirement of her rationale (repeated at MEND III) that there should first be an interface between school music and music in Irish culture, reaching out to community perceptions as capable of influencing the development of suitable curricula. Here Dr McCarthy constructively touches the nerve centre of contemporary global music education sensitivities when she asserts that 'music in Irish education will best serve the country when there is a vital, ongoing symbiotic relationship between what students experience in school and what they experience in the socio-cultural context that frames their identity". There can no longer be any doubt that she is magnanimously enfranchising all musics in believing 'that a reconciliation of all definitions [*of Irish music* - writer's italic insertion] is necessary when planning a music curriculum for Irish schools. It may be conceived in terms of balancing music from our heritage with the music of contemporary Ireland, thus illustrating the evolution of various traditions'. And the evolution leads to a resplendent conclusion when this music of the primary culture reaches the mature stage of being capable of engaging with and making meaning of distant musical traditions in a mutually fructifying way. And all of this is unexceptionable when viewed against a sliding scale of multiculturalism where 'the rationale for multicultural music education will differ from one country to another'. And the argument is not invalidated by western art music being considered, in an Irish context, as belonging simply and naturally to a local and national dispensation or to the related musics of Europe. Marie McCarthy's plan is flexible and seems to be defining the phased 'challenge of accommodating and transmitting various streams of Irish music education (biculturalism) as the primary concern and goal of contemporary efforts but . . . not to the exclusion of the other rich traditions of this global village we live in'.

A whole system of general music education, in harmony with the efforts of specialism (as, for example, performance), is carefully laid out in this important contribution to MEND. It was only in the rereading and close analysis of this paper at the post-MEND Phase III stage that its significance as a basis for truly innovative curriculum development was fully appreciated. In a multicultural sense - its ultimate efflorescence - it adumbrates the endorsement of Professor Shehan Campbell at Phase III (Ref. III P v).

Ref. II P vi See Document 206 in Proceedings

Children of Ireland, Children of the World: Appropriate Music Curriculum for Ireland in the 21st Century.
Dr Kari Veblen (Commission on Community Music, International Society for Music Education)

The features constituting the main thrust of Dr Veblen's thesis were extracted in the original review, which appeared in the Interim Report of MEND Phase II. Since Prof. Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin's follow-up documented strategy for the enhanced insinuation of traditional music into the school experience of Irish children is still pending it seems unfair to try to anticipate it as a model against which to judge Dr Veblen's vision. And to do justice to the intrinsic freshness and unprejudiced delvings of her doctoral work it would be unreasonable to expect the same depth of treatment which should characterize the outcome from his massively informed personal database. But Dr Veblen made some interesting observations which must resonate within the nexus of problems to be confronted if a successful, if not somewhat painful, transition is to be made by which the school experience of Irish children will be enriched biculturally without undue loss of the distinctiveness which characerizes the components of that biculturalism.

Dr Veblen's advocacy list for greater insinuation of traditional music into Irish education may be taken as axiomatic and compelling, while raising the question as to why it has not been more

persuasive, before now, in the realities of educational strategic thinking. She makes a number of observations, in relation to traditional music, that may have interesting correlations:

1. Traditional music currently resides with the subset (Dr Veblen's terminology) of music makers in the community.

2. It is not officially part of the school system.

3. It offers an intriguing model of successful music teaching and learning practices.

4. It is performance-based.

5. It belongs within a rapidly evolving scenario.

6. It has relied heavily and volitionally on one-to-one interaction.

7. If Dr Veblen's interviewees are to be taken on their face value, the community modes of transmission in a pedagogical sense have been even less related to organized interactions as to the occasionally happy but rare consequences of a combination of natural talent, hit-and miss, trial and error.

8. The one-to-one mode of transmission was/is sometimes boosted by a monitorial system, redolent of 19the century primary education.

9. Authentic traditional practices seem to define a real dichotomy where masters and persistent (talented) apprentices form a small cohort, while audience forms the larger. This raises genuine concerns in post-modern philosophical terms where experiential performance *for all* is a desirable goal.

10. The social dimension of the genre is important. This is a double-edged tool which empowers traditional music either to bridge the gap between school and the community or to metamorphose with some loss of its individuality, identity, separateness and otherness, qualities that are currently intrinsic and value-laden.

11. Memory and ear *training* [Dr Veblen's word] are emphasized in transmission. The music is 'picked up' and there is an implication that there is/was a guru system jealously guarding personal collections, though, of course (as Dr Veblen notes), these practices have had to yield to an openness thrust upon them by modern technology.

12. The boundaries, 'situatedness' or location of the repertoire have crumbled with the growth and pervasiveness of audio-technology. This is generally welcomed.

13. The music is non-literacy based, though there is a detectable tendency for the more commercial teaching to favour some kind of notation as a mnemonic. The writer is of the opinion that the potential of notation, over the broadest spectrum, is not lost on the proponents of traditional music; the issue would be one of those to subside in a school ambience and acquiesce in the benefits of formal education.

14. For most the music is presented in a pedagogically rudimentary way. The skills and professionalism of teachers rely, for both teachers and learners, on chance; there seems to be no corpus of agreed methodology. As Dr Veblen's quaint euphemism puts it: 'Tunes are a vehicle for learning about the music. Unlike other systems, there are no scales, exercises, practice pieces. Technique and repertoire are seemingly inseparable'.

15. Virtuosity in the genre seems less related to pyrotechnics than to the value placed on the intuitive, expressive, sometimes ornamental mode of delivery, which seems capable of

communicating strongly to afficionados. The instinct for musicality in the culture bearers is very strong.

16. The network of support for the genre is currently still largely informal.

17. The successful campaign, from the 1950s onwards, to 'save the music', has been at the price of some change to the music itself. The authenticity dichotomy has developed along several axes. (See also Santos -Ref. II P vii – for a convincing perspective on this dilemma).

18. The benefits of technology have, in general, been welcomed as opening the genre to a dramatically widened listenership and participation. Simultaneously, not unexpectedly, and not without a hint of truth as to significant incidental losses in an evolving culture, some culture-bearers lament the passing of the old order. Dr Veblen recorded one such perceptive gem from the late Denis O'Brien: 'Before . . . they picked up the music by the fire, from house to house and it was more a part of what they were. . . . It's gotten now in a classroom . . . and I don't think it's appreciated in the same way. It's now a *skill* [writer's italics]. It's not a musical heritage anymore. "Is it difficult"?; "Can I do it"?; "Is it a tune I like to play"? That's where it starts and ends'

These are the inferences from Dr Veblen's presentation and they offer a formidable challenge to Professor Ó Súilleabháin's ingenuity in fashioning a framework within which the musical biculturalism of Ireland can comfortably adapt educationally in the resolution of dissonances which, in an art such as music, are accepted as being both endemic and, it is to be hoped, manageable. And Dr Veblen's *Model for Irish Music Education*, presumably a bicultural one, is structured as a framework of questions which might well be urged on Professor Ó Súilleabháin as a basis for his response.

Ref. II P vii See Document 207 in Proceedings

Perspectives on Music(s), Culture, and Tradition with Special Reference to Contemporary Music Education.
Dr Ramon Santos (Professor of Composition, Theory and Musicology at the University of the Philippines)

Dr Santos constructs a broadly-based world of music which is truly diverse, benign and placatory; he is a committed nationalist too, but in a non-aggressive sense. And as a multiculturalist he takes a comprehensive view which is additionally interesting because he comes from a non-western culture, the only major participant in MEND to do so; he views multiculturalism as a reactionary post-colonial phenomenon which has a significantly conservationist brief. Dr Santos's lecture should be read in conjunction with the contributions of Professors McCarthy (Ref. II P ii) and Shehan Campbell (Ref. III P v) to which it is complementary. His paper is reviewed in the Interim Report of Phase II but it has additional relevance as a post-MEND III reading; it raises questions about and provides some useful clarification of basic concepts which, the writer believes, will assist Professor Ó Súilleabháin's deliberations. They are itemized below and should be considered separately.

1. Multiculturalism is an outgrowth of ethnomusicology which itself had its origins in the expanding scholarship of the western art music tradition. It is thus, paradoxically, a phenomenon within western art, towards which it seems, nevertheless, to act in a threatening role. At root it is less concerned with the overt cross-fertilization of musical cultures than with the recognition in the first place of the diversity, character and value of other musics. From a non-western viewpoint, however, multiculturalism is seen as mitigating the destructive self-interest of so-called Eurocentricity by retrieving many threatened genres from implanted perceptions of unworthiness, from neglect and even from extinction. The hybridization of forms and styles, a feature of multiculturalism, and

its potential into the future must be viewed as one of the most powerful forces in musical discourse. This has important resonances for the Irish context.

2. Multiculturalism is a developing phenomenon which still harbours certain ambiguities. The ethnomusicologically approximate classification into primitive, folk, popular and art music is imprecise as there are so many crossovers. The insinuation into education of 'musics of the world's cultures' is also a problematic and shifting aspiration as to whether it includes only ethnic musics. And how is ethnic music defined? Is it the same as folk music and to what extent can it accommodate hybridization without losing its innate ethnicity?

3. Is multiculturalism as a reaction to colonialism and as a nationalistic emblem a positive force in music and in music education? In other words, is music in a functional political an-aesthetic sense compatible with the more idealistic aims of education and does it really matter if it is not? David Elliott's views should be compared here.

4. Note Dr Santos's scholarly and carefully-worded version of the shibboleth of 'no musical practice [being] inherently better than any other' is a model of non-confrontational and discreet diplomatic language. 'It is no longer tenable to impose the artistic valuation of one particular tradition on another. . . . Moreover, the equal regard for the autonomy and the immanent significance of each and every musical tradition suggests a breakdown of attitudinal barriers and prejudices that have been developed and much ingrained during the centuries-old colonial period.' Compare this with the statement in the (unpublished Arts Council) Report *Listening Ears?* (Phelan) which refers to 'recognition of equality across all musical genres' (p12), a considerably less malleable approach, - and with David Elliott's 'No one Music is innately superior to any other' an assertion (see also Ref. I D iiic) which has been hotly debated as to its precise meaning.

5. A multicultural approach can be significant in understanding music by relating it to its cultural context. The functional approach to music is an important component in any universal philosophy of music (see Reimer and the review of his universal philosophy paper - Amsterdam 1996 above). The question for biculturalism is whether Irish music should be valued (in education) for its own sake (intrinsic beauty) or for extrinsic reasons of cultural conservation or political nationalism? Are the two aims always compatible?

6. Ethnomusicology provides an intellectual-artistic impetus to the emancipation of individual traditions from limited definitions and classifications of music based on western artistic experience.

    a. It has redefined a concept of universality in the field of musical experience.

    b. It has underscored the value of each and every individual tradition

    c. It has emphasized the intrinsic relationship of music and culture. The conservative view of tradition as a static socio-cultural property is pitted against a more pragmatic concept of its being a living and ever-changing phenomenon.

    What is the significance of these ethnomusicological clarifications for Irish music and for 'musics of the world's cultures' in education in Ireland?

7. What is perhaps a most important path . . . is to find ways of sustaining practice and growth without losing artistic integrity and spiritual essence in modern society. This line of thinking is intended to eschew ethnocentricity.

8. Pluralism in the musical world should be viewed not just as a source of the total independence of different individual traditions from one another and the enhancement of national identities, but rather as a means of discovering relationships with other people's history and culture.

9. Dynamic relationships have been forged from cross-cultural influences. This applies also to the proliferation and assimilation of European art music into other cultures. Dr Santos suggests four guideline truths to underpin this phenomenon

    a. No musical culture is, or can be, isolated from other cultures.

    b. Musical traditions are partly a result of influences from other cultures.

    c. Individual musical traditions derive their discrete uniqueness from the cultural and the social values and way of life of the people in a community;

    d. Authenticity is an ever-changing phenomenon relative to the dynamics of culture and aesthetic parameters.

    There is much food for thought here in approaching the divisive authenticity debate

10. The inculcation of awareness of a cultural-national identity, through music, is the responsibility of education and is a challenging task

11. Dr Santos takes a very broad view of music literacy as:

    a. The ability to understand a particular musical language or system

    b. The ability to execute as a performer, creator, or both, music according to a particular idiom or style

    c. Knowledge of the technical and theoretical elements of a musical system or systems.

    d. Knowledge of various musical traditions from a musicological and cultural perspective.

    e. The ability to analyse musical styles from a sociological viewpoint.

    There is considerable flexibility in this definition with no hang-ups on the particular function of notation

12. Dr Santos finally offers some underlying principles for multicultural education:

    a. Music cultures should be viewed as not in opposition but as complementary.

    b. A most effective way of gaining musical understanding is through actual performance (see Elliott - Ref. II P viii)

    c. New repertoires will require new skills, new perspectives, new stylistic orientation and new levels of musical understanding.

    d. Musical universality has taken on new meaning, encompassing the uniqueness and discreteness of individual traditions.

It is interesting that Dr Santos's view of multiculturalism seems to envisage its home as being in tertiary education. He sees the idea as issue-laden in the West but gives many examples and philosophical underpinnings in relation to developing and highly successful programmes in the countries of the Pacific Rim, starting from a basis of natural affinities (e.g. geographical proximity). At one end of the ideological spectrum these courses reflect the internal goals of preservation of traditional cultures, the cultivation of cultural identity, nationalism and emancipation from foreign colonialism; at the other there is a societal and cultural need felt for a diversity which accommodates indigenous, western and neighbouring cultures - a most utilitarian and rational view of the practicalities of multiculturalism. It is important to emphasize, however, that the views expressed point towards third-level education as the focal point of the multicultural movement, whatever about any eventual plan to insinuate the massive corpus of the music itself, even selectively, into general education at lower levels.

Ref. II D iiia See Document 257 in Proceedings

Traditional Music and Formal Education

Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin
Reporter: Odhrán Ó'Casaide
Panel: (Prof. Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin); Prof. Ramon Santos; Dr Kari Veblen

The presence of Professors Ó Súilleabháin and Santos, and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Dr Veblen, as panel members resulted in a significant amount of duplication in the treatment of the subject matter since they were the main contributors to the debate and were both presenters at Phase II of MEND (See Ó Súilleabháin/Santos/Veblen – Refs. I P/D N; II P vii; II P vi). However the progress of the debate was faithfully recorded by Odhrán O Casaide, who found much stimulating material in what was on offer.

Most of the discussion centred around the issue of 'authenticity and change' and the effect of this separate somewhat stormy debate on the prospects for a stable input of traditional music, if it is decided to insinuate it more thoroughly into the formal education system in Ireland. This would be a crucial concern in the choice of teaching materials. We were fortunate in having had Professor Santos, whose expertise was ideally suited to the treatment of this issue. In fact this was one of the first questions raised - the nature and value of authenticity. Professor Santos took a very pragmatic and tolerant view of departures or variants from what are regarded, in coterie circles, sometimes on somewhat flimsy evidence or on a kind of gerrymandering operation, as a pure strain transmitted orally and frozen into a kind of time capsule which precludes any changes, least of all rearrangements which introduce instrumentation which does not correspond with understandings of how the music was performed at its chronological source. Professor Santos claimed that the survival of the music depends on continuity of performance and transmission and this must accommodate elements of stability *and* change if the culture is to be dynamic and the performance is to retain elements of creativity, whether in interpretative detail or in the choice of sonority, which need not be diminished in effect or dynamism by choice of instrument or instrumentation. Dr Veblen cited the current global popularity of Irish traditional music and its robustness to withstand change without losing its integrity, character and even 'authenticity', if the latter quality is considered to be valid as a protean element in itself, which cannot be fixed in time, except for reasons that have less relevance and urgency than the overriding consideration of keeping the music alive and available to the widest audience.

A somewhat tenuous and arguably peripheral discussion took place on the question of the relationship between language and traditional music in Ireland. While admitting that language and music intersect, obviously in the accents, metre and intonation used in singing, Professor Ó Súilleabháin felt that the survival of the music, about which there is considerable optimism, is not dependent on the fate of the language.

The discussion reverted to the authenticity issue in relation to the use of non-indigenous instruments. Again Professor Santos gave priority to the music itself, as far as it can be considered in isolation from the instrumentation used in its performance. He believes that the phenomenon of adapting music to the availability of instruments and even to the taste of performer/listener is a totally natural process which respects the integrity of the genre and can therefore be claimed to have authenticity, especially as much enthusiastically received traditional music has gone through many metamorphoses which serve to underline its robustness to withstand change without losing its character. This is the criterion which should be invoked, and which is unnecessary as the survival of the music is itself a telling self-justification.

Professor Ó Súilleabháin, in relation to the future of traditional music and its possible merging into the stream of education to partner and cross-fertilise the long-established pedagogy and methodology associated with western art music, drew attention to the emergence of a new type of artist - the bi-musical (bicultural) musician - who can play a significant role in the formulation of a music curriculum that can accommodate both traditions without unduly sacrificing any of the features that contribute to a widening of musical experience and skill base. It was only at this point that a passing reference was made to the issue of literacy (as against oracy) but it was not developed.

Recommendation

1. The question of authenticity is a non-issue in traditional music and should not be allowed to cause unnecessary divisions amongst educators concerned with the enhancement of the status of traditional music or the choice of repertoire used in the school experience.

Ref. III P v See Document 305 in Proceedings

Music, the Universal Language: A Multiculturalist's Perspective
Patricia Shehan Campbell, Professor of Music, The University of Washington (Seattle)

It has already been stated that there was hope that presentations invited for Phase III of MEND (based on the evolutionary nuance of the agenda, which in turn was the product of clarification from the earlier phases) would point toward a more sure-footed approach to contextualized music education in Ireland . . . that solutions to identified probes would begin to come into view. The ascendancy of the school music programme and the national curriculum as the prime and indispensable enabler was not only assumed as an immutable value before MEND began; it was authentically handed down from the underlying ethos of the *Deaf Ears?* Report and was never challenged during MEND. Furthermore it emerged from Phases I and II of MEND that the very understanding of music education, for better or worse, in a western society is one in which western music of high culture dominates. This fact is, paradoxically, both covert and self-evident, simply because it is music of the western tradition that is constantly under attack; the arguments are insidious in parading an allegiance to a presumed morally-superior stance, namely that of gravitation towards a democracy of musical values, in which all musics have equal claim on the attentions of teachers and learners. The defence of western values, which it is likely that nobody wishes to dispense with anyway, is weakened by a prevalent subconscious but flawed assumption that because they were imposed by an educational tradition perceived by some as outmoded and despotic, they are also somehow vulnerable as to their continuing suitability as a paradigm. The greater accessibility to 'other' musics, a double-edged characteristic of this technological age, completes a *mise-en-scene* which forms the background to this state-of-the-art conflict. But it is difficult to see how radical change can come about in a short time, even if the will to act is strong and convincingly supported with an impeccable rationale. The topic is provocatively treated *en route* in Professor White's paper. But it is also thrown into sharp relief, and in a different context, by the attempt during MEND to establish a plausible, if arguably interim, position for Ireland in dealing with the specific problem of balancing, or even justifying, its currently unstable bicultural

educational ethos against a persuasive siege by the multiculturalists and supporters of 'musics of the world's cultures' in education. This is not to dismiss any of these implied approaches as inherently invalid but to signal that conflict is afoot (and dissension is not unhealthy), or rather that there is competition for the straitened time slot available for music, and for students too, in the curriculum. Professor Shehan Campbell steps into this breach with a paper which makes no apology for championing the right of world music to be *blended* into the curriculum, without usurping it; this is perhaps how her persuasiveness might best be defined and applauded.

Patricia Shehan Campbell is no ordinary multiculturalist. In Sir Frank Callaway's keynote address at MEND one line in the genealogy of the discipline of ethnomusicology/social anthropology is traced from Percy Grainger, through the UNESCO/ISME route to John Blacking, through the mediation of Sir Frank Callaway himself. Dr Shehan Campbell has inherited that mantle by invitation.[114] Her approach is immediately attractive because it is so intentionally philanthropic, but it begs many questions which turn on fundamental concepts in the philosophy of music education - ultimately a key issue in MEND. If we follow Paul Lehman's line of reasoning, the *context* of a philosophy will hang on what it is we want learners to absorb and why it is important; presumably the *intrinsic* benefits of music education should rank high in reaching decisions. The *pragmatism* of the philosphy, on the other hand, will look to resources, human and fiscal. It is possible to fabricate from this base a series of questions to test the applicability of a world music approach to general music education in any constituency. Professor Shehan Campbell is herself not always decisive (and she is never aggressive) in her stance, understandably because she is dealing with an approach which is still evolving.

1. Should a world music programme be a response to the presence of a significant racial or ethnic mix in particular educational environments or is it motivated by the pure philanthropic desire to share experiences?

2. Professor Shehan Campbell states that 'as we might expect, ethnomusicologists are supportive of the presence of musics of the world's culture in the curriculum.' But may we assume that the scholarship of ethnomusicology/social anthropology is educationally driven in a school-music context in the first place? If not, it is a case of contrived prioritization.

3. If the absorption of the deepest significance of musical experience is 'processual' (Dr Shehan Campbell's word) and therefore time-dependent for 'maximal experience', is this not a powerfully persuasive argument against superficial exposure to many musics, most of which will, by definition, be foreign to most of the learners, most of the time, in any educational environment? Isn't the basic aspiration of the world music programme too idealistic for low density learning situations, such as that within a general school programme?

4. Unfashionable as it may seem to pose the question, isn't the equal merit of all musics a difficult concept to defend if intrinsic artistic value is a criterion. Parity of esteem and parity of accessibility, yes, ... but undiscriminating equality of artistic worth (which is sometimes implicit and persistent in non-western approaches) is an impossible premise since like is not always being compared with like in terms of function, craft, development, scale, resources, skill base, curricular suitability etc. Professor Shehan Campbell has understandable reservations about Bennett Reimer's out-of-context exhortation to '[S]tudy nothing but the monuments of musical literature', and stoutly defends her position when invoking music as a representation of the spirit of a nation - a characteristic world music concept. But valuing and judgement must have a presence too

[114] It is known that during MEND Phase III Sir Frank Callaway negotiated with the widow of the late John Blacking to have all his papers donated to the Callaway International Research Centre for Music Education (CIRCME) at the University of Western Australia in Perth. Patricia Shehan Campbell was invited to process that material. She is therefore regarded as a highly significant figure in her field.

and the ascendancy of teacher knowledge and experience must be recognized and validly applied to the context. It seems obvious that the contexts of world music pedagogy and 'music education as aesthetic education' (MEAE) differ greatly. Thus Patricia Shehan Campbell's presentation gratuitously highlights the importance of contextual philosophy and this is a significant outcome of MEND. Valuing and judgement presume the general availability of high levels of expertise in teachers. If this is considered in the context of non-specialist teachers being the norm, the situation becomes untenable. There is also a tendency for world music approaches to focus on extrinsic values, such as tolerance, empathizing etc.; can this be accommodated as a prime driving concern in the limited time available to music as a subject in schools? It seems that the missionary zeal to have 'musical and cultural democracy at play within the curriculum' could be demanding too much of the participants in its processes.

5. How is a balance struck between the claim that the quest for authenticity is a non-issue (See Santos - Ref. II P vii) and the pursuit of 'imitative authenticity' by learners at the expense of hiring culture-bearers to define and illustrate it? On this and other issues isn't the world music curriculum expensive to service and resource?

6. Dr Shehan Campbell stresses the pre-eminence of skills, knowledge and time (and presumably she is referring to teachers and learners in the correct relativity) in the successful delivery of a world music programme. How is this reconciled with the rival demands in an overloaded curriculum with time limitations? Again the ministry and expense of very sophisticated (specialist) teaching is implied.

7. There is no reason to suppose that the processes of socio-political and economic internationalization should have a correlation in the choice of musical partners in a world music educational context, unless it is assumed that all musics are equally accessible and artistically suitable. And it is not clear how the choices are made in limitation to a smaller number of in-depth studies. Isn't dilution a constant problem with a world music approach? Professor Shehan Campbell seems to favour limitation when she speaks of 'putting in time . . . paying our dues . . . time management [being] an issue'. Isn't this, by definition, though admirably pragmatic, a severe watering down of the basic aspiration of the world music approach?

8. Should the satisfactory insinuation of indigenous biculturalism (the Irish context) where it exists (as distinct from limited multicultural 'immigrant settler' diversity [the US case] or even a full-blown non-prescriptive world music view) take chronological precedence in curricular planning?

9. Isn't an approach through 'high probability universals' a rather theoretical, over-sophisticated limiting methodology with little empirical base as an aid to common or subconscious understandings in learners?

10. Is there a corpus of empirical back-up to support the world music approach as a method in music education?

The Agendas of World Music

The above queries are intended to challenge Professor Shehan Campbell's stance, admirably philanthropic as it is; this is simply because the world music approach is gaining ground and fashionability in so-called first world countries (especially those with substantial multi-ethnic population profiles), the feasibility of its insinuation, without distress, into an already overloaded curriculum needs to be vindicated, and Professor Campbell is the globally-respected figure most likely to have an overview of the problems - and some of the answers too. While it may be unacceptable to be lodged stubbornly and uncritically in a comfortable *status quo*, it is also prudent to test the

credentials and the internal consistency of the novel in education. Let's see how Dr Shehan Campbell approaches the implementation of her thesis.

It seems a faltering start to quote McAllister as saying that 'It's (still) better (for children) to learn anything about other musical cultures than nothing at all' and Nettl as noting that '[S]ome things are worth doing - even when they are not done too well - until, through further study, they can be done better'. Dr Shehan Campbell goes on to treat four of the essential issues in a programme for the adoption of world musics into general education. The first is the question of how the relevant Musical Competence can be gained. It is notable here that although Professor Shehan Campbell underlines, from time to time, her ultimate goal of introducing these musics into the experience of children, she deals with the competences in a third-level context, adding that 'we ought to strive to match the content of teacher education programmes to the expectations of the curriculum and the realities of the classroom' - sound and pragmatic advice, which evinces admirable priorities. But she leaves open the question as to the stage at which world musics should be introduced in schools. Her own enthusiasm for the subject seems to have prevailed in the design of the courses in music education at her own university (where students seem to have a massive mandatory exposure) but one wonders as to how typical this is in American teacher training, or as to the acceptance of her principles by the leadership in music education, whatever about the rank and file, even in America. And the routines, although well supported by culture-bearers, the employment of whom must be perniciously depleting of departmental funding, are still productive of an 'imitative authenticity' only - one of the real dilemmas when a transfer of the routines to schools is the ultimate goal. Professor Shehan Campbell does, however, engage this problem (authenticity) later on and minimizes its significance as an inhibitor in education, as indeed in any other sphere (see also Santos - Ref. II P vii). The alternative ways of gaining competences, which she lists, are all subject to time management and dependent on interest and a sense of the value of such exercises which may not be shared universally. Professor Shehan Campbell's persuasiveness is engaging and attractive here but it is ultimately more idealistic than practical if the expense, alone *inter alia*, of a school-based programme is pondered. In an Irish primary school context it is not promising since

1. Government is not currently supportive of specialism in music teaching in primary schools, and for reasons that are plausibly argued.

2. General class teacher training is already strained beyond its limits in the imparting of basic knowledge and skills, and it is doubtful whether, at this stage, even our limited specialism within the class teacher training programmes could accommodate the kind of concentration, suggested by Dr Shehan Campbell, which is appropriate more to her own highly organized, appropriately endowed, dedicated and comprehensive music specialist training programme.

3. It is manifestly an expensive programme and could not be resourced in the current ambience, to which MEND has drawn constant attention in the matter of calling for resources (in-service and materials) which are culpably scant.

So far we are no further forward than might fit Professor Lehman's warning to beware of reluctance 'to do the things that are possible on the grounds that some things are impossible'; but the acid test is whether these are things we want to do - out of conviction.

In agreement with Professor Santos's treatment of the subject of Authenticity, Professor Shehan Campbell sees it as an artificial barrier to progress in the democratization of music in the sense defined by her as achieving 'parity among the world's musics - a true musical and cultural democracy'. Note the subtlety of phraseology with which she side-steps the issue of qualitative equality among musics - an argument that is unlikely ever to result in universal agreement (see White - Ref. III P viii and Elliott - Ref. II P viii). Indeed on this issue (of authenticity) Professor Shehan Campbell, with copious support from authoritative writers, is totally convincing. Extracting the most telling arguments, first she quotes Bell Yung as claiming that 'musical genres can be traced back far

enough to earlier, often foreign, influences'; he then asks: "Where is one to draw the cut-off line" between the authentic and pure music and the music that has been borrowed, adapted, and accepted as their own by the people of a designated culture? And the professor adds: "Indeed, where?" 'There is no such thing as a static or totally stabilized music'; but, if there were, it would be vulnerable to extinction from its very stasis. It appears that there is an emerging conviction amongst those committed to the sharing of 'musics of the world's cultures' that a narrow view of authenticity, which is the counterposition to the above arguments, is pernicious and destructive of music's natural vitality and its aspiration to evolve, absorb and metamorphose. There is one reservation about Dr Shehan Campbell's case for authenticity being a non-issue; her arguments are ill-at-ease with, at best, the imitative techniques of 'second generation' educators who cannot be admitted legitimately to the company of authentic culture-bearers, whether afficianados of 'pure' or 'adapted' materials. A very telling educational point is made in suggesting that learning to distinguish between 'authentic' and adapted versions of the same material can assist in the aural-training programme.

Professor Shehan Campbell herself has difficulties with the next multicultural issue - that of Representation. Assuming that 'we are persuaded of the importance of providing children with a broader view of music as a human phenomenon', conscientious teachers are confronted with the question of materials and choice, quite apart from availability, and the resource itself is probably less problematic than how best to use it in the context of a specific classroom need. We are presented here with the sheer universality and bewildering scope of music-making as an activity and the various means of its preservation (typically notational and oral-aural), but, we are told, even the specialists in any particular cultural context are slow to make definitive choices as to music that is characteristic and representative as an educational resource. That is cold comfort for the harassed teacher in search of the best materials. It throws the initiative back on the judgmental and valuing skills of individual teachers and presupposes a teacher cohort sophisticated far beyond normal expectations. There are (though not in Ireland at the moment), plenty of textbooks available where these choices are made for the teacher, but it suggests that in multicultural applications there is, on the one hand, a potential plethora of undiscriminated material, while on the other the question of choice is not as clearly guided as in western art music, where scholarly guidelines are much more available and the training itself is so much more geared to the inculcation of strong judgemental powers in matters of quality and style. But it is no indictment of the validity of multiculturalism to state that its pedagogical techniques have far to go. Professor Shehan Campbell's pioneering spirit is to be admired at this stage.

One of the attested benefits of multiculturalism, though it suggests a benefit which is extrinsic in purely musical terms, is its power to break down social and international barriers and to celebrate our humanness as citizens of a global village. Though this is an imponderable, it nevertheless raises the question of Cultural Context and the degree to which music education sessions devoted to world music should 'set the scene' so that students are made aware of the social and cultural implications of the music, if these are essential to an overall understanding. It is this kind of problem that led Professor Colwell (see Colwell – Ref. II P ix) to advise that much of this kind of education should not be a burden on the music class, already typically pressed for time, but should perhaps appear as components in other courses such as history and geography and, in third-level applications, ethnomusicology. This does not, of course, invalidate the case for the inclusion of multiculturalism in education. Professor Shehan Campbell raises the issue but, beyond insisting that the music should constantly be kept in focus as the driving force and primary experience, she does not take up the challenge as to how extrinsic benefits and musical outcomes are to be balanced to produce the desirable artistic result.

It is in her statement of a personal model for multiculturalism in music education that Dr Shehan Campbell defines a notional job-specification. It is idealistic and could not be construed as for the non-specialist; in this sense Dr Shehan Campbell seems locked into a typical American scenario which might be capable of accommodating her model with the help of policy makers committed to the idea of multiculturalism, as she herself is. Since her schemata seem, at best, to fit into a second-level context, because that is where specialist teachers are to be found, the problem of continuity could be troublesome (from a zero primary exposure). But there are two other major obstacles in Ireland. The

first would be to convince second-level educators of its worth sufficiently to send them back to the planning stage to incorporate multicultural elements where they do not already exist in the density or abundance that Professor Shehan Campbell obviously has in mind. The second would be to produce and/or re-train a teaching cohort of such sophistication that it could take up the challenge of enlarging its curricular choices to accommodate the unfamiliar component as a superimposition on a revised curriculum which is currently only in its infancy and already raising problems of content, standards and training. Professor Shehan Campbell's model, carefully laid out in her paper, is nevertheless eminently practical should the emphasis on music education be changed to include a greater if not dominating presence of world musics - an unlikely turnabout since its implications for the balance of the whole curriculum, already painstakingly weighed as to the inclusion of its various elements and the continuity of its phases, would be too great to countenance another review at this stage. Her praxial principles (and they are all practicable in favourable circumstances) are contained in the recommendations below.

Multiculturalism is still an imprecise methodology, requiring much more research input and empirical support than the ethnomusicologists have so far succeeded in mustering to its support. It has its attractions but, as an immediate substitute or a fitting partner for traditional method, it lacks the scholarship and pedagogical sophistication which has characterized the old system by sheer weight of years. With a world shrinking under the benign influences of technology and ease of travel, the facility to know other musics and even to experience them in authentic settings (including those created by culture-bearers within the educational system) is increasing for educational leaders and for their charges in the more prosperous areas. It might therefore be said that the time has come for multiculturalism to play a part which has been hitherto barely feasible in human discourse. It is significant that the initiative seems to be coming in a top-down barrage, and notably from America, which has the resources (at least more than most) to promote it and is unencumbered by a music curriculum which is mandatory on a national basis. It is significant too that the nearest approach the US has to a national curriculum (see Lehman – Ref. III P iii) are the National (content) Standards (which the most aggressive advocacy campaign in the history of American music education [and mounted by MENC] has not yet fully succeeded in having universally adopted). These standards, specifying what American children should know and be able to do in music makes but a token gesture to multiculturalism; it is notionally included (and the multiculturalists will undoubtedly insist on this reading) but could just as easily be ignored without doing violence to the intent of the standards. And these are the standards that are implicit in the Goals 2000 educational legislation for the US. It appears that the campaign for widespread multiculturalism is far from making a convincing breakthrough in establishing itself unequivocally in education at school level. (See also Bennett Reimer's response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness* [Ref. III P viii] for the sceptic's point of view on the multiculturalism debate)

Dr Shehan Campbell is a charismatic advocate. Although she adhered to her brief in the wider context of muticulturalism, and offered a compelling case for circumstances that matched any identified need, she was prudent in proposing the closely related pair of concentric circle models (see also McCarthy – Ref. III P vii for corroboration of this methodology) which are adaptable to the inclusion, when the time is propitious, of multicultural elements in the repertoire of teacher and learner. Both start with the so-called musical mother tongue derived from childhood experiences in family and community. In the case of teachers, the exposure and the openness to world musics should occupy the first outer circle and be additionally supplemented by the authentic inputs available from the local community. In the case of children, the degrees of sophistication are less and go through an intermediate phase of adding the indigenous musical experiences to mother-tongue repertoire (though the transition from one to the other is blurred - inconsequentially); openness to the music of the global community is then the outer layer. Dr Shehan Campbell, perhaps in deference to her Irish roots, shows sensitivity in invoking the contextual philosophy born of an intuitive awareness that, in Ireland, our innate biculturalism could very well be a necessary cause for intervention on the road to a more comprehensive multiculturalism, when the time is ripe.

Recommendations

1. School music and the National curricula should have primacy in the development of music education in Ireland.

2. World music should be blended into the curriculum without usurping it.

3. The driving force of the multicultural campaign should be identified and appraised as to its credentials in an educational context, particularly in low-density learning situations such as the general school music programmes, typically in primary schools.

4. Multicultural teaching strategies, such as teaching fewer cultures in greater depth, should be examined as to their integrity as a derivative from a 'pure' world music philosophy.

5. Caution should be exercised in making claims as to the democratic right of musics to be treated as equal in all respects.

6. The possible interaction of a dominating multicultural programme with a bicultural one must be appraised as part of the decision-making process for a balanced music education, appropriately phased, in Ireland.

7. The question of time management for teachers (in the acquisition of skills and knowledge) and for students (in the limitation of curricular demands) must be weighed in any programme for the introduction of world musics to general education.

8. The cost of a serious multicultural programme should be weighed in the context of extra resources (equipment and materials), teacher training, prioritization, and the possible employment of culture-bearers.

9. Authenticity in folk music is a non-issue (see also Santos - Ref. II P vii), especially in educational contexts.

10. The extrinsic features/benefits of music education should never be permitted to dominate in a typical music class. The music itself and its intrinsicality must have priority.

11. Any multicultural music programme must take into account the need for continuum.

12. A model for multicultural music education, based on praxial (practical) principles should take the following into account:

    a. Traditional repertoires should be supplemented by world musics. Blend the 'old' with the 'new'.

    b. Listening critically to a selection of world musics, relevant to the context, is essential before selecting - and certainly before teaching it.

    c. If the music is to be performed or taught interactively, concentrated repetitive practice must be carried out in preparation.

    d. A promising strategy for world music is to teach comparatively. If a 'structure of disciplines' approach is the norm (teaching concepts), examples from non-western world music might be used for illustration purposes. The music itself must always be the dominating input, however.

    e. Concentration, rather than dilution, is to be preferred as an approach. Teach fewer cultures in greater depth. (This is also David Elliott's recommendation but it is ill-

at-ease with the ideal of total multiculturalism and presents enormous problems of the criteria for choice of genre and specific materials, as well as the need for very sophisticated powers of valuing and judgement in teachers).

f. The addition of contextual information, necessary as it is, should be minimized to allow the musical experience to be the main impacting agent.

g. Contract traditional musicians where possible. The use of culture-bearers boosts the general authenticity of the offerings.

h. Apply judgement in context to the suitability of all music to the circumstances.

i. A balance in the curriculum should be maintained between historic traditions and contemporary fusions. The evolving dynamic nature of music and its tendency to metamorphose must be taken into account in updating selections.

j. When in doubt seek advice from culture-bearers or competent ethnomusicologists.

Ref. III P vi See Document 306 in Proceedings

A Strategy for the Promotion of Traditional Music in Formal Music Education Contexts in Ireland
Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin

There is a curious history attached to Professor Ó Súilleabháin's contribution to Phase III of MEND. The intention, when issuing invitations to present, was that the papers would be convergent – even as to suggesting possible solutions - in sharpening the focus on issues and problems (such as philosophy of music education, continuum, multiculturalism, assessment and so on) which had already established themselves as priority concerns. It was felt that nobody involved in Irish music education could give a more authoritative view of the dynamics of the bicultural/multicultural issue than Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin, as he had been a fascinating and informative contibutor, on the topic, to Phase I. In the event he was unable to complete the paper as to its dedicated subject matter (*A Strategy for the Promotion of Traditional Music in Formal Music Education Contexts in Ireland*) or in hard-copy form, being forced by circumstances to present informally - though with characteristic panache. In subsequent negotiations, he gallantly undertook to make good the shortfall by offering an interview in which the burning questions might be posed for his considered responses. This remedy was acceptable and conferred a beneficial character on the result. Since a considerable amount of time had elapsed between the final phase of MEND and the setting up of the interview, the analysis of the initiative's proceedings had already moved forward to a mature stage. This meant that the many questions that needed to be asked had been ordering themselves in a systematic way, drawn from the analytical engagement, in depth, with other contributions. It was hoped that these would elicit more pertinent responses from Professor Ó Súilleabháin. The interview was conducted by two senior staff members drawn from his own team at the Irish World Music Centre at the University of Limerick – Niall Keegan and Sandra Joyce. A copy of the written analysis (a substantial corpus), as far as it had proceeded on the topic (Multiculturalism, of which Biculturalism is a subset), was made available to all parties, as background information to stimulate more apposite commentary. In addition, a notional questionnaire was provided. It must be stated that the content of this questionnaire was considered to be have been severely limited by virtue of the writer's relative unfamiliarity with the detail and nuance of the specialized field in question. It was hoped that the interviewers, in consultation with Professor Ó Súilleabháin, would have modified and expanded the template to a more penetrating and searching format in resonance with the dedicated title of the initial enquiry. The fact that the questions were left virtually in their original form may seem to be flattering to authorial insights; on the other hand Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin may have found them adequate as a sounding board for his own abilities accurately to identify lacunae and to add detail which was not overtly invoked. In addition to

exploring the strategies for the promotion of Irish Traditional Music (ITM) in Irish music education formal contexts, the brief was widened somewhat; it was hoped to investigate the possible interactions between such a manoeuvre and the growing urgency of tactical, and arguably considerably more organized, approaches to insinuating total multiculturalism into music education, a topic that has assumed a priority as being probably amongst the three most importunate issues facing music educators today anywhere. The queries centred on Ireland's readiness to involve itself in this potential upheaval of educational priorities, with its massive implication for curriculum time. It bordered too on the relevance of the movement to Ireland's particular circumstances and its currently 'contained' cultural/ethnic plurality, quite apart from its responsibilities in the 'global village' context.

In the event Professor Ó Súilleabháin proved himself to be no iconoclast. His moderate views, understandably vitalized, though never distorted, by an overlay of his self-admitted bias, are largely those of an observant pragmatist; he is fully aware of the subtle overtones of historical heritage, of the power and dominance of other traditions in music education, of refractory time constraints in the curriculum, and of the much-needed interaction between the new generation of researchers in Irish traditional music (with their academic and 'street' credibility) and their educational responsibilities. And yet there is a certain complacency and detachment in his response. He is not entirely dissatisfied, or so it seems, with the current state of traditional music as an instance of a fully understood, well-sampled and appreciated legacy of all. Although, when asked, he vehemently supports the idea of ITM being a dimension of all music education in this island, he stops short at acknowledging the idea of the ministry of schools being the best or the only way to ensure its vital presence in the sensibility of all who claim to be Irish. And from his frequent reference to and justifiable pride in the waxing enterprise at the Irish World Music Centre at the University of Limerick he intimates that he feels he is doing his part to support the interests of the art of traditional music; but he does not give the impression that he is about to spearhead an immediate and serious campaign to marry it to school music education as a means of enhancing its popularity.

The significant detail of his responses is itemized below but the overall impression created by of Professor Ó Súilleabháin is neither one of urgency nor of perceived threat. He sees the educational spectrum very much from the perspective of his own leadership in the areas he refers to as third-, fourth- and fifth-level, and his mentality is redolent of their isolation from the realities of general studies at lower levels. He believes that the prospects for the introduction to schools of more relevant offerings in ITM will be assisted by the corpus of research currently expanding at UL, while simultaneously confirming that purely *educational* studies are minimal at WMC. He is rather too idealistic in sketching the school scenario as one in which student needs should be tailored, almost individually, to the spectrum of first culture musical experiences of the class mix, and relies heavily on self-motivation and even on extra-curricular teaching to ensure progress. This is probably amongst the less utilitarian of his suggestions. And it is difficult to reconcile his ideas that cultural bridges between the community and school should be fostered (he sees ITM as a particularly valuable vehicle in this respect) while preserving the ethos and 'otherness' of the school ambience. In other words he wants the authenticity of the ITM movement to reside exclusively within the community and favours the twin method of importing the services of culture bearers to the schools or of using field visits for students to savour the culture at its purest and most natural. This is a double-edged tool which is surely as likely to deconstruct as to build bridges. He seems undismayed at the prospect of combining multicultural approaches with the current mix of western art music and popular music, ITM being seen by him as a kind of hybrid of the latter two. Nor does he see multiculturalism as a threat to the proper development of bicultural appreciation; he believes that its inclusion in education is not just desirable, but essential. He touches on the importance of performance, using the ITM context as a paradigm for education. He therefore supports it in its full spectrum, from what is possible with minimal skills to its virtuosic potential. Here he occupies the middle ground (or rather mediates) between the MEAE of Reimer and the praxialism of Elliott; his pragmatism here is encouraging as a context for Ireland and implies the desirability of general and specialist streams in performance studies. He leans towards process, or musical activity, while acknowledging the inseparability of product and process. He believes that options (especially in performance) that recognize the differences in talents between learners, respecting their inclinations and sensitivities, should be on

offer; this is complemented by his conviction that education should not be the same for everyone but should be purpose-built, or at least flexible, where possible, to mesh with students' first culture experience and propensities. His pejorative references to the history of the dominance of western art music norms in Irish music education (the so-called 'Oxbridge' model), and to the conscious (or subconscious) resentful reaction in some to its legacy in modern times, leads to the feeling that Professor Ó Súilleabháin would be a supporter of the 'inherent equality of all musical cultures' – an Elliott maxim; at the same time it is interesting and ironic to ponder that he, more than many, is particularly well situated to bring the services of genuine collective cross-cultural expertise to bear on the processes of judgement in inter- and intra-cultural contexts. Again occupying an intermediate position between MEAE and Elliott, Professor Ó Súilleabháin acknowledges the crucial bearing of time on the acquisition of skills that are satisfactorily serviceable, while appealing that the attempt should be made to inculcate practical skills in an effort to bring active music making, however modest in aspiration, within the immediate experience of children.

Overall the response, although impeccable in its sincerity and honesty, is not imbued with the evangelical passion that might have been expected from Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin. Perhaps he is conscious of his position and the need to be both politically correct in his pronouncements and non-judgemental of the provisions of the revised curriculum until they have been given time to deliver their intentions. Or perhaps he is just cynical about the prospects of wresting time from curricular allocations to make worthwhile progress in promoting general awareness of indigenous culture? As a manifesto for the promotion of ITM through music education at first and second level (the preferred route identified by MEND as a precondition, and handsomely endorsed by the whole panoply of philosophical persuasion consulted) it is too tentative, as its style is reactive rather than proactive. It is prone to a species of procrastination that can tolerate current neglect on the understanding that deliverance is at hand if we can but be patient for research to point the way. Yet, there is sound educational sense to be found, too, in the detail, and much material that can be usefully garnered for service if and when a more determined campaign is launched.

The following is a summary of **Professor Ó Súilleabháin's recommendations** and comments:

1. The reasons for expansion of ITM offerings in school music education are:

    a. The promotion of its cultural value in absolute and relative terms as an intrinsically Irish responsibility.

    b. Its potential, as a unique live presence, to cross-fertilize and introduce a new balance in music education.

    c. To juxtapose new values such as the side-by-side use of literate and non-literate approaches, improvisatory and notated composition, without prioritizing either. This should be seen as an opportunity – not as a problem. The wonder of literacy is highlighted by the growing tendency of non-literate (the word is not to be equated with illiterate) musicians to appreciate and annexe its observed benefits. This is complemented by the emancipating effect of encouraging literate musicians to work outside the sometimes and arguably constraining domain of an exclusively literate outlook.

    d. ITM, if and when introduced into general music education as a significant component, should be integrated as a reciprocal enrichment

2. ITM is largely praxial in outlook; its strengths are in **Performance** and Improvisation (**Composition**), both valuable components in the promotion of holistic music education. **Listening** can be integrated or reciprocal, IT musicians changing roles more typically than in other genres, such as western art music. Although it is an oral/aural tradition, the processes of transmission, which can be systematic and complex, should not be

pejoratively deemed informal, in the haphazard sense; they should be respected in so–called formal settings. Much significant development in methodology has taken place in recent decades. ITM supports performance, at all levels from minimal skill to virtuosity; it expects that appropriate provision be made in a way which 'recognizes the spatial and musical intelligence, in the domain of performance, of some people as higher than [that of] others'. Note this is confirming that talent education and the notion of specialism should be supported in education. Students should not be pushed beyond their limits but neither should they be the sole arbiters of their own involvements, which would be contrary to established educational principle.

3. Music education should be concerned less with curriculum than with people, less with music than with musicians.

4. Music education in Ireland should respond to a typical first cultural experience of music drawn from western art music and popular forms, of which ITM is a hybrid. The increased availability of 'musics of the world's cultures' should be grasped not as a desirable but as a necessary enrichment; in particular they should interact with ITM to the benefit of both. **Western art music is, however, a quintessential component of Irish musical heritage and must continue to be supported by right. On the other hand popular music has a way of 'looking after itself'.**

5. The new music curriculum in Irish schools need not be cast in stone. It is still exploratory in character and reacting to the failures of the past. ITM has greater presence and recognition than hitherto in the assessment procedures. This is a step in the right direction and may be seen to have followed (not preceded) developments in higher level education. Above all new strategies should be open to constant reappraisal as to their success and relevance.

6. Interaction between genres of music in education should never be in the guise of climbing a cultural ladder but of moving across a bridge. There should be no hidden agendas, political or cultural.

7. The research base at LU, especially in its ITM activities, is producing a crop of highly articulate bicultural musicians with academic and 'street' credibility. This enterprise must eventually feed fruitfully into music education at lower levels. Some of this cross-fertilization is already apparent in the revised curriculum at second level.

8. ITM should be allowed to infiltrate and permeate the whole educational enterprise and be used as a facilitator to build bridges between the community and the schools. But, if only one choice were available for the dissemination of ITM benefits it should retain its community-base as celebrating its primeval source and inspiration. 'The provision of authentic settings or the simulation of them in education is in my opinion a flawed approach. It reduces an awareness of the school environment as something unique in itself. Instead of pretending that it isn't what it is and attempting to make it something that it isn't, it should be recognised for what it is - in other words its own unique environment and different in its own way from the environment outside the classroom or school system". Education outside of school is an important concept; school is an addendum for the community. Live interactions rather that technological or other simulations should be the aim of the kind of humanistic encounter that characterizes community-based activities

9. ITM is overtly related to process but this should not disguise the fact that product and process are inseparably interrelated. ITM is a communal music, meaning, primarily, music in and of the community. Virtuosity and simpler forms should be equally valued as they both result naturally from the nurturing environment; current debate seems to

endorse this, emphasizing rather than playing down the existence of both streams. 'Of course, in the contemporary world, professionalization, commercialization and popularization of the music has meant that sometimes it has to be recontextualized into the concert situation'. But, in community settings, listeners and performers typically participate in interchangeable roles. This characteristic is particularly valuable and broadens the praxial scope of the whole enterprise.

10. Professor Ó Súilleabháin sees verbal knowings and over-conceptualization as harbouring the danger of deprioritizing purely musical pursuits. This concern is discussed elsewhere (in the Reimer/Elliott reviews) and is something of a 'red herring', in the writer's view. The reader is referred to Reimer's pronouncements on the subject (see his review of Elliott's *Music Matters* p81) in which he demystifies this *bête noire* of most practically based musicians.

    'Concepts about music give us a logical, developmental, artistically focused medium by which to build progressively more challenging experiences *of* music, so they are the best tools we have for creating manageable curricula. But they are *only* tools, and it is important that we understand that, so we do not misguide our activities as we teach. . . . **Conceptualizing, when it goes on without sufficient listening to music exemplifying what is being discussed, without sufficient performance to keep the learning musically creative, without appropriate probing of inner musical conditions through analysis, and without musical assessments, becomes academic in the worst sense'**.[115] (writer's block)

Ref. III D iiia See Document 355 in Proceedings

Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in Music Education: Attainable Ideals, or a New Threat to an Overloaded Curriculum?

Chair: Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin
Reporter: Ms Kathleen Hegarty
Panel: Professor Marie McCarthy; Professor Patricia Shehan Campbell; Dr Kari Veblen

It is only with slight reservations that this debate can be seen as having proceeded without a definition of what, precisely, multiculturalism in music education really is. The question of definition, while it did not affect the thrust of what was being asserted, nevertheless becomes a problem when the question as to whether multiculturalism, in the Irish context, includes only music of the western tradition and its derivatives, or not, is posed. For example the so-called musical mother tongue is much more likely to approach homogeneity in Ireland than it is in such multi-ethnic countries as our eastern and western neighbours, the UK and the US; the educational contexts are, in consequence, very different. Let it be said that the debate proceeded with a tacit acceptance that multiculturalism, by whatever definition (although the writer believes, from the account, that a western-style multiculturalism was, typically, the understanding of the meeting), is now an educational requirement (JC and LC) and that fitting it into the curriculum, whatever the consequences, is not optional but mandatory. It must be conceded, as confirmed several times in MEND debates, that the skilful use of materials to match the structure-of-disciplines approach, controversial as it is, can successfully address the time constraints in introducing multicultural elements without distress.

The meeting first pondered the issue of how teachers might cope with a spectrum of varying musical 'mother tongues' as opposed to no mother-tongue at all, the guiding principle seeming to dictate that

[115] Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1970, Second Edition 1989) 170-171. Also see the extensive discussion of concepts in Chapter 5, which contrasts conceptualization with aesthetic perceptual structuring, and argues that art is nonconceptual in essence.

teaching and learning in school should proceed from this basic somewhat imponderable building block. The socio-ideological dimension here could generate problems but this may be offset by the fact that, taking Ireland as the example, the effect of TV is to establish a repertory of musical involuntary learnings that tend towards homogeneity. Professor Shehan Campbell and Dr Veblen both took up this point, but their insistence that the teacher has the responsibility to identify a starting position and move forward from there did not minimize that responsibility; in fact it was evidence that the musical sophistication, in psychological terms, now demanded of teachers is constantly in need of upgrading to cope with current methodological development. Although not identified until later in the debate, the need for appropriately focused and relevant in-service training for teachers is implicit in the multicultural approach. It was confirmed at the meeting that methodologies (such as those based on the Kodaly concept) are constantly being updated to reflect the features of this technological age when young children, typically, have a much more comprehensive access to musical experiences and bring these sometimes subconsciously sophisticated learnings to school with them; all of these aspects add complexity to the teacher's task.

The question of the preservation of the tradition of teaching and singing songs in the Irish language was raised by Eibhlín Ní Chathailriabhaigh, this being a crucially important aspect of multiculturalism, if it is to be seriously addressed and implemented in schools. Professor Ó Súilleabháin's reassurances, while apropos in relation to the question as posed, were based on current provisions in the universities of Limerick and Cork in relation to the employment of sean-nós singers to boost the 'authenticity' of what is on offer; the question that remained unanswered is how this provision can be transferred to the school experience of children. Perhaps Professor Ó Súilleabháin's imminent treatment of the topic of achieving an increased presence of traditional music within the curriculum will address this concern more thoroughly (see Ref. III P vi above).

It was agreed that all genres of music should be accorded parity of respect as to their aspiration for inclusion in the curriculum; note that this carefully worded report, presumably reflecting faithfully the feeling of the meeting, does not make the arguably fatuous claim that all musics are equal. The problems of integration of popular strains into what, by implication, is a curriculum dominated by the repertoire and methodology of western art music, were not minimized. The generation gap between teachers and learners was seen as an inhibitor in finding criteria for the inclusion of unfamiliar contemporary styles within the school repertoire; this harks back to concerns as to the criteria of assessment being relevant to what is being assessed (see Ref. III D iib) but the responsibility on the teacher (even with diminished understanding/expertise) to decide, in such circumstances, on the suitability of particular items was not challenged, although a case was made for allowing children to have preferences. This part of the debate, since it was addressing what is truly a major dilemma in the democratic ordering of the music curriculum became the linchpin of the proceedings with many contributions enlivening the input. It seems that the problem has not been definitively solved, even in the US where there is a much longer history in tackling it. The guiding principle seems to be that pedagogical material be taken from children's identifiable background and adapted to the purpose of the musical task in hand; this, of course, typically seems to suggest a structures- of-discipline approach which is at variance with the Elliott approach to music education philosophy (see *Music Matters* p 243 *et seq.*). It appears, as confirmed by Professor McCarthy, that the place of world-pop music in education (multiculturalism in its broadest context) is still the focus of much debate and experimentation in a global sense, not least on the contentious issue of selection and validation of suitable materials. Meanwhile, in an Irish context, this shortfall between ideology and resources to implement it is a serious inhibitor to creating a stable ambience in which the idea of multiculturalism could be fairly tested and judged as to its effectiveness. The personal but discreet intervention of Dr Bradhaw at this point should be reported. He seemed to be recommending that the multicultural approach could be blended with our concerns about the promotion of our own culture (surely an ideal solution?) but that much suitably-resourced scholarly work would be needed, involving careful selection of materials. It should be here recorded, as it has been already, that there was copious praise for Dr Bradshaw's work, in this essential area, during Phase I of MEND, including concerted pleas for further published materials derived from his research.

This highly productive and well-reported meeting ended with further emphasis on familiar lacunae, in the Irish music education scene, that need to be readdressed. These were raised at many other debates and called for better organized in-service training for teachers (contact with culture/tradition bearers in the case of multicultural applications), better classroom resourcing and better communication of information on the resources available to teachers. There was on-the-spot confirmation from Department of Education personnel (both established and seconded) that enhanced advisory services were now in place and available to schools.

Recommendations

1. Multiculturalism is, primarily, in need of exact definition as to which musics should be appropriately included, under that heading, in an Irish context.

2. Multiculturalism, at least in the sense of an expanded repertoire of western music, crossing the art music/pop/trad interfaces, should be embraced in music education.

3. The need for appropriately focused and relevant in-service training for teachers is implicit in the multicultural approach.

4. Efforts must be made to make the norms of university research and practices more relevant to school experience. This refers, in this particular instance, to the preservation of vocal styles, both popular and idiosyncratic, in the Irish language.

5. All genres of music should be accorded parity of respect as to their aspiration for inclusion in the curriculum.

6. Children should be accommodated, where possible, in their musical preferences.

7. The application of appropriate professional standards of judgement and value should continue to be the criterion in making educational curricular choices.

8. Attempts should continue to produce research-based materials to accommodate mutually the interests of Irish traditional music and those of the wider context of multiculturalism.

9. The priorities in advancing multiculturalism in the classroom in Ireland are 1) in-service courses with inputs from culture-bearers and 2) the provision of classroom resources (with emphasis on materials).

10. A user-friendly communication/information service should be made available to keep all teachers, with special targeting for the more isolated ones, informed of the resources available.

18.7 Music Education at Third Level

"Music is enough for a lifetime - but a lifetime is not enough for music"

Sergei Rachmaninov
An Encyclopedia of Quotations about Music (comp Nat Shapiro. New York Doubleday & Co 1978 , p.248)

18.7.1 Options

Ref. II D iiic See Document 259 in Proceedings

Third-Level Music Education in Ireland: Vocation, Choices and Philosophies in Conflict.

Chair: Professor Hormoz Farhat
Reporter: Professor Ronald Masin
Panel: Prof. Richard Colwell; Prof. Bennett Reimer; Dr Terri Sundberg

It appears that the recording device was not switched on for this debate. The reporter was therefore left without this additional support, and had to rely on referring back to some of the participants to piece together an account of what was discussed. In the event, a collaboration between Professor Harry White and Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat produced a satisfactory account of the salient topics raised. The debate does not appear to have addressed the issue of how philosophical stances are affected (in both students and teachers) in third level music education by the kind of specialism being pursued or taught. This, of course, is a very important issue as it focuses on the reasons for the dichotomy between academics and practitioners (performers) in their approach to educational priorities. The report on the debate, in the event, appears in the Proceedings as a letter from Professor White to the reporter, Professor Masin. The input from the panel is, sadly, missing.

The dominance of a performance specialism at the freshman stage of candidature for third-level music courses was discussed, and yielded consensus along the lines confirmed in papers read by Professor Gillen, Mr William Halpin, Dr Janet Ritterman, Dr Eric Sweeney and Professor Harry White at MEND Phases II and III (see Gillen – Ref. I P xv; Halpin – Ref. I P xi; Ritterman - Ref. II P iv; Sweeney – Ref. I P xvi; White – Ref. I P viii and III P viii). The main point made was that there is a need for a variety of third-level programmes to suit all needs; in particular, composition, musicology and performance were cited as the three main branches. As to performance it was suggested, and found to be an agreed stance among academics also, that it is a necessary component in all programmes but at different levels of expertise. There was general support for a performance *option* being available in all third-level under-graduate programmes.

Although this issue was covered also in Professor White's own presentations (see White - Ref. I P viii and III P viii) the crucial question of extended library facilities available for graduate and undergraduate music research students was raised as a matter of growing urgency. The suggestion was made that instead of replicating slender resources, a collaborative effort between third level institutes to create a central resource in one or more accessible locations should be actively investigated. As a rider to this suggestion, the very pragmatic proposal was made that librarians with the skills to advise and assist in the building of such a facility should be recruited, or chosen for specific training.

Recommendations

1. Performance expertise should, typically, be required for all undergraduate courses in music.

2. Collaborative inter-institutional efforts should be made to amass a representative music research library in Ireland in one location or more, as an alternative to unnecessary replication.

18.7.2 Professional Training

Ref. III D ivb See Document 308 in Proceedings

To Triumph or to Perish on the Rock of Relevance. Evolution or Revolution in Third-Level Music Education in Ireland.

Chair: Ms Mary Lennon (Head of School of Keyboard Studies, DIT [Adelaide Rd])
Reporter: Professor Pamela Flanagan (Senior Academic, RIAM)
Panel: Sir Frank Callaway; Professor Paul Lehman; Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin; Professor Harry White

A very distinguished and widely experienced panel had been assembled to inform this debate. There appear, however, to have been difficulties for Professor Flanagan in submitting the report. It proved impossible to elicit a response or to recover the tape. The session is, therefore, regrettably, not covered.

Ref. I P xiv See Document 114 in Proceedings

Music Teacher Education: Understanding Teacher Knowledge.
Ms Mary Lennon (DIT).

As has already been observed in the initial review of this paper (Interim Report Phase I), Ms (now Dr) Lennon's contribution is very relevant to the encouragement and development of new levels in the professionalism of teachers, as envisaged in the wider MEND aspiration. Although her research focused on the problems of leading instrumental teachers to self-exploration in understanding the reasons behind the pedagogical decisions they make, much of what she has discovered is equally applicable to teaching in general and to music teaching, across the spectrum, in particular. The reason she singled out piano teaching for her specific study obviously had to do with the fact that it is one of her own professional spheres of activity and that she is concerned that many teachers in this area have, in the past, had very little ready opportunity to use formal analytical procedures, much less to study the research output in this area, in expanding their own knowledge of pedagogy and method. This, she believes, accounts eventually for the low professional ratings of piano teachers in the private sector. And yet she discovered in her own case studies that many teachers go well beyond the intuitive, the rule-of-thumb, and prescriptive method in dealing with problems, on-the-spot so to speak - revealing a great deal of underlying wisdom not all attributable just to experience but rather to the way in which they have used their ongoing experiences of teaching unconsciously to sharpen their own analytical powers. She observed several distinct personality types - facilitator, guide, model, instructor, problem-solver - emerging as characteristic rôles played by a single teacher in giving a lesson. The target of Dr Lennon's research was to confirm and advert to the presence of a corpus of pedagogical knowledge based on *reflective* teaching and to make a case for the codifying of this knowledge in a descriptive case book, so that practitioners in music education could learn in a systematic way from the accurately reported analytical experiences of their colleagues. This path to

the professionalization of teachers stresses the ascendancy of education over training[116], thinking over doing and reflectiveness over effectiveness, leaving behind the prescription-boundedness of the simple practitioner in the ability to communicate the reasons for professional decisions and actions to others.

This research-based cameo from Dr Lennon admirably points up, in a disciplined way, the need to professionalize teachers of music right across the field; it dovetails very well with, as indeed it complements and influences, the MEND finding which stresses the need for teachers to have a philosophical orientation.[117] Dr Lennon's research breaks new ground in providing a scholarly foundation to a basically simple but profoundly important message - that music teachers (in Ireland) must, in their own interests, be more professional, meaning that they must be more reflective and analytical in building a self-generated repertoire of teaching experiences rather than being merely 'accumulators of procedures and method'. The question of the timing of Dr Lennon's desired input to teacher training invites responses which might start with the suggestion that her theory should apply bilaterally to a child's first music lesson and systematically thereafter; obviously much depends on the general level of awareness of and acceptance by particular teachers of the potential for musical maturation embedded in the strategy and their willingness to transmit those benefits as part of a regenerative cycle. Perhaps the key significance of Dr Lennon's paper, however, is that it highlights the need to encourage original research into issues of music education; promotion would come naturally within the ambit of the music education forum and seems to point to the desirability of forming a research sub-committee.

Recommendations

1. Teachers of music in Ireland should not see themselves as 'accumulators of procedures and method' but should aspire to a more reflective approach leading to self-exploration in seeking to understand the reasons behind the pedagogical decisions they make.

2. A beginning should be made to codify a corpus of pedagogical knowledge, based on *reflective* teaching, in a descriptive case book

3. The path to the professionalization of teachers stresses the ascendancy of education over training, thinking over doing and reflectiveness over effectiveness. These principles should be inculcated from the earliest stages in the educational cycle (see also Abeles – Ref. II P ii)

4. Original research into issues of music education must be encouraged; promotion would come naturally within the ambit of the Music Education Forum and seems to point to the desirability of forming a research sub-committee.

[116] There have been many references to this distinction in MEND papers. See White - Ref. III P ix and McCann - Ref. I P vi.

[117] Copious support for this strategy can be observed in the papers of Abeles, Callaway, Elliott, McCann, Reimer and White (*qv*). The sequels to the fundamental consideration of philosophical underpinning of actions are curriculum, syllabus, method, appraisal and feedback (all applicable to teaching in private as well as in class settings, and all rich in opportunity to apply reflective procedures).

18.7.3 Teacher Training

Ref. I P vi See Document 106 in Proceedings

Teacher Training as a Priority in a National Campaign for a Better Provision in Music Education
Ms Gabrielle McCann (Trinity College, Dublin)

Ms McCann's paper makes important comments on philosophical issues (without delving into philosophical preoccupations *per se*) but it is most pertinently germane to the teacher training issue. The paper is reviewed in the Interim Report of Phase I. In particular it should be compared with Professor Abeles's paper (Ref. III p ii) as indeed most of the points made are either in agreement or are complementary in the context of the whole approach to music teacher training for school/general applications. Especially to be noted is the insistence that 'the teacher training process must be an ongoing one, extending well beyond the initial one-year or [Irish model] 3-4 year course'. The recommendations from Ms McCann'a paper might well be simply a call for the implementation of the promissory aspiration of the provisions in the 1995 White Paper on Education. Although the White Paper is/was, of course, addressing, *inter alia*, the *general* case of education, and teacher training in this context, it should be applicable selectively to the needs of any component within it; this is Ms McCann's approach in applying general statements to the specific needs of music, and relating Government policy statements to the urgency of their implementation. She ably articulates her own three-part plan for effective extended teacher training and, with astuteness, draws support from the statements in the White Paper. The alignment between stated Government policy and the views of both Ms McCann and Professor Abeles is so remarkable that it defines a pragmatic approach to comprehensive teacher training.

Ms McCann accurately targets many of the burning questions in her area of expertise, amongst them, i) the need to inculcate, in trainee teachers, clarity of thinking on the distinction between knowledge and skills, education and training, professional characteristics and professional competences (see Lennon - Ref. I P xiv), intuitive and cognitive approaches, theory and practice (she deplores current UK innovation which deprofessionalizes teachers by implementing a kind of apprenticeship scheme of teacher training which reduces theoretical and conceptual input to 25 % of the total training package); (ii) the need to put accessible ongoing services in place to support teachers at all stages in their career, thus retaining them in the profession and preventing the likelihood of teacher burnout and, quoting Hanley[118] (iii) the need for student teachers to develop a philosophical orientation. In this respect she is echoed by Abeles; insofar as she discloses her personal preference, she identifies with the Reimer definition.

Recommendations

1. 1. Teacher Training should be perceived and provided for as an ongoing professional evolution in three distinct phases: - (i) pre-service, (ii) induction/probationary with links to parent institutions, and (iii) continuing professional development assisted by rationalized and co-ordinated in-service modules. In other words:

2. 2. Implementation of the provisions of the 1995 White Paper, *inter alia*,

[118] Betty Hanley, *Music Teacher Education: New Directions* (Publication details not given)

a. ‘A well developed and carefully managed induction scheme, coinciding with the teacher’s probationary year, will be introduced for first and second level teachers . . . supported by teacher education institutions and schools’.

b. Consideration will be given to the means by which the completion of a full Leaving Certificate course in the creative and performing arts, as well as a scientific or technological subject, will be encouraged for prospective entrants to Colleges of Education’. (See analysis of MacLiam – Ref. I P xiii)

Ref. I D iic See Document 156 in Proceedings

Third-Level Training in Music; its Spectrum and its Possibilities.
The Professional Dimension in Teacher Training.

Chair: Professor Pamela Flanagan (Senior Academic, RIAM)
Reporter: Ms Sinéad Collins (DIT - Wholetime Student)

There was a thoughtful and searching analysis of the material covered at this debate and there was strong chairmanship too, a combination which resulted in a revealing exposé of the range of topics discussed, which was delimited from the start, although, in the event only two items out of a chosen four were covered in depth. However the spirit of the meeting is vibrantly caught in the report. An unusual feature of this debate was that there was a conscientious attempt made to reach conclusions and make recommendations.

A windfall bonus from the debate was the result of a partial misunderstanding of the title. The professional dimension in teacher training was taken to include its widest context in applying also to teachers of third level students. And there is no reason why this interpretation should not have had a place in the discussions; in the event, interesting and focused commentary was generated and there was lively dissent too. The group grappled with notions that have only recently come into currency in Irish higher education but which are normal in American practice and are gaining ground in the European scene. These are the contentious but currently burning issues surrounding the appointment and retention of staff for third-level education and growing pressures that the universities should be accountable for the quality of the teaching delivered in pedagogical rather than content aspects. Some of the questions raised were:

1. Should staff be appointed on the basis of their teaching or their research duties - on the basis of education or of scholarship?

2. Should third-level lecturers be expected to show superior teaching competences (?) and

3. would they be well advised to take pedagogy modules before applying for posts, or should they be obliged to have a suitable qualification in education?

4. In university teaching unclassified as to career destinations of graduates, should education studies be a mandatory dimension?

The discussion had all the characteristics of an *ab initio* debate, uninformed by the expectations of procedures currently ripe for implementation. The delegates obviously found its novelty engaging and rapidly came to conclusions which were as vulnerable to the charge of ambivalence as that the subject itself was, arguably, largely indeterminate from their database. There seemed to be agreement that all teachers need pre-teaching education studies which should rely neither on the fruits of in-career maturation nor on the rare occurrence of totally natural ability (*cf.* McCann – Ref. I P vi). It was felt that this should apply to third-level teachers regardless of the idiosyncratically dual nature (teaching/research) of their employment, and that it was simply not acceptable to rely just on the

professionalism of interview boards in appointing the right candidate to the job. This was remarkably close to the reasoning behind current American-led but now global tendencies in assuming 'accountability for accountability'. It was perhaps to tarry in the haven of trust (in the 'system' itself and in the candidates for employment to protect their own interests) to recommend that courses in education should be available but optional (even at undergraduate level), while in-service training in information technology and communication skills should be actively encouraged, just falling short of imposition.

This group added awareness of time to its virtues and even when the discussion was moved on by the chair, to other topics, interesting correlations, which were explored more deeply in subsequent MEND deliberations, were foreshadowed. On the question of a possible rationalization of third-level education in music the group had its finger on the pulse of current largely unarticulated concerns as representing the views of consumers. It was felt that:

1. There is an indiscriminate rush to establish power bases in third level music education with scant concern for the time-honoured virtues of progression from established and effective lower levels and discreet academic drift; rather is there a perception of indecent precipitation.

2. The concern expressed by the Higher Education Authority that there is a serious discontinuity in standards between music at second and third level is symptomatic of grave consequences for the regenerative needs of music education.

3. Communication between second and third level music education agencies is poor, resulting in:

    a. desultory patterns in seeking adequately and collectively to publicize the range of third level courses available to school leavers. This in turn feeds

    b. a general perception that Leaving Certificate Music is merely an enabling subject in 'points' acquisition for entry to careers other than music. One delegate linked this, somewhat paradoxically in musical terms, to a plea for *lower* LC standards in the interests of take-up for the subject at second-level.

4. Falling standards in school music education may be traced to failures at primary and even pre-school levels.

There is a common theme, not articulated, connecting all these concerns. It is not clear whether the HEA finds third level music to be too high or second level to be too low in standard. That there is any appreciable difference at all, at the interface (LC level), is the real concern. If the LC standard is too low, for which there is convincing evidence (see reviews of Seán MacLiam's paper: *The Proposed New Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus: Perspectives and Attitudes* – Ref. I P xiii) the discontinuity will inhibit the abilities of candidates for third level music courses to cope or will devalue the chosen courses themselves. If the third-level institutions lower their entry requirements there will be a similar devaluation of the currency. The malaise over standards is putting the candidates for music courses in a buyers' market with the inevitable proliferation of third level courses, institutional cupidity and power-mongering. It also accounts for the lack of a common policy on student recruitment, which poorly serves the interests of prospective cohorts. And (a low standard) Leaving Certificate Music as a pawn in the points game augurs badly for the future of music itself in its wider educational contexts. Lastly, poor communication between teachers at different levels is symptomatic of a deepening dichotomy, between music teaching cohorts, which has given rise to one of the principal findings of the whole MEND initiative. It is significant that it should have surfaced at such an early stage in the MEND proceedings.

This debate, one of the most consistently perceptive and fruitful of the MEND Phase I proceedings, benefited from tight management, effective reporting and the fortuitously penetrating style of the delegation itself. The report itself is worthy of close study.

Ref. II D ivb See Document 261 in Proceedings

Teacher Training: The Transition to Professionalism and a New Crisis for Philosophy in Action

Chair: Professor Pamela Flanagan
Reporter: Dr Gareth Cox
Panel: Prof. Marie McCarthy; Prof. Bennett Reimer; Dr Kari Veblen

Although the topic for this debate contained two key words - Professionalism and Philosophy (of music education) - neither featured strongly in the discussion or in the responses. And the provocative question posed by the chairperson – 'does the considerable amount of courses (in teacher training) offered at third-level perpetuate the fractured continuum' - was not taken up either for debate. But aspects of teacher training and supply, and the relationship between the teaching force and the Department of Education dominated much of the exchange of ideas; all of this material is, of course, useful but leaves the intended area of enquiry without a thoughtful response.

1. Colm Ó'Cleirigh dismissed the 'shopping list of complaints and disenchantment with past practices' approach as unworthy of a forward-looking policy and claimed that there was much to praise in the current achievement and job satisfaction of (primary) teachers. He pinpointed the lack of regular in-service training and the non-availability of specialist advisers in music as the main inhibitors in school music. It was later confirmed during the course of the debate that the Department of Education does organize In-Career Development and, of course, it is provided for in the terms of the 1995 White Paper.

2. A pilot scheme - Home-School liaison initiated in 1990 and involving parents in the teaching process - was described as a heartening development in bridging the School/Community divide and in usefully enhancing the class teacher's input. It had, however, foundered owing to the lack of flexibility in the system to cope with its non-standard character.

3. A plea was made for accountability and bilateral communication in the affairs of music education as between the teaching force and the Department of Education. This particularly singled out the ready availability of information/statistics which could be used in forward planning.

4. Information requested by Professor Reimer as to the course content for primary teacher training, when provided, elicited the comment that it was more than was offered in the US. It was nevertheless suggested that the entry level, aims and content for teacher training courses in Ireland should be reviewed.

5. The practice of teachers meeting to share ideas and discuss common problems was confirmed as being part of the Irish professional scene, especially in rural areas.

6. The terms of the Benson Report of 1979 which proposed that peripatetic music advisers be provided to schools were invoked as worthy of further representations to the Department of Education. This suggestion surfaced many times during MEND but is part of the open and still unresolved question as to the extent to which specialist services in music education should be made available. It is obviously advisable to keep this issue on the agenda as a priority item, perhaps for the music education forum to take up seriously, and on which considered recommendations, based on a sound rationale, should

be made to government. MEND facilitated this issue being aired, but it needs thorough reappraisal to reconcile differences as far as possible or reach consensus on a way forward. It obviously touches on a very sensitive area of philosophical importance and calls for creative treatment, sensitive to the balanced plausibility on both sides of the philosophical dialectic.

7. The issue of uncertified teachers arose in two contexts. One was the need to provide suitable teachers for the band movement. It should be noted that this movement has now become very much a part of Irish rural (and indeed urban) life and can be credited with providing enjoyable and often very positive musical experiences for its members. In city locations it has, because of its immediacy and availability in local settings, a tendency to remove the former dependency on schools of music for more expert training. While this is a mixed blessing, there seems no reason why this initiative should not be encouraged and assisted in a positive way in relation to amateur music-making. Professor Reimer, who has often attested to the excellence of the band movement in the US in terms of the standards of performance reached, suggested that while the ultimate criteria for teachers were professionalism and ability to teach effectively, there should be a balance between musical expertise and teaching expertise. It appears that the problem of certification is a difficult one[119]; the discussion, however, did not provide a ready solution to the person concerned about the supply of teachers available to the band movement in Ireland where the question of certification is not the immediate issue. Professor McCarthy advised that this kind of problem could also yield to a good in-service training scheme which could simultaneously address the pedagogical shortcomings of some good performers and the academic/musicianship problems of uncertified teachers. A related concern - the typical teaching of traditional music by non-literate method, by rote and by folk performers relying on 'natural pedagogical ability' led to disagreement between Professor Reimer, who pleaded scepticism, and Dr Veblen who staunchly defended the method. This, while it contributed nothing by way of clarification of the issue, contributes to the plethora of questions that must be confronted by Professor Ó Súilleabháin (MEND Phase III) in relation to the transmission of folk music and the means of protecting the learner in a scene where 'anything goes' in terms of setting up a teaching practice. Professor Ó Súilleabháin had himself already raised this query a number of times without providing or eliciting satisfactory answers. It remains, withal, an issue that will acquire increasing intractability if a successful scheme for the enhanced presence of folk/traditional music in formal education (general schools) can be formulated and implemented, a hope entertained by the promoters of MEND.

8. Yet again the hybrid version of a specialized music advisory service to schools was raised, on this occasion by Colm Ó'Cléirigh, suggesting that existing (school music?) teachers could be trained to provide a service to a number of collaborating schools (without in any way threatening the principle of the autonomy of the class teacher).

Recommendations

1. A more regular and comprehensive scheme of in-service training, for primary school music teachers, than currently exists, should be organized and implemented. Alternatively this service could be provided by specially trained music advisers being made available to schools grouped collaboratively (See 3. below).

[119] Note that in Australia (and more recently in South Africa) a system, pioneered by the trade unions, to quantify expertise in a series of unit standard specifications, is gaining ground and could go a long way in music education in removing the tensions between performer teachers and academically trained teachers in the matter of giving a much needed boost to amateur music-making by recognizing the skills of performers as often very relevant to teaching situations.

2. The entry level, aims and content for teacher training courses in Ireland should be reviewed.

3. The question of the appointment of specialist music teachers or advisors to schools should be kept on the agenda for music education.

4. The question of the certification of folk/traditional teachers should be addressed.

18.7.4 The Conservatoire Aspiration (A National Academy for the Performing Arts?)

Ref. I D ivb See Document 161 in Proceedings

The National Conservatoire Aspiration

Chair: Professor Ronald Masin (DIT; European String Teachers' Association)
Reporter: Ms Bríd Grant (DIT)

Although events have overtaken, though not eclipsed, the relevance of much of this debate (the ministerial announcement to allocate some £35m to the establishment of an Academy for the Performing Arts having been made in January 2000), a small but well-qualified group, consisting mainly of performance teachers, discussed the issues involved and brought into focus most of the defining parameters. The debate was introduced by the chairman, Ronald Masin, with a useful exposé of the history and rationale of specialized professional training for performers and teachers (practical) of music. As an immigrant professor himself he commented, from detached observation, on his certainty that the levels of the best teaching and student talent in Ireland were feeding the demand for something considerably better than current physical provision could hope to deliver by way of the complete spectrum of study possibilities needed by young professionals to compete with global trends and standards. Although some sensitivities were touched and tensions arose during the meeting, the chairman succeeded in circumventing these to produce a meaningful outcome.

The points raised are itemized below:

1. The notion of an Irish national conservatoire was treated aspirationally. Apart from some vague hints as to ongoing negotiations, there was no feeling generated which might have been taken to have anticipated the pace of developments as they have transpired.

2. Current Standards. There was consensus that the best teaching, across the board, in Irish third-level performing courses (music) is delivering satisfactory results (with good global comparability) under arguably deprived conditions. It is facilities and, typically, not teaching, that are called for. An influx of distinguished teachers, which a Government adequately-sponsored enterprise might facilitate, would, of course, 'raise the ante'.

3. The function of a *national* conservatory was queried in the context of young well-trained advanced performers naturally seeking training abroad (where it could be afforded), not because they undervalued home provision but because of the undisputed advantages of a cosmopolitan ambience away from a home base, with consistently high levels of achievement, for students of the arts. The suggestion that Ireland is now ripe to enter that race (*attracting* students from abroad to create that ambience) was put forward as a counterposition.

4. This inevitably led to discussion of the current (and projected) numbers of suitable *Irish* students available to justify the title *national*, the capability of the infrastructure to deliver them (considering other concerns raised at MEND about the total inadequacy of

this provision at present [see Centrality of Performance Debate – Ref. I D iiib]), and the depleting effect of such a new institution on the supply to other agencies currently providing, in underpopulated courses, for the existing numbers. This shifted the focus somewhat away from arguably élitist training, at international levels of excellence, and towards the much more pressing needs first to develop the feeder system as a priority. At the other end of the continuum, the idea of Irish students seeking postgraduate training abroad was seen as healthy and liberalizing. The discussion therefore tended towards a model in which a high level institution, established *ab initio*, would cater selectively for Irish undergraduates (with perhaps some of the best candidates still choosing to go abroad [their right in this respect being upheld]) and a large contingent of foreign students to make up the balance, particularly at post-graduate level. The need for ongoing review of Arts Council policy in relation to funding students abroad was raised.

5. A target number of some 400 music students was arrived at but without taking into account the related problem of the cannibalization of the potential flow of third-level students to other (currently existing) institutions and the associated debilitating effect on staff enterprise and motivation.

6. Current trends in employment possibilities for performer graduates were discussed in the context of the questionable pragmatism of training performers with such precarious job prospects, especially considering the competition from Europe and the known employment problems. Later in the discussion the related aspect of teacher training was raised as to its complementary and key function in the operation of a new national college - and not just as a ploy to boost numbers.

7. The siting of the conservatory was discussed. Opinions and choices vacillated between the capital city which, according to norms worldwide, would be the natural choice for a first-time (flagship) facility . . . . and the artistically more sensible one of locating the conservatory near to the centre of current maximum active music-making at professional level, in order to benefit from the proximity of potential teaching staff, especially over the full spectrum of orchestral instruments. This latter criterion, it was felt, could also eventually favour the capital city.

8. The question of numbers, to which the delegates returned time after time, seemed to dominate the meeting in terms of trying to make sense of the currently very small numbers available (some 50 maximum in Dublin) and the effect of the transference of even that number away from the institutions which had pioneered the development of indigenous third-level education modules for performers and had succeeded in having them upgraded to degree status and beyond. This was considered to be a major area for sensitive negotiation if debilitating undercurrents were not to arise.

9. Because the membership of this debating group happened to represent the Dublin-based lobby mostly, the discussion seemed to focus on capital-based concerns and specifically on the main education agencies (DIT, Maynooth and RIAM) in or near the capital. The group endorsed collaborations between institutions for the common good and recommended ongoing discussion involving all interested parties in converting this exciting aspiration to reality.

The question of the Conservatoire Aspiration is dealt with in Dr Janet Ritterman's lecture at MEND Phase II (Ref. II P iv; see below) but, on account of its importance and the renewed urgency in the light of the ministerial announcement, it is treated in a separate monograph under the title *Reflections on a Programme for the Establishment of an Academy for the Performing Arts: A Submission to the Ministerial Sub-Committee* (June 1998), a copy of which appears in the appendices to this report.

Ref. II P iv See Document 204 in Proceedings

Performing Music, Knowing Music.
Dr Janet Ritterman (Director, Royal College of Music, London)

It was regrettable that Dr Ritterman did not have the time to deliver the full text of her address, which was searching and provocative over the wide range of performance-related issues which had been posed by the proceedings of MEND Phase I and which had been conveyed to her, inviting her comments. And there was no doubt that Dr Ritterman was responding specifically to these concerns; pertinent observations from her careful reading of the Phase I Report punctuated her lecture, giving it an immediacy which was reassuring as to her determination to be fully focused on the issues at stake. The lecture is thoroughly reviewed in MEND Phase II Interim Report, but the passage of time, and the announcement by the Ministers (of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands - and Education) of a decision to establish an Academy for the Performing Arts have added piquancy to her observations, some of which had a prophetic role in anticipating, and possibly even influencing, the decisions so far promulgated.[120]

Dr Ritterman's contribution, which skilfully underlines the interdependencies between meaningful performance at second level and its natural progression to a variety of potential applications at third level, makes a particularly strong impact in terms of the breadth of her underlying vision. Since the conservatoire idea is an embodied component in the Academy for the Performing Arts which is now a reality awaiting further development, Dr Ritterman's remarks should now be appraised in terms of their relevance to the ongoing dialogue. And there is little doubt that she has astutely and disinterestedly put her finger on the pulse, if not the nerve centre, of current concerns. In dealing, as she says, . . . non-hierarchically, with the six P's - purpose, place, partners, philosphy, profession and practicalities (see the review in MEND Interim Report Phase II) - she does plead for principles before practicalities. In defining the fundamental details of a rationale, she arguably touches, however obliquely at times, on areas that may well need to be addressed or reconsidered in the unfolding scheme.

1. The place of the conservatory/academy 'must grow out of the history, the geography, the society and its visions'.

2. **Dr Ritterman stresses, over and over again, the idea of partnership**, from liaisons at local and national levels to European and other international collaborations. It cannot be 'entire unto itself': it needs to be 'part of mankind'.

3. Much has been written on the subject of philosophy and its treatment during MEND. The conservatoire, in the contextual sense argued by Bennett Reimer, must be in touch with the sensitivities and artistic stability of the community it serves. It must be 'issues oriented, value-centred, sociologically and politically involved in the culture's ongoing life', in the sense that 'its curriculum, its aims, its relations with students and its staff and with the wider musical community, are a living out of a philosophy of music education'. Dr Ritterman argues that 'the philosophy of music education embodied by any new conservatoire [be] congruent with the system as a whole. . . . there needs to be a shared belief that a conservatoire forms a vital complementary part of the whole'.

4. At a professional level, what kinds of musicians are needed now and in the future? What are the skills, areas of knowledge and personal attributes that seem to be central? What might this mean about the relationship of conservatoire and community?

[120] In a submission (on behalf of MEND) made to the working group set up by the Minister (Síle de Valera) to investigate the feasibility of the proposals for such an academy, the text of Dr Ritterman's lecture formed a significant part, as summarizing many of the concerns aired at MEND on this issue.

5. Having established purposes, there is a logical progression to resources. Here Dr Ritterman is at her most insightful and persuasive. **'Among the practicalities that should be considered would be appropriate links with the rest of the educational and music education system. What links should be made with other third level provision? With other universities? With other specialist institutions? With other arts? With teacher training? With other parts of the music education network?'** How accurately and prophetically these anticipate current concerns. These issues will be touched upon again in the separate appraisal of the national significance of an Academy for the Performing Arts. Dr Ritterman sketches a variety of functions that might be served by the new institution but her comments are underlined constantly by the desirability of liberal collaboration and interconnectedness. **'The integral connection between conservatoire, profession and community is, I believe, something to which to hold fast'**.

As if anticipating the recurrence of traditional problems in Irish specialist music education, Dr Ritterman's remarks, in the re-reading rather than at the time of the delivery of her address, seem to be labouring the point, but to good effect. 'Devise an organization which is open and which encourages its students and staff to identify with the society and the communities in which they are located - not to regard it as an "ivory tower". . . . Create an institution that is true to itself, "not a university in disguise". . . . Create partnerships and connections, not to institutionalize the "fractured continuum".

Turning pragmatically to a consideration of the employment prospects for graduates from third level music studies, Dr Ritterman feels justified in taking a 'robust approach'. The writer finds this model - Janet Ritterman's 'mosaic career' where the challenge is not one of 'getting jobs' as of 'making work' - Peter Renshaw's ideal of the musician as 'a catalyst in a living culture'[121]- less than convincing in the context of its presenting daunting challenges to all but the most gifted musicians. It is still an accepted cause for concern in conservatories worldwide (and the writer has had copious first hand evidence of this phenomenon all over the world and in five continents) that training in these institutions is typically unsuccessful in tempering the performer instinct with the pragmatism of the market place and is producing a cohort of so-called 'failed performers' who are not even effectively salvaged for the teaching profession. Characterizing options as being 'either performing or teaching', reprehensible as it might be as a manifesto, does not emanate from the policies of conservatories but is imposed by the unrealistic ambitions of the young musicians themselves, who characteristically do not even accommodate the teacher option in their aspirations or even in their thoughts. Realistically, the writer argues, the other options enumerated by Dr Ritterman would account for only a small percentage of the total performing/teaching norm. The ideal balance would seem to arise from a Reimer-type range of options at lower levels (see the Reimer lecture [Ref. II P iii] which quotes the norm in the US as being 9-15% performing in high school with the remainder opting for much lower levels of involvement) feeding into a further fractional participation in practical music at third level which can supply societal needs for professional performers and teachers; the latter would be required in relatively greater numbers if the music education system itself has reached a corresponding balance, based on insightful awareness of the need to develop a meaningful dispensation . There seems to be a slightly lingering impression in Dr Ritterman's presentation that even conservatory management can inadvertently absorb and perpetuate the idea of teaching being the residue of its success stories in performance. One of the challenges to the conservatoire mission is surely to inculcate in all students

[121] The writer has had confirmation from several promoters of community-related projects, such as the ideal of Peter Renshaw's 'catalyst in a living culture' evokes, that they are interested only in candidates who have, to use Janet Ritterman's words, 'qualities of leadership, are versatile, are good communicators and good at working with others'. This is to cast such a job opportunity as highly élitist and a far cry from the more modest aspirations of the 'common denominator' young professionals, even those coming from distinguished institutions. This may be a pessimistic view but it begs to be challenged. The writer would 'settle for knowing that he is wrong'

an awareness of the regenerative responsibility and the dignity of the teaching profession; and this need not necessarily be done by playing down the performing instinct.

Dr Ritterman gives cautious approval to the idea that a conservatoire should involve itself in teacher training (for performance). She seems to be dichotomizing practical teachers into those suitable for high-level work and, by implication, those whose abilities are more comfortably tested at modest levels of student expectation. This is obviously a practicality that will have to be addressed in due time, but imposed dichotomies and discontinuities have historically been divisive and tension-laden in Irish music education and should be conscientiously avoided as new and idealistic educational systems evolve. Dr Ritterman, in fact, refers to another dichotomy - that of the practitioner and academic, the doer and the thinker - which she would characteristically deconstruct by insisting on the so-called well-rounded education, which ensures that practitioners are fully conversant with and participators in the spectrum of academic activities, with similar reciprocal understandings being mandatory for those who major in options formerly perceived as largely non-performing. Her views should be compared with, as indeed they may have been evoked by, those expressed by various speakers at MEND Phase I (Gillen, Halpin, Sweeney – Refs. I P xv, xi and xvi respectively). Her support for the extrinsic benefits of involvement in performance[122], *inter alia*, aligns her with the wider context of a Referentialist philosophy of music which is contentious, typically as between Reimer and Elliott. But, above all, Dr Ritterman extols the genuine benefits of performance teaching properly conceptualized as something that 'encourages sharing, talking, demonstrating . . .; that is not negatively examination-oriented; that is not focused on the vainglorious 'at the expense of the work or the ideas'. Her idea of performance is summarized in the ideal that it should 'bring music to life' as 'an activity enabling the participants to feel a sense of genuine achievement and to experience for themselves music's expressive powers'.

With reference to the Leaving Certificate syllabus and the fear expressed that it will inhibit the prospects for the recruitment of third-level music students (See the review of the Sean MacLiam Paper Ref. I P xiii), Dr Ritterman has this to say: **'The [music] education system needs to ensure that fit provision is made both for the future amateurs and the future professionals, and that the learning opportunities give to each some means of understanding the other's perspective'.** In a magisterial sweep Dr Ritterman ended her lecture by placing performance in centre stage as genuinely, and not just perceptually, the safest key, for the majority, to knowing music which, after all, is what music education purports to help the learner to do. **'Educating people to know *about* music without encouraging them also to *know music* is, I believe, a false direction. For most, however, it is through performing that they begin to know and respond to music. . . . It is the process of helping people to know music . . . that is, I believe, the task of the conservatoire, as much as it is the task of the individual teacher.'** Nor is this to be seen as taking sides in the Reimer/Elliott confrontation; it is rather to mediate between them and to point up areas of genuine agreement that should be shared by all musicians enquiring into to the nature and purpose of their art.

Dr Ritterman ends with a touching invocation of an eloquent quotation from Alastair Reid, epitomizing the goal of expressive performance; it ends:

> *'Play the tune again;*
> *and this time, when it ends, do not ask me what I think.*
> *Feel what is happening strangely in the room as the sound glooms over you, me, everything.*
> *Now play the tune again'.*

[122] Such as the quote: 'Performance encourages the development of sharing, of teamwork, and of other transferable skills vital for life' - an idea which is attributed to the distinguished British music educator, John Paynter.

Ref. II D iia See Document 254 in Proceedings

The Conservatoire Aspiration. Educational Contexts of Music in Process of Transmission

Chair: Ms Mary Lennon
Reporter: Mr Pádhraic O'Cuinneagáin
Panel: Professor Richard Colwell; Dr Janet Ritterman; Dr Terri Sundberg

It should be remembered that this debate took place some three years before the announcement of the setting up of the Academy for the Performing Arts in Ireland. The panel members represented a useful cross-section of European and American practice in performance training. Dr Ritterman was authoritative on details of the pure European model of a conservatoire devoted to the training of performers; Dr Sundberg came from a typical American university setting which also caters for performance as a major component for its degree award; Professor Colwell's expertise was in music education within a conservatory in the United States - a somewhat untypical but interesting background from which to view the particular problems of setting up, *ab initio*, a conservatoire-type institution in Ireland to act as national focal point.

This debate was very succinctly reported and contained much substantive material arising from what seems to have been the dominance of the panel members in responding comprehensively and authoritatively to most of the questions raised. The title of the debate itself left open the question as to what was being *transmitted*; it could have meant either the training of performers to transmit and create musical experiences or the training of teacher/performers to transmit educationally to ensuing generations of musicians. In the event the teacher-training aspect was not taken up, although it is a crucially important fundamental decision as to the function served by a conservatoire, quite apart from the natural fallout which results in many aspirational performers turning to teaching their instrument, for whatever reason.

The main points treated in the discussion were as follows:

1. Dr Ritterman immediately made the vital connection between performing and teaching by defining performers as teachers who teach themselves - perhaps a sanguine view but one that is highly relevant to the whole mystique of performance and how performers should be trained. She argued for the widest range of educational options and freedom of choice to expand the spectrum of performer types. She attached fundamental importance to the use of methodology which optimizes self-regulated practice routines.

2. The need for a conservatoire was examined within the perspective of other educational priorities in Ireland (see also Colwell - Ref. II P ix for a similar viewpoint on the timing for the establishment of a conservatory in Ireland). It was felt, not surprisingly, that the fundamental issue in Irish music education was that of providing a satisfactory musical experience for all children in primary schools, with all the problems of physical resourcing, teacher training, distribution (availability), accessibility and relevance that this would entail. The implication here was that the current infrastructure for music education in Ireland is currently neither sufficiently stable nor robust to produce a national (Irish) student body for a conservatoire. This view was further supported by a reference to the number of institutions currently supplying third-level education for performers and performer/teachers in Ireland and more than meeting the demand in terms of the number aspiring to the profession who could reach the entry standard required.

3. There was broad agreement that both types of third-level music education - with academic (university) and practical (conservatoire) orientations - are needed, the latter left unspecified, that is - regardless of whether it was provided in a purpose-established national conservatoire or as a continuation of current institutional arrangements.

4. Professor Colwell took the lead in commenting on the perennial dilemma of the surplus of performance-orientated students over the employment opportunities (see Ritterman for further discussion of this topic - Ref. II P iv). This issue is, of course, ineluctable and should/must be realistically confronted in any policy decision or feasibility study in relation to the setting up of a conservatoire. He acknowledged that the competition, typically for places in good orchestras, is so intense that practice routines for aspiring performers are draconian; but standards are correspondingly high. He pragmatically advised that taking a degree in music (presumably implying an academic degree, defined by Dr Sundberg as representing a broader education) should be a deeply considered option for most performers, who statistically, as Professor Colwell euphemistically put it, may end up 'looking for a change of career in mid-life'!

5. There seemed to be a perception from the floor that the concept of a conservatoire needs careful definition. In response to a question from Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin as to how an ideal music institution might be defined, Dr Ritterman, consciously using the model of London's RCM (of which she is the director), plausibly listed the institutional characteristics as independence, having direct funding, autonomous degree-awarding powers, freedom from restraining linkages with other institutions and flexibility in responding to the needs of students. She confirmed Professor Colwell's suggestion that the most desirable basic qualification is a degree, this being a matter of public perception; degree awarding powers without the need to be accountable through a validation procedure were therefore important if the syllabus content of courses in music were to be controlled by management sensitive to the needs of performers. This naturally led to a discussion of the question of academic weighting in curriculum for qualifications in music. No definitive recommendations were made on this issue beyond a simple clarification without comment or noticeable bias. Dr Ritterman drew attention to the need to consider weighting in relation to the real time allocations (instruction and study) for practical and academic subjects as well as to the marks available. Dr Sundberg confirmed that a similar regime operated in the US where degrees could not be earned without significant input to academic aspects. It appears that to change the university perception and to gain parity of practical subjects with academic modules in terms of weighting would invite a lengthy and arguably acrimonious battle with a doubtful outcome; the situation is aggravated for performers by the perception of an academically-biased degree as of superior value and status.

6. Professor Ó Súilleabháin, somewhat characteristically, was prepared to challenge the order which decrees the academic bias referred to above. There are, of course, differences here between American and European practice. In the US the academic bias is typically copper-fastened, since most universities (which do the bulk of practical training, unlike their European counterparts) award degrees and can insist that the content be suitably laced with non-performing credits. In Europe (as witness the RCM) the degree status battle has been lost since diplomas have been converted, for intern students, to graduate courses, thereby, presumably, accepting that the content does not merely comprise performing and related practical modules. And it is arguable that this decision was not based arbitrarily on a policy of capitulation but has defensible merit in guaranteeing a broader and more adaptable educational package than specialism in performance only could guarantee. The problem in performance is that, as Professor Colwell commented, the competition for employment is fierce and therefore the preparation for it tends to be too narrow in focus should other employment opportunities be desirable as a fallback position. The storm of argument is unnecessary to defend the aspirations of the successful performer, who may not even need a diploma to obtain professional employment, which typically depends on the ability ('on the spot') to perform only. On the other hand a performance-oriented diploma is really not a convincing qualification in a pedagogical sense. It might seem that the challenge

Professor Ó Súilleabháin faces is one of influencing public opinion, not the university canon.

7. The question of having a junior school attached to a conservatoire was raised. Again this elicited only information as to the existence of a conservatoire feeder system, for that is the principal function that a junior school performs, allowing the parent institution to earmark talented students from an early age and partially to remove the gamble of a free-for-all auditioning system. There is, of course, educational logic in the strategy also as it brings talented youngsters, at a critical age, into contact with the best teachers available, thereby enhancing their potential as future professional performers. The system works in both the UK and the US but is not typical in continental Europe, where the designated music school, very often with staff drawn from the local conservatory or academy, achieves the same (or perhaps an even better) result in successfully monitoring the progress of the talented.

   The discussion did not proceed to considerations of how an Irish conservatoire would recruit its intake and whether it would incorporate its own junior school or rely on a notionally widespread amelioration of performance training opportunity throughout the country. This latter is an issue that is as crucial to address as the setting up of the conservatoire itself, but this issue is discussed elsewhere in this report (see Section XVI - Rationalization – Towards A Contextual Philosophy for Music Education in Ireland).

8. Mary Lennon's question concerning a definition of what a conservatoire might be could have been evidence of a veiled concern as to whether its brief might include the training of teachers of music, further definition being then required as to what kind of teacher training might be included. Again, there was no response to this beyond Professor Ó Súilleabháin's conjecture that a conservatoire might be construed as catering for performers at post-graduate or post-diploma levels, a very plausible suggestion in the context of recognizing that (third level) primary degrees in performance are already available in four respected institutions in the state.

Recommendations

1. A crucial decision in the setting up of an independent conservatoire in Ireland should define the scope of teaching to be undertaken - basically whether it includes teacher-training as well as performing

2. The provision of a satisfactory primary education network, as a suitable skeletal infrastructure, should take precedence over the establishment of a conservatoire at this point in time.

3. The work of those institutions currently providing training in performance to degree level should be taken into account in any arrangements made for an independent conservatory.

4. The welfare (and notional professional destinations) of the whole cohort of performers should be considered in the course content of conservatoire training. Teacher training should be mandatory for all performers.

5. Ideally a conservatoire should have institutional characteristics as follows:

   a. Independence

   b. Direct funding

c. Autonomous degree-awarding powers

d. Freedom from restraining linkages with other institutions (e.g. university validations) and

e. Flexibility in responding to the needs of students.

6. Awards issuing form a conservatoire should, where possible, be at degree level.

18.8 Forum for Music Education

"To be sure, music is a miracle. . . . What miracle wants of us is not that we, as thinking beings, shall capitulate to it, but rather that we shall do justice to it in our thinking. Precisely because music is a miracle, incomprehensible in the framework of the dominant mode of contemporary thinking, impossible to fit into the current conception of the world - a miracle not only in its greatest and most splendid, its most exceptional, manifestations, but in its plain fundamentals, precisely because of all this it is our duty to think about it. The purpose is not a rationalization, a setting aside of the miraculous. Thought that is true to its subject does not annul miracles. It penetrates the fog around them; it brings them out of darkness into the light."

Victor Zuckerkandl
Sound and Symbol p.6

Ref. I D ivc See Document 162 in Proceedings

A National Forum for Music Education in Ireland

Chair: Professor Paul Deegan (RIAM)
Reporter: Mr Martin Barrett (University of Limerick; Royal Irish Academy of Music; University of Hull)

Judging from the report of this debate, it seemed tentative and did not evince the confidence and consistent depth of thought to grapple with such a crucially important issue so early in the total span of the initiative's programme (it was, nevertheless, the last debate of the MEND Phase I Proceedings). It proved difficult to prevent the meeting from side-tracking into the specifics of a forum's business, the intention of the organizers being, rather, focused at that stage on laying down principles for the establishment of the forum in the first place. However, sifting through the material generated by the debate, useful pointers emerged, some of them subsequently cropping up when the post-inaugural business of the forum itself began to be addressed (1997). The most pertinent ideas from which the debate draws its value are as follows:

1. The structure of MEND itself (pre-ordained and agreed agenda, conference format, combination of scholarly presentations and open forum discussion) is itself one stream of a workable model as to how a forum might conduct its business.

2. Comprehensive membership should seek to establish democratic principles, and all constituencies of interest - amateur, professional and regional - should have *fair* representation

3. The forum should have no connections to a particular institution. It should be autonomous and be accountable only to its members.

4. Membership should not be confined to institutions only.

5. The (executive?) location of the forum (for meetings?) should be flexible, depending on circumstances, resources etc.

6. The meeting accurately anticipated subsequent lively discussion (1997) as to an appropriate title for the embryo forum. The rapporteur noted the meeting's preference for the title - *A National Forum for Music and Music Education in Ireland*. The meeting agreed that:

It is essential to retain the word education in the title, since there is a vast need for a national music education body with a lobbying rôle.

The remainder of the business of the meeting was in the form of rhetorical questions, which seemed mostly to be suggesting possible functions that the forum could carry out:

1. Address the needs of the disabled through musical provision.

2. Establish a secure funding structure for the forum.

3. The forum should rotate in choosing venues for its meetings.

4. The forum should consider the peripatetic issue (raised many times at MEND) in all its aspects.

5. The forum should accommodate consultancy/information services, seminars/conferences, the drafting of music education policy, research.

Ref. II P v See Document 205 in Proceedings

The Rôle of the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC) in American Music Education: Current Changes and Challenges
Ms Dorothy Straub (MENC)

Dorothy Straub was invited to speak at MEND for two reasons. She had already proved herself as a communicator of substance and cogency in a strong presentation at the ISME biennial conference held in Tampa, Florida, in 1994. As a recent president of the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC), representing some 70,000 music teachers throughout the US, she was a natural choice for enlightenment on how organized and unified effort can achieve what seems impossible by individual, casual or sporadic inputs, no matter how well-intentioned or well-informed. To quote Ms Straub's impression of the Music Education Summit hosted in the US by their National Coalition for Music Education in 1994: 'The conclusion of the two-day summit resulted in unanimous agreement that we can do far more together than any of us can accomplish alone. The summit, which brought together some 90 national leaders from nearly as many organizations, published its proceedings under the title *With One Voice*.

As already stated in the earlier review of this paper, it is abundantly factual in a useful way which, above all, lays bare both the macrostructure and infrastructure supporting American music education efforts; it would therefore be to diminish its impact to try to summarize Ms Straub's carefully interwoven mosaic of collaborative endeavour, since it forms an essential backdrop showing how cumulative networking enterprise, in the face of crisis, could effectively change, and not just influence, the course of American federal legislation. The issue was the inclusion of the arts in the educational *Goals 2000* legislation, surely a make-or-break situation which had epochal implications for the health of the music education system in the US and indeed for the world, which must be, at least subconsciously, influenced by politico-cultural and humanistic policies in the richest economy.

An unabridged copy of Ms Straub's paper was included with the Interim Report from Phase II of MEND since it was a veritable handbook on the workings of one vibrant well-interconnected forum for music education, from which much preparatory information could be drawn to inform the Irish context. On careful rereading, at the post-MEND III stage, of Ms Straub's paper, a number salient points applicable to and capable of throwing light on the general concerns of MEND emerged strongly.

1. MENC, from its inception (1907) almost a century ago, has been committed to the 'advancement of music education' and this basic mission has never changed. It exists as

a forum for the exchange of educationally-oriented ideas and to facilitate the healthy cross-fertilization of educational effort from many sources, sometimes representing stances of considerable diversity and differing aims. In this sense, apart from the scale effect which is less adaptable to the Irish case, there is a paradigm here for creating an ambience in which the many dichotomies in outlook (and even deeper and more complex divisions) within the Irish system could be confronted in face-to-face interactions, which just do not occur as we are currently constituted.

2. It demonstrates how systematic actions of association, as systematically encouraged through the agency of a generally accepted flagship group (such as MENC in the US) can lead to the general adoption of a mission statement, which can in turn provide guiding principles, establish priorities and impose a *modus operandi* where concerted action is called for on critical issues. A mission statement can help to co-ordinate effort while keeping basic goals (such as, in this case, 'the advancement of music education') clearly at the top of the agenda.

3. It shows how the existence of a dedicated group can set up a recognized power base with political muscle, and how such a group can be self-sustaining and self-strengthening by forging fertile liaisons with like-minded enterprises. The National Coalition for Music Education (1990) in the United States is one such conglomerate (and it has proliferated state-by-state ever since). The original partners were MENC, NAMM (National Association of Music Merchants) and NARAS (National Assembly of Recording Arts and Sciences); **a strong caucus is evident here and it is particularly to be noticed that it successfully bridges the high/mass culture dichotomy.**

4. Ms Straub clearly demonstrated how, through the auspices and persuasion of MENC, music educators' interests were successfully insinuated into political discourse and how the group became the co-ordinating agency, at the invitation of government, for the drafting of the epochal National Standards, which Ms Straub claimed, with a justification separately confirmed by such influential figures as Paul Lehman and Bennett Reimer, to be the ' most significant event in music education [in the US] in this [20th] century, perhaps in the entire history of music education in America'. It is particularly relevant to note how the networking and openness which are features of the system, as it continues to evolve, ensure that all members have identifiable channels for the democratic submission of their ideas on how the system should work.

5. MENC is a constant public reminder of the power of advocacy. As a strong and truly representative group it can co-ordinate strategies to ensure that advocacy is well focused, well argued, and well targeted, as the lengthy 1983 -1994 campaign so spectacularly demonstrated. And MENC has its own internal strategic plan to ensure that the association continues to be effective. In its list of priorities the mission to 'improve the quality of music teaching and learning' has been not so much superseded as sharpened in focus by the priority given to 'providing leadership in advocacy for music education'. Starting from this high priority activity (advocacy), the lesson to be learned from American practice is that Ireland is particularly ineffective in this area and that the working of a forum for music education is a measure that is urgently needed and deserving of unanimous support from the music profession, in its own interests.

6. In relation to performance teaching in the US, it is clear that most of this, at pre-third-level, takes place in school. Ms Straub's paper does, however, clarify the details of an extraordinarily dichotomous norm, which does not have a parallel in Ireland but which is helpful to consider as a flawed paradigm which has virtually rocked the American system to its philosophical foundations. It appears that:

a. ‘In most high schools in the US music is strictly an elective. As a result, music education touches only a small percentage of high school students’.

b. ‘Most of the students who do not elect music perform in band, orchestra, or chorus. It is usually an either/or situation. The performing students do not receive a comprehensive music education.’ At its conceptual best this, of course, usefully highlights the pragmatic mentality that meaningful satisfying performance *is* a specialism which is time-, interest- and skill-dependent and is, no doubt, supporting a huge servicing teaching cohort with a vested interest in the *status quo.* At its conceptual worst (which is probably also at variance with the aspiration and intentions of educators of the general class) it perpetuates the notion of two separate streams of music education and ideas of élitism. It corresponds exactly with Janet Ritterman’s concern (Ref. II P iv) when she laments that ’those students who imbibe what, at worst, can be music’s “hidden curriculum” [the majority] are generally lost to music for life: from this they sometimes learn that music is only for specialists, that it is difficult to understand, that it is often boring, that it is all about composers’ lives. It was learning of this kind that, over twenty five years ago, led to Music’s being described by English pupils, whose views were summarised in the Newsom Report, as “the most boring, useless subject in the school curriculum”’. This damaging dichotomy, however challengeable as a representation of the reality, conjures up a notional world of non-literate (or worse still illiterate) performers and literate non-performers. It must obviously have made the MEAE movement vulnerable as to its perceived aims and spawned, on the one hand, the epochal revision of strategy which the National Standards encapsulate and, on the other, the honest frustration which David Elliott’s *Music Matters* treats so fundamentally and magisterially to find another way.

We should be grateful to Dorothy Straub for a finely honed, information-packed presentation which so urgently presses home the positive and negative aspects of American school music education while, above all, suggesting how greater familiarity with the totality of its successes and failures can beneficially infuse Irish thinking.

Ref. II D iib See Document 255 in Proceedings

A National Forum for Music Education; A Strategy for MEND Continuity

Chair: Dr Eric Sweeney
Reporter: Mr John O’Flynn
Panel: Prof. Bennett Reimer; Ms Dorothy Straub; Prof. Ramon Santos

It can be seen from the agenda chosen by the MEND delegates themselves (at the Heralding Debate in 1994) that the idea of a continuing forum, specifically to ensure continuity of music education debate at national level, was considered a *sine qua non*. It nevertheless demanded continuing debate, during the course of the initiative itself, as to suitable parameters for its establishment and operation. This debate, the second on the issue, represented an advance on earlier thinking. It was well attended, the chairperson was thought-provoking and efficient in stimulating useful discussion, and the debate was well reported.

1. There was reference to the Association for the Promotion of Music Education (APME), an initiative of the 1960s. Although the fact that this petered out could be attributed to apathy or lack of leadership (a real problem that is referred to elsewhere in this report - see Colwell - Ref. II P ix) the reasons advanced on this occasion (reasons that are very valid and, in hindsight, very pertinent to consider in the light of the possible fate of the established Forum) were:

a. The initiative was *solely* Dublin-based

b. Its work was duplicated by the Music Association of Ireland

c. There was little or no response from the Dept of Education

It is interesting to reread the report of this debate, as a post-Mend III exercise, as it can be seen in the light of the progress of the work of the forum as established. The debate was fortunate in having two panellists from the American scene of music education; Professor Reimer and Ms Straub, as being very much in the forefront (technical and management) of the Music Educators' National Conference in the US, were in a position to speak authoritatively on both the similarities and differences between the Irish circumstances and those in the US.

2. There was lively dissent on the question of setting pragmatic limits to the brief of a forum for music education. The spectrum included a suggestion for an inter-arts organization (Dr Sweeney); a bottom-up approach which sought to respect the work of special-purpose coterie groups by encouraging them into a larger coalition (Ms Finn and Messrs OFlynn and Glynn); a forum with an inclusive agenda which could lead to a pan-music front and eventually to a pan-artistic front. A further variation and part-synthesis of these suggestions was subsequently debated comprehensively by the independent forum as established at Phase III of MEND.

3. Ms Straub listed four essentials for ensuring vibrant, relevant and focused activity in the proposed forum:

   a. As an absolute priority, an agreed agenda was necessary so that core issues could be identified. She was adamant that an agenda should be assembled *before* politicians and legislators were approached.

   b. Leadership training for those who were to lead the forum's activities.

   c. Geographical planning. Presumably this would mean, in the Irish context, ensuring that there was countrywide participation and that issues outside the main centres received equality of treatment.

   d. A movement towards promoting consensus on and standardization of the fundamental parameters of music education. An agreed agenda would facilitate such a gravitation. Ms Straub would have been reassured to know that we have a National Curriculum in Ireland; it would therefore be rather for a music education forum to lobby for guarantees that such a curriculum was being effectively implemented. There is currently (2000) an initiative in music education which seeks reassurances from government that meaningful exposure to a satisfactory spectrum of musical experiences be provided for every primary school child in the country.

4. Several queries as to possible sources of funding for a forum were not followed up.

5. Professor Santos endorsed the idea of coalition, stressing that a multiplicity of single coterie negotiators would be unwelcome to politicians. A united front is the most effective strategy to adopt; the forum should strive to achieve a coalescence of smaller groups. Professor Reimer favoured an approach which brought all the arts together in a common endeavour. This strategy has been successful in the United States especially in the movement to get the arts (music amongst them) confirmed in the curriculum of the Goals 2000 legislation for education. This is however a double-edged tool as it can lead

to promoting the extrinsic benefits of a music education over the intrinsic, which should be the main concern of music educators (see Colwell - Ref. II P ix for further discussion of this aspect).

6. There was confirmation that an embryo agenda (that of MEND itself) had been carefully worked out and could act as an opening gambit for the executive work of the forum. It is interesting that here an intervention by Mr O Flynn did single out an issue (ripe for the agenda) which cropped up many times during the MEND proceedings - that of suitable materials for Irish schools and the funding to provide these. A further suggestion - that continuity in music education (between primary and second-level schooling (see *Deaf Ears?* Report) be a priority on the agenda was advanced by Mr McKenzie; this, of course, was already a prime item for discussion at MEND itself, as having been the single issue that brought MEND into being in the first place.

7. Professor Reimer endorsed a suggestion by Dr Joseph Ryan that the two branches of music education for the young - the general music education programme (in schools) and performance training (whether in schools or not) - would need separate treatment.

Recommendations

1. The forum for music education, there being a consensus as to the need for its establishment, should coalesce with or absorb the interests of other similarly oriented groups so that a single and united voice on music education would result.

2. The forum should attend to

    a. Formulating an agreed agenda

    b. Leadership training for its executives

    c. Democratic representation and an effective geographical spread

    d. Promote national standards in music education (without stifling individual initiatives, the benefits of creative thinking or the aspirations of special interest groups).

3. Priority agenda items for the forum should be:

    a. Continuum in education between primary and second-level schooling.

    b. Materials for general music education, suitably tailored to the Irish context.

19 Rationalization

19.1 Rationalization – Towards A Contextual Philosophy for Music Education in Ireland.

Throughout the MEND proceedings, and, to be factual, even from the conception of the MEND brainchild itself, there was a growing awareness that, in tracing the troubled progress of music education in Ireland back to its sources in the nineteenth century and, indeed, to the notional fundamentals of thought on the subject, an irreducible essence would eventually crystallize around the need for a philosophy by which to appraise the past and to underpin current and future efforts. This realization had taken shape significantly with the delegates by the end of Phase I of MEND and continued to wax in spite of Harry White's feeling and frustration, expressed at Phase III, that there was too much concern about theory before the fact of amelioration[123] – too many obvious targets in sight that scarcely needed a philosophy to justify immediate action. Festina lente! Without dismissing White's healthy impatience, the consistent[124] input at MEND by distinguished philosophers of world renown made the case, and made it forcefully. Although the philosophical theories seemed, at first, to cover such a spectrum - from thesis to apparent antithesis, and the many shades in between - that they engendered invitations either to be ignored (with impunity) or to be rationalized, the passion and urgency of cumulative pronouncements over the past decade commanded respect. They insinuated, in spite of (or perhaps because of) apparent disagreements, compelling new thought processes aimed at finding an approach to music education that would have universal appeal in a world at last aware of the totality of the musical heritage to which it owed allegiance, along with concern for true and sensitive service to its multifarious manifestations. In other words, the need for a philosophy of music education that would rationalize the teeming corpus of intellectual input was evident as a priority consideration. But, although music and music education may be considered an inseparable pair, the *a priori* existence of music and music making – a universal experience and faculty[125] - and of much philosophy in relation to it, may not be assumed immediately to follow a well-lubricated path to a derivative theory as to how it should be imparted in education – how society might preserve that which it values. It may be true, as Harry White so aphoristically summarizes it, that 'the music, you might say, comes first'. But David Elliott's definitions that 'works of music are multi-dimensional thought generators . . . [and] music making is thought-impregnated action' are in themselves thought-provoking pendants. Music cannot grow and flourish in transmission without thought; it is our duty to think about it.

The field of music in human affairs (for music is unique to humans) is so bewilderingly vast, varied and complex that the task of transmission of its benefits is dauntingly challenging. It is unnerving to attempt a rationalization of the parameters that would lead to an indissoluble essence in the strategies that can offer a minimal, eclectic and representative sampling of music to enrich all lives. It is palpably clear from the insatiable scholarship that has fed on the educational and transmission aspects of music that there is scarcely a consensus here and, indeed, that the last word has not been spoken, if

[123] Harry White, *A book of manners in the wilderness: A Model of University Music Education and its Relevance as Enabler in General Education in Ireland.* (College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society, Volume 38 [1998]) p.62

[124] In using the word *consistent* the author wishes to indicate that the apparent incompatibilities observed in rival philosophies were, in his opinion, more virtual than substantial and were eventually rationalized into a form that allows a consistent way forward, for Irish music education, to be proposed. Perhaps the only claim that, on its face value, is difficult to reconcile with the educational principle of the need to inculcate the mature faculty of judgement and evaluation, was that of David Elliott that 'no musical practice is inherently better than any other'. The claim is, of course, indispensable as a justification for absolute multiculturalism, and frames another of the three major dilemmas facing today's music educators. The multicultural issue is crucial in Irish music education and is treated in depth in this report (Section 18.6).

[125] See Heneghan, *The Interpretation of Music: A Study in Perception, Expression and Symbol* (Unpublished treatise; University of Dublin, Trinity College, 1990) Par. 1.4.01 p. 10

indeed it ever will be; this, of course is the attraction and value of continuing philosophical debate. However, by invoking the pragmatic and fructifying criterion of the 'division of labour', it is possible, of course, to divide musical activity (and its associated educational burden) into professional and amateur, into specialist and general streams, into academic and practical pursuits, into the making and appraising of music - composer/performer and listener and so on. These convenient dichotomizations simultaneously simplify and complicate the task of educational transmission but they must be confronted and choices must be made if progress is to have a logical basis, never more urgently than now when music has to justify its place more than ever in the curriculum and stake importunate claims to the physical and mental space in the lives of learners. And assuming that music must be taught and learned if it is to survive and evolve meaningfully, at many levels from informal or casual absorption to intensely organized and committed involvement, there are many key considerations that must be taken into account if ideal, or even satisfactory, results are to be aspired to:

1. Music must be made more user-friendly, a criterion that accounts largely for the distribution of musical preferences. This must be accomplished in education through the areas of knowing – *within, how, why, about* to use Bennett Reimer's admirable list to sketch a paradigm for the divisions of musical enterprise that must be attended to, independently of the informing and guiding philosophy.

2. Judgement and Value ought to be invoked in choosing music for transmission and consumption, whether in education or even in less goal-directed engagements. The criteria of excellence and 'relevance for the purpose in hand' are axiomatic. The responsibilities of educators in this regard cannot be overstated and it is here that the timing of exposure to and involvement in philosophical debate at the teacher-training stage becomes significant.

3. Music as art. The importance of music in virtually all cultures attests to its mysterious and existential nature; the recognition, conscious or intuitive, that music has these special qualities aligns it with culture, in its broadest sense, as one of its most precious forms of communication, often demanding the most sophisticated and specialized forms of utterance at its most ineffable and sublime, and accounting for the esteem in which expert music makers are held in enlightened societies. 'The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. From it flows all fine arts and science . . . . All composers and musicians must search deeply into mysterious ways. (Albert Einstein, quoted in John Buckley's paper [Ref. I P iii]). It is impossible to escape this symbolic association of music with art – man's attempt thoughtfully to comment on and to formalize his engagement with life, as perception, expression and symbol, to uncover its deepest meanings. 'Symbol and meaning make man's world'[126]. The notion is pervasive, and almost all recent philosophical writings (including those associated with MEND), even the most liberal and sociologically emancipated, are shot through with references that are essentially drawn form artistic and aesthetic lore, exposing highly vulnerable inconsistencies when the domain of music is expanded beyond the limits it defines. But it should be stressed that this does not presuppose an Absolutist/Formalist theory of art and the aesthetic[127] as promulgated typically in relation to western art music. The aesthetic is a necessary criterion for art to exist (the terms are cognates) and, as such, it should be applied to musical experiences, but it is not sufficient to invaginate all of them; this is a critical distinction about which post-modern music education philosophy is currently deliberating. Some musics are more modest - or just different - in their intent; there is music that can function outside of art, and because of this we have the classical dilemma that faces music educators, and now more than ever as we face the educational

[126] Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New* Key, p 28 (Heneghan Thesis, p 66)

[127] The aesthetic is, broadly, the science of perception as related to sensation, consciousness, imagination, recollection, feeling, reasoning and subjective response. The writer uses it in this sense rather than in the narrower understanding of a philosophy of the so-called fine arts.

challenges, in music, of this new millennium. There needs to be absolute clarity and understanding on the pretensions of all forms of music if they are to dovetail with the aims of formal education. And those musics that must relinquish their claim to be art (but, arguably, *not* to being music), whether by fiat or voluntarily, because of insupportable dissonances with the canons of the aesthetic, must be called into question as to their place in a programme of arts education, in the first place, and as to the methodology of teaching them, if it is not to be by arts-orientated means. This is proposed as a line of thought that has not been given due consideration in educational philosophy. It is one thing to apply aesthetic criteria to all music and by inference to find some forms and intents wanting; and there is no denying that this does not work in a liberated age that cannot live with exclusions but has not quite come to terms with all the consequences of the strategies to remove them. It is quite another to begin by validating all musics by right, and therefore to assert their equality vis-à-vis one another and insist on their free, and even indiscriminate, insinuation into education, without taking into sensitive account the ability of the educational system to cope, to equip teachers with an appropriate methodology or corpus of knowledge and to discriminate authoritatively. And Harry White's concern about the fragility of certain endangered norms that no music educator would consciously dispense with, and his impassioned cry that 'this high-handed repudiation of art music [and] the assumption that one generation is free to dispense with its obligations to the generation that follows'[128] acquires a new urgency that calls for searching reappraisal of what is commonly proposed. Alternatively, all musics in the arts programme should be taught primarily for their artistic qualities, and these too must be understood by those who aspire to a teaching role. If there are other musics that seem to have an inalienable right to inclusion in education, is their place in some other area such as social anthropology, if indeed that has a clear place in early education. Professor Ó Súilleabháin's views are apposite here (Ref. III P vi). Nor is this élitist, as the accusation is so often levelled. The canons of art did not evolve and were not defined with the intention to exclude. The benefits of art are available to all; the democratic principle is upheld in their being free to embrace, ignore or even reject them. There is so much misunderstanding, dissembling and mindlessness in attitudes to this far from undemocratic fact that it amounts to a commanding question in music education. Stated differently, which musics are suitable for educational purposes? We have Elliott's characteristically elliptical qualification to consider here. 'I argue also[129] that while no Music is innately superior to any other, some musical practices may be *educationally* more appropriate than others'. But the question above implies no preconceptions. And if it seems unexceptionable to prescribe excellence, there are plausible guidelines available to reach mature judgements in this respect. For example, in Ireland, the idea that general music education should incorporate offerings in so-called classical music, in traditional Irish music, in multicultural and popular musics is not compromised if the notion of artistic content is invoked as a criterion in relation to their suitability. This is to throw down the gauntlet to the architects of curriculum to appraise the template of art, which, after all, probably does mesh with almost all musical experience relevant to education - whether consciously or subconsciously, at novice or advanced levels, whether in making or listening to music, in casual or intense encounters. The experience of art, too, in its widest contexts and definitions is uniquely human – so much so that to be aware of its power is a fundamental human characteristic and is, indeed, *to be human*; this is proved by countless examples, even from prehistoric sources, of man's instinctive urge to express himself in the symbolic 'language' of art. So, we cannot side step the artistic integument of music in formulating educational strategy.

---

[128] Harry White, *A book of manners in the wilderness: A Model of University Music Education and its Relevance as Enabler in General Education in Ireland.* (College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society, Volume 38 [1998]) p.60

[129] David Elliott, *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1995), pp 210-211

4. Engagement with the artistic vocabulary is not narrow in its application, nor is it to be assumed that it is the prerogative of western culture, in spite of its overweening plethora of philosophical and other scholarly writing in relation to it. And indeed within western art music and its derivatives, as elsewhere, the horizons of artistic experience have been inexorably driven back to interface, at best, with other sources of meaning within reach of the human condition as expressional, social, ideological, representational, personal, cathartic, religious - and with other experiences. David Elliott summarizes in relation to his praxial philosophy: 'Works of music (in the praxial sense) are artistic cultural constructions involving several interconnected dimensions or facets of meaning including the following: interpretative, structural, expressional, representational, social, ideological and , of course, personal meanings'

5. Philosophers (and we should be indebted to David Elliott for a notable attempt here) have tried to grapple with this challenge and to define a philosophical provenance that will accommodate the inevitable dissonances that occur at these interfaces. And Bennett Reimer, although still within the safe haven of his aesthetic convictions, has, in his response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness*, identified the attempt to reconcile the totality of musics of the worlds cultures (specifically listing popular music, the all-embracing multicultural field, and art music as the three forces to be harmonized), into a manageable educational provision, as another commanding challenge in general music education, fuelling the search for an amicable and satisfactory accommodation.

6. It is predictable that the philosophical travail in relation to the nature and value of music, in all its ramifications, will be ongoing and that it will continue to produce differing versions of education philosophy to empower the crucial steps towards the formal and systematic introduction, through education, of music as a life force. The questions surrounding the music itself (which music?) are primordial in nature (simply because the experience is primeval in its historical context) but they must eventually lead to implementation of inculcatory strategy, and so to a new phase of philosophical concern - appropriate means and methods of transmission. The incontrovertible truism that music is a universal experience and faculty leads ineluctably to the ultimate cornerstone of the MEND edifice, one that has been handsomely endorsed throughout the initiative - and without solicitation. It is simply that the universality of the experience calls for a universality of opportunity to allow the benefits of musical experience to be shared by all, with the potential for growth. In western society (and we must keep in mind that, in the final analysis, a consideration of the Irish case must be resonant with the norms of that classification) this predicates music in general education, meaning that music education must be part of the school experience. For this aspect alone there is every justification for invoking the American (US) experience, as this apparently self-evident truth has, only in the past decade, been recognized by the federal government and adopted in educational legislation, following a remarkable and historic challenge by the advocates of music and art, galvanized into concerted effort. Furthermore it predicates that all other musical activity must be influenced and conditioned by what goes on (and even more importantly what does not happen) in general education, from primary (and even from kindergarten where appropriate) to the interface with third level, where other chosen specialities may justifiably phase out or terminate the formal experience. That this is not happening – in other words, that there is . . . at best, a cleavage between the intended and the delivered curriculum , . . . at worst, no clear intention at all - is a matter of grave concern to musicians and to those who will champion the cause of music - in almost every society. Furthermore, that there are two perceptions of musical experience, one emanating from the educational system (school music) and the other from the community (popular music is typical), must be of deep concern to educators who are trying reconcile the two without any certainty that they are reconcilable.

7. Depending on the (verbal) system used to define it, musical experience can be subdivided into as many as five (or perhaps even more) categories. The attempts have led to many misunderstandings and concern about omissions, undue dominances and de-emphases. The analysis of the Reimer/Elliott debate alone, which has been a necessary preoccupation in the aftermath of MEND, is a case in point.

    a. The alternative perceptions of music as product or as process are the cause of serious divisions and vituperative debate. Harry White attributes to David Elliott, as the fundamental tenet of his philosophy, the claim that 'all music is a human activity rather than the product of that activity'.(P54 of the College Symposium document) It is easy to imagine how this could be hotly contested when superimposed on the current argument over the place and the relative importance of absolute or total multiculturalism, typically as a challenge to the perceived dominance of western art music, in the curriculum

    b. The division of musical experience into its academic and practical pursuits is a simple manifestation of classification by specialism, of a pragmatic division of labour so to speak, using a somewhat more blunt instrument than that (Reimer's) which emphasizes the need for both in a complete and balanced educational package which should inculcate forms of knowing within and how (practical), why and about (academic). This dichotomy is, and has been, all too apparent in Irish music education and is troublesome in the sense of the lack of understanding of each cohort of the other's priorities and the intolerance which that breeds.

    c. A third means of classification separates musical involvement variously - into music making and music appraising or, with further breakdown, - into composing, performing (David Elliott adds improvising, conducting and arranging) and listening (knowing about music is curiously absent from this latter breakdown).

    d. Professional and amateur

    e. The division of music by genre, however classified

These are different ways of presenting the experience of music; they interpenetrate and cross-relate but none would divide into quite the same cohorts as any other. It is notable that none overtly, if at all, singles out the enabler of all advancement in musical experience, if not the facilitator of the most embryonic awareness of meaning in music – the teacher. It is arguable, and strongly too, that the teaching of music is a unique way of experiencing in that it has a double involvement in transmission - that of empowering the experience itself and of inculcating the skills that can lead to self-empowerment. The dangers of compartmentalizing an activity (music-making) that is itself holistic are obvious, not least in the possibility that some of these component activities can assume disproportionate importance, worse still that they can become mutually exclusive or excluding. This has led to vagaries in philosophical stances that are in need of rationalization and reconciliation (as, for example, Elliott's apparently undemocratic rejection of listening *per se* as a fully-fledged musical activity capable of equality with performance *et al*).

Because of the scope for disagreement as to the hierarchy of the components in this quasi-debacle of musical experience to illustrate the full matrix - as music itself or as an educational challenge, it is necessary not only to define and delimit each area but to mount a defence of its claims should it find itself isolated or deprioritized. This is, of course, also to define the task of music educators in general and curriculum developers in particular. And this in turn leads back to the need for a consistent self-justifying philosophy to identify the contexts and to inform the decisions. The search for such an enabling philosophy should start with an aspiration towards a universal rationale, one which might bind each system to its responsibilities in the 'global village', cherishing similarities while honouring differences, taking and receiving, resolving dissonance while accepting it as evidence of human

feelings and convictions strongly felt, establishing canons that respect all musics, conferring rights while demanding that each justifies its position according to its merits and state of development, and by agreed criteria. That such a brief, if successfully taken to conclusion, would be Utopian is almost self evident, as is the fact that if it were in existence the MEND initiative would have been largely superfluous. But the attempt should be made; only when abortive should universality yield to modification and lead to the particular. It was in following this process that it became attractive to examine the American philosophical arena. And it should be stressed that it was not because of similarities between the Irish and the American systems of music education that this reliance developed but simply because music education in the US was in a state of flux on fundamental issues when the MEND initiative was mooted.

It seemed unexceptionable to take Bennett Reimer's *A Philosophy of Music Education* (1970, rev. 1989) as a possible point of departure – no more, no less. After all, few music educators would cavil at the claim that it commanded a reverence that made it enormously influential, epochal and unchallenged in the global scene for almost a quarter of a century which just overlapped the beginning of MEND. Fortuitously it was supplemented in 1996, on the occasion of the Amsterdam Biennial Conference of the International Society for Music Education by a notable attempt, by invitation, to sketch a possible model for a Universal Philosophy of Music Education. More pertinently, it *was* finally challenged by David Elliott in his *Music Matters - A New Philosophy of Music Education*, itself, in the writer's view, perhaps a less fêted work on universal music education philosophy specifically (it was not its stated brief) but no less significant. And yet it is perhaps in its address of the universality issue that David Elliott's book comes closest to his claim of offering a real alternative to Reimer; the two views, or rather approaches, in this respect are polar but also complementary. Reimer's method is to build a system step by step on the basis of the views it should accommodate (leading to some bizarre partnerships, which, if retained in their idealistic forms, would eventually guarantee its collapse as a panacea).

Elliott, on the other hand, starts with a total acceptance of all musics (another kind of universality), whatever their intent, leading back to constrain himself eventually to the praxial mode, an assertion of the linked pair of total multiculturalism and the innate equality of all music cultures - and a disproportionate dominance of activity (practical music making according to his own definition), amounting to an equally implausible solution to the universality aspiration. These attempts are copiously dealt with in this analysis, notably in (See Section 18 Agenda Item 1 ii [Contextual Philosphy]) It must be evident that, in analysing individually, in addition to comparing, contrasting and rationalizing these philosophies of music education, a useful corpus of relevant knowledge will emerge; the sources themselves and the analysis must encapsulate a great deal of received wisdom, copiously endorsed from other distinguished sources, and a nucleus of contentious issues to be taken out of the limelight of public disagreement and subjected to impartial scrutiny to extract any essence of consensus that might empower a way forward. The writer, having gone through this exercise in conciliation, believes that a sense emerges that allows these two views to coexist peacefully and to contribute, in their reconciled form, to a philosophy of music education which is not only plausible and applicable, but is particularly adaptable to context (including the Irish one) without losing its more general integrity - an admirable compensation for its predictably compromised status as a universal philosophy. This may very well lead to authorial reaffirmation of the essential differences seen by these scholars as sealing the mutual unadaptability of their stances. It is hoped, rather, that they will recognize the will of this author to respect what is noble and meritorious in their work. And it must also be affirmed that the writer is not posing as a philosopher with yet another 'new' message, but as a willing arbitrator, 'standing on the shoulders of giants', so to speak, in a confrontation that has so much potential for progress. As Harry White says, in deceptively naïve phrase, "the music, you might say, comes first". Music education must move on, ideally with an eclecticism that benefits from apparently irreconcilable views; impasse, on the other hand, is barren.

19.2 The American Philosophical View on Music Education. Towards a reconciliation of the Reimer/Elliott Counterpositions.

It must be stated that, in pillaging the writings of Reimer and Elliott for a consensus view, the writer became aware that the dates of the documents reviewed were very significant. It may thus be claimed that each was in position to benefit by hindsight from the promulgations of the other, as they occurred chronologically, and to respond to them. Not the least meaningful in this sense was Reimer's Universal Philosophy essay for ISME Amsterdam in 1996. In fact the sabre sharp attack on Elliott weakened its impact by identifying his sensitivity to the dismembering of his own philosophy by Elliott, gratuitously paying him the compliment of public attention and disapproval. And it coloured, too, his own construction; but the model is, withal, astutely fashioned and elegant, all the more so since Reimer himself is candid about its fragility. And in sketching it he incorporates some subtle shifts in his own evolving position without, however, compromising the basic tenets of his aesthetic stance, as a reconfirmed irreducible in the 1989 revision of his philosophy (Preface xiii). It is worth conjoining, at this juncture, the fact that in his approximately contemporaneous response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness*, he is even more forthcoming in identifying the global issues, stated with masterful succinctness, that would test the applicability of a universal philosophy. These are:

1. the urgency of the multicultural issue,

2. the psychologically confrontational mutuality of popular and art music in education, and

3. the unchallengeable dominance of performance as an issue. By implication, of course, the status of listening *vis-à-vis* performance is being postulated for validation.

Reimer cleaves to moderation as much as he eschews extremes or fundamentalism in his treatment. He acknowledges what is useful and praiseworthy in Formalism (aligned with Idealism and Absolutism) but acknowledges that it was a child of its time; it was serviceable in what it set out to clarify in the celebrated aesthetic conflict of the nineteenth century, but has been superannuated in its inflexible form. He embraces Referentialism in an expanded definition which cleverly accommodates Expressionism, and even conceals his own favoured hybrid of Absolute Expressionism, without distress. He does not, however, engage the issue of the subtle difference between emotion and feeling, which is the Langerian essence of Absolute Expressionism, perhaps because of its dissonance with the currently fashionable idea that the cathartic value of music is a valid context. He condescends to acknowledge praxialism as the activity-centred side of the product/process coin but rejects any radical version of it, especially one which disproportionately champions performance, a fundamentalist stance which he attributes to David Elliott. [The much more detailed confrontation on the (mis)interpretation of this position should be studied for a fuller understanding of its implications (see Section18.1.2).] Elsewhere Reimer (and, to a less forceful degree, Elliott too) attest to the inseparability of product and process. But it is in his treatment of the contextual approach to music education that Reimer arguably breaks new ground and opens the door to the potential accommodation of other functions of music, possibly even those that might be in conflict with the aesthetic idea, although he does not specifically allude to them. This compromise is to identify the very heart of current contention. While Reimer outlaws the idea of unrelieved physical activity (such as performance, however mediated by artistry and musicianship) in the acquisition of true musicianship, thereby taking issue with Elliott (on grounds that are, however, disputed as spurious in their interpretation) he does not reject out of hand the elements of Elliott's claim for total multiculturalism. Nor is this entirely at odds with Reimer's own philosophy, since the aesthetic ideal is not compromised by the spectrum of music admitted to its critical lens. And there is nothing to suggest that he is not prepared to compromise even more. Reimer is at his most affable and accommodating here; it is only under direct provocation by Elliott that he adopts an attitude, albeit stoutly defended, of inflexibility, when he identifies the bottom line of his tolerance.

Clearly Reimer is intuitively aware that the four approaches he treats (Formalism, Referentialism, Praxialism and Contextualism) are ill-at-ease with one another; considerable compromise and loss of definition would be necessary to bring them into total alignment. Nor is he disingenuous about the price to be paid or a certain blandness in the result of the synthesis. Since the paper had no obvious brief other than to share his enormous insights with a world anxious to hear them, the most sensitive issues are generally played down but it is not difficult to extract them and to identify them as the three concerns above, with which he sharpened the focus of Harry White's unease.[130] Thus, the multicultural issue can most easily be constituted within the contextual approach; the complex sociological phenomenon of the pop/art dissonance is mirrored in a relaxation of the absolutist approach and in a referential view which aligns music with life as lived rather than as a special *sui generis* pursuit, if indeed it is not also barely concealed in the praxial and contextual approaches. His concern over the centuries-old misconceptions about, and mismanagement of the performance issue, the desideratum around which music education seems constantly to turn, can take its cue from his outburst about the extravagance of some praxial notions that effectively encourage a performance dominance in which the delicate balance of the total music education dispensation is destroyed with irremediable consequences.[131] The parameters are therefore consistently presented, from the two sources, in this *mise-en scène.*

Before proceeding to the denouement of this necessarily circuitous attempt to sketch a contextual philosophy for Ireland based on what is considered to be the relevance of American theorizing (rather than of its practice), it is necessary to offer some explanations of features of the American system which differ from ours to varying degrees. It would lead to serious misunderstandings if it were to be assumed that we are comparing like with like. It is interesting, as a preface, to be reminded of observations and writings from luminaries such as Charles Leonhard and Bennett Reimer himself, in which they cast doubt on whether the average American music educator fully understands the tenets of the philosophical pronouncements in relation to aesthetic education. This is astounding considering its general applicability for some thirty years as the 'official' rationale presumed to underpin Music Education as Aesthetic Education (MEAE); and there is no reason either to call David Elliott's use of the word 'official' into question or to doubt the claim about flawed insights. But one cannot hope to find a fair treatment either of the philosophy, or of the system based on it, by reading Elliott. It is, nevertheless, crucial for any serious observer to understand as much what it is *not* as what it *is*. And if its plausibility endures, it will go hard with Elliott's praxialism to supplant it.

[130] See Reimer's response to Harry White's paper – *A book of manners in the wilderness* (Section 18.1.1).
[131] For a comprehensive treatment of this commanding concern see Reimer, *Beyond Performing: The Promise of the New National Standards in Music Education*, which is reproduced, by authorial pemission, in the Appendices of this report.

19.3 Music Education as Aesthetic Education

The system so described attempts to put into practice the tenets of aesthetic theory as synthesized and considerably expanded by Bennett Reimer, using various distinguished sources. Nor is it to undervalue his own epochal contribution when it is remembered that the task he undertook was to act as thoughtful mediator, in the delicate middle ground between theory and practice, to adapt a manifold corpus of mature thought to its educational consequences. Reimer's critics, Elliott chief amongst them, are apt to forget too easily the inauspicious circumstances under which MEAE came into being. The historical perception of music education in the United States, even in the renascent enlightenment of the post-WWII years, held steadfastly onto the traditional idea that music was about learning to perform (Elliott might have no fault to find with the concept so baldly stated, whatever about the detail) - virtually no more and no less - a notion that Harry White would see as reflecting a similar Irish (mis)conception - one that dies hard on both sides of the Atlantic. But the dispensation in the two countries was vastly different. If, as seems fair to it, the US *source* is consulted (Reimer's1970/89 book, which is mandatory reading for anyone who wishes to understand the arguments), it presents, quite apart from the hard core of its philosophical principles, a comprehensive system of music education. It typically balances practical and theoretical components, but tailored by circumstances to the needs of the dichotomized cohorts of music learners. These comprised a healthy 10% or so of performers and a complement of non-performers (by choice) who could best be described as apathetic and neglected at that time (1970). This was notably different from Irish provision in that performance training was, as ideally represented in advocacy statements, freely available in schools to those who wished to take up the option and, presumably, this was built into the financial management of the school option system and into the American economy in its educational contexts. There was a similar division (to ours) of the labour force into practical and general (academic) streams except that these were juxtaposed within the school system itself in the US; there can be little doubt that tensions existed between these groups, especially as to their rival claims to curriculum time, on the one hand, and to the options and allegiance of students on the other. America did not have a national curriculum, as we have, so music was not even guaranteed a place in education as a right. If the ministry of informed and reflective practitioners is superimposed on this scenario, MEAE at its best and healthiest may be seen as providing a holistic musical education for those with inclinations open to it. The aesthetic ideal is/was, of course, implicit; and, in this regard, ongoing philosophical enquiry had every right - indeed even a duty - to continue to appraise the validity of the ideal in a changing world. But the system itself and the underlying philosophy should not be confused when negative criticism is being levelled. Neither can stand or fall by calling up examples of the best and most inspiring teachers/teaching or of the unimaginative and uncommitted - an all-too-common and naïve approach to championship and its obverse - fault-finding.

MEAE had, therefore, to contend with public opinion inured to performance (rather than holistic musicianship) and the teacher training and employment pattern that bolstered it up - formidable barriers to break through. It seems probable that it engaged with this scenario and that the best results were exemplary of their kind; certainly performance throve and Reimer has, on many occasions, referred to this outcrop with cautious pride. But the benign fallback position of MEAE - the one which is now used to denigrate it - was to rescue the dramatically disproportionate non-performing cohort of some 90% of learners, and to give them an exposure to music, without doing violence to the real intent of their 'option' which surely must have been to minimize their involvement in the well-known technical challenges associated with even competent performance. [The writer is convinced that to speak of practical competence in the absence of skill acquisition is a nonsense. Time spent is the crucial factor here.] It is arguable, from the best professional practice, that the receiver should not dictate the methodology used or the objectives aspired to; but the reality was that these learners had a stated commitment to a non-performing option – another formidable barrier for the would-be educator, already denying him one avenue of progress. But it is central to the MEAE rationale (and, indeed, *it* is consistent in upholding its commitment to the idea) that listening to music is, in itself, a fully-fledged and fertile musical activity, and worthy of pursuit in its own right. Reimer is eloquent, and pragmatic too, in his defence of its integrity. It is worth quoting him at length to show the

common sense of his philosophy in this respect. He does *not* say that listening enriched with performing opportunities and skills would not be more fulfilling if it were possible within time constraints and the need for hard-won physical skills; what he does offer is an encouraging prospect and serendipitous consequences for the vast majority who, through well-understood circumstances, find their involvements with music largely defined by and concentrated in their propensity to listen to it, without performing it themselves. Here is what Reimer has to say, in a US context admittedly (but it is generally true), and it is unanswerable:

> In fact, of course, practically all people in western cultures (and most other cultures) are music listeners, because even the small minority who are performers, composers, and conductors also listen to music other than the music they are producing at the time they produce it. The vast majority of people in our culture engage in music only by listening (with the exception that many sing occasionally, as in worship services, communal events, and so forth). Listening, then, is the one musical involvement germane to all people in our culture, and it is pursued regularly, avidly, in a great variety of ways, and at no small expense. (The Recording Industry Association of America reports that 12 billion dollars was spent on recorded music and music videos in 1994 – more than ever before in history.) That music education has poorly served the needs of people to become more perceptive, intelligent, discriminating listeners is perhaps our major failing, in that we have opted, instead, to focus our major efforts on helping the 15 percent or so of students who choose to learn to be performers.[132]

If listening is taught by discriminating, imaginative and reflective practitioners who are enthusiastic - of the kind that David Elliott seems to imply are rare, if not unknown, within the MEAE movement – then its fruits need not be painted like a still life in sombre and monotonous colours. But to suggest that this is the only activity to which MEAE can lay claim to promoting, and to the exclusion of all others, is a gross misrepresentation of its intent. That there may be instances of this folly is possible (indeed probable) but, in the writer's opinion, it cannot be taken as typical and it certainly belies the underlying philosophy. And there is a very simple and obvious correlation to be drawn from Reimer's words too. If listening is the virtually universal form of engagement with music and if it is, as it should be, a respected form of independent activity (and Elliott, in the ultimate, does not deny this either), it should be taught; and the place to do this at its most fundamental is in schools, which act as the throughput net for the overwhelming majority of people in western-type societies (including Ireland), as already alluded to. Three of Reimer's ways of knowing – *within*, *about* and *why* – are admirably served by cultured, informed and well guided listening. But David Elliott has other ideas, based on the *how*, which arguably discriminate against listening as an unattached activity of pure concentration on the sounds received, unencumbered by the physical and mental processes of actually creating those sounds in the first place:

> 'In sum, educating competent, proficient, and expert listeners for the future depends on the progressive education of competent, proficient music makers [performers][133] in the present.'[134]

Since listening and music-making (performing being typical) loom large in this irreducible essence of what separates Reimer from Elliott, it is clearly necessary that these two activities should be closely examined in their educational contexts to establish whether the two points of view are reconcilable. We have arrived at the ultimate defining dichotomy – the confrontation between the performer or music maker (and there is no fine thread of difference implied here, for the performer is, vicariously,

---

[132] Bennett Reimer, in *David Elliott's "New" Philosophy of Music Education: Music for Performers Only*, (Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Spring 1996, No 126)p.75

[133] The bracketed intervention is Reimer's; in fairness to Elliott's defended position it is spurious and clearly intended to be pejorative.

[134] David Elliott, *Continuing matters: Myths, Realities, Rejoinders*, a response to Reimer's review of *Music Matters*, in the Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 1996, p17.

the composer) and the listener. The Viennese music philosopher, Victor Zuckerkandl, epitomizes the challenge to music education and music educators in his passionate plea for a unifying formula to empower the musicality of all men:

> It is a matter of fact that in its highest development music separates people rather than uniting them. There may be many listeners, but many more never listen, and among those who do listen only a few will really be able to hear what goes on . . . . Are we not, then, bound to conclude that in its highest and strictest sense music is the special possession of a very small minority? Ought not our conceptions of music and musicality take this fact into account?. . . To be sure, the confrontation with a musical masterpiece seemingly divides people rather than uniting them; only a small band is being united, clustering around the work, separated from those who may give occasional attention and go away unaffected, and from all the rest who are too distant to be aware of the music at all. But only a very superficial view could conclude that music does not concern all these others too, that it does not exist for them at all. Beethoven wrote the words "From the heart – may it reach other hearts" before the opening chords of his Missa Solemnis. Was he thinking only of the musically gifted? . . . it is addressed to all, to the whole of mankind, to the human heart . . . just as many may share in a new illumination without seeing the source of the light. In this sense the greatest works of art – and indeed particularly the greatest – are, if not addressed to all, created for all.[135]

And, elsewhere, Zuckerkandl writes with equal passion:

> Precisely because music is a miracle, incomprehensible in the framework of the dominant mode of contemporary thinking, impossible to fit into the current conception of the world - a miracle not only in its greatest and most splendid, its most exceptional, manifestations, *but in its plain fundamentals* [writer's italics], precisely because of all this it is our duty to think about it. The purpose is not a rationalization, a setting aside of the miraculous. Thought that is true to its subject does not annul miracles. It penetrates the fog around them; it brings them out of darkness into the light.[136]

The élitist tone of the first mellows into the comfortable domesticity of the second quotation. Together they sound the imperative in music education to focus on these two faculties - performing and listening – to define their true character and function – most of all their complementarity - and to ensure that they be reconciled into that balanced relationship if music, in all its forms, is to attain its ultimate goal of reaching all human hearts. And Zuckerkandl is still prodigal with apt words when addressing the idea of opposing but complementary forces (we should feel free to substitute the art/pop dichotomy or that of performing and listening as a pair): "only if the mediators are balanced and in a sound state is the soundness of the whole guaranteed. . . . the incontestable advantage of sticking to the facts as we experience them and explaining them adequately . . . is that it cannot be gainsaid that the evidence of our experience does not support any high-flown claims to universal validity'. And the undeniable fact is that, for the overwhelming majority, when their truck with or dream of performance is over, if they ever indulged it, they are left with listening alone. The question is whether, if the balance in their musical education had been tipped towards holism, they would be better equipped for the reality and listen more effectively. The answer is clear. And Reimer adds 'Performance is an essential component but insufficient on its own to carry the entire weight of the music education enterprise at this point in history'[137].

---

[135] Victor Zuckerkandl, *Man the Musician* (Princeton N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1976),18-19

[136] Victor Zuckerkandl, *Sound and Symbol* (Princeton N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1956; paperback 1969, Second printing 1973),6

[137] Bennett Reimer, *David Elliott's "New" Philosophy of Music Education: Music for Performers Only.* Review in Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Spring 1996, No 128, p. 61.

There is no intention that the reader should infer from the above that MEAE is being proposed as flawless. It has served music education (as Hanslick's nineteenth century diatribe, *On the Beautiful in Music*, served the art music of his time by laying down discriminatory canons) through insisting that a code of ethics, drawn from the theory of art, be invoked in choosing educational materials and method, and in highlighting the characteristics, within the materials and the experience, that are most to be valued. This is worthy in itself and probably broadly unexceptionable to the vast majority who think it through without any prejudicial notions, but it is potentially out of phase with some social norms evolving since its introduction; these tend to be more liberal in their attitudes to a wider variety of musics that MEAE has had difficulty in confronting as to their conforming to its canons or as suitable in education. Elliott concedes – that 'while I argue also that while no Music is innately superior to any other, some musical practices may be *educationally* more appropriate than others'[138]

There is great deal of fear, as there is also a polar attraction, in the popular perception of music as art; but the stronger emotion, mistrust of the arcane, the mysterious and the *difficult*, finds a convenient quarry in MEAE and its association, by definition, with art and the aesthetic idea, seen as élitist and exclusive in intent. But why all this consternation in the face of art? In an age which disdains hierarchies, is it passé to claim that music as art is answering to its highest calling? Stated simply - as abilities, talent and genius are not evenly distributed in humans, so musics, as their output, are not all equal, in their specifics or in their collectivity. It would be a negation of man's powers of judgement to claim that they are. All musics are owed parity of esteem in their right to engage, initially, man's curiosity in educational enterprise, but, in the end, all must submit to judgement and the value based on it.

Art is a celebration of the threateningly unspecific, the turmoil in which we are constantly made aware that our questions outnumber our answers, in which we are called to interpret, to search for meaning, often at the deepest levels of our consciousness. Art is uniquely human; it confers on man the demiurgic qualities of giving substance to his innermost feelings. That it is cognate with virtually all music few will deny ('All art aspires to the condition of music', as Walter Pater so eloquently puts it)[139], unless they have a specific agenda for so doing; but let such agendas look to their possible consequences and, at least, not reject the advantages, in education too, that accrue to traditional and intuitive understandings and that merit their retention, *inter alia*. Few, I take it, will deny either that music is, for most, a journey in search of what is beautiful. Without fear of giving hostage to either of the protagonists in this philosophical drama, let it be said that music is not only about products, but is about the activities that arise from them too. And aesthetics merely places these activities under a scrutinizing lens. As Collingwood reminds us 'aesthetic theory is the theory not of beauty but of art. . . . the quality [of beauty], invented to explain the activity, being in fact nothing but the activity itself, falsely located not in the agent but in his external world'.[140] Art is communication, expression, and implies inseparable dualities and complementarities – perception and response, objective and subjective, product and process, active and passive, giving and receiving and so on; it is that which challenges our interpretative powers and, as Annette Barnes so wisely observes, 'when its claim to art is defeated, it loses its interpretation and becomes a mere thing.'[141] Is that the fate to which man will condemn his own creation?

While a case has never been seriously made for the indiscriminate inclusion, in principle, of all musics in education, it is still easy to demonize MEAE as representing the *establishment* with its exclusions but, more seriously, of highlighting and institutionalizing the cleavage between the totality of music in the community and music in education. Whether it is possible to bridge this gap is one of the great unanswered questions of evolving music education strategy. Even Elliott is cautious about musical

[138] David Elliott, *Of Irish Myth: A Response to Harry White*, (College Music Symposium, Journal of the College Music Society, Volume 38 [1998]) p.67
[139] Walter Pater, "The School of Giorgione", in *Studies in the History of the Renaissance –Studies in Art and Poetry* (1873; reprint New York: Mentor Press, 1959), 140
[140] R G Collingwood, *The Principles of Art* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958),41
[141] Annette Barnes, *On Interpretation – A Critical Analysis* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1988),167

admissions to education as his remark above illustrates. Although the dissonances are somewhat less serious than they are painted, it would nevertheless be prudent for MEAE and its underpinning philosophy to move towards greater détente with and accommodation of musical experiences on the weaker side of the artistic spectrum, notably those in which craft is obvious and in which the balance of their 'usefulness' responds more to musical, and therefore artistic (words dear to the heart of David Elliott), than to purely social criteria. No, MEAE as the defendant on a charge of élitism is falsely indicted; there is a more prosaic reason for its finding itself the scapegoat in disenchantment with progress in music education.

The predestined failure of MEAE has been that it never had, or was permitted to have, widespread applicability in its philosophically pure form. So it has always been vulnerable to the accusation that it was a party, however proportionately innocent, to the consolidation, by the mere fact of engagement with it, of a damaging dichotomy between performing and general streams of music education, in which neither was well served, in spite of the spectacular results of a minority. It is desirable, approaching the ultimately idealistic, that performing *and* general streams should be concentrated in schools. In this America has vast potential, as indeed it could eventually be an almost utopian example for less prosperous economies. It is also desirable that specialization in performance (with its massive commitment to time spent) should be optional. How then can two streams with different objectives be combined in a single dispensation which guarantees for all an acceptable standard of musicianship? The answer to the conundrum is that the system needs, in the first place, the backing of legislation to give authority to curriculum developers to ensure that differing needs are appropriately met. The US now has this legislation, albeit in federal law which still defers to the individual states for the enactment of details; the principle is established but it is difficult to see how uniformity can be achieved. In Ireland we have no such caveat. But . . . we have a national curriculum that is not fully geared to the accommodation of the performing stream at proficient levels; it recognizes its existence and facilitates it (as an import from the private sector) in examination credits, but it does not embrace it. The same can be said of official policy to Irish traditional music [ITM] in education (see the review of Professor Ó Súilleabháin's Phase III interview [Ref. III P vi]). This is a serious drawback to the potential of the national curriculum to do more than guarantee a flimsy presence of music in schools.

There might be a temptation here to identify and embrace David Elliott's philosophy as providing a solution to the associated problem. More and more the music education dilemma seems to hang on the way performance is accommodated within the total provision; obviously, in an Irish context, that calls for an examination of the provision outside of schools, since the latter do not minister satisfactorily to the need (ITM being another case in point). The nub of the problem is quite simple but it precludes the ministry of the praxial philosophy, however well intentioned its aims. The answer is *not* to make skill-intensive activities such as performance mandatory for all in its skill-intensive forms. Performance is by nature a specialized activity, suited to the aspirations of some, but of a necessarily limited minority; it is mercilessly time-dependent and is therefore outside the scope of school exploratory offerings within general music education, as it is pure idealism to suppose otherwise. It cannot escape its association with levels of native talent, interest and commitment. It *must* be treated as a separate activity within this definition and provided for accordingly, not only in its own interests but to safeguard the majority from involvement by mandate. It should be available, accessible and affordable. If the levels of availability in Ireland fall below those in, say, the United States option system, the standards of achievement will be correspondingly disappointing and an essence of musical activity will be less functional as the boost to general well-being within the total dispensation that it ought to be.

It is unnerving to ponder the statistic that Americans spent twelve billion dollars ($12,000,000,000!) on recorded music in 1994 (the year in which MEND was mooted) and the simple claim that listeners (virtually 100% of the population) have been poorly served in education. On its face value, does there seem to be a massive contradiction here? A plethora of questions, many of them psychologically searching, arises from this juxtaposition and they are at the heart of current concerns.

1. What is the deepest activity-related motivation for engagement with music as a human pursuit – listening or performing? Is listening a satisfying vicarious acting-out of the 'performing fantasy' or simply the agent of some craving for hormonal release, and the associated enjoyment or pleasure, unrelated to conventional ambition or achievement?

2. Does listening to music , at this staggering published level of take-up, need the agency of music education at all – a grim possibility to consider, if the answer is no?

3. Is Reimer's claim – 'that music education has poorly served the needs of all people to become more perceptive, intelligent, discriminating listeners is perhaps our major failing' - evidence of a definite agenda in music education. Of course it is, but the observation is benign in intent. And is Elliott's constant invocation of the musical and artistic as the aim of music education any different in its objective? Of course not. Could there be trust in a music education philosophy unopposed, by nature, to the commercial exploitation of immature, undiscriminating and value-free taste represented by attributing, albeit with a judgemental edge, the purchase of approximately 6 CDs per annum to every adult American? Is it to be that 'anything goes', that there are to be no standards for criticism at all? The answer is still no to both questions.

4. What then is to be the role of music education in relation to the population at large? Surely this is a valid and burning question if it is to be relevant to the cultural advancement of society - and no other brief can be tolerated? Is it or society well served by an assertion of the inherent equality of all music cultures, or is it now permissible to interpret this as meaning that specific musics cannot be denied that starting position until the powers of judgement and discrimination have pronounced otherwise? Equality is not an unmarked and value-free concept; it predicates comparison, which in turn suggests judgement, if it is to have any significance. Is music education therefore empowered to implement its agenda to sharpen those powers by the systematic application of principles honoured with universal validity? Or is there to be nothing absolute except the relative – an impossible prospect? Where does the process start? It seems like an exercise in reinventing the wheel to suggest that we are dealing here with the evolution of the principles of art. But within those canons let us try to find flexibility in the definitions to accommodate current contexts.

If, as it now seems reasonable to assume, music education has an implicitly hierarchical view of musics (though not necessarily by *genre*) which is largely unrelated to the evolution of listening preferences in society, how then does it retain its relevance to the needs of society at large if it is to justify its place in education? A searching question! Is it caught, then, between the Scylla and Charybdis of irrelevance in the face of a wanton population and the unprofessional watering down or repudiation of standards? Are judgement and value, the cornerstones of the educational edifice, sufficient to rescue it from its dilemma? Are both Elliott and Reimer, and indeed all other respectable philosophies of music education, not constraining all music to enter the same filtering manifold, with the finest mesh fashioned by the taste-refining method of reflective and discriminating practitioners? The hierarchy is real and serviceable after all and conforms to the norms and expectations of society, in that it is not in conflict with the basic equality which is at the heart of true democracy. Perhaps this is merely to confirm what Elliott meant by his statement about the *inherent* equality of all musical cultures, and neutralizes one area of concern in relation to his philosophy. Nor can Reimer be charged with an élitism that implicitly elevates western art music above all others, for this is not congruent with his or any other canon of aesthetics. This leads naturally to a consideration of standards; and fairly recent American travail in this respect is very worthy of consideration. The questions must be asked as to whether America is moving away from conceptual MEAE, trying new strategies and redefining educational challenges in a more user-friendly way. *Tout court*, is it (and is the rest of the developed world too) trying to confront and come to terms with the abysmal cleavage, which at last is being acknowledged, and taken seriously, as separating classical ideas of music education from the popular understandings of the norms of participation in musical experiences outside its ambience.

19.4 The American National Standards (1992-1994)

Music Content Standards

1. Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music
2. Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music
3. Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments
4. Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines
5. Reading and notating music
6. Listening to, analysing, and describing music
7. Evaluating music and music performance
8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts
9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture

Paul Lehman's admirable exposé (Ref. III P iii)[142] of the history of the movement which culminated in the proposal of these standards for adoption by the federal authorities in the US is recommended for close study by those who demand comprehensive detail. The standards are really remarkable in that there is scarcely an exceptionable word to be found - not surprising since they were drafted by a representative committee, a notionally perfect filtering instrument which, nevertheless, in seeking to neutralize conflict, always runs the risk of a certain blandness in output. That they were expertly fashioned is disguised by their simplicity and directness, and a pervasive feeling of adaptability which would find them scarcely at variance with similar statements emanating from other respected systems. Lehman's treatment of the difficulties encountered, from the earliest days of deep concern about the absence of the arts from the US Goals 2000 legislation to their subsequent and triumphal inclusion, is masterful in its succinctness and would suffer from over-abbreviation. But there are some crucial defining comments which could usefully be kept in mind; for these there is an irresistible temptation to return to and dip into his generous offerings, which feelingfully transcend the necessarily laconic style of the Standards themselves.

1. Standards summarize results sought, rather than activities. Standards place the emphasis on kids' needs rather than on adults' needs. They specify a destination but not a road map for getting there.
2. Standards are not a panacea for the problems of music education.
3. Standards are not a curriculum, though they provide a basis for one.
4. Standards don't promote any particular methodology.
5. Nothing should be called for in standards that isn't currently being demonstrated in practice. They should be based on the best current practices within the profession.

[142] The paper presented by Dorothy Straub at MEND Phase II (Ref. II P v) is also recommended as supplementary material, though the content of both follows similar lines as far as National Standards are concerned.

6. Standards should be ambitious and not a reflection of the *status quo* but a vision for the future. Standards are an aspiration.

7. Standards are unrealistic if a school doesn't offer a music programme or is content to offer the most watered-down bargain-basement curriculum it can and still maintain its accreditation.

8. Philosophy and practice are mutually reinforcing because philosophy provides a basis for practice and practice provides an opportunity to test and validate philosophy.

9. Speaking of music education in the US: ' . . . performance plays a very important part in music at every level. The challenge now is to expand that emphasis to include analysis, music of other cultures, and so forth. . . . we need a balance between the so-called "arts approach", which emphasizes performance and creation, and the so-called "humanities approach", which emphasizes analysis, criticism and history. . . . the precise nature of that balance is subject to honest disagreement.' Don't wait until you have all the answers before you move forward.

10. Lack of time as an obstacle to the implementation of the curriculum is sometimes exaggerated. It is the only resource that is allocated with absolute and complete equality to every school in the world. Time is a false issue. The problem is not a lack of time; the problem is a lack of will masquerading as a lack of time. [Writer's comment! Presumably Lehman is referring here to the total allocation of time to a school and not to the proportion of that time allocated to the music programme. His comment should therefore be interpreted in this context.]

11. (In the US) standards represent the closest thing we have to a statement of philosophy.

12. Implementation is the key issue. Reaching consensus on the standards, difficult as it may be, is easy compared with implementing them.

13. We can achieve marvellous things working together that we could never achieve working separately (speaking of coalition of the arts, a strategy very relevant to the Irish Academy for the Performing Arts).

14. We can't teach things we can't do. In-service and preservice education for music teachers is a priority.

15. Education reform is largely political, not educational. And "all politics is local" (quoting Tip O'Neill, Irish-American politician).

16. Standards emphasize evaluation and assessment. Standards do more than make assessment possible. They make it necessary. We cannot have standards without assessment. Assessment is not only helpful but inevitable. "I see assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for music education in the coming decade". (Paul Lehman, MEND, November 1996)

17. Standards give a basis for rationalizing the entire educational process.

18. Standards clarify our expectations.

19. Standards bring equity to our expectations.

20. Standards move music beyond entertainment. Music is not simply an activity; . . . it is based on learning specific skills. There is indeed an important body of skills and knowledge to be taught and learned.

21. Standards provide a basis for claiming needed resources . . . and for insisting on qualified teachers. Discussions about specialists and classroom teachers become irrelevant because the label is irrelevant. What counts is the results.

22. Standards provide a vision for education

Lehman's peroration is worthy of recollection as to its altruistic vision and its homely bite! **". . . Music is vitamin M. It's a chocolate chip in the cookie of life. . . . The only question, in both the United States and Ireland, is whether we want to limit access to music to those who can afford it or whether we want to make it available to all of our citizens to enjoy. I think the answer is clear"**

The American standards documentation (especially in its insistence on specifics which are, nevertheless, generally applicable), and the plenitude of Lehman's discussion in relation to it provides further necessary and valuable information to inform the search for a contextual philosophy. They are, in the writer's view, eminently applicable to Irish music education, if indeed it might not be claimed that their general sense is already evident in recent curricular revision, though, based on the chronology alone, it is unlikely that they were invoked. They are agreeably non-contentious in nature because they are neither philosophically bound nor methodologically constrained. Their value, in fact, probably lies in their potentially general acceptability to the widest spectrum of music educators, a very necessary criterion in the advocacy campaign which followed in their wake in the US. As a starting point they are epochal, certainly in American music education. But, for all their seemingly innocuous statement of the seemingly obvious, they aim a lethal shaft, if adopted, at the very heart of American complacency with the *status quo* and the public perceptions that have always upheld it. They transcend, as they are inimical to, the imputed shortcomings of the two philosophies of music education that are being here appraised as to their relevance to the Irish context. Thus, while there is little doubt that performance-dominant music education will still thrive in the US, and through school dispensation too, it will no longer be available to the exclusion of a balanced participation in all the other defined components that constitute a holistic exposure and absorption. Performance will still have a vibrant presence (that will cause no pain to either Reimer or Elliott) but it will be recognized, at its proficient level, for the specialization that it is, and must be, and it will be removed in that aspect from general music education. There will be a balanced programme mandatorily provided for *all* learners and, at least theoretically, this will not favour activity (including listening and performing as the two main components, if indeed either is a true hubris of MEAE or praxialism, as imputed) over other knowings of a more obviously academic mien. This substantial upheaval, and a new beginning, will have been achieved through the agency of the National Standards alone; no wonder Paul Lehman could celebrate their virtues. But Lehman sounds a warning about the difficulties of implementation.

We are told that the National Standards are not a curriculum, though they provide a basis for one - the closest thing the US has to a statement of philosophy. Put another way, this conveys that the Standards were indeed infused with curricular and philosophical thought, for the architects of the Standards must have been music educators of stature who were well versed in such matters. The Standards are a reconsidered response to the cumulative centuries-bred awareness of the benefits of music. In stating what is needed they are responding to the question 'how can there be music?' rather than to the question 'how can there be music education?'; and presumably, the underlying philosophy is similarly biased. Harry White's aphorism may yet again be called into service for its precision in defining the critical but interim nature of the Standards benchmark. 'The music, you might say, comes first'. They are also positioned on the first rung of the curricular ladder; they state what is intended with the hope that it will be still recognizable when implementation and delivery have been effected. This is the point at which the philosophers of music education make their entry and their input. It is also a useful point, in this study, to take stock of what may already be in place.

If we trust Reimer's acumen in defining the problems that are likely to be encountered (see Reimer's response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness* in Section 18 Agenda item 1i – Overview of Music Education Philosophy) we can hold the National Standards up to that template. Although supporting documentation is also specific, an examination of the Standards themselves, in isolation, clearly defines a system of *school education* corresponding approximately to the Irish spectrum of primary and second-level education; that much is immediately relevant and in agreement with MEND ideas. But the Standards stop short at endorsing music education philosophy and method which, as we have seen, concern themselves passionately with both repertoire (in a generic sense) and the crucial relationship/balance between performing and listening. What we may infer, with ease, from the Standards is that 'what *every* young American should know and be able to do in music' at the end of the twelfth year of study is indeed a great deal in terms of the variety of the enabling repertoire, the skills and the understandings. But we can infer much more. With the implementation (whatever the state-by-state nuance) of such a mandatory programme, generality becomes the norm in which breadth is prized over depth - at least as far as the official mentality is concerned. There is no room within the paradigm for specialization which, by further inference, of course, can and will exist outside the common denominator. Performance is by far the most sought-after specialization. Far from sounding the death-knell of performance as an option, the implementation of the National Standards will revitalize it in fructifying ways. It will identify the truly committed (for there is no future in any other attitude to it) but will empower them for greater achievement and enjoyment by equipping them with a higher level of imported musicianship, which, it seems, has been typically sparse in the past. It will arrest the traffic in students joining the performance programme merely to escape the imputed doldrums, in the past, of the general programme. It will enable gifted (proficient and expert) performers to contribute enhancing experiences to the general programme without upsetting the delicate balance between the dimensions of the new curriculum, or expecting that the general level of performance within it can render that service, facing impossible challenges in the attempt. The two-tier system will ensure that all learners have the opportunity to take performance at the level of their willingness to engage it beneficially. [In the writer's view the two-tier (by definition multi-tiered) option (put another way, progressive specialization) is the only feasible solution when a necessary component in a general programme outgrows its aspirations and threatens balance and stability. The principle is well understood in its application at third, fourth and fifth levels of educational pursuit in universities.] It follows too that listening will not be inhibited by the need within the class to provide its own music - all the time. Balance, common sense and pragmatism will have their day. It is assumed, of course, that the demand for performance, which it is anticipated will not disappear, will still be met from within the school; otherwise the benefits of both systems will be lost and the last state will be immeasurably worse than the first. Presumably the music education watchdogs will be vigilant lest their hard-won benefits will crumble at the hands of mischievous politicians with readjusted funding policies. The complementarity of the two programmes is quintessential if the fruits are to be worthwhile; but the prospects are heartening.

The applicability to Ireland is eminently plausible if the self-deception of current policy can be arrested and exposed. It would be nonsense to claim that our curricular revision has replicated in a single provision the best features of the two-tier system described above just because of the accidental presence of a pitifully small cohort of good performers within it; that would be a return to the worst kind of duplicity exposed by the *Deaf Ears?* Report in 1985. But this is not to gainsay the laudable progress made by our government-appointed music curriculum sub-committee. [And it should be remembered, apropos -in political terms too - that Ireland is on the crest of an economic boom as evidenced clearly by the importation of a labour force for the first time in our history.] Can we now afford to dispense with the sham of proficient performance being claimed as a dimension to school output, as registered in our assessment procedures, and support it honestly? The strange hybrid of performance specialization (or indeed any other) being available to students on the basis of their imported skills has been hailed as a breakthrough in educational accommodation. The sinister truth is that performers are also welcoming it as an opportunity to gain credits for their non-school-based expertise, without giving a thought to the price that posterity may have to pay for acquiescence in the delusion. The oldest trick in politics is the adaptability of short-term benefits to dodge the occasional embarrassment of being reminded of deeper responsibilities. The NCCA sub-committee is to be

praised for coping, in a pragmatic way, with the not so subtle imposition of the bottom line on funding; but the music education dispensation, while it stands to gain from their input (and this is not in question) is still far from comparable with the potential of the remarkably similar American problem and its solution, simply because of the funding aspect. But this will be treated later on as to possible means of redress. The Irish system is tottering on the brink of significant success but a clearer understanding of the performance dilemma is a prerequisite. However, as far as the US is concerned, both performance and listening stand to gain from the implementation of the National Standards in the wider sense of the readjustment of the balance between them resulting from the implicit recognition of performance as a true elective, and a detachable specialization by definition. If we in Ireland can embark on a campaign to obtain funding or subsidies for electives approved as being in the general interest (performing in music being one of them), we too can expect to see significant advances in the health of the national programme for arts education. In the US, the National Standards, in responding to the mandate which brought them into being and empowered them, have successfully 'blown the whistle' on the abuses by which the highly endowed performance stream has discriminated against all music education cohorts, including, ironically, themselves. We should not, in Ireland, disdain to search out the correspondences and to benefit from American experience; in this context the similarities are more significant than the differences, and are worth exploring.

As to Reimer's other two concerns (outside of performance), they have to do with repertoire and indeed might be viewed as coalescing into a single generic issue which attempts to grapple with the time-sensitivity alone of opening educational doors to all musics - quite apart from their suitability, to which many standards of judgement can be applied. Here it is a different story with the National Standards. They would have split the carefully-constructed music education coalition along partisan lines if they had become embroiled in that delicate question. And so they are, consciously it seems, vague and inscrutable; in vain can they be searched for guidance. There is little to be made of the bland statement of content which specifies a 'varied repertoire of music'. And yet the issue must be confronted if the ultimate conversion of the Standards into a workable curriculum and syllabus is to be achieved. Reimer is right; this is a major problem and could be a Pandora's box once the search for repertoire begins. In a system such as the American, with a high degree of local autonomy, this dilemma may very well be sorted out in a contextual way which takes into account the racial and social circumstances of particular communities; but this does little to come to an understanding of the deeper concerns which call for solutions approaching universal validity and adaptability.

Many will argue, and convincingly too, that the subdivision of music – typically into art, folk, popular and multicultural (though this is by no means to exhaust the categories) – is largely artificial and is belied by the levelling forces of multivalence, interpenetration and hybridization. How then can a satisfactory criterion be arrived at in deciding on the suitability of one type of music over another? The decision is pressing; it cannot wait and it cannot be ignored. The ultimate levelling agent of the availability of time, particularly in the constrained ambience of a general music programme in schools, must have priority in ordering the other factors. An array of questions must be answered

1. What is the assessable first culture experience of the cohort to be taught and is it uniform across the matrix of cells? Continuity is also a criterion.

2. What is the relevance of the music chosen as a confirmation of identity or, alternatively, as a justifiable expansion of horizons beyond that of the reigning culture?

3. What criteria of judgement can be applied to test the excellence of the music in a way which is also consistent with its function and its accessibility for the learners?

4. Is there a consensus philosophy of music education underpinning the decisions, and are teachers versed in its tenets?

5. Is there a consistent methodology for the teaching of the chosen music, and are teacher training and on-the-spot expertise congruent with this?

6. What is the 'coefficient of authenticity', cultural and educational, in the resultant experience? What criteria are applied to establish its musical intrinsicality over and above the aims of other agendas?

7. Is the enabling curriculum part of an arts education programme and, if so, is it consistent with its ethos?

Reimer may be right in seeing the art/pop dichotomy and the post-modern multicultural issue as psychologically separate. And it is no small wonder how misconceptions about definition can enter the popular mentality and defy logic. Thus there is an intuitive understanding as to what the domain of 'pop' embraces, but an all-too-easy acceptance of mutual exclusivity when it is compared with so-called art music. The term 'art/pop dichotomy', in a sense of inimical mutuality, is arguably a misnomer when applied to education; it has been unnecessarily and divisively judgement- and value-laden, as if there is no possibility of peaceful coexistence, mutuality, integration and complementarity between the musics so differentiated. The task of music educators is surely not to widen an illusory chasm by acquiescing in the idea of its existence and its polarities in the first place - but to combat the associated prejudices to show that they are without substantial foundation in educational terms, and to ply a methodology which consolidates that view. There is a profusion, and confusion, of ideas, which must be brought to order and compatibility if the tensions of this perceived cleft are to be safely discharged and not to escalate into insupportable crisis. And it might, therefore, be as well to see this problem in isolation from the multicultural issue since it is more concerned with real hierarchical and intellectual snobbery; multiculturalism, on the other hand, has largely emanated from an impeccable source in the ethnomusicological interests of the greater institutions of learning.

1. Some though not all pop music is easily linked to the post-1960s syndrome of cultism and the challenge to established authority. It is a sociological phenomenon for which the music is merely a convenient vehicle. It is arguable that music in this classification, which may merely mirror reactionary defiance and non-musical gratification, is, by nature and definition, incompatible with normal educational practice and unsuitable as repertoire. It has its place, for other reasons of course, in third- and higher level studies in social anthropology, sociology and related studies. It is, withal , entitled to consideration if it can pass muster in accordance with agreed criteria.

2. Music for easy listening, which is audience-friendly, immediate and overtly, though perhaps at times deceptively, simple in presentation, may very well define the popular label but it should be remembered that the definition is generally adaptable, even desirable as a goal, and may straddle a wide variety of musics.

3. At a less aggressive level, devotees of popular music may subconsciously harbour resentment of the privileged position of western art music (WAM) in education (this is a theme which has surfaced significantly several times in Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin's MEND presentations). As a form of people power, it may be fuelling the offensive against WAM as the established and preferred vehicle in education. A campaign so based may lack intellectual substance and advocacy; but it is not less dangerous on that account. On the other hand, the case for popular music is compromised in the suspicious mind of the Epicurean by the perceived machinations of market forces. This is Harry White's theme but he should remember that it is not aversion to WAM but capitulation to or being overwhelmed by commercialism that characterizes the American music education dilemma

4. To draw on Professor Ó Súilleabháin again, he observes that 'popular music has a habit of looking after itself outside of the school system, but the school system can have a special place to play in reflection [on], I suppose, or re-evaluation of what that music is which is so close to the majority of students in the classroom.' (Ref. II P vi, p4). And is it too judgemental, or merely being cavalier, for Bennett Reimer to claim, in relation to

some of the more 'extreme' forms of pop, that 'we can bypass such music safely because few youngsters would expect or want it to be brought into school'.[143] But in current circumstances it is not so easy to ignore the pressures of popular forms for inclusion in the curriculum. One wonders whether Professor Ó Súilleabháin has not 'hit the nail on the head'. Popular music, in its finest manifestations has something to bring and to add to the educational experience but it is almost a natural outcome of its popular status that it needs little advocacy in education itself; nor is it typically likely to offer to educational method its most searching challenges. It is WAM which needs advocacy, and the reason is clear.

5. Harry White in his defence of WAM and its benefits in music education describes its plight with scintillating imagery. 'A European art form which rivals literature in its range and depth of feeling, structure and historical engagement withers and dies under the incessant pressure of "Me" and "Mine" and the present tense of American popular culture.' And a pair of short eighteenth century quotations place the matter in further unambiguous perspective. On the one hand 'music is a secret and unconscious mathematical problem of the soul'[144]: on the other it is 'a method of employing the mind, without the labour of thinking at all, and with some applause from a man's self'[145]. Could any juxtaposition more succinctly summarize the problem? WAM, like the mathematical calculuses or organic chemistry, is educationally challenging, absorbingly appealing to some - but *difficult*. Is this a reason why they should all be deprioritized in education, ignoring their underlying usefulness in underpinning many other related but dependent activities; would such be tolerated in the sciences? It is precisely because it is difficult that it must be retained and with a share proportional to its usefulness. And it is for education to uphold and protect that usefulness, without, however, disdaining to justify it in advocacy or policy statements.

6. The enabling repertoire is only a small, albeit a crucial, part of the educational construct. Of equal, if not transcending importance, are the underlying rationale and its associated literature – the informing philosophy, the curriculum development, the pedagogy and method, the assessment procedures, the whole paraphernalia of how these components relate and interact. It is arguable that these have evolved from the same stream of scholarship that might be suspected of supporting the aesthetic model in the first place, presenting a virtually impregnable citadel of learning-centred and concept-driven education in closed shop. But it is as appropriate to appraise what popular music forms bring to this system as much as it is to observe and complain of what they take from it. In the interests of the dependency of the whole dispensation (all musics included) on the norms of educational practice that have evolved from the canons of WAM, it would be prudent to retain what is most serviceable and to make that effort with a confidence based on and worthy of its value. It is axiomatic that vulnerability is to be found in the weakest link; it is paradoxical that the educational edifice should be in danger of collapsing on the topic of repertoire, arguably its most assailable flank, when its strongest member (WAM), with its armoury of justifications, has allowed itself to be painted into the corner of apologizing for its very existence. Or is it merely a question of who wants to consider cold logic in these days of rampant iconoclasm. It is not a matter of re-establishing the stranglehold of WAM but of retaining a balance which allows it to survive in education, if not even with some gratitude for its timeless contribution, al least for the unsung but manifold and indispensable benefits which its panoply of services

[143] Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (rev. 1989), p 144
[144] Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibnitz 1714, taken from John Amis and Michael Rose, *Words about Music; An Anthology* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1989) viii/ix
[145] Samuel Johnson quoted by Boswell 1785, taken from John Amis and Michael Rose, *Words about Music; An Anthology* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1989) viii/ix

continues to guarantee. In the urgency of cleansing the system of its abuses and tyranny, and of establishing a new order, let us not 'throw out the baby with the bathwater'.

7. This apologia for WAM may pale beside the lofty eloquence of Harry White; but neither should blind us to the need to consider the merits of other musics in education. So what, first, of so-called popular music in education? If the more and more questionable educational distinctions between it and WAM are accepted, how can we essay an imperceptible blend which removes the odorous sense of hierarchy, as centred in the genres themselves, and leaves neither compromised. We cannot eradicate the perceived difficulty of WAM but we can minimize them by inspirational method; David Elliott's maxim of matching musical challenges to the level of musicianship confronting them is admirable in this respect. We cannot gainsay the natural advantage of popular music's immediacy but we can contextualize it into its most fruitful serviceability in education commensurate with its value. And how is this value assessed. The value of all music is surely its relevance to its function – its ability to bring human consciousness and give unique human expressiveness to that which its function demands. Expressiveness invokes the idea of human feeling, much less that of emotional discharge; it is more redolent of subjectivity and of a pervasive condition *within* than of the need to dissipate that inwardness indiscriminately. When expressivity is aided by craft it becomes art, not in the narrow aesthetic sense of Hanslicks' *sui generis* upliftedness, but in the comfortable sense of the mysterious and the mimetic, fulsome with intrinsicality, that we all know. To apply the criteria of craft and feeling (expressiveness) then, as so expertly laid out by Reimer in his book[146], is to treat all music as equal, in the best and most democratic sense, and to test it in the crucible of artistic aspiration. No music is excluded, there are no preconceived hierarchies, and there is no hiding place for the falseness of mindless taste or indiscriminate claims. The bluff is called on the '"Me" and "Mine" and the present tense of American popular culture'; music, and music education too, are emancipated from the threatening tyranny of false dichotomies.

[146] Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (rev 1989), pp 133-138

19.5 Multiculturalism (MC)

Of all the topics discussed at MEND, the latter-day cult of multiculturalism - novel, fashionable, seemingly fulsome with ideas and potential to expand musical experiences to undreamed-of levels of diversity, burnished with all the glamour of information technology and contemporary communication systems – had the least conclusive of outcomes. It enjoyed kaleidoscopic treatment, from the cautious optimism of scholars who were more comfortable with its base in higher-level education - to the offerings of philanthropic enthusiasts who were more convinced and vocal about its benefits in education than they were mindful of the associated problems – to the scepticism of those who had reached the appraisal stage as to its track record and were posing a new set of questions as to the nature of its place in education.

Without gainsaying the incalculable wealth of music at its disposal - the potential of multiculturalism to saturate the individual ear with judicious choices from its treasury, and collective consciousness with a new-found certainty of the universality and variety of musical experience and music-making – it may also be seen as the voice of conscience, a monumental 'discovery' by some musicians of the western tradition that other musics exist and that they are abundant, interesting, often sophisticated and professionally charged - and challenging to ideas of educational holism. In a world where every branch of human discourse has been subjected to radical rationalization, it may be suspected that political correctness has led WAM to reappraise its conquistadorial attitudes of cultural supremacy to reach détente with all other musics. MC is, then, paradoxically an outgrowth of western culture. It is as simple as that, although there are other more charitable and partisan explanations as to how the multicultural idea has progressed.[147] Its history spans little more than half a century: its ascendancy has yet to establish itself convincingly. It is axiomatic, in a world largely dominated by western ideas and under the spell of western scholarship, that other musics could not have escaped its insatiable appetite for new conquests in the field of knowledge, in this instance social anthropology which, in the case of music, branched into the discipline of ethnomusicology. What is so amazing is the speed at which it established a kind of moral order which quickly outran the clinical study of the musics of other cultures and began to demand that they infuse the educational process in the West with the absolute democracy of total multiculturalism. That ethnomusicological consciousness, or ambition in its designs on the educational field, was fuelled by the multicultural ambience in the United States, is also probable; it must certainly have been appreciative of the nudge. Such alluring maxims as achieving 'parity among the world's musics - a true musical and cultural democracy', and 'breaking down social and international barriers to celebrate our humanness as citizens of a global village' flow freely in the advocacy literature for multiculturalism. The feasibility of the dream in its grander aspiration, though still relevant, was naturally of less interest at MEND than its implications for Ireland – and for what was seen as our limited plurality of indigenous cultures currently confining us to, at most, three distinguishable streams – art, popular and Irish traditional music. And there has even been a tendency to further simplify the problem educationally into an ideological confrontation between traditional and other WAM-related musics - the bicultural view – but this is locked into the whole process as to how cultural difference is defined in the first place. The crisis, if it is recognized as such, is not helped by the superimposition of the multicultural campaign.

It became obvious during MEND that the practice of multiculturalism has not nearly settled down as yet to a consensus view. As perusal of the papers presented will show, internal inconsistencies abound, simply because such a range of possible applications is sketched that the term becomes nebulous, without a determinate meaning; it is reduced to an attitude or openness, to musics outside current experience, which can vary from evangelical fervour and total conviction to a mere tolerance

[147] Professor Ramon Santos from the Philippines (a non-western culture) with a serious commitment to a pragmatic MC which concentrates on the music of the Western Pacific rim, understandably gives an non-western (complementary) view, which is, nevertheless, eminently plausible. He sees MC as a reactionary post-colonial phenomenon, a nationalistic emblem aimed at the recognition and preservation of endangered non-western musics, the possibilities of widespread cross-fertilization and the mitigation of the destructive self-interest of so-called Eurocentricity .

akin to indifference. The National Standards in the US are (necessarily) so bland in their avoidance of advocacy that they could easily be interpreted as a consolidation of the *status quo* by anyone with an agenda so targeted. Thus multiculturalism could be seen as a serious threat to the stability of the system, if it could be imposed in one of its more extreme forms, or merely as a frill, not without its usefulness but to be adopted or ignored at will. The irony of the situation in the US, where the multicultural campaign is being fought, is that the battle is likely to resemble hand-to-hand combat, where every inclusion will be at the discretion of a local authority; advocacy will need the service of a taut and convincing rationale and prejudice can always have its day.

The mix of the multicultural menu in any situation will, of course, respond to the context but, other things being equal, it will and must stand or fall at every inclusion, even of individual items, on the criterion of quality. As an opening gambit it might seem to convinced multiculturalists that their campaign would be helped by a feigned levelling procedure implying that all musics are equal. It was bound to come to this; the idea is superficially attractive (based on notions of the 'brotherhood of man' and 'the global village') but it is both meaningless and insidious. Multiculturalism and the simulated equality of all musics form a natural, convenient and predictable liaison, which has served its purpose in deceiving the unwary and impressionable, but the idea is a hubris that will eventually come to haunt the perpetrators. To be fair to the varied statements tending towards this view in MEND documentation (and it is interesting to compare them) they are mostly qualified, and not without skill, to safeguard the fragility of the assertion. David Elliott speaks of *innate* equality – an elliptical term; let him be given the benefit of the doubt by assuming that he means *provisional* equality, an innocuous claim, though his thesis does not eventually bear this out. Equality (or inequality) may be assumed until it is defeated; but, like a theorem in Euclidian geometry, it must be proved before the next logical step is attempted. We cannot assume a fact because it cannot be proved otherwise; that is a nonsense. And it is not to deny, either, that the necessary proofs are not readily available in musical contexts (see Reimer's Philosophy [1989] pp133-138). The equality issue is insidious because it does a disservice to multiculturalism, which should not have to rely on such a shaky foundation - and merely for the uncritical acceptance of the many undoubted excellences which it invaginates. It is insidious too because it undermines the whole educational edifice by denying the powers of judgement. Pragmatism, on which the success of the whole educational system depends, is the cumulative essence of myriad judgements and their consequences. To put aside the functions of judgement or to declare them inappropriate or ineffective is to engage in relativism, which does not serve the search for excellence well. So let us dispense with this meaningless phrase and see how multiculturalism fares without it.

From painstaking rereading of the considerable corpus of documentation generated by MEND the following emerges as a summary of germane observations on the subject of MC: -

1. Total multiculturalism is an ideal and aspiration in education neither of which is attainable. This is obvious by juxtaposing the overwhelming scope of world music (its repertoire alone) and the merciless constraints of the time factor in education at all levels, especially in the general programmes at second-level. This aspect of multiculturalism can only be confronted, and even then with definitive incompleteness, in higher education. There is (or will be), however, a need for multicultural teaching competences to be developed in third level teacher programmes as a prerequisite to the satisfactory spread of MC in any form which is worthy of the name. MEND documentation, however, is much more convincing in locating MC, as an offshoot of ethnomusicology, most comfortably within third-level education than in establishing its relevance within general music education at lower levels. This, of course, is a developing situation in which emphasis can change if it is a part of vibrant and systematic policy and the decisions that flow from it.

2. Modified multiculturalism has, by definition, the adaptability to be compatible with many approaches to music education. Most contemporary music education is multi-cultural by definition; the so-called biculturalism issue in Ireland is also covered as a subset. But it

is unlikely that these applications would satisfy convinced multiculturalists. Definitions are, withal, rather discretionary in the documentation. Versions of modified MC that are practised include: -

a. Choosing particular ethnicities to correspond with the mix as encountered in the particular class situation. But this is reactive MC; it arguably defeats its own purpose in being a form of ethnocentricity, and, in content, it is unstructured as a model of repertoire suitable for general application.

b. Choosing, eclectically, the best materials to give a flavour (which may be coloured by the prejudice of the chooser) of what is desirable.

c. Illustrating concepts in one culture through relevant examples from another. Taking the time constraints into account this may be all that is possible in a general music education programme. It is superficial and smacks of minimal compliance and the amateurism of the non-specialist teacher. It lacks the depth of a real commitment to MC as a significant component in a holistic approach to music education. It is nevertheless approved of in multicultural circles as a step in the right direction.

It should be noted that there are copious materials commercially available in the US to boost multicultural effort; these are often encapsulated in comprehensive methodology packs and are expensive. On the other hand there were persistent complaints at MEND about the paucity of materials in Ireland, especially of a kind that married traditional method with relevant offerings and systematically researched workings from indigenous folk music sources (see Albert Bradshaw - Ref. I P ii)

3. It is not clear whether multicultural method envisages a holistic involvement in composing, performing and listening. It does seem, however, that ideas so far developed centre on performance or attempted performance of the music itself. MC may therefore be seen as boosting the performing function.

4. A strong consensus about the importance, even the dominance, of WAM in education (its panoply of method, well-researched and classified repertoire and assessment procedures) is still evident, even amongst multiculturalists. This, of course, applies particularly to education systems within the western tradition.

5. In approaching multicultural repertoire, choices should be influenced by musical considerations rather than respond to the additional bonus of musically ‘extrinsic’ benefits, such as reduction in mutual alienation, the development of tolerance, empathizing, general collaborative skills and teamwork, self-esteem and a host of transferable skills; these latter should be viewed as beneficial consequences but not as priorities. The music itself and its intrinsicality must be paramount. But this cautionary advice is not peculiar to MC.

6. The importance of judgement and valuing is not denied in MC.

7. Depth over breadth is the preferred method in MC. Concentration rather than dilution is to be encouraged as an approach. Therefore teach fewer cultures in greater depth. If the music is to be performed or taught interactively, concentrated repetitive practice must be carried out in preparation, implying the inculcation of skills. There is a significant time dimension to be taken into account.

8. MC presupposes a purpose-trained teaching cohort of considerable sophistication, depending on the scope being attempted. It is unlikely that anything other the most

rudimentary exposure could be attempted by non-specialist teachers; this would be problem in Irish primary education and it could spill over into second-level.

9. MC, if adopted as an additional dimension of music curriculum, should be fitted into a programme of music education balanced to include all of the time-honoured components (see the US National Standards Ref. III P iii). Traditional repertoires should be supplemented by world musics. Blend the 'old' with the 'new'. If a 'structure of disciplines' approach is the norm (teaching concepts), examples from non-western world music might be used for illustration purposes in western-type teaching. Professor Shehan Campbell insisted, however, on the right of world music to be *blended* into the curriculum, without, however, usurping it.

10. The concentric circle model for music education was proposed by several respected practitioners. This proceeds from an inner core of so-called first culture experiences (musical mother tongue derived from childhood experiences in family and community) to which are then added the wider repertoire of musics available in the immediate community, after (and only after) which is recourse to the wider repertoire of world music an appropriate step.

11. MC is resource-intensive. It is also typically hampered by the norm, at best, of imitative-authenticity in the presentation of the music. There are also difficulties in insinuating music of oral traditions into literacy-based formal education; these should not be under-estimated. The process of mutual adjustment could be a stimulating *or* disorientating experience for learners. It is interesting, on the other hand, in this context, to study Professor Santos's compelling reconciliation of conflicting views about literacy (Ref. II P vii)

12. Method in MC education is still at an early stage of evolution. There is as yet only a limited backup of research into the educational implications and methodology associated with the movement.

13. In modified MC there are problems with choice of repertoire to yield representative examples. Even the specialists in any particular cultural context are slow to make definitive choices in the search for the best materials. This is a further challenge to the judgement and valuing abilities of ordinary teachers, calling for relevant training.

14. Arguments for MC in education based on a theory of the equality of all musics should be treated with circumspection; nor should this caution be attacked as a dismissive Eurocentric reaction. Professor Santos has accurately summed up the situation with characteristic sensitivity and a measure of scholarly detachment. 'It is no longer tenable to impose the artistic valuation of one particular tradition on another. . . . Moreover, the equal regard for the autonomy and the immanent significance of each and every musical tradition suggests a breakdown of attitudinal barriers and prejudices that have been developed and much ingrained during the centuries-old colonial period.' And Professor Santos is additionally helpful in defining the role that ethnomusicology played in the democratization of music which led to the MC phenomenon in music education.

    'Ethnomusicology provides an intellectual-artistic impetus to the emancipation of individual traditions from limited definitions and classifications of music based on western artistic experience.

    a. It has redefined a concept of universality in the field of musical experience.

    b. It has underscored the value of each and every individual tradition

c. It has emphasized the intrinsic relationship of music and culture. The conservative view of tradition as a static socio-cultural property is pitted against a more pragmatic concept as a living and ever-changing phenomenon.

Dr Santos's concluding observation is perhaps the single most significant comment made at MEND in the context of validating the efforts of multiculturalists and the aspirations of MC

15. MC is very sensitive to context, as can be seen from the variety of teaching styles which characterize it. There was thus no feeling of embarrassment or inconsistency in viewing Ireland's so-called bicultural needs as falling within the category of a special case of MC. Dr Shehan Campbell was relaxed about tempering her otherwise idealistic commitment to total democracy of musics with a sympathetic acceptance and understanding of this context.

16. There is an arguable dissonance between MC and Professor McCarthy's policy plea that bridges of mutual understanding should be built between music in the community and in school. 'Music in Irish education will best serve the country when there is a vital, ongoing symbiotic relationship between what students experience in school and what they experience in the socio-cultural context that frames their identity". A too liberal advocacy of MC, with possible sorties into all kinds of exotic musics, would surely be as counterproductive here as the perceived downside of WAM.

17. Dr Santos finally offers some underlying principles for multicultural music education

    a. Music cultures should be viewed as not in opposition but as complementary

    b. A most effective way of gaining musical understanding is through actual performance (see Elliott Ref. II P viii)

    c. New repertoires will require new skills, new perspectives, new stylistic orientation and new levels of musical understanding

    d. Musical universality has taken on new meaning, encompassing the uniqueness and discreteness of individual traditions.

It is questionable whether Ramon Santos's vision here is not predicating a third-level context for MC. His ideas are convincing but seem to place the practicalities outside the capabilities of the general school programme to deliver. Perhaps it is not too surprising that five of the seven invited MEND speakers (on the MC topic) remained somewhat entrenched, though doubtlessly unintentionally, in a third-level perspective. Only Professor McCarthy and Dr Veblen chose to anchor their thoughts in the practicalities of community and school settings. As already stated, the writer's ultimate impression is that multiculturalism has been visited precipitously and almost prematurely on an educational world not quite prepared for its inundating presence and self-generated urgency. That it will become a real and, in some ways a benignly disruptive, presence in music education there is little doubt. It merits flagging in any philosophical statement as to what is in store for Irish music education. But beyond injecting a tincture which meets the challenge of a token response to what is undoubtedly fruitful in it without administering saturating doses, it must stand in line until what should be our more pressing concerns with Irish traditional music have been engaged and solved.

19.6 Residual Dissonances

The resonances from Harry White's paper *A book of manners in the wilderness* have endured since that ultimate presentation at MEND, in November 1996; far from being convergent in relation to solutions to the problems of music education in Ireland, it generated, through its global exposure, a plethora of quintessentially important questions – those that define the irreducible intrinsicality of the music education dilemma in the developed world. The writer is nevertheless indebted to Professor White for having set a new tide of rhetoric in motion. It not only evoked responses from Reimer and Elliottt, each redolent of their characteristic views, but opened up the wider and fascinating enquiry into the source detail of those views. The reader who has persevered this far will be aware that the analysis of their celebrated confrontation and of the catalytic services of Harry White in stimulating their 'proximity' engagement with *his* version of the problems of Irish music education, has been extensive, if not comprehensive.

It must be self-evident that to take an undisputed classic in music education philosophy (Reimer's *A Philpsophy of Music Education*, rev. 1989*)* and to pit against it a self-styled challenge (Elliott's *Music Matters*, 1995*)* amounting to and parading as an apparently polar counterposition, would be bound to highlight differences, weaknesses and strengths, enduring truths and vulnerabilities in both, sufficient to throw valuable light on the eventual path of progress. The scope of the exercise was greatly expanded by the fact that Reimer wrote a critique of *Music Matters* to which Elliott was invited to provide a rebuttal. While it is the writer's conviction that the analysis (mostly of the secondary material generated, though both books were also carefully studied) eventually uncovered more disguised similarities and agreement than genuine and irreconcilable antitheses, the study did produce a residue of real and virtual dissonance which must also be taken into account in proposing a rationalized position. In contrasting the two philosophies they are found inevitably to cast themselves as an established position and a reactionary one. But there is a third document – The American National Standards: Music Content Standards (1992-94) – a template against which each might be measured. It is likely that both authors would look to the Standards as the instrument by which their mettle would eventually be tested. The nature of Elliott's challenge was to bind itself inextricably to Reimer's model; this resulted from Elliott's wilfully persistent and virtually monothematic obloquy as opportunities to attack Reimer's philosophy occurred. No doubt there are other respectable sources, besides these two, that could have been afforded the same depth of treatment, but the writer's view is that to have made some sense of the study undertaken has been significant in itself; the conclusions are eminently applicable, in their generality, to the Irish case. Yet a further Reimer document, *Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education ((Amsterdam 1996),* is also valuable in providing an additional summary of possible philosophical approaches to music education. Finally, and somewhat surprisingly, it should be made clear that neither philosophy has been fully tested in practice - Elliott's because of its newness and Reimer's simply because the curriculum of the Aesthetic Movement (Music Education as Aesthetic Education – MEAE) associated with his name, has, apparently, never been widely implemented (or delivered) as intended.

The National Standards for the US are neither a curriculum nor a philosophy so it is perhaps all too easy to disparage them as having been minimally challenged; after all, they had only to state what ought to be, without facing the task of implementation. But they admirably responded to their brief and are unexceptionable in embodying the classical content of the music curriculum viz. composing, performing, listening and appraising. They are consciously couched in terms that gave no hostage to philosophy or method. Without measuring their potential against the searching parameter of time they have one commanding characteristic – that of content balance. And it is this question of balance that dominates the whole philosophical and methodological argument, as will become apparent. As Paul Lehman says (Ref. III P iii, p 13), 'the truth is that we need a balance between the so-called "arts approach", which emphasizes performance and creation, and the so-called "humanities approach", which emphasizes analysis, criticism and history. . . . In any case the precise nature of that balance is subject to honest disagreement'.

It is on the question of emphasis – or balance - in the performing/listening programme that we find Elliott and Reimer at loggerheads. But their disagreement otherwise is more in the nature of a battle of words than substantive. Without combing over the copious documentation again, let it be said that they both fully recognize the importance of performance in the educational package in spite of their mutual carping. Reimer accepts some *responsibility* for the undue dominance – but also the acclaimed success - of performance (without the backing of the other classical components) in American music education, while Elliott focuses on the (Reimer?) MEAE listening programme as playing down performance. Neither system, of course, approached the ideal balance of holistic education; both are now superannuated by the intent of the National Standards. Needless to say, these models would not be suitable for Ireland. Reimer is critical of Elliott's praxial philosophy which ostensibly recommends such a preponderance of musical activity (especially, it might be added, performance, which is disproportionately emphasized, in spite of Elliott's belated claims to the contrary) that, again, the balance is seriously compromised; this is especially so, claims Reimer, in the neglect of listening alone and the failure to recognize it as a valid activity in its own right. Clearly, on its face value, this objection would rule out the Elliott version of praxialism as a way forward. But we are left with the clear understanding and agreement that performance must be accommodated in music education; this may seem to be an obvious priority but it has proved extraordinarily problematic and refractory in its educational implications, chiefly, the writer claims, as to its time constraints at any level of proficiency.

It is interesting, in all this rhetoric about the self-evident and undisputed centrality of performance in musical discourse, that neither scholar has drawn attention to the fundamental truth as to why this is so at a psychological level, and why the popular perception is so heavily committed to it. It is simply that music is, at bottom, a performing art; that is not to say that it will survive on performance alone but it is a basic consideration. The exercise of skill (whether physical, cognitive, artistic) as a demonstrable measure of achievement has always been so attractive to human beings that it might well be considered a congenital aspiration. This arguably accounts for the fundamental preference within musical options for performance, over listening, in our society. But there are pragmatic considerations too, which temper the trend of the distribution. Listening gives a much more immediate access to musical enjoyment with a bias towards satisfying cognitive and affective appetites over the physical (psychomotor). Performance, with its physicality and implied skills, is more *difficult*. The statistic confirming a low involvement (significantly diminishing with age) is therefore not surprising, but the aspiration can be strong and it unquestionably has huge psychological implications for the music education process.

The acquisition of cultured listening skills is a prerequisite, indeed a *sine qua non*, in any effective musical engagement which is undividedly and intrinsically musical; that is axiomatic. It is required of necessity in any purely listening act and must be taken for granted as the indispensable guiding agent in any successful musical activity of the kind listed by Elliott (performing, improvising, composing, arranging, conducting). There is no disputing that pure listening (that is, without involvement in the process of giving the music presence in the first place) is overwhelmingly the most widely practised participation in music; it must obviously carry a huge educational burden. Not surprisingly, Elliott and Reimer are agreed on the need for listening to be part of the educational process. But we are presented with the two caricatures, first of MEAE being a 'listening only' form of engaging with music and of praxialism virtually outlawing it except as a concomitant of music making (performance *et al*). Once more the question of balance arises. When both positions have been clarified it is found that one limb of MEAE indeed concentrated on listening simply because the students in the programme did not wish to have performance (this, of course, encapsulated faulty philosophy, on educational grounds, as is now realized) while praxialism, when hard-pressed, admitted to the usefulness of the listening programme itself, as encouraged outside of other activities. Moderation in all things seems to be emerging as a maxim here. The extreme forms of these positions cannot be admitted as desirable in education; the substance of difference between Elliott and Reimer is evaporating as the literature is scanned for its unambiguous bedrock position.

Another storm in a teacup raged over the plausibility and relationship of two views of music education - as related to product or process. Reimer, in his Amsterdam address (1996) connected the product and process views to two philosophical positions, namely Formalism (or Absolutism) and Praxialism. He chose to classify his own aesthetic position (Absolute Expressionism) with less precision under a species of Referentialism (as 'yielding or referring to auxiliary value for musical involvement' [*Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education ((Amsterdam 1996),* p 22] but see also the discussion under Philosophy (Section 18.1.13 [i]); its muted absolutism is perhaps more appropriate in that connotation and avoids being coupled with the perceived extremism of unmodified Absolutism. He also points to the degree to which the four philosophical positions he sketches (Contextualism is the fourth) overlap with and adapt to one another, the musical intrinsicality of the approach being the base desideratum. But the effect is still to relate the so-called art object (product) to a form of unbending aestheticism (though not necessarily Reimer's position) which would find its natural antagonist in Elliott. Nevertheless this *mise-en-scène* predictably was to cast Reimer as champion of the idea that all musical activity derives from the response to the primacy of the musical product (whether in existence, notated or in the course of composition); on the other hand Elliott, by his own hand, cast himself in the opposite corner with his opening gambit. '[I]n every example of a musical product that comes to mind, what we are presented with is more than a piece of music, a composition, an improvisation, a performance, or a "work" in the aesthetic sense. What we are presented with is the outcome of a particular kind of intentional human activity. Music is not simply a collection of products or objects. *Fundamentally, music is something that people do'* (MM, p.39). [It is interesting to compare Reimer's words apropos when, surprisingly, defining Formalism in music: '"[m]usic", then, is not the quality of the activity or product, but the kind of thing being *done* [writer's italics] – to create with sounds, significant, or intrinsically meaningful forms, embodying sets of interrelations capable of yielding musical responses by those able to be engaged appropriately with them'] However, as became apparent in the analysis of the Reimer/Elliott review literature on *MM*, after all the cut, thrust and parry of the rhetoric, both scholars assert the indivisible relationship between product and process in musical discourse; it is simply not possible to have one without the other. This reconciliation may be reassuring but it says nothing of balance; it contains the seed of further confusion in relation to that all-important question in music education (a genuine MEND concern – see Findings) as to what constitutes performance or, more crucially, as to how the ranges of its continuum are defined into general and specialized categories. The nub of the problem is that specialized performance (at expert or even proficient level) is a *sine qua non* if music is to flourish over its full range of subtlety, artistry and sophistication. This is to point the difference in attitude between professional and amateur perspectives on performance. The process is necessary to guarantee the product: the product is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the process. This is deeply to invoke standards and the assessment procedures that are inseparable from them ('I see assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for music education in the coming decade [Paul Lehman – Ref. III P iii, p 24]).

The burning question, derived from the MEND proceedings, is at last defining its significance, asserting itself and demanding a conclusive answer. America has spent the whole of the twentieth century in self-admitted error on this issue, or rather in the grips of a stubborn public consciousness (as to the equation of music education and instrumental performance); this somehow communicated itself to the seats of power and fed the political apathy that might well have persisted into the new millennium if the coalition of the arts had not intervened and demanded its due rights in 1992 (see Lehman and Straub Refs. III P iii and II P v). The existence of the problem is palpable in the Reimer/Elliott confrontation. It is difficult to be sure whether Reimer is not just rationalizing and confusing the many undoubted excellences in the underlying MEAE philosophy (the intended curriculum, as defined in *A Philosophy of Music Education)* with the unsatisfactory outcomes of the delivered curriculum. The bifurcation of MEAE (without its total school base, as in the US) has its resonances in Ireland. There is no ambiguity about the American product-biased performance programme (typically devoid of musicianship modules); there is considerably more even as to a token presence of (process-based) performance in the general programme of school music education, but none at all as to the abject failure of the programme as to its uptake. Again the problem has been one of balance. Clearly, however, Reimer has no illusions about troublesome differences in the

educational approach to the two kinds of performance, particularly if there are moves afoot to minister to both in a single programme. And it is inconceivable that the recently promulgated American National Standards could be entertaining this myopic aspiration, which would be incontinently discriminating against both cohorts of learners. Depending on the innate balance (or bias) in Elliott's philosophical underpinnings, which seem unambiguous in recommending that '[a]ll music students ought to be taught in essentially the same way: as reflective musical practitioners engaged in music making generally and musical performing particularly. Artistic music listening ought to be taught and learned in conjunction with artistic music making', it is possible to conjecture that, (1) he is confining himself to school applications of music education, (2) he considers that his views on specialist performing training are not relevant to that brief or (3) that his philosophy envisages a single democratic programme to replace the dual (streamed) system of the past, with the implication that it can cope with both product- and process-based applications to performance and develop holistic musicianship, with minimal offerings of pure listening - all within the time constraints of typical music education curricula. Note Reimer's criticism that 'treating all students the same fails to honour the principle "that different musical goals require different programmes tailored to each"'

It is now possible to speculate further as to possible offerings in the US, pursuant of the inherent and situated intentions of the National Standards, remembering that they are, as written, not committed by policy to any philosophy or method:

1. A single statutory programme will be offered, with a balanced, but notionally also a flexible, menu of learnings (excluding for the moment the question of the inclusion or not of multicultural components). This will be mandatory for all students up to an agreed level and will minimally inculcate 'what every young American should know and be able to do in music (typically at the end of grades 4, 8, and 12)'.

2. The above-mentioned single programme generally supplemented on a voluntary uptake basis with specializations, including performance - statistically the most sought after. This may or may not be school-based.

3. A single mandatory programme will be available with a bias towards activity-based involvements (such as performance [particularly] but allowing for others such as composition, conducting *et al*) with a view to guaranteeing, for all, levels of expertise approaching specialization (possibly proficient level) in addition to concomitant holistic musicianship.

The unequivocal relevance to Ireland of such a notional raft of programmes must be obvious. Taking time constraints and individual propensities into account, it seems to the writer that the hierarchy as to the desirability and the educational plausibility of such offerings is also obvious. And it is not possible to dissemble on the nature of specialization. In any enterprise of potential educational diversity, such as music, specialization is necessary - efficiently to identify and minister to the areas of increasing complexity, and to protect the more modest aspirations, viability and manageability of the general stream; in fact, it demands streaming, and separates itself, almost by definition and of necessity, from the general cohort. Ireland, which ignores the specialist component as far as generally organized state subsidy is concerned, is no paradigm in this respect and is out of step with its European partners, not to mention America. The other side of that coin, which is equally deserving and demanding of close scrutiny, is the fact that many learners themselves arbitrarily choose to be in the specialist stream, although they do not give it the commitment of time that is its due; because this happens along the dichotomous axis of affordability, it has dubbed performance an élitist pursuit. Elliott has this to say about the myth of elitism: 'Teachers and students will find the achievement of competent, proficient and expert levels of performing (improvising, composing, arranging and conducting) central to the development of individual musicianship and therefore, central to the individual self' (*MM*, p 74). And Elliott goes further in defining performance as the ultimate act of music –making, playing down even composition, somewhat, as a mere step in the realization of the music. 'Musical works involve intermediate agents . . . who contribute substantively and artistically

to the events that listeners cognize as musical performances. This is why we say that it is only in the artistic performance of a musical composition that everything a composer conceives and intends is decided'.[148] Clearly there is much work to be done to redeem this situation from the damaging misunderstandings that tarnish its image. But, as far as the general stream of music education is concerned, we are left with the pragmatic option that performing and unencumbered listening should coexist in a balanced relationship responding to achievable goals; and there should be a clear understanding of what those target outcomes are.

The remaining issues - the innate equality of all music cultures, the relevance of judgement and valuing as tools of education, philosophy in its contextual aspect, and its more arcane existential layer, as a route to the understanding of the nature and value of music, art (and music within it) as a discrete branch of human endeavour and knowing – form a nexus which can be approached from the connectedness within it.

We can assume, without demurring, that Elliott, Reimer and White were trying to search out the ultimate truths about music which this nexus invaginates, as indeed, whether subconsciously or overtly, all those to whom music matters must also be perplexed as to its mercurial and elusive character. Above all there should be a concern to reconnect music, music scholarship and musical experiences, of all kinds, to their social, indeed their essentially human, context. Depending on the depth of penetration and the resultant insights from such a study it might be possible to uncover and approach the irreducible universalities that bind music and musicians. Mindful of the universality of music and music making, of the presence and inseparability of experience and faculty - to the extent that to be musical is to be human and *vice versa* - it may he assumed that such a study could clarify the features of a possible universal philosophy of music education – one in which the implications of product, process, reference and context might interact and successfully crossfertilize.

There is a need here to confront music in its *utilitarian,* as much as in its artistic, aspects since this is at the deepest roots of much of the rhetoric in which currently perceived dissonances are expressed. What makes art is not the same as what achieves usefulness, whether this be in the form of a physical artefact, or a feelingful response. 'This is not because (as Oscar Wilde said, with that curious talent for missing the truth and then giving himself a prize for hitting it) "all art is useless", for it is not; a work of art may very well amuse, instruct, puzzle, exhort, and so forth, without ceasing to be art, and in these ways it may be very useful indeed'[149] Elliott aptly quotes Richard Taruskin on the same topic: 'A tremendous amount of critical activity is now devoted to . . . showing that the music regarded as set off from the world is still in the world, doing worldly work; to showing that musical meaning continues, as before, to arise out of the relations between the musical artwork and its many contexts, pharisaically stigmatized as "extramusical"; to showing that artistic seriousness is not incompatible with social function . . . . The dismantling of the utopian lie, runs the post-modernist argument, will be as much a cathartic and a therapeutic for art as it has proved of late to be for the body politic and economic. I certainly believe this to be the case . . .'[150] Note again the alignment here of music with art, obviously accepted by Elliott and calling for clarification of the intent of some, at least, of his extra-musical functions. And it should be remembered, too, that there is aesthetic theory that admirably dovetails with this view and which does not seek to divorce music from its essentially human context in its most quotidian manifestations. And David Elliott himself stresses the wider intrinsicality of musical experience in his own characteristic way, balancing himself precariously and provocatively on the threshold of art, without doing violence to its aspirations. 'The situated nature of music cognition and musical works, the social and cultural ingredients of particular musical ways of life, the affective specificity of musical enjoyment, and the centrality of *artistically* produced sound [writer's italics] – all these differentiate music and the values of music from all other

[148] Elliott, *Music Matters,* p 173
[149] R.G. Collingwood, *Principles of Art* , p.41
[150] Taruskin, R. (1995). *Text and act: Essays on music and performance.* New York: Oxford Universtiy Press. Quoted in David J.Elliott, *Continuing Matters: Myths, Realities, Rejoinders.* Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 129, p.30.

human pursuits.[151] It is remarkable that in all of these extracts the idea of music as art still persists and is even pervasive.

The idea of clothing the *context* of musical experience in philosophical garb comes as an invaluable placebo, indeed a catalyst, in blending (and, if needed, reconciling) the tenets of Formalism, Praxialism and Referentialism, in their non-extremist forms, without disavowing their artistic claims. Before expounding on this aspect, Reimer summarizes their shared features and interrelationships. 'Formalism, when understood as calling attention to the products created by musical processes and how those products can be experienced, and Praxialism, when understood as calling attention to the processes by which musical products come into being and are shared, are not, except in their extremist versions, incompatible. . . . Referentialism is a powereful instrumentality for achieving values to which music can lead us. Consequent or derivative values are what count, over and above those evinced by considerations of music as product or process. Referentialism calls for interpretation as to what the music means. But it must still focus on the unique products and processes which give music its essential reason for being. In the sense of music as communication it is a valid candidate for inclusion in a universal philosophy.[152] But the interdependency, interconnectedness and balance between these three philosophical positions must be taken seriously into account and allowed to function.

Context is what relates each position to its environment; it defines the interrelated conditions in which something exists or occurs. In the *Contextualist* view music is seen as a means of cultural social engagement; its sociocultural functions are the focus of attention. It becomes the aural portrayal of the psychological, emotional, political and social forces of the human context in which it exists. 'Music must be issues-orientated, value centred, sociologically and politically involved in the culture's ongoing life.'[153] Contextualism, in being proposed as a fourth possible philosophical orientation is, of course, a highly adaptive position, interacting freely with the other three, distinguished particularly by the underlying courage to engage the an-aesthetic at its crucial interface with art. In focusing on the functions of music in real life it can operate within the canons of art – or, it could fall prey to the buffetings of the anti-aesthetic theorists or even to the relativist attacks of the 'institutional' theory that art can be whatever a culture's institutional policy-makers decide to call art. But it behoves music educators to temper the fashionable trends of such nihilistic notions, interesting as they might be to ponder, and to spare their art from being diluted and consumed in a truceless war over what is and is not music; this will not serve music education in its current fragile state. To convert such extreme positions into workable educational theory would, in any case, be daunting; this, seemingly, is not currently demanded by any system considered in this report. But balanced contextualism is still full of possibilities. Applied to circumstances in Ireland it could usefully explore the 'psychological, emotional, political and social forces' that influence the reigning mentality on biculturalism as an interim phase of multiculturalism, on teacher training in all its aspects including the policy on class teaching versus specialist teaching, on the burning question of performance and its accommodation, on the prioritization of musics within the curriculum, on the real potential of curriculum time to reach its targets - and on much more, such as streaming of music education cohorts, building of music-rich bridges between formal education and the community, the management/reconciliation of the so-called popular/art music dichotomy, the implications of considering music as art and as part of the arts education curriculum, aspects of balance in the curriculum in sociocultural terms, and so on. Of course all of these issues are not peculiar to Ireland but the complete nexus is unique. Yes, there is an Irish context and it can be made to respond to a thoughtful application of as comprehensive a philosophical stance as can amicably be negotiated

[151]David J. Elliott, *Continuing Matters: Myths, Realities, Rejoinders.* Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 129, p.32

[152] The passage is freely paraphrased from Reimer's Universality essay (ISME, Amsterdam ,1996), pp. 17-20

[153]Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a universal philosophy of music education?*, (International Journal of Music Education Number 29 1997) pp 4-20. Much of this exposé of Contextualism is paraphrased from the advance copy of the afore-mentioned lecture, made available to MEND before its official publication under ISME auspices (pp. 22-23)

between the forces of these influential positions, whose compatibilities are at least promising. But is there another universality that can encourage a more profound awakening of these stances to their affinities and their responsibilities. Reimer thinks so and, in his peroration, again invokes artistic criteria. It presupposes the artistic theory of how music functions. But let us first dispose of outstanding issues.

The writer finds nothing in Elliott's philosophy that would suggest that he has a considered and deep-rooted antipathy to the idea of music as art. Taking a tiny but immensely relevant sampling of his writings we can arrive at a formula for music education which is highly adaptive and plausible, apart from questions about its methodology. He describes a philosophy of music education as building 'a concept of music by investigating the nature of music makers, listeners, music making, listening, musical works, and the contexts and interdependencies of all'. In connecting to the repertoire, he then explains that 'works of music (in the praxial sense) are *artistic* [writer's italics] cultural constructions involving several interconnected dimensions or facets of meaning including the following: interpretative, structural, expressional, representational, social, ideological and, of course, personal meanings', adding the sensible disclaimer that, in education, 'some musics are more suitable than others'. Of the processes of education he observes that 'teachers and students work in relation to a variety of constraints – practical, curricular, moral, social, cultural, ideological, political.' His vision and definitions are wide-ranging, and utilitarian too, but they do not disavow music as art, even selectively.

It must surely be non-threatening to claim that art is a universal and precious phenomenon occurring in all cultures - in particular that it is not being Eurocentric to make such a suggestion. Successful art communicates - having wrested order from man's teeming but initially chaotic ideation when addressing, from its inception, any instance of it. Art aims to be understood, and the essential response to art, which completes the act of communication, must be possible and 'lie within the available human repertoire. . . . If the response is to be significant to the person who feels it, it must bear some relation to his life as a whole: it must be part not only of his enjoyment, but also of his *concern'*.[154] We should find it comforting to consider Langer's uncharacteristically muted but largely referential view when she observes that 'works of art are not in the end independent of their makers, their audiences and the wider world. . . . Form may be the essence of art, but it should not deny emotion a place.' [155] And, again, she observes, in relation to music, that 'not communication but insight is the gift of music; in very naïve phrase, a knowledge of 'how feelings go'.[156] The *order* of musical communication, facilitating such insight, 'resides in the perceptual [feelingful] experience of those who hear with understanding'.[157] If the experience is insignificant in its potential for understanding, if it is not part of the listener's *concern*, or if the shortfall between the musical sophistication of giver and receiver is too great, the art is compromised and so too is the music's potential to communicate. Such experiences, if they can be even typically identified, define the material which is problematic for inclusion in the educational process.

The notion of the '*innate* equality of all cultures' is, in the end, as non-contentious and naïve as stating that 'all men are born equal'. It confers no hierarchical rights; it alters nothing. It is therefore ineffective, inoffensive and virtually meaningless. Yet it is interesting that in the reviews of David Elliott's *Music Matters*, David Aspin took grave exception to the claim while Bennett Reimer obviously did not see it as a threat at all. But it is dangerous when this pseudo-equality, in the case of music, is adduced as sufficient justification for admission to the educational cycle without any further pedigree or submission to the processes of judgement. Harry White may be gently taunted for bordering on the disingenuous, but he is surely right when he says that 'historians of music are not

[154] Roger Scruton, quoted in Reimer, *Should there be a universal philosophy of music education?*, (International Journal of Music Education Number 29 1997) p. 25
[155] Susanne K. Langer, *An Introduction to Symbolic Logic* (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1937) p.25
[156] Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* , p.198
[157] Roger Scruton, quoted in Reimer, *Should there be a universal philosophy of music education?*, (International Journal of Music Education Number 29 1997) p. 25

much concerned with implausible theories of musical superiority [equality?]. Nor should they be; they are a waste of time and intellect'.[158] Emotion, as lack of detachment, clouds the powers of judgement and it is particularly true that artistic appraisals can be notoriously subjective and biased. What is needed is a canon of judgement that is easily applicable with a reasonable hope of reliability when plied in the hands of relevantly competent professionals. The irreducible criterion of art (aesthetics, as the philosophy of art, being the informing agent) – the presence of craft and expressiveness (feeling) – appears to the writer to provide, or at least to hold out the promise of, impartiality.

Viewed as indices on the continuum of art, the four positions sketched (Formalism, Praxialism, Referentialism and Contextualism) have substantial interfaces of compatibility. The extrinsic utilitarian values of music within Referentialism need not invalidate the artistic. Only the extreme nineteenth century versions of Formalism and the anti-aesthetic and institutional theories of 'art' are, by definition, non-adaptable, but these need not be allowed to come into conflict with a mainstream rationale. Put another way, the notion of art, if carefully defined, can serve music very well and especially in its educational contexts, where the need for an informing and enabling philosophy is most felt. The criteria of art challenge educational principle at its most fundamental by bringing the forces of judgement into play to arbitrate on and prioritize the processes of music education itself in a systematic way. But art, too, provides abundant scope for further excursions into the realms of human consciousness to uncover its primeval characteristics and probe the universality within them. In the epilogue of his essay on a possible universal philosophy of music education, Bennett Reimer, acknowledging a debt to the humanistic anthropologist Robert Plant Armstrong, establishes a crucial connection and common denominator which offers new hope for reconciling confrontational forces. It seems that man has a need to impose his consciousness on his world and that art is, perhaps, the most potent means at his disposal to achieve this at its most idealistic. Reimer's necessarily brief treatment of Armstrong's philanthropic insights is compelling and arrests this philosophical enquiry in a placatory, valedictory yet provocative way. Its entrained truths are as relevant to the intent of the Mozart scholarship extolled by Harry White as to the sociocultural trends of David Elliott's praxial philosophy, and are at one with all phases in the healthy evolution of Reimer's own protean philosophical views.

[159]Armstrong attempts to reach the level at which the condition and experience of being human in any culture can be glimpsed in its non-verbal acontextual nature as the very beingness, or phenomenality provided by the culture's patterns of activity, as exemplified in its art. We are on reassuringly familiar ground with his Langerian definition of 'aesthetics . . . as the theory or study of form incarnating feeling'; nor is it surprising to find feeling then verbally transmuted into 'affect' in describing the work of art as the *affecting presence*, which may incarnate an unaccountable fact of awareness about which one feels significantly. The confrontation between art and a participant is an act to which the role of witness is of critical importance. This act is a phenomenon in the personal world of man - an act ever in the process of enacting itself - an instance of incarnated experience in terms that are definitive ones – the living forms of consciousness. The affecting work, insofar as it embodies the least common denominator of particularity which uniquely establishes one culture, is a presentation of the basic irreducible being of that culture. Great works, it goes without saying, greatly incarnate these vitalities. What is universal is not each culture's affective quality of life experience, which is uniquely its own, but music's power to incarnate a culture's affective consciousness, making cultural interconnectedness more feasible. Music universally is sonic form incarnating affect[160]. Thus does man make the world! . . . It is a human imperative that consciousness be imposed upon the world. The

[158] Harry White, *A book of manners in the wilderness: Model of University Music Education and its Relevance as Enabler in General Music Education in Ireland*, p. 56

[159] This paragraph attempts to paraphrase Reimer's treatment of the Armstrong theme. For greater detail consult Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a universal philosophy of music education?*, (International Journal of Music Education Number 29 1997)

[160] Note Langer's insistence on the interrelationship of feeling and form, and the copious references within this report to the characteristics of craft (form) and feeling which are necessary to legitimize artistic endeavour.

affecting presence incarnates consciousness itself, in its own terms, and it arrests flux, fixes the mutable, renders physical the metaphysical . . . . The affecting presence . . . *celebrates consciousness*.[161] The dimensions of form, practice, reference and context can be seen, through Armstrong's vision, to be inseparable components of music, in what music is, what it does, and how it serves the deepest human needs. Music education too celebrates that consciousness, our mutuality, our capability to create presences which make our human condition sensible. The extent to which such a view can help us to achieve balance between the component views of the nature and value of music, will also be a measure of our success in bringing its fruits more potently into the lives of our students.

[161] It would be interesting also to compare these views with the philosophical writings of Arthur Schopenhauer, as expressed in *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung (The World as Will and Idea,* trans. E.F.J. Payne, New York , 1969)

19.7 The Irish Context

Note: The writer is indebted to Bennett Reimer for his exposé of the generally less contentious philosophical issues which must be understood and taken into account before details of a particular (Irish) system and its idiosyncrasies are articulated for appraisal.

The intention is to construct a matrix which clarifies, in a dynamic way, the current context of music education in Ireland. Basic reference points at this stage of the analysis will be the 8-point Agenda of MEND and its 6 Findings. The features of the music education dispensation will be sketched drawing attention to its strengths and shortcomings, especially in relation to influential philosophical positions. The most pressing problems will be identified. These, together with the philosophical stances considered will be rationalized, to minimize internal dissonances, and reduced to a number of commanding parameters in which philosophy and progress are compatible. The following headings define the route taken.

1. Some basic understandings about music and music education.
2. Involvements and Diversity in music education. Balance
3. The philosophical stances on music education
4. Towards a universal philosophy of music education
5. Philosophy in action. Standards, curriculum, method
6. The relevance of American practice
7. Music as Art and in the arts programme
8. The conceptual confusion about performance
9. Diversity. The role of popular music and multiculturalism in music education.
10. The current state of music education in Ireland
11. A way forward for Irish music education. The Time Factor. Achievable targets.

19.7.1 Some basic understandings about music and music education.

1. Music and music making are uniquely human; the experience and faculty are universal.
2. Music is a positive force in human affairs. It is culturally important and distinctive and can enhance the quality of life.
3. The benefits of musical experience can be greatly enriched through education.
4. Music and music education are worthy of support in the community and through general education.
5. Music and music education should be generally available, universally accessible and affordable.
6. Music education (the acquisition of appropriate skills) should be especially available to the young.

7. Comprehensiveness should be the aim in music education. Openness to a reasonable diversity of musical repertoire and to a balanced involvement in musical practices is desirable.

8. Education in music should be systematic and regular with built-in continuum across educational levels.

9. It is recognized that natural ability in music is not evenly distributed. Those with talent are the most likely to enter the profession and to be active in the transmission and continuity of music both as experience and in education. Talent is therefore worthy of special support and encouragement over and above what is available generally; this should, however, be given in a discriminating way which is seen merely as setting appropriate challenges for differing levels of ability and commitment within a programme otherwise focused on a 'music for all' objective

19.7.2 Involvements and Diversity in Music Education.

The criterion of comprehensiveness in education is, by definition, inapplicable and unattainable, and immediately leads to difficult choices typically responding to the demands of rival approaches, many of which may lay undue stress on one component of education over another. Choices and dichotomies may be between professional and amateur approaches to standard, between active involvements in music making and more purely academic pursuits, between music as product and music as process, between open and restricted repertoires, between music as art and music in its more utilitarian forms, between specialized and general streams, between music as entertainment of evanescent consequence and as profound experience. The most advanced and progressive curricula favour a wide range of involvements (depending on the diversity and sophistication of the musics to be transmitted and their cultural idiosyncrasies) such as composing (including improvising and arranging), performing (including conducting), listening, reading and notating, appraising, evaluating, understanding cross-cultural significance and so on. The American National Standards (Music Content Standards), produced by the Music Educator's National Conference (MENC, Reston, Virginia) in 1992 is an unexceptionable statement of desirable outcomes (with their implied activities) in a holistic general music education package.

As to diversity of repertoire there is currently much debate which, for systems naturally evolving from the overwhelmingly influential ideas of western culture, has tended, in advocacy literature over the past thirty years or so, towards an inclusivity defined, at its most extreme, as total multiculturalism. Suffice it to say that the supremacy of western art music has been seriously challenged as to its being either the only or even the dominant vehicle for the transmission of traditional skills in school music, even in western contexts. On the other hand, a clear picture is far from emerging as to the verified extent of other inclusions, their assessable merits and success in implementation, or their independence of methodologies associated with the transmission of western art music (WAM). Attempts to balance the offerings have tended towards undesirable dilutions, especially in general music education, where allocations of time are limited. It must be borne in mind particularly that involvements in music that have a significant psychomotor (skill) content are notoriously slow to develop to proficient (and even competent) standard; if undertaken seriously, they are apt to skew the profile of achievement (ratio of achievement to time spent), if indeed that profile must not itself be defined in terms which take into account the likely differences in resultant capabilities as between cognitive and psychomotor components for equal increments of time.

Questions centring on the diversity of repertoire and the balance between involvements are amongst the most contentious in music education practice today; two in particular dominate current deliberations. Music is ostensibly a performing art; this is scarcely challengeable and is honoured by popular perception and professional endorsement. The exercise of the skills of performance is admired, coveted and exacting. It is right that the problems of managing the performance function in

music education should be a perennial preoccupation; this is so for the simple reason that a satisfactory formula for its inculcation in general music education has eluded the efforts of the most imaginative music educators throughout the whole of the last century, particularly so in the United States for reasons that have been comprehensively reported in this analysis. The question can only be satisfactorily addressed/resolved by treating performance as the specialization that it is. The other problem has to do with the apparent cleavage between the realities of music in the community and in education; this focuses on valuing systems, generally as between art and social function, which sets popular music and WAM on a collision course.

19.7.3 The Philosophical Stances on music education

The basic understandings about music and music education listed above gravitate towards an aspiration for music education, but they lack credibility if they are not underpinned by a statement as to exactly why music is a positive force in human affairs and, leading on from that, why it should be included in general education. *Tout court*, what is the nature of music and why is it, or should it be, valued? This is to begin to address the deeper issues; philosophy is the appropriate vehicle for such a study. The need for the understanding that a carefully-reasoned philosophy could facilitate was felt at a very early stage of MEND. Phase II was consciously devoted, *inter alia*, to the articulation of a plethora of philosophical statements. It was less surprising to find that consensus seemed to be lacking than to discover, as observed in the *Interim Report – Phase II*, that 'philosophically, then, we are in a protean field' and invited 'to heed, to think, to contextualize, to analyse, to adapt – in short, to 'philosophize' ourselves'. In spite of the conviction and confidence with which Bennett Reimer and David Elliott delivered their philosophical packages they added disclaimers too. Reimer warns that 'aesthetic education, then, is not a dogma, or a fixed set of beliefs and actions, but rather an ever-changing, ever-developing, position that music is worthy of serious attempts to learn it, and that education must include musical learning if its unique benefits are to be available to all' (Ref. II P iii Section II.1). And Elliott concurs, by implication as to the mutating context of music education, calling for caution in invoking applicable philosophy: 'of course, no philosophy can be perfectly applicable to all practical situations. . . . [and quoting Kant] "the practitioner must exercise his judgement to decide whether a case falls under a general rule"' (Ref. II P viii p. 1).

David Elliott's address to MEND II (Ref. II P viii) opens promisingly in spelling out the need for a philosophy of music education, by which he means 'a critically reasoned set of beliefs about the nature and value of music education. . . . nothing is more practical for a music educator than "a philosophy" (in this "critically reasoned" sense), because a reasonable philosophy, like a carefully drawn map, is essential for deciding destinations and goals, maintaining course headings, keeping the "big picture" in view, avoiding dead ends, and knowing when and where one has arrived". A philosophy of music education should provide the insights to address and answer such fundamental questions as - 'What are the aims of music education? What musical knowledge is most worth learning by all students? What is the role and responsibility of the music teacher? What is the role of the music learner? What teaching-learning processes, contexts, and assessment procedures are most appropriate for music teaching and learning?' (II P viii, p.1) Clearly, already, there is enough to suggest that many of the individual answers will be challengeable and hotly contested; this is evident, too, from the sheer length of the MEND report. Consensus or acceptable rationalization does not come easily. And David Elliott, before offering his own solutions to the multifarious problems facing music educators, gives further cautionary and salutary advice to the non-critical in highlighting the need for discriminating judgement. ' . . . anyone who wants to consult or use a philosophy of music education must be prepared to query its general principles in relation to national, local, daily concerns. The application of a philosophy to a practical situation is not a passive process of carrying out suggestions; it is an active process of asking questions about practicalities with the guidance of critically-reasoned principles.' (II P viii, p.1) And quoting Entwistle he adds: "the job of a theory is to evoke judgement rather than rote obedience. The application of a theory to practice is the bringing to bear of critical intelligence upon practical tasks rather than the implementation of good advice." On the relevance of teaching inputs Elliott warns that 'it is essential that these roads [teaching

methods and materials] be taking students to the right places. To suggest otherwise is to abdicate responsibility to think intellectually about why and how one ought to educate people'. Elliott effectively constructs a *mise-en-scène* for philosophical enquiry.

If moderation, eclecticism and balance are to make their contribution to achieving consensus it must he obvious that philosophical theories should be capable of reconciliation one with the other; axiomatically, then, extreme or over-idealistic positions are the least likely to lead to widespread acceptance, and call for compromise and the ministry of pragmatism. It is true that the two philosophical stances (those of Reimer and Elliott) most singled out for comprehensive review in this report emanate from North America and are contextualized to that scenario; their relevance (or, rather, their adaptability) to the Irish case is, however, stoutly defended, as arising from the analysis, as appropriate, of their history, their strengths and weaknesses. The serendipitous consequences of Reimer's independent attempt eclectically to fabricate a formula for a universally acceptable philosophy of music education (Amsterdam 1996) are that his admirable effort provides a convenient yardstick against which to measure the potential of individual theories to pass muster. And much of Reimer's phraseology is so ingeniously conceived as to be a celebration of the notion of adaptability. Significantly, Reimer's own philosophical position (assumed to be a cognate of MEAE) is, on the one hand, difficult to align exactly with any one of the four influential positions he treats; on the other, it has the flexibility to coexist with all of them and is perfectly congruent with the existential theory of music being a 'celebration of human consciousness', in turn an amalgam, if not an apotheosis, of form (product), process, reference and context. David Elliott's philosophy, too, while easier, by definition, to focus onto praxialism, and the pre-eminence of process, is not irretrievably out of line with the broader sweep of the universal idea. This is to share the honours equally between the malleability of the synthesis of philosophical views (as enunciated by Reimer in Amsterdam –1996) and the immanent plasticity of Elliott's and Reimer's base positions.

The writer has always considered that it would be helpful if a single concept about music could be found which is implicit as a binding force in virtually all of the philosophical positions. The idea of music as art is proposed as such a notion; it is confidently believed that sufficient has been said on this subject to give it plausibility. Form is the essence of art and so Formalism is, of necessity, validated. Praxialiam, being concerned about process and music as activity, *inter alia*, does not disavow its affinity with art, as Elliott's phraseology so amply confirms. Referentialism, while at one end of its continuum it accommodates outcomes that are not specifically musical, and also supports functions which may evaluate music on a technical (utilitarian) theory of art, need not deny its relationship to art, arising from its compatibility with other philosophical views, to preserve its integrity as a separate stance. Contextualism too is not inimical to the notion of art, even in the 'aesthetic consciousness' sense, unless it is specifically set up in this context.

19.7.4 Towards a Universal Philosophy of Music Education

[Note that the philosophical stances being considered here are four – Formalism, Praxialism, Referentialism and Contextualism. A form of Existentialism is also treated by Bennett Reimer above but it is drawn from a reflection on the power, significance, and the wider anthropological function of art as a human pursuit rather than of music specifically as a member of the arts family.]

The idealism in the notion of a universal philosophy of music education is appealing. Because it is a question of taking into account as many respected and influential approaches as possible, it becomes (certainly in practice) an exercise in compromise, in concession, in minimizing and rationalizing differences, in negotiating incompatibles out of the picture. It is important here to keep in mind what philosophy is (an enquiry into nature and value) and what its specific subject matter is. It is essential, therefore, to distinguish between a philosophy of music and a philosophy of music education and to realize that to progress from the one to its derivative, without becoming embroiled in questions of 'diversity and involvements' (see above), is a difficult exercise in detachment, if indeed such distancing is worthwhile. Thus Formalism and Referentialism are closer to examining the *nature* of

music (how it affects people internally and subjectively), while Praxialism and Contextualism are more concerned with throwing light on its *value*, and are arguably more objective in their approach. Since education may be construed as being concerned with the preservation of what is valued in a culture, Praxialism and Contextualism may be taken as true philosophies of music *education.* And because they focus on activities and on diversity of repertoire and involvements (this is very clear in Elliott's praxial philosophy) they are characteristically further along the music/music education continuum, implementational in overt intent, and therefore more prone to being confrontational and dissonant, though no less interesting on that account, simply by virtue of their being at the very cutting edge of the sociocultural experience.

Another aspect of universality is the diversity and ubiquity of musical experience itself. In the case of the vast majority who enjoy music, and across a bewildering spectrum, it must be obvious that they are not equipped, by a formed mentality or specific education, to grasp the proffered insights of scholarly enquiry as to how and why the experience is pleasurable; that it is gratifying is what counts and is sufficient. The epistemology of the aesthetic or of the forms of musical knowledge - even of the nature of music itself - is outside their range of immediate interest, although its absence does not inhibit the enjoyment in kind, whatever about degree. That music is valued is obvious when there is a propensity to repeat the experience; as Roger Scruton says - 'it must be part not only of [one's] enjoyment but also of [one's] *concern*.' It is the value of music that is universally felt; and value judgements (especially in education) should be predominantly cognitive and rational - and vigilant lest the power of emotional attachment or uninformed taste should lead to a feckless outcome. Logically, therefore, a philosophy of music in practice should evince some bias towards an enquiry into *value* as a pragmatic concern, important in education too, where perceived worth and curricular prioritization tend to be in a direct relationship. It seems that the philosophical stances under discussion can be placed on a continuum which suggests an index of musical intrinsicality in any experience being considered, without necessarily placing a premium on the value of that intrinsicality. Reimer, because of his association with Absolute Expressionism and his affinity with Langer, as the most eloquent proponent for those ideas, is spiritually a Formalist, especially since he is implacable on the primacy of intrinsicality in separating musical (*sui generis*) from pseudo-musical experiences, artistic from utilitarian applications. Yet his product-orientated bias spontaneously embraces praxialism on the understanding that product and process are inseparably bound. For the same reason Elliott's praxial philosophy is compatible, at least partially, with Formalism, both process and product being of necessity intramusically conceived, and, as suggested, concerned with the *nature*[162] of music. But neither, thus far, can account fully for the extraordinary spectrum of musical experience – above all for the range of values that music gives rise to outside of its purely musical functions. Undoubtedly it is this worrying shortfall that gave rise to attempts to account for this outcrop of values which normalize, as it is proper that they should, a vast area of musical experience defined within the alleged claim that more than 90% of all musical experience is non-aesthetic. Referentialism comes close to being the panacea which validates all other music-related outcomes. It allows Reimer the scope to present the symbolic theories of music as art (the aesthetic), highlighting *mimesis* (imitation), craft and feeling (sensitivity/expressiveness), imagination and authenticity and to distance himself from extreme Formalism. Elliott is accommodated in that representational, social, ideological, personal and emotional (cathartic) references can have legitimate value. It must be obvious that any universal philosophy of music or of music education must come to terms with the value system of Referentialism if it is to be applicable to all species of organized sound which merit description as music. If the notion of music and music-making being universal experience and faculty is accepted,

[162] There may appear to be some confusion here and a contradictory reorientation of pairs of philosophical stances as to the main thrust of their *denouement*. When, as is proper, the philosophies are examining the nature *and* value of music, Formalism and Referentialism, being concerned with the way the music is received, seem biased towards *nature*, as the other two, Praxialism and Contextualism, are value-centred. When, however, only value is being examined, Formalism and Praxialism, because of their concern about the inseparable relationship of process and product, enter into a closer liaison which is intra-musical, while Referentialism and Contextualism are compromise positions which open up the field of enquiry to the controversial but crucially important area of extramusical consequences from musical activities.

then it is natural that the idea of a search for a universal philosophy should suggest itself. It appears to the writer that this is more accessible in the case of music itself than in that of music education, where the question of diversity and possible guidelines for discriminating choices, if not actual exclusions, looms.

There is a feeling of unease that David Elliott (but only typically and therefore possibly not uniquely) does not sufficiently clarify his stance on 'music as art'[163], probably for reasons of his obsessive aversion to and selective misunderstanding of the idea of the aesthetic, in its widest and comprehensive sense, and its association with Reimer and MEAE. The concern arises because of his insistence on the admissibility of functions of music outside the aesthetic, leading, in the writer's view, to his rather vapid claim that all musical cultures are innately equal – and then, logically, to the conclusion that all music is on common ground as a candidate for inclusion in the educational curriculum. He does, however, mitigate his insistence by allowing that some musics are more suitable in education than others. But Elliott himself can be credited with providing the solution to this problem in his admirable correlation of musical challenge and level of musicianship. Challenge is not a value-free word; it suggests, in the educational interaction (the area of this enquiry), an active cognitive engagement by the percipient/participant in a process, leading to understanding, assuming that there is ample material to understand in the first place. Presumably the greater the challenge the greater the satisfaction in meeting it and thus, even in an inter-musical sense, a musical hierarchy (or, at least, a progression in accomplishment and skill) is being sketched (assuming that the challenge is not a purely technical one); otherwise why would anyone seek challenges, unless there is the payoff of greater enjoyment? It follows that music which presents no challenge calls for no musicianship, and, by definition, is not a candidate for ready inclusion in an educational programme – truly an acid test. This is to suggest another criterion, though less precise than Reimer's (see Reimer *A Philosophy* pp 133-142 for a highly cultured, honest and sensitive treatment of this difficult topic), for judging musical quality. It also renders the call for free access to all musics more malleable, more truly democratic, and more susceptible to the rigours of professional judgement responsibly exercised. It matters little how the decision to limit the repertoire of music admissible in education is arrived at, provided the route is one in which the criterion of excellence and the exercise of discriminating judgement are paramount. It appears that a workable consensus on this issue is not an unattainable target.

The last philosophical position to be accommodated in any approach to a universal understanding is Contextualism. It has a built-in universality of its own, in that there is a context to every instance of musical activity; Contextualism holds that it is this *context* that gives the experience its value. It is, as

[163] The following extract from Heneghan, *The Interpretation of Music: A Study in Perception, Expression and Symbol* (Unpublished thesis; University of Dublin, Trinity College 1990) pp. 11-12 attempts to show the correlation between the evolution of music, leading to its art connotation, and its social realities.
The glory of music, as part of its claim to be species-specific, is its diversity (even within a culture) and its rejection of stasis. The broadest common denominators of music show its evolution to be non-Darwinian because it is exceptionally non-linear, and non-Spencerian in that it neither fits into the mould of "simple to complex" nor conforms to the progression of "imperfect to perfect" or "lower to higher". It now appears that the fascinating speculation of *homo musicus* (man the musician) is not merely beguiling but is stamped with an eminent plausibility; the necessary and sufficient indications are that primitive man was endowed with a faculty to express himself in terms of the copious musical experiences which his congenital vocal and rhythmical capabilities made possible. Add to this the power, implicit in the same species – *homo sapiens* – to be creative and individualistic in a cognitive way, and the notion of music as art demands investigation. But the species is, according to the social anthropologist, John Blacking, not human, but *human and fellow human.* The social nature of man's pursuits is pervasive. So too is the art of sharing, and the diffusion that follows carries with it the promise of universal experience and a common faculty.
'The very condition of individual self-realization is sharing with others, just as a healthy community depends on the creative contribution of its individual members. . . . A human being becomes human through other human beings. . . . Art lives in men and women, to be brought out into the open by special processes of interaction'. (John Blacking, *A Common Sense View of Music*, pp 25-26) Art encroaches on life, and the sharing which art makes possible can best be described as an attitudinal engagement between an art-object, such as music, and the individual perceiver; therein is the invitation to creativity to which music handsomely responds.

Reimer points out, a hybrid and derivative position, if not also a placatory synthesis, which interpenetrates freely with the others, as it superimposes its values on theirs and complements them. As Reimer so convincingly argues, no single position can stand alone with any hope of general acceptance or plausible ministry to the total remit of music as a human pursuit, and as universal experience and faculty, without interacting fruitfully with the contextual idea – indeed by either consciously accepting or first calling into question its canons, before embracing it. Contextualism is an admirable post-modern mentality which courageously confronts the absolute and fundamental truth about music on which its claim to inclusion in the educational process rests securely; it celebrates the universality of musical experience and faculty by limiting, if not disavowing, élitism as a satisfactory route to the full appreciation of the significance and panoramic range of that universality. Contextualism, in its sometimes painful interactions and reconciliations (and possible impasses) with other philosophical positions, advances the search for a universal philosophy of music education, but there is an unquantifiable price to pay for that accommodation. Its area of concern is the whole corpus of music; it holds up for appraisal not just the naïve and the profound, but the ethically questionable too, and music with consequences that are infinitely more focused on functions other than purely musical ones, where the search for quality is foremost. The Platonic ideal of virtue in art may be superannuated as too crude for the more complex and permissive mentality of the third millennium; the question of the broader morality, or the ethical authenticity, of our educational choices is, nevertheless, still pressing. The reader is again referred to Reimer's powerfully convincing analysis of this ineluctable problem, which arises from the need for quality appraisal in music (Reimer, *A Philosophy*, rev. 1989, p.133 -144). And, it must be suggested for the reader's consideration that where Elliott is mercurial in his, no doubt, well-intentioned advocacy statement that all music cultures are innately equal, Reimer, rather, grapples with the problem without fear of being perceived or peripheralized as out-of-touch with current liberal ideas. Here is what he has to say:

> Music educators especially must be informed about the criteria in choosing music for their students to experience and in assessing the quality of their students' handling of the music. Whether or not music educators care to think of themselves as "arbiters of taste", an inevitable degree of control over musical experiences does exist and always will exist so long as formal teaching and learning of music takes place. It is impossible to avoid making value judgements about music when one deals with music as a professional. And while any overt imposition of musical values would be distasteful to most music educators and most students, the entire music education enterprise is built on the assumption that musical tastes can be improved, that musical experiences can be deepened, that musical enjoyment can be refined, that musical significance can be made more available to all people. These assumptions, all of which are very healthy and beyond criticism, do imply a movement toward "better" musical experiences of "better" music. The question is, what makes music, or any art, "better"?

This indeed is an ultimate question. Philosophy can only offer guidelines and Reimer's is a remarkable effort in dealing with the criteria of craft, sensitivity (expression and *feelingfulness*), imagination and authenticity; but once the boundary is crossed by which philosophy proceeds to standard-setting, implementation and method, there is the inevitable confrontation with diversity, involvements in educational settings, and, above all, balance - and the notion of universality of approach comes under severe, though not insupportable, pressure.

Bennett Reimer, in his search for the parameters of a universal philosophy of music and music education, accepts that differences are as significant as similarities in the way we think about music.

The tenor of our times, philosophically and politically, seems much more to be focused on differences among peoples than on similarities. . . . surely an argument can be made that it is what divides people, musically as well as in so many other ways, that determines how we think, what we believe, what we cherish, and how we act. . . . So it may not only be impossible or at least very improbable that we can articulate a universal philosophy of music education, it may even be undesirable or even harmful to attempt to do so.

> I find such arguments to be quite persuasive. But I do not believe they are persuasive enough to cause me and others devoted to such issues to simply abandon the challenges they present and to retreat to less difficult ones also needing our attention. I believe the music education profession would benefit in important ways from attempts to articulate the issues related to a universal philosophy of music education, to go as far as we are able toward proposing resolutions of those issues, and to formulating positions that, while perhaps falling short of a single, completely acceptable, worldwide philosophy – a "*Gesamtphilosophie*" if you will – would nevertheless portray what such a philosophy might look like. . . . The task of a universal philosophy of music education is to build on insights, to further reconcile what only seem to be irreconcilable viewpoints, to honor the distinctiveness of each of the world's cultures and music, and to continue to clarify that which is universal about culture and music.[164]

Bennett Reimer, characteristically, it might be suggested, considering his eminence in the field, has laid out music education philosophy in a way which searches out the potential for accommodation between stances that are traditionally seen as mutually exclusive; he does this by playing down differences, but not in an unrealistic way, and by stressing moderation and balance as a means to maximize similarities and promote détente. He is professionally reticent about his own celebrated contribution to the field. It is not easy to appraise his own philosophical stance - which in its focus on the aesthetic is nothing short of a philosophy of art - in the extent to which he feels it approaches a universal philosophy. But in his climax he adduces art (admittedly as treated by a different hand - that of the "humanistic " anthropologist, Robert Plant Armstrong) as the strongest of common denominators - a cherished practice and sacred cow in all cultures – . . . art, the ultimate metaphor for all human experience, the 'celebration of consciousness'. The rhetoric is powerful and it must give us pause to ponder that there is an agency (music) which is truly primeval and, at its best and most genuine, an apotheosis too of everything that is good and honest, noble and admirable in the transmission of human culture.

19.7.5 Philosophy in action. Standards, Curriculum, Method

The need for a philosophy of music (and music education) arises from a *priori* basic understandings about the saturating presence of music in human affairs and the need to organize its functions in an optimal way, principally, it is suggested, through education. Philosophical enquiry is a quintessential exercise in probing the deeper issues to test the truth of and lead on from those basic assumptions, and to establish the intellectual foundations from which executive decisions might proceed; yet, although it is arguably in the sphere of the finest thinkers it is still only an interim step on the road to a delivered curriculum. And again, in spite of the helpful clarification of issues which is its stock-in-trade, it is remarkable how seldom philosophy is directly invoked in practice, indeed how little it is studied and understood by teachers (in fact both Bennett Reimer and Charles Leonhard [author of a book *Foundations and Principles of Music Education*, which appeared in 1950, 20 years before Reimer's] have both commented on the worrying degree of professional vagueness and misunderstanding surrounding the definition of aesthetic education). A great deal of lip service or tacit uncritical approval is given to philosophy in music education; but philosophy, nonetheless, is deemed *difficult* and expendable by many. In the writer's view this has impoverished the field and led to the acceptance of many abuses, such as those evident throughout the twentieth century in the US where philosophical pronouncements (MEAE is an example) were ineffective in controlling or even refining the power of popular perceptions as to the nature and ascendancy of performance. As has been seen, the first important finding of MEND was to draw attention to the need for a well-debated and consensus-supported music education philosophy together with the educational processes to insinuate philosophical dialectic into teacher training so that the underlying and underpinning truths about music education, however varied and disputed, might be well aired and understood. As David Elliott reminds us, philosophy helps in 'keeping the "big picture" in view', preventing educational managers and strategists from becoming bogged down in contentious detail at too early a stage in the

[164] Bennett Reimer, *Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education*

evolution of policy. But this is problematic too, as when philosophy (as has been seen in the development of a notional universal philosophy above) can become so emaciated in the attempt to be adaptable to all views that its very generality and neutrality lack bite and can lead to its being ignored or manipulated with impunity. The real issues arise when philosophy retains the power to control and call into question, at times, the initiatives that arise from it; these are standards, curriculum and method, the tools of education which invite quotidian dissonances and from which philosophy cannot remain aloof.

The close liaison that should exist between philosophy, standards, curriculum and method is notoriously difficult to handle; failures to maintain a healthy connection in this respect can arguably account for many disappointments in educational achievement. Philosophy is supposed to transcend all the others, certainly as far as the chronology is concerned, as much as it should infuse them. Paul Lehman's lecture at MEND, on the 1992-4 American National Standards (Ref. III P iii), was a model of information on the subject of this intimacy; it highlighted also some significant differences, which are worth noting, between the Irish and the American dispensations. We have had a national curriculum in Ireland for many years and it has traversed many vicissitudes, responding implicitly, in its various revisions, to a range of philosophical underpinnings. It is, through the syllabus of the current revision, specific on aspects of diversity (materials/repertoire) and involvements (activities) but has attracted many critics on the question of the credibility of its balance - and of its outcomes in terms of the standards achievable. It summarizes expected outcomes and therefore, by implication, standards, but does not specify method, for the obvious reason that the infrastructure of teacher training in its present form could not accommodate a single approach and there is, in any case, no special virtue in uniformity with the implied exclusions of many worthy methodological approaches. The American system is also liberal about the choice of method. But because the notion of a national curriculum is incompatible with state autonomy in education, American music educators have to be satisfied with a statement of expected outcomes as a starting point. The Music Content Standards, specifying what every young American should know and be able to do in music at the end of grades 4, 8 and 12 (Ages 9, 13 and 17 respectively), represent a considerable achievement in officially and mandatorially insinuating music into American general education for the first time in its history. As Lehman so pertinently remarks, the National Standards 'represent the closest thing to a statement of philosophy', underlining what should be an inseparable relationship in the sequence from one to the other; they 'are not a curriculum, though they provide a basis for one'. And should the philosophy of music education in its protean pronouncements also challenge the processes of teacher training, method too can be infused with prevailing convictions. It seems, however, that, in an ideal dispensation, philosophy, curriculum development, standards (and assessment) and method should form a nexus in which all are mutually and severally compatible, complementary and supportive; but philosophy must lead, simply because, by assumed mandate, it must first pontificate on the deeper issues. In the US the implementation of the National Standards is the equivalent of the implementation of the philosophical principles they embody with little ambiguity. Lehman is very conscious that there are logistical problems produced by the structure of education in the US. 'Implementation of any program, of course, is the key issue. It's also the most difficult. Reaching consensus on the standards, difficult as that may have been, was easy compared with implementing them'. But there are also difficulties inherent in the way information passes from philosophy into curriculum and how this is perceived by the educators. This has to do largely with the balance or bias of the components of curriculum which are responding to prevailing philosophical precepts.

The confrontation between Reimer and Elliott was enormously helpful in raising these issues and biases, in probing some seemingly polar positions in relation to them and happily, in many instances, in showing that they could be rationalized, from the cut and thrust of the rhetoric. But what are these parameters that flow from philosophy into curriculum – the first step in the process of implementation? We learn from the painful Reimer/Elliott battle and from equally painful analysis that *product* and *process* in music are indeed an inseparable pair; neither is possible without the other and both must be the concern of both teachers and learners in balancing what is on offer. So, although Reimer might broadly be deemed a product-orientated philosopher and Elliott a process-centred one, they are indispensable to one another, in spirit and in practice, if their pronouncements are to be seen

to support a holistic experience of music. On the question of *involvements* we find them eventually in general agreement on the specifics, endorsed in the National Standards, if not, however, on the bias – and this is significant. The traditional activities are supported; composing (including improvising and arranging), performing (including conducting), listening and appraising (with all the conceptualizing and cognitive learning that is entailed) are all included. Creativity is defined and encouraged, albeit with some honest disagreement as to its appropriate point of entry along the continuum of achievement (as a successful instance of bringing musicianship [and creativity] to bear on musical challenges). The validity of concepts and verbal knowings in the menu for musical advancement is proposed. The notion of music as art, together with all the paraphernalia of its aesthetic connotations and without any bias towards the specific canons of western art music, is admitted (both explicitly and by simple inference); the importance of this conclusion cannot be overstated for its potential to be a useful discriminating criterion in the qualitative analysis of repertoire, one of the most currently controversial of all educational processes. But philosophy can and does go further in suggesting, if not insisting, that the technical theory of art (art, of all kinds, in its utilitarian context) and extra-musical values must be taken into account as applicable if the full spectrum of music as universal experience is to have real meaning in general education. This, of course, expands still more the scope of the controversy in music education and confronts one of the commanding essences of current concern, constantly invoked throughout Elliott's book, and covering two of Reimer's three identified dilemmas of turn-of-the-century music education; it is not difficult to infer that it concerns the right to a democratic presence, at the heart of the music education endeavour, for popular musics and multiculturalism. Nor is this to imply that musics other than WAM do not conform to and indeed honour the definition of art. Quite the contrary - and so much so that it might even be claimed that misunderstandings in this respect, born of fear, ignorance and aggression, are at the root of a great deal of unnecessary dissonance in music education. Indeed to deconstruct these misconceptions calmly on the basis of adduced evidence would be to do a great service to the profession and to future generations of learners. But the manifold admission of musics of all kinds to the educational domain must always be seen against the background of inevitable dilution (Harry White's concern. Ref. III P viii), as much as that of 'thinly-spread comprehensiveness', notions of relevance and excellence, the inescapability of the functions of judgement and valuing - above all, the ruthless levelling agency of time. The overriding importance of the art connotation is dealt with in Section 18.1 ii – Contextual Philosophy under the Reimer/Elliott critique/rebuttal of Elliott's *Music Matters.*

There is one area of musical activity which, in the writer's view, has been inadequately, or perhaps inappropriately, served by philosophical advocacy and exegesis. This is the area of performance. It is dealt with, in further detail, in subsequent sections below. The most compelling evidence for this claim is the fact that in the United States of America, the richest economy in the world, and one traditionally committed by popular support to music education, it has only recently been admitted that there has been a major failing in this respect; attempts are being made, within the remit of the National Standards, to redress the situation. But the National Standards are, of necessity, couched in such general terms that the issue is far form clear as to its implications. Performance, as has been seen, is also a major bone of contention between Reimer and Elliott. And here is the distinguishing factor between, typically, the generality of philosophy and the particularity of the subsequent stages – standards, curriculum and method. This can apply to any of the parameters contained within the 'diversity and involvements' rubric but, for the purposes of this criticism, let us concentrate on performance. In an activity so disproportionately demanding on time for the acquisition of even competent status and skill, it is necessary, in general education, to be honest and realistic in defining what is achievable (standards), the balance (or imbalance) vis-à-vis other activities resulting from the time factor (taking tuition and practice time into account), the availability and expertise of the teachers - above all the reasons why learners choose a performance stream or not (assuming that it is an option for them). It is foolhardy to assume that a performance programme, initiated on the basis of good advice from an informing philosophy, will not, in the absence of time and expert teaching, add a moiety to failure statistics, if standards are also being targeted. Philosophy and curriculum which do not recognize performance as a specialism by nature are doomed to upset the balance of the general music programme and to compromise the success of the other components; this is particularly the case with listening. To be peripheralized as an activity in its own right (after all, says Reimer, 'listening is

also musical praxis'), to be offered as an alternative to the performance programme, to be impoverished by the demands of an unrealistic performance expectation – none of these is a fate that should befall that most ubiquitous, and arguably therefore the most important of all musical activities as far as the inculcation of its skills in music education is concerned. But these are some of the real consequences that have ensued in the curricular implementation of philosophy. Is it any wonder that Lehman should remind us that 'implementation of any program, of course, is the key issue. It's also the most difficult'. Philosophy is necessary but it is not sufficient in itself to guarantee effective implementation; neither are diversity and involvements, no matter how painstakingly defined, sufficient. Implementation must also take balance into account.

19.7.6 The Relevance of American Music Education Practice

In the final presentation to MEND the relevance of American practice to Irish music education concerns was called into question by Harry White in a valedictory and provocative shrugging off of the huge, helpful and highly influential input to MEND by American philosophers. After all, in relation to Ireland, America was seen as intrinsically multicultural, having superannuated phases of music education that we have not yet reached and, above all, capitulating in education to the 'pop and rock forms of the present day, those that press down with such ubiquitous insistence on the musical imagination'. But Professor White did not reveal that, as he spoke, arrangements were already in place to secure responses to his paper from both David Elliott and Bennett Reimer; in a sense this was to extend the deliberations of MEND into a new international phase. Reimer, however, having first been substantially in agreement about the non-relevance of American practice, found his 'second wind' and deftly redirected the enquiry, in a comparative way, which examined how the state of music education in Ireland could be reflected in current American concerns. In the course of his reply, Reimer touched candidly on the art/popular music dichotomy and on multiculturalism in America. His conclusions - in relation to the first, that 'I wish we could say that they [other countries, including Ireland] could look to America for thoughtful leadership in this matter. I don't believe they can', and, in relation to the second, that 'we [in America] have a long way to go to get our own house in order, let alone being a model for Ireland with its very different cultural identity' – may be taken to imply that these are perennial problems still pressing in the United States but applicable to Ireland too, the similarities being more significant than the differences. However, it is when Reimer identifies the performance problem that the relevance to past and current difficulties in Ireland is apparent. If we in Ireland got it wrong (and it is the writer's view that Harry White's interpretation of this concern [*The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland* as he terms it. Ref. I P viii] is also open to question) it is true that the Americans did also. The topic is covered copiously in the analysis of MEAE and of the Reimer/Elliott debates. Harry White's concern that the traditional craving for performance (any kind) in Ireland, when indulged, has not produced good (listening) musicians and has impoverished the uptake and the quality of general music education – and Reimer's that the performance programme in the US was implemented with scant regard for the holistic training of performers, and dichotomized the music education cohorts to the detriment of both – are surely the same in kind. Certainly the solutions that are currently being implemented in both countries are similar and must fall unless they exist beside a well-supported specialist performance stream to cater for the more committed and for the embryo or potential music majors (professionals) of the future.

The policy decision to include the American lobby of music educators in MEND was something of an act of faith, but it was based also on a thorough survey of the global music education scene to establish a profile of the density of and investment in proactive engagements with current problems in the field. This was greatly facilitated through the ISME connection, three important World Conferences on Music Education having been staged (Seoul, Korea in 1992, Tampa, Florida in 1994 and Amsterdam, The Netherlands in 1996) around the time of the MEND initiative. Many useful contacts were made during this period. It was particularly important that access to published work by direct involvement with distinguished authors should be possible. The following is a summary of how the American model suggested itself as admirably applicable to Irish concerns. If the Agenda of MEND is kept in mind (and indeed, as they turned out, the Findings of MEND also, although they

could not have been predicted with accuracy in pre-MEND days) it will become obvious, it is felt, that the input of American music educators was indispensable to infuse MEND deliberations with the kind of world perspective that informs much of the research in their very productive and relatively well-sponsored field of activity.

1. At the most fundamental levels - of music education philosophy - the US could arguably boast the most celebrated writer, on the subject, of the post WWII period in Bennett Reimer. In Reimer's *A Philosophy of Music Education* there was, thus, a generally respected prototype (no more was expected by MEND) from which debate could be initiated. But, well-orchestrated publicity material at the time when MEND was being mooted made it known that Reimer's philosophy was in the process of being challenged. This added zest to the prospect for provocative proceedings, particularly, as turned out to be possible, if the protagonists in the anticipated confrontation could be invited to present at MEND. Nothing could guarantee an exciting debate more than the idea, not so much of philosophy in a state of flux, but of the open disavowal of tenets long accepted and honoured by the passage of time

2. The issue of Elliott's book *Music Matters*, the challenge to Reimer in the US, coincided almost exactly with Phase I of MEND. The publication of the book destabilized the US music education lobby which had just completed a reappraisal of the requirements of general (school) music education in publishing the American National Standards (Music Content Standards).

3. America, for reasons broadly related to the educational autonomy of each state, did not have a national curriculum or any recognizable equivalent. From 1989 onwards the omission of the arts from the proposed Goals 2000 educational legislation led to confrontation with Government and successful lobbying, by the National Coalition for Music Education, to have them admitted. The non-statutory National Standards (Music) date from 1992-1994. Although their drafting in very general terms contained no more than a hint of dissatisfaction with the unevenness in outcome and selective bias of the binary school music education programme, their intent was to introduce(if accepted state-by-state) a mandatory single programme for general music education which would, at the very least, call into question previous practices. This melting-pot scenario had a close affinity with the Irish situation, except that our binary system, of nominally practical and theoretical training, did not (and does not) typically operate within the school system.

4. The period between the revision of Reimer's *Philosophy* and Elliott's *Music Matters* was a time of great soul-searching in the US on the subject of school music education. It was the first time that music education had become a real political issue, and this is also significant. The National Standards were thus a response to Government, a move in the direction of a possible national curriculum, a manifesto for music – an extra-musical apologia which listed the aims of music education side by side with those of other subjects. The National Standards can thus be seen to transcend the rival claims of warring philosophical factions. This quasi-political aspect of the times had particular relevance to any initiatives which Irish music educators might have had in mind.

5. Current information (1989-1994) on the state of music education in the US and dissatisfaction with the overall success of its provisions centred on two key areas of the curriculum – performance and listening; the dichotomy was either complete, as defining two distinct and mutually exclusive programmes, or virtual in failing to establish a balance between them that aspired to holism. The writer must add the disclaimer that, in his copious reading of the literature, he has never found outright dissatisfaction expressed with the way composing is handled in the general music education programme. He interprets this as confirming the obvious – that composition/creativity is daunting to

popular perception, that the level of interest in it as a student priority in education (much less as a professional aspiration) is statistically low and that it is overwhelmed as an adult pursuit by the universality of listening as a musical activity and the very significant and educationally sensitive survival of the performing instinct. A third problematic area, less fully defined because of its latter-day origins, was concerned generically with diversity (repertoire) but was less explicit in articulation. All these issues, fruitfully brought to a head, though not for the first time, by the Elliott/Reimer/White debate, have common ground in one fundamental quandary which, in the writer's opinion, has always been, not just understated, but ignored. There has always been and there will always be an intrinsic conflict between time and the notion of comprehensiveness. The diversity issue is a case in point. The containment of the repertoire has been subjected to a two-pronged attack, both on the presumed authority of combating élitism. The much lauded notion of the school-community bridge seems to rest on the desirability of reaching détente with popular musics; the more insidious intramusical pressure comes from within - the multicultural lobby with the claim that music education should be opened up, ideally, to all musics. That is not to question the validity of either as an extender but to point to the difficulties that can arise in searching for pragmatic balance. All of these concerns appeared to be as relevant to Irish music education as to the American system.

6. MEND has highlighted the need for thorough research into the *philosophy* of performance – an investigation of its nature and value. This arose from the seriously flawed and incomplete perceptions of the activity coming from the debates at MEND; it acquired greater force from the realization that American music education too was dogged by its own inability to maintain a convincing profile of performance informed by musicianship (and its complement – musicianship supported by performance). Again the balance issue was seen as being as applicable to Ireland as it was an ongoing concern in the US. Another version of the same dilemma - seeing the listening (largely conceptual and academic) programme as an alternative to performance, and practical music as not requiring the underpinning of some sophistication in listening – found the two countries grappling with the same problem.

7. Though no particular teacher training mode can be taken as characteristic of American school music education, there is sufficient reliance on the idea of music specialism for teachers at lower levels that Irish music education could benefit from reporting on this question. In the event, the arguments for and against the idea of relying on non-specialist class teachers to teach school music at lower levels became a rich source of debate and has now surfaced as a major concern about the potential of the new primary school curriculum (1999) to deliver the music programme.

8. Summarizing the relevance of American music education practice to the Findings of MEND:

    a. There was already evidence, borne out by the American input to MEND, that lack of understanding by teachers of **philosophical underpinnings** (especially of MEAE, regarded as a species of *official* position) was a problem in America. In other words there were signs (1994) of impending instability (see 2. above) in the philosophical approach to music education, coupled with soft policies as to how or whether relevant philosophical discourse **should be a component in teacher training** and at what stage (see Harold Abeles - Ref. III P ii).

    b. The **dichotomy** separating practical from general music teachers was sealed, at close contact, into the school system in the US, as it was supported by the teacher training modes which specifically offered those options to postulant teachers training for school careers. Clearly this was also further consolidated by a self-generating system, in which good performers would opt for performing (teaching)

careers while the less gifted (or failed performers) would be automatically steered towards the less glamorous listening programme. It could, arguably, also have accounted for the malaise in the general music programme of MEAE, eventually bringing it (through its worst examples) into disrepute.

c. It would be impossible to overstress the **time management** problem in music education. It is particularly troublesome the richer the involvement in activities that have a psychomotor (physical skill) aspect, such as **performance**. The problem of available time, or just the prioritization of the time available towards specific activities, eventually led, apparently and typically, to the complete divorce of practical from musicianship streams in the US. The success, on occasion spectacular, of the practical (performance) programme in the US should not, however, be gainsaid and has been a source of national pride. The downside, which was addressed by the Goals 2000 legislation and the National Standards research, was the overt promotion of performance as an élitist pursuit (albeit optionally available to all); the poverty with regard to holistic offerings within the performing and non-performing cohorts; the abysmal uptake of the non-performing option; the pragmatic acceptance of virtual failure to promote the idea of 'music for all'; the absence of anything approaching a national curriculum. The relevance to Ireland of desiderata based on some of these shortcomings is all too obvious.

d. The National Standards (1994) with their implicit common denominator approach to a single ideal minimum musicianship programme mandatory for all would undoubtedly change the pattern of **teacher training**, if their implementation were to respond to campaigning by MENC for their manifold state-by-state adoption. Because of the prevalence of specialist teacher training, even for lower levels, the problems would be less severe than in Ireland, where the burden of an ambitious programme must be borne by non-specialists. However, the proportion of practical to general teachers would have to change drastically, practical teachers being less in demand for purely performance specialisms with some being diverted into the general programme. All of these considerations were to make American views on teacher training very germane to Irish concerns.

9. Examining the MEND Agenda itself in relation to American practice resulted in further proof of affinities between the two systems.

a. **Philosophical pronouncements** from the US on music education, beginning with the Reimer *Philosophy*, were as rich, varied, scholarly and provocative as those from any other single source.

b. The key issues, subsequently identified as a nexus by Reimer, defining the **state of music education** in the US, had important resonances in Ireland too. The status of popular music and multiculturalism (Irish 'biculturalism' being a species of multiculturalism) in the music education dispensation and the stabilization of the performance issue were not far from the Irish mind.

c. **Continuum**, in the sense described in the *Deaf Ears?* Report (1985), does not seem to be a burning question in American music education.

d. **Performance** as an issue was and is very high on the agenda of American music education. Perhaps the most searching exposé of the problems in an American context is to be found in the Reimer/Elliott documentation. There was little doubt that the Americans would have a great deal to offer by way of experience and mature comment on this topic, especially in the light of their own successes and failures, from philosophical concept to practice.

e. **Assessment** seems to have had a lower profile in American school music education than other curricular aspects. It is suspected that the dominance of the performing option and the relative unimportance of the general programme in terms of its uptake at higher levels may account for this. The writer has seen the American practical system in operation; it seems to rely more on the enthusiasm engendered for communal performance (the band movement is an impressive example) than on the measurement and documented evaluation of the results achieved. With the introduction of the National Standards that is going to change. To quote Paul Lehman (Ref. II P iii, P 18 et *seq.*): 'The existence of standards has changed the educational landscape utterly and completely by emphasizing evaluation and assessment. . . . standards do more than make assessment possible. They make it necessary. We cannot have standards without assessment. . . . I believe that assessment is not only helpful but inevitable. . . .Unless we begin to take assessment more seriously we will likely find our discipline has been relegated to a position on the periphery of the curriculum . . . . I see assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for music education in the coming decade.' Rereading Professor Lehman's paper alone provides sufficient justification, in hindsight, for the decision to invite American comment on the issue of assessment.

f. It was absolutely essential to sample American views on the multicultural education issue as throwing light on the specific Irish context of so-called biculturalism. The writer, as the organizer of MEND, was particularly concerned that the rapid development of the multicultural programme, especially in the US, and the urgency with which it was being promoted in advocacy statements to the global community, had the potential to overwhelm the, as yet, underdeveloped campaign for the enhancement of the position of **Irish folk/traditional music** in Irish music education. The contributions, from America, of Professors Marie McCarthy and Patricia Shehan Campbell and Dr Kari Veblen were very helpful in establishing a better perspective on the combined issue, since they covered aspects of both approaches.

g. Most of the American contributors were concerned more with school education, as being a prime concern of the MEND initiative in the first place. However there was one representative, Professor Harold Abeles, who contributed to the teacher training topic as one critically important branch of **Third Level Music Education.**

h. The existence in the US of the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC), as the largest **national forum** in the world (70,000 members) for the processing of problems related to music education, was sufficient to suggest that its well-documented wealth of expertise should be invoked as a stimulation towards the inauguration of a similar body in Ireland. As has been stated elsewhere, if a single recommendation were to be demanded of MEND it would stipulate the setting up of such a forum, without which there would be no mechanism to perpetuate the work undertaken by MEND. In the event, contributions by Dorothy Straub and Paul Lehman were extremely concise and focused in introducing the MEND delegates to the copious advantages of having such an assembly.

19.7.7 Music as Art and in the Arts Programme

'If it is art it is not for all, and if it is for all it is not art'.[165] There is something humanistically depressing about the remark attributed to Arnold Schönberg; it may account for a subconscious or

[165] The remark is attributed to Arnold Schönberg. Ian Crofton and Donald Fraser, *A Dictionary of Musical*

even overt feeling of threat when the notion of music is exclusively coupled with that of art for the self-styled liberal contemporary music educator. It accounts too for the happily superannuated assumptions of musical élitism which have little place in current deliberations on music education. The problems in music education are not generated by élitism so much as by the need to make potentially rewarding musical choices and the time to explore them gainfully. In other words the question of balance always looms.

There are many aphoristic statements by eminent writers eulogizing art in its sublime manifestations and in its educational contexts. 'Great art proposes the alert mind of the educated listener',[166] claims Schönberg. And Bernard Shaw, in the Preface to Pygmalion adds that 'it is so intensely and deliberately didactic, and its subject is esteemed so dry, that I delight in throwing it at the heads of the wiseacres who repeat the parrot cry that art should never be didactic. It goes to prove my contention that great art can never be anything else.' Walter Pater adds another dimension, relating art to its musical context: 'All art constantly aspires to the condition of music, because, in its ideal, consummate moments, the end is not distinct from the means, the form from the matter, the subject from the expression; and to it therefore, to the condition of its perfect moments, all the arts may be supposed constantly to tend and aspire.'[167] But all music is not, all the time, aiming at such lofty goals; if it were it would be only a part of life and unfitted to its claim to be a universal experience. The comforting reality is that much music is far more modest in its pretensions and therefore more generally accessible. All musics worthy of respect must be contained within an educational plan aimed at compatibility with prototypical guidelines. The spectrum of musics admissible in education can be made wide enough to satisfy most demands but the choices must be responsibly made. In this context the sense of music as art need not be so intimidating and unnerving.

1. The idea of art is universal and transcultural. Although western culture has contributed a great deal to the philosophy of art (aesthetics) the rubrics are not and should not be derived from coterie notions of western art. The concept of music as art and as the intentional expression of some internally felt concern, often in an idealistically (Platonic) cultural context, is pervasive too and there seems also to be an intuitive need to have this process recognized for what it is, whether as communal or personal expression. There is probably very little music that does not align itself in some way with this criterion. Music in this context is valued, but must yield to the detached and disinterested forces of judgement, if called upon to be comparatively evaluated.

2. Music as defined by the canons of so-called strict aesthetic theory (proposing a *sui generis* feeling of pleasure divorced from the popular perception of the arousal of a spectrum of empathic feelings (even emotions) of quotidian occurrence) has its own validity but is not adaptable to the notion of universality. It must relax into a more accommodating definition of what art entails. This is a genuine educational concern, which is at the heart of current deliberations.

3. The symbolic theory of music, in its broadest sense, where music, standing proxy for some internal condition, which craves expression, effectively externalizes it, is attractive and adaptable without the need to refine it with Langerian precision. In other words, art as imitation, although, of course, not universally acknowledged, is not only an influential theory but is compatible with the deeply pondered psychology and wider aims of much music that is likely to be proposed for inclusion in education.

Quotations, (First published 1985 by Croom Helm; London paperback 1988 by Routledge) p.116/12

[166] Arnold Schönberg (*Memories and Commentaries* 1960). Ian Crofton and Donald Fraser, *A Dictionary of Musical Quotations*, (First published 1985 by Croom Helm; London paperback 1988 by Routledge) p. 8/13

[167] Walter Pater, *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, 1873, 'The School of Giorgione' (in Ian Crofton and Donald Fraser, *A Dictionary of Musical Quotations*, (First published 1985 by Croom Helm; London paperback 1988 by Routledge) p. 13/29

4. Evidence of craft, the plying of those objectively-acquired skills which can give external form to musical ideas, is another necessary though not sufficient artistic criterion, which is nevertheless applicable as a test of worthiness when appraising music in a comparative way – a process that is ineluctable in educational practice. It is even allowable that an appreciation of the subjective ministry of imagination can enhance the effectiveness of music so judged. In fact there seems to be very little in artistic theory that is, so far, exceptionable.

5. The idea that the experience of art being uplifting - at the very least that it should not be debasing – is persuasive in educational ethics and might be argued as arising from the fundamental option of normal human beings. The goodness and virtue in art – its didacticism, so to speak, with its ethical Hellenic overtones – is a difficult notion to put aside. But, as Bernard Shaw reminds us: 'Music will express any emotion, base or lofty, she is absolutely unmoral'.[168] Music which, by consensus view, is deemed vulgar, debasing or even decadent by virtue of its associations or its dedicated functions, must be confronted and contained in a way which, without visiting it upon vulnerable and captive audiences, confines it to those who intentionally seek it.

6. The technical theory of art, which can elevate the perceived value of well-crafted music in recognition of its usefulness, should not be despised. We have seen how the philosophical stances of Referentialism and Contextualism are particularly benign in validating a wide variety of outcomes, from musical activity, that are, to a greater or lesser degree, not intramusical. These could include such instances as expressions of non-musical cultural ideas, cathartic discharge, exhortation, amusement, advocacy and persuasion, the reaping of extrinsic benefits and so on – values that loom large in the Elliott philosophy. There is no reason why music should not be experienced as utilitarian, to some extent, in its outcomes, while retaining its purely musical features; to argue otherwise would be to divorce it from human concerns, as something contrived and artificial. It is the writer's view that music which apotheosizes feeling and form, which brings craft, imagination and authenticity (to use Reimer terminology) to bear, and to expressive ends, must, by definition, have more *musical* value by virtue of that intramusical connection than could accrue from its other functions. But put another way, music which is true to its artistic connotations should not be invalidated as art because it serves a number of other functions. And stated pragmatically, the admittance of diverse music practices to education should not so elevate the importance of artistic criteria as to ignore or devalue the other useful functions which the music may perform.

7. Finally, it is argued that the verbal phraseology to do with music is so imbued with the trappings of artistic lore that it would be difficult to find examples of music that are independent of it. This gives further licence to the demand that music should not be divorced from its artistic base. After all it is generally accepted that music education belongs within the arts programme; as such is it unreasonable to expect that it should be true to the values of art? Lest there should be any doubt about the implications of this conclusion, it should be stated that judgements applied in accordance with the general trend of the arguments presented above should not be expected or manipulated to favour one musical culture over another.

19.7.8 The Conceptual Confusion about Performance

In proceeding from a philosophy of music education to its implementation, the means - towards the end of making music present - must be confronted and appraised; ideally balanced choices must be

[168] George Bernard Shaw, *Music in London* (1856-1950), quoted in Ian Crofton and Donald Fraser, *A Dictionary of Musical Quotations*, (First published 1985 by Croom Helm; London paperback 1988 by Routledge) p. 13/42

made if holistic education is the aim. Keith Swanwick's CLASP model of how music works in education succinctly summarizes the components,[169] while adhering closely to Reimer's 'diversity and involvements'. But it is the *act* of performance that typically and uniquely makes the music present for the vast majority; and it is this witnessing of performance (live, through CDs and so on) that so possesses the mind as constituting an instance of music. In the case of those to whom musical experience is an important life dimension, it is to follow an easy psychologically-based enquiry to arrive at the conclusion that performance in some form or other would be attractive to such people as a means of playing out their musical fantasies. Performance may be the hubris of music education; of its primacy, as the most refractory and problematic component in the dispensation, there can be no doubt. Performance as an option is the activity which most typically evinces a response and initiative from postulant learners, who might be quite passive and malleable where their attitudes to other components of the curriculum are concerned. And we have seen how, in the US, performance has been a powerful force in dichotomizing the music education cohorts. But there should not be, nor is there, a mandate to curb this most healthy of instinctive drives. And it should not be assumed that by closing the avenue of performance to those who wish to use it they would or could be made into better musicians; this is the mistake Harry White makes in partially attributing musical illiteracy (as far as cultured listening is concerned) to self-indulgence in mediocrity by the performance cult. Appreciative and informed listening is not thwarted because people want to perform but because they don't. David Elliott has a very valid point to make in this respect though it lacks moderation, in the writer's view. The problem for performance is to achieve peaceful and fruitful coexistence with the other components of holistic education. It might even be argued that music education through performance could be a route to a holistic outcome, though not the most resource-efficient. Therefore, let it be stated from the outset that the confusion about performance arises from misunderstandings, misconceptions and mass self-deceptions as to the disproportionate time-factor involved; this is simply because it is physically skill-, and therefore time-intensive. Until music education comes to terms with this reality, while upholding the basic premiss that music is a performing art, there will continue to be serious problems.

We have seen how all the philosophical pronouncements of the twentieth century have failed to banish the popular myth that education in music is and should be primarily concerned with training in performance. A whole culture evolved in the US around this myth; its results were impressive but failed to address the fact that the vast majority (the non-performers) were paying the price, albeit voluntarily. Music educators looked on helplessly at this undesirable proof of strategic (even political) failures. In Ireland, would-be performers took themselves off to the caring ministry of the private sector, earning the unmerited tag of élitism in the process. Both countries had much in common and it can be seen how recognition, by the interested public, and pursuit, of performance as a specialism (outside of school), encouraged and even sanctioned academicism, and ultimately barrenness, in the approach to school education; there might even have been a sense of relief that it did not have to burden itself with performance, though this is purely conjectural. One unfortunate outcome, especially troublesome in Ireland, was that the nature of the overall dispensation bred the nature of the teaching cohorts that served it; it could not have been otherwise. This further consolidated the differences in the approach to music education. The problem is still with us, as indeed it is too in the US, and it will be interesting to see how a nominally balanced 'curriculum', recently introduced in both countries, can be served without drastic retraining and reorientation of music teachers.

Current progress in rationalizing the curricular options (in the US and in Ireland) is soundly based and admirable. It should continue to be monitored critically and analytically. The writer is convinced that the outcomes (delivered curriculum) from recent reform, if appraised honestly, will place the performance issue in true perspective. It will show that what is possible in school performance, based on derisory time allocations, will amount to little more than what Reimer describes as 'exploratory'. This, of course, will be even more acutely obvious if teacher training and expertise are not,

[169] The mnemonic CLASP stands for Composing, Literature, Audition, Skills, and Performing. *Skill*, of course, is partly redundant since the activities may be assumed to include the skills. Literature and skills correspond to Reimer's Diversity (materials) and Involvements (composing, performing, listening/appraising)

meanwhile, upgraded to deal with the expanded brief. What will be realized too is that the music programme is very thinly spread because of its new diversity; and it will have to be appreciated by all that to upgrade it, accepting the time demands entailed, would be to discriminate against the majority who need, individually, a corresponding balance in the mix of the total curriculum (all subjects) followed, and are therefore less inclined to allocate more to music than to other subjects. Performance will re-emerge as the specialism that it is, to be pursued and encouraged without stigma by those who choose that option. It is therefore to be hoped that in the US the current well-supported performance programme will remain but will enter a new and even healthier phase, while in Ireland an upgraded performance programme, whether available through the public or private sector, will be made available, accessible and affordable.

19.7.9 Diversity. The Role of Popular Music and Multiculturalism in Music Education.

With a shrinking world and the availability, through technology, of so much music that was hitherto inaccessible, a new conscience has developed as to how such a vast resource might be turned to good account in education. It is not a simple dilemma. An abundance of information seen against the background of a virtually unchanging level of human absorption is challenging. We are spoiled for choice - a phenomenon that transmutes itself into an educational nightmare. Teachers are faced with the need to expand their base of knowledge and skills; learners have to respond to the pressures from other curricular choices (also suffering from the growing pains of the information boom) and the inevitable dilutions, at personal levels, which occur in such circumstances. The tensions at the interfaces between general and specialist studies are mounting. Against this background, this live turn-of-the-millennium issue about the diversity of musics in education seems a natural outcome. But it is fuelled also by notions of global artistic democracy, the demand that educational decisions be politically correct and, in western societies, the subtly implanted sense of guilt that in undertaking 'the cultural colonization of the world and the imposition of European values and habits of thought on the whole human race'[170]much music had been ignored and ostracized and is now ripe for reappraisal. These sometimes sophisticated socio-political arguments can be persuasive but they are strengthened by the post WWII mentality that no system is impervious - that challenge is the order of the day, to be welcomed rather then discouraged. This is the scenario in which the erstwhile undisputed position of western art music as the enabler of music education in western contexts has been seriously called into question. And many music educators who have hitherto been happy with the *status quo*, and never considered the incursions of other musics into education as a serious threat, now feel themselves under siege. They are painting themselves into the corner of believing that they have been alienating their students by creating two mutually incompatible perceptions of what music is as a life force, without taking into account that they may be going against the sociological phenomenology confirming, perhaps, that this is precisely how the students want to perceive it. Harry White seems to see the problem as sourced in the overwhelming commercially-generated influence of popular music outside of school and its pretensions to infiltrate the education system indiscriminately, through a form of people power, bypassing any kind of formal appraisal of its worth in educational terms. Bennett Reimer, being by calling better focused on the niceties of school education, is probably more accurate in seeing the campaign as bifurcated and coming from different sources, multiculturalism being the second. In this sense, diversity has come to mean *all* musics and the system is thus left trying to cope with an amorphous collection of possible candidates for inclusion in education. In Ireland we have western art music and its derivatives, popular and traditional forms, and the ultimate diversity of world musics, or multiculturalism, all potentially pressing for equal rights in the curriculum. Music education has been trying to respond to this. Clearly some kind of more thorough research-based rationalization is called for. MEND deliberations have something positive to offer to this exercise.

[170] Christopher Small, *Music: Society: Education* (London, John Calder Ltd, 1977, rev. 1980, second Impression 1984), p.1

Time is the overriding factor. There is no calling into question the intentions of music educators to optimize, even to democratize, the musical experiences of their students in a way that is informed by mature judgements. But in addressing the question of diversity in the repertoire their choices are limited by what can be dealt with in the time available.

Although the typical delegates to MEND, being music educators, might be taunted with the tag of belonging to the old hard-line school of music education, there was convincing evidence of openness to new ideas, especially concerning the widening of the school music repertoire to include a more catholic exposure to world trends. **But this was always seen against a background of the security of western art music, in itself invaginating comprehensive diversity.** Obviously the curriculum was never in danger of being uprooted in a nihilistic way; music educators are, above all, good citizens and generally conservative. The defence of western ideals was convincingly based, not so much on an impregnable repertoire, as on the crucial importance of its peripheral elements and infrastructure, chief amongst them being methodology and phraseology (see Harry White *A book of manners in the wilderness* Ref. III P viii for an interesting comment on the borrowed use of phraseology*)*. There are many aspects of traditional method that are specific to western art music; they would have to be adapted to other repertoire or vice versa. These include teaching by concepts and verbalizations (both, remember, eventually accepted as being part of music education by reconciling Elliott with Reimer), the product-centred listening programme, highly sophisticated technical method in vocal and instrumental training (*cf* Kari Veblen – Ref. II P vi), notation/literacy, appraisal and criticism. A glance at the American National Standards, for all their attempts at neutrality/impartiality, betrays an implicit model based on the canons of western art music – adaptable it is true but nevertheless there. And it is interesting, too, to note that Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin adverts to this need for adaptability when different cultures are juxtaposed in education (Ref. III P vi). **There was not a single voice raised at MEND against the need to retain the undoubted advantages of western lore in education. This pragmatism is hardly surprising but it should nevertheless be noted as a seminal statement.** It should also be borne in mind that the scholarship which has fed on and grown out of western art music is but a reflection of the genius explicit in the music's outward manifestations; if one survives, so must the other. It follows that there is agreement in principle that WAM still has a place in music education, if only as first among equals. It appears also that its characteristic approach to scholarship, the sheer scope and sophistication of the corpus of knowledge itself, its application and conformability to educational method, are indispensable and worthy of preservation.

The question of **popular music** in education is less clear-cut but no less worthy of serious consideration. Its sheer intra-genre variety and its interfaces with almost all other musics are bewildering. It is relevant in the context of the understanding in this report to review that aspect of it that we associate most typically with the American version, its commercial significance and the hold it has established globally. Viewed from a traditional music education viewpoint it seems more and more to be an overwhelming presence of music, independent, self-sustaining as a genre but consciously ephemeral in specifics, with a total infrastructure often sophisticated and complex, almost untouchably external to educational practice and intractable as a subject for conventional study by traditional means. Popular music is in no need if educational respectability (that is outside its brief); it is not pretentiously didactic in an artistic sense. But there is a need for music education to subsume the musical essence of popular music, simply because without this working interface it is in danger of peripheralization by compromising its role as dispenser of music in its claim to universality. Relative to so-called classical music, which lends itself so readily to contemplative, introspective and cerebral pursuits, the typical function of popular music is overtly social and gregarious; it is, almost of necessity, music for easy listening, and, in spite of the professional and technological refinement which often characterizes its presentation, is normally not challenging in a way that interests educational methodologists or that is comparable in power to that of the great and enduring exemplars of the classical repertoire. Or perhaps it is just that this kind of study has not suggested itself on either side of the divide. On reflection, there is no question about the abundance of melodic, rhythmic, harmonic, textural and formal excellence to be found in popular music (if this is not too western-orientated a means of categorization) and ready for assimilation into the processes of music education.

It is just that it is easier for the average music educator to choose examples from familiar repertoire; on the other hand, there is no convincing profile of 'pop' educators, and the practitioners are typically unconcerned about educational possibilities in what they are doing. We are left with the arbitrary and undiscriminating absorption of popular elements in music education which is the source of a concern that could be obviated if the challenge were to be taken up systematically at a higher and more analytical level. Meanwhile there is the pressure arising from the presumed right of popular music to a presence; and there are the worrying preferences of learners for music that is foreign to the didactic experiences of their teachers. Above all there is the conviction visited upon the profession that what is needed are musical bridges between school and community which are notionally largely associated with a working détente between the repertoires of each, stable in one case, protean in the other.

A proposal has been made as to the approach to choice in this matter. Without prejudice to any music chosen for educational purposes, absolute quality is not the only criterion; if it were the repertoire could be inaccessible to most. Quality must be coupled with diversity and tempered with the criteria of relevance and musical accessibility. It is suggested that music be screened to establish an 'index of related social behaviour'; this should amount to a filtering procedure which can assess the relative values of the musical *vis-à-vis* the social experience. It may be that the former is not compromised by the latter, in which case the judgement can then proceed along artistic lines. The choice cannot be arbitrary; there must be standards and guidelines. The writer believes that the art criterion is the only option - and it will not be disavowed by the 'pop' aficionados. The Reimer suggestions for assessing the quality of any work of art and, in the case of the perfuming arts, its performance, are to test the embodied (1) craftsmanship, (2) sensitivity (quality of feeling), (3) imagination (originality, creativity, cultured unpredictability) and (4) authenticity (control, by honest giving way to the demands of the material).[171] There is no hidden agenda in this listing; it is capable of isolating the banal as it celebrates the genuine and inspired, regardless of the cultural origins of the music.

On the basis of diversity, then, the infusion of music education with popular musics is plausible and feasible without compromising standards or quality. But once the criteria of relevance, diversity and accessibility are honestly satisfied it seems not unreasonable to suggest that the final balance should reflect quality.

It was anticipated that, at MEND, the place of **Irish traditional music** (ITM) in general music education would produce a plethora of provocative comment and apologias as to the desirability of its augmented presence in the future. And indeed the opening salvos were promising. But in the end the collected commentary was inconclusive, especially, it might be added, as to the low level of alarm evinced in relation to the threat to Ireland's still underdeveloped biculturalism from the tide of multiculturalism, which has global significance in its urgency and in its advocacy. It ought to be a truism to claim that Irish traditional music is important in Irish general music education; but the facts do not bear out the assertion. Music itself still has a far from secure presence in the system although recently worked curricular revisions have attempted to reshuffle the options at second-level to make them more accessible and attractive. Traditional music as a practical option is one such possibility but, like related options in classical music, it relies on expertise imported from community effort. While this has undoubted merit in the bridge-building context it still emphasizes the *external* base of traditional music. The music is by nature more practically than academically based so it might be argued that the school system, always ill-at-ease with performance-based education, has moved to accommodate it, but has done little more. And primary school music, still dogged by the 'pragmatic' decision that class teachers rather than specialists should carry the burden of music education, is arguably two steps away from a satisfactory presence of native elements in the menu; this is, first, because class teachers typically cannot be expected to have the expertise to guarantee manifold exposure to even minimal offerings, and second, because music specialists would be hampered by the norms of the overall system (teacher training), which does not adequately support native music.

[171] Reimer, *A Philosophy* (rev. 1989), pp 133-139.

The traditional music issue is interesting in other ways. It highlights the fact that performance-based music is, in the official mind, intuitively regarded as an unmanageable intrusion into school music and bears out much of what has been observed in relation to performance in the dedicated section above. It confirms the normal status of performance as a specialized study. It draws attention to the vibrant though by no means universal presence of this genre (ITM) in the community as a selectively sought-after and satisfying artistic pursuit. But if school music cannot cope with the skill/time base of music that is practical in essence, what is left to import into the system if ITM is shorn of its performance branch? If the writer's interpretation of Professor Ó Súilleabháin's comments is correct, we are led to believe that traditional music is dependent for its effect and its appeal on a kind of holism in which the music and the performance, the repertoire and the activities, the performers and the listeners are integrated inseparably. Thus the question to be answered is whether music education in Ireland is ready and sufficiently flexible to accommodate ITM activities, without which its repertoire is emasculated as to its function in energizing the activity itself. Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin's interview (Ref. III P vi) takes on new meaning in the light of this question. His complacency with the *status quo* (ITM mainly thought of as a community activity) and the fact that 'he does not give the impression that he is about to spearhead an immediate and serious campaign to marry it to school music education as a means of enhancing its popularity' may very well be rooted in a conviction that the task is either too difficult or not worthwhile. Professor Ó Súilleabháin did not evince any overt enthusiasm for a mere presence of the music in schools as an opportunity for listening. On the other hand there was significant enthusiasm at MEND for the importation of the aesthetic of ITM, as represented by the pioneering research of Dr Albert Bradshaw, into the teaching repertoire for schools.

There is an unanswerable case for the inclusion of ITM in Irish music education, whether as a passive presence of the repertoire itself for its intrinsic beauty or on the terms of the aficionados; this latter is a matter for the devotees of ITM to take up as a challenge since it can happen by no other means. As to the repertoire it can be judged by the criteria (listed above) side by side with all other music being considered for inclusion. That it is relevant and accessible is endorsed by its current status as a significant quasi-cult music in Ireland, a categorization that is necessary because it is not universally supported as, perhaps, it should be. (Sadly, ITM cannot be claimed as securely within the first-culture experience of all Irish children.) It is capable of adding an important moiety to the diversity of offerings. The guarantee of quality (for, like all other musics, ITM covers a wide spectrum in this regard) must be the responsibility of music educators, by informed collective approval or simply by individual preference. That other crucial dimension of ITM - the performance itself - especially if it is to be excluded from the school experience, lends force to the argument that it is a specialism, that it must be encouraged and supported as much as all the other, perhaps less contentious, branches of musical activity if music as a life force is to be celebrated, as it ought to be, as a dimension of the Irish psyche and of Irish culture.

It should follow from an appraisal of the Irish context that the case, here in Ireland, for ***Multiculturalism***, especially of the absolute variety, is weak. Its trump-card shibboleth - multiculturalism for a multicultural society (such as that in the US or UK) – is simply not applicable in Ireland at present. Professor Shehan Campbell, a distinguished protagonist, especially, in the context of Irish concerns, as to first and second level applications, argued persuasively at MEND and with moving humanitarianism, but she left many unanswered questions in her wake. Bennett Reimer, a latter-day though arguably reluctant convert to the principles involved, probably gave the most detached, and therefore the most objective view of the phenomenon in his response (*qv*) to Harry White's MEND paper - *A book of manners in the wilderness*. With searing candour he throws the whole issue back into the melting pot. Here is what he has to say:

> Few if any counter arguments to multiculturalism have appeared, but I sense we may well begin to have some reservations expressed before too long because pendulum swings always, sooner or later, reverse directions. Already, the issue "why do it?" has been raised. Can political/social ends drive our efforts convincingly, or do we not need an authentically musical benefit from opening ourselves to diversity as a goal? I have argued that the essential benefit of understanding music that is foreign to us, to whatever

> extent that is possible, is that it enlarges our experience of those meanings which only music can express. We need to continue to clarify our philosophy of multiculturalism - our understandings of its intrinsic nature and value – if we are to sustain present efforts beyond the short term, and I look forward to a growing debate about this fundamental issue. . . . We [in the US] have a long way to go to get our house in order.

There is a consistency in David Elliott's praxial philosophy being coupled with absolute multiculturalism. In considering the knowings relating to music (Reimer's admirable and succinct subdivisions into knowing *within, how, why, about*) it must be obvious that those approaching any music from outside its culture would selectively concentrate on knowing *about* and *how*; of these two, knowing *how* is the most musically intrinsic, the most practical and therefore the most congruent with a praxial philosophy. This is borne out in the literature and in the advocacy presentations concerning multiculturalism; Patricia Shehan Campbell's lectures (the writer has attended many) are uniformly permeated with grass-roots examples, practical demonstrations and participant sing-alongs. As multicultural music education currently stands, it exhibits therefore (as has been seen in relation to ITM) an intimate bond between its advocacy theory, the repertoire and the practice. Its inclusion in music education, beyond mere tokenism, presupposes an allocation of time that may just not be practicable. This is the problem with all augmentations of the content of the curriculum. The questions must be asked, "Is there time; is it relevant; what is compromised in the process?". The price of multiculturalism must be weighed. If the common denominator approach is invoked, allocating minuscule time slots in the interests of diversity, there is the obvious danger of dilutions so damaging that the hope of developing any musical or cultural identity in the students is seriously compromised if not forlorn.

Because of the fact that the philosophy of multicultural music education (a study of its nature and value) has not stabilized beyond statements (and not very convincing ones at that) as to its desirability, a great many questions have still to be answered before it can be adopted as an understood dimension in all general music education.

1. Is it, ideally, conceived in terms of the importation of both its repertoire *and* practices into music education?

2. Using the concentric circles model of early music education (see Shehan Campbell and McCarthy, Refs. III P v and III P vii), are meaningful offerings in comprehensive multicultural education feasible in the time allocations available, considering the scope and demands of other prioritized experiences?

3. Should the study of multiculturalism be reserved as a specialism, for third-level work or as part of another sector of education (social anthropology?)?

4. What is the nature of the dilution that will occur in the overall educational package as a result of introducing or expanding multiculturalism?

5. What are the implications for teacher training in proposing a programme of multiculturalism?

6. Authenticity has been described as 'a red herring', a non-issue, in intracultural terms (see Santos - Ref. II P vii). But there is a very different context when music is being approached from the stance of another culture. Is it better that children should be taught from the model of a best-fit culture (rationalized from the experiences of the teacher, assuming these to be relevant and sympathetic to the dominant or adopted culture of the classroom) or exposed to second-hand or sometimes sham examples which will achieve little in terms of a better understanding of other cultures.

The insinuation of musics of the world's cultures into education is less problematic in terms of the music itself than of its practices. It is, of course, resource-intensive and, considering its near infinite possibilities, it must be prohibitively expensive, especially if ideal conditions approaching authenticity are sought, using culture bearers to lead the music making. Notions of political correctness and of promoting the idea that music is a binding force in the global village are really too idealistic to warrant visiting a programme of multicultural music on mercilessly overloaded curricula. Nor should general music education be burdened with the responsibility of unfolding the significance of the socio-cultural elements of the music being taught when these will have little significance for naïve learners and are more appropriate to the area of social studies.

In the final analysis, in the view of this writer, the case for multiculturalism in Irish school contexts falls short of a persuasive argument. The subject is of absorbing interest, of course, and is worthy of scholarly input, but this should be selective to those whose propensities lean in that direction. In the United States, which may be reliably regarded as the source of the movement, a convincing profile has not yet emerged, although there are examples of brimming enthusiasm which ought to be encouraged for their philanthropic intent. Significantly, the latter-day promulgation of provisional national standards for school music education in the US are specific on activities but not on diversity; although they are ostensibly neutral it would be difficult to argue that their intent is truly multicultural on any ambitious scale. In Ireland, apart from the need to address the bicultural issue, as a subset of multiculturalism, in a more proactive way, reasons for not embarking on full-blooded multiculturalism are more prolific than are the grounds for proceeding. Questions of genuine relevance to the current needs of Irish children, time within the curriculum, teacher training to produce a competent teaching force, the policy decision not to employ music specialists in primary schools, authenticity in the offerings when compared with the corresponding potential of more familiar musics – each of these is a daunting obstacle to the successful development of a multicultural programme. Where specific cases of personal teacher expertise exist, the skilful weaving of multiculturalism into the seam of music education is an interesting possibility. And the seeking out of materials which painstakingly, and with good musical heart, explore multiculturalism without aggressive incursions of time would seem prudent as a provision against the uncertainties of the future.

19.7.10 The Current State of Music Education in Ireland

To be consistent, the state of music education in Ireland should be viewed through the lens of the MEND Agenda, fabricated as it was from the informed estimate by Irish music educators as to what were the burning issues in Irish music education at the end of the millennium. The survey can now be further focused by reference to the expected and confirmed Findings of MEND (See Section20.2) and to Bennett Reimer's inspirationally simple analysis of Harry White's concerns, which framed the MEND epilogue.

The most fertile starting point for an enquiry of this nature is to establish the historical quasi-political disposition towards music education which influenced the evolution to its current state. Two significant factors emerge. There was pre-philosophical recognition in Ireland from the first half of the nineteenth century that music was sufficiently important, in an aesthetic sense, to merit inclusion in the curriculum of schools (typically and almost exclusively at primary level). The universality issue is implicit here since schools were singled out as the conduit through which this enlightenment would find expression. Second, and flowing from the first, a national curriculum was developed in the early days of the independent state. These positive attitudes persist but they were offset in the early days by the typical colonial reality of the most rudimentary offerings to schoolchildren contrasting with the élitist opportunities of the well-to-do, which bred the popular perception that 'real' music education amounted to performance education. The interactions and dynamics of these parameters pretty well define Irish music education as it currently exists. Stated at its most naïve there are still problems with the working of the school base, the curriculum, the understanding of performance and the élitism issue.

It is not surprising that there is no convincing evidence that serious philosophical enquiry, leading to consensus, informed the music curriculum for Irish schools; this became a fashionable global trend only in the post-WWII years, which found Ireland still educationally in a post-colonial phase and not yet ready to take its own initiatives based on a wider pool of knowledge. Perhaps now we have reached the point where more independence of thought can be expected and is being practised.

MEND Agenda I – Philosophical Considerations

School music education in Ireland responded therefore, but always belatedly, to many trends, the creativity phase (*An Curaclam Nua*) of the 1970s being perhaps the most notorious and fully acknowledged failure, as reported so tragically in the *Deaf Ears?* Report. But that there was a growing interest in serious philosophical underpinning became obvious once the work of the statutory body, the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) Music Sub-committee got under way in the 1980s. It must be claimed that MEND has added a significant chapter to this enquiry into the nature and value of music, with its necessary and logical extension into the area of music education. The lacuna in philosophical confidence was evident at Phase I of MEND; it was alarming to find many of the music educators ill at ease with the subject, in some cases being dismissive in self-defence. But the discovery was made and acted upon; it is to the credit of those same music educators that they returned in strength to participate in the appropriately philosophy-laden Phase II. There is no reason to recapitulate on the thoroughness of the treatment and its valuable spin-off in the Elliott/Reimer/White encounter, which introduced the Irish problems to global audiences more effectively than MEND could ever have done. The whole saga (for that is what it turned out to be) is fully reported in this document. From this exhaustive treatment it is hoped that a better understanding of the deeper issues in music education, and in the Irish context, has come about and that it can be used further to inform the decisions and modifications of the future, even if consensus must wait for the agency of continuing debate. After all, MEND merely 'attempted to give an account of as much experience as it could . . . allowed for more than it could explain, and has, therefore, signed beforehand, if not dated, the death warrant of its philosophy.'[172] What has been achieved is - a painstaking extraction from the analysis of the MEND initiative of philosophical principles that are near to consensus, a careful rationalization of areas of dispute, and an honest appraisal of the balance issue in reconciling diversity of repertoire and the nature of involvements (activities) with the pragmatic constraints of time and teaching expertise.

MEND Agenda II - The State of Music Education in Ireland.

In reviewing the *State of Music Education in Ireland* under the headings of the MEND Agenda the heading repeats itself. The writer therefore accepts the challenge, at this point, of attempting an ultimate précis of the problems.

1. Ireland does not have a high music education profile.

2. The inherited and prevailing culture in education is that music is low in priority, with low optional uptake.

3. The popular perception of music education still centres on the idea of performance. Performance as élitism is a divisive force.

4. There are serious disparities between urban and rural opportunity

[172]C. D. Burns, *The Sense of the Horizon,* quoted in Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key,* p.5.

5. Performance in school contexts is no more that exploratory; more serious performance studies (extramural specialism to proficient and expert levels) receive very little state subsidy and are of questionable availability, accessibility and affordability at the standard required.

6. There still are serious discontinuities in music education, now particularly between second and third level.

7. Philosophical underpinning for music education has been inadequately researched as a collective exercise.

8. Irish traditional music is seriously under-represented in general education

9. Teacher training in music education needs ongoing review. Specialist services in primary education are problematic. Necessary growth in the performance area will demand progressive upgrading of teacher expertise.

10. Problems are anticipated in the conversion of the intended curricular reforms to delivered curriculum.

11. Rationalization of scope and intent (Academy for the Performing Arts) with regard to third level studies in music, as a performing art, is necessary.

12. The time factor in music education needs to be considered more realistically.

13. There is dissonance between school music (education/learning) and popular music (leisure). The establishment of education-community bridges is a priority to encourage reconciliation of these views.

14. There is a clash of interests between practical and academic streams in music education at all levels.

MEND Agenda III - Continuum in Music Education

Bennett Reimer, in his essay, *Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education* (p.8) lists as a common value, in relation to music education, that 'music study for all children should represent thoughtful attempts to systematize learnings over time rather than to consist only of sporadic and unorganized activities'; this implies, if it does not demand, both regularity and continuity. And the chilling conclusion, reached in the *Deaf Ears?* Report, that 'the young Irish person has the worst of all European musical "worlds"' drew its conviction from the identification of the fractured continuum between primary and second -level music education in Irish schools as a source of the relegation it lamented. And the alarm in the *Deaf Ears?* pronouncement signalled the beginning of the MEND initiative. Continuity is undoubtedly an important issue, as indeed discontinuity, dichotomy and separatism must be searched out and addressed as negative influences. In this respect it may not be that the situation has deteriorated between 1985 and the enactment of MEND but that, once alerted to the nature of the concern, we have adverted to other cleavages.

There can be reasonable hope, based at least on the stated intentions of the curricular reforms of the 80s and 90s, that the damaging and disorientating discontinuities between primary and second-level school music education have been addressed. The chronology of the reform took the form of a top-down exercise in which primary music was the last to be addressed – a questionable strategy. What is generally agreed to be a watering-down of the standards at Leaving Certificate level effectively narrowed the total spectrum and must, therefore, have facilitated an accommodation at the interface of first and second level; but it was at the cost of compromising another equally fragile and pivotal

bridge between second and third-level music education, threatening if not necessitating devaluation of the latter and therefore of the whole trend of music education. In the writer's view, the notion of a single programme leading to assessment (Leaving Certificate) with the multiple aims of 1) (laudably) making the subject attractive to a wider cohort of general studies music students, albeit typically interested in university entry credits only and 2) (equivocally) suggesting, without guarantee, that the programme might also provide a secure transition to third level music studies (without the benefit of imported [generally practical] skills?) is highly questionable, if not dishonest. The dangers inherent in this compromise are fully discussed in the body of this report (see Refs. I P xiii; I D iva; II D iiib; III D iib); the writer regards this issue as one of the most significant in the evolution of the music education endeavour in Ireland.

Apart from the commanding continuum fracture, with its sinister consequences, described above, there are other discontinuities, within mentalities and in physical terms, which should be mentioned, as each contributes negatively to the flawed panorama of Irish music education.

1. Between the aspiration and the achievement realities of the performance base in school music education, ignoring the spurious importations of skills from outside. This should lead to the recognition of performance as a specialization, indispensable to the ultimate survival of music at a respectable standard, and worthy of support.

2. Between the availability of copious, albeit conflicting, philosophical underpinnings and their effective transference through teacher training. It is not necessary, however desirable as an end, that there should be agreement on the empowering philosophies of music education; it is, however, desirable that there should be discussion.

3. Between teacher training and the demands of the curriculum, especially where the performance aspiration is concerned within the new dispensation at second-level (see [i] above).

4. between music as experienced at school and popular music, endorsed by the community

5. Between the academic and practical biases of teachers, leading to misconceptions, misunderstandings, over/under-estimates of time demands, and intolerance. This is a perennial problem which causes much tension and distress, not only for learners but at professional levels also.

6. Between the artistic (aesthetic) and functional (utilitarian) aspects of music as a performing art.

7. Between the components of musical diversity (typically WAM vis-à-vis popular and multicultural offerings) as to their suitability for admission to the general music education system

8. Between practical (vocal/instrumental) teachers and performers, leading to the pejorative misconception that all teachers are 'failed performers'.

9. Between significant coterie sytems (such as ITM) and the general music education system to which they seek access by right.

10. Between literate and non-literate methodologies

MEND Agenda IV – Performance

The context of performance being addressed here is not the limited aspect associated with school achievement, but the general case of performance as the enabler of nearly all musical experience. The overwhelming attraction of performance as a pursuit cannot be gainsaid. Performance makes the music present. For the performer, it represents the ultimate challenge in the balance of faculties it demands. Expert performance presumes a poised interplay of cognitive, affective and psychomotor activity. It is exciting as the self-generated outgoing manipulation of the materials of music at its defining point of transmission. No wonder that it is in the sights of all who are attracted to music. But there are determining truths about performance that are not always sufficiently taken into account. It is skill- and time-intensive. It is axiomatic that it requires the ministry of expert teaching. Because of its artistic intensity and physical complexity, especially in its more sophisticated forms, it benefits from a one-to-one methodology; this is indispensable at expert levels. It is therefore expensive tuition. Its support in education is not a matter of spurious economics. The question is not can we afford to have it but, rather, can we afford not to. There may be many activities in music, but performance is the lifeblood of the whole endeavour; it takes possession of the popular mind, and rightly so, as being the characteristic act of music making, the essential link between the demiurge and the listener. Under-investment in performance can lead to only one result – mediocrity in the comprehensive experience.

The Irish context of performance and performance education may be summarized as follows:

1. Performance would normally be understood as meaning skills in the delivery of western art music; the teaching profession generally reflects that understanding.

2. In the above context the profile of performing in Ireland is not a distinguished one. It followed colonial and post-colonial trends, from the nineteenth century onwards, in which music education was on low priority, but it also paralleled the norms of British practice (the dominating culture) of the same period, where élitism had the effect that only those who could afford it had the opportunity to excel. But British norms evolved more promisingly, probably in relation to indices of economic prosperity, leaving Ireland behind for most of the twentieth century. The latter-day trends in Ireland are, of course, very heartening but the country lacks the cadre of expert teachers in sufficient numbers, even should the initiative to promote performance be taken seriously. Significant improvements are not merely a question of the will and the fiscal resources; as far as the delivered curriculum in music education is concerned, they move in phase with the supply of that most wanted of resources – trained teachers within a secure employment structure that attracts others of high calibre into the profession and, indeed, produces them. That this cannot happen overnight is an unfortunate truth. We must start somewhere and we must start now. Nor is this a call to produce a nation of performers! No, it is rather an attempt to see performance for what it is, as a specialism, to identify and encourage those whose propensities seek it out, and to provide adequately for that currently unappreciated resource. This is not happening in an organized and convincing way.

3. For most of the last century instrumental teaching was a feature of some convent school education but standards were low, mirroring the expertise of teachers. This became a self-perpetuating phenomenon. Institutions offering specialized performance studies were few in number and confined to the cities. There was very little organized teacher training for performance studies. Even in very recent times (1990s) reliable statistics reveal that more than 90% of Irish candidates for the instrumental teaching diplomas of reputable external examining bodies in the UK fail.

4. Instrumental performance as a feature of general music education in schools has only recently been included in the curriculum as a result of reform in the past decade. There are no reliable indicators of its success; rumour tends, however, towards the unimpressive. Suffice it to say that unless it is taken to mean mere exploratory activities

made possible through the minimal expertise of non-specialist teachers (even in secondary schools) it could potentially be a destabilizing factor in the time balance of the whole enterprise. There is, in fact, no other way of thinking of performance except as a specialism with optional status in the curriculum. Where this option is sought it ought to be accommodated. The US is the prototypical example of this principle in action, except that it seemingly divested the general programme of performance, and the performance programme of ancillary musicianship studies, both contributing to an unbalanced and unsatisfactory provision, now the subject of radical revision.

5. Performance in Ireland has tended to be a non-school-based specialism. As such, quality tuition which is available, accessible and affordable has been very unevenly distributed throughout the country. The peripatetic system is insufficiently invoked or exploited in rural Ireland; the better-qualified teachers seem to gravitate to the cities and, once established, are reluctant to make themselves available for outreach. The band movement has made significant strides in recent years but the organizers, with great honesty and some frustration, are constantly complaining about the shortage of qualified and experienced teachers. An unpublished Arts Council Report, *Listening Ears* (Phelan, 1998), on the state of the provincial music education provision in performance, outside the state or semi-state sector, is a pathetic commentary and is an almost unrelieved chronicle of only moderately-qualified staff, derisory salary expectations and under-financed management structures, as far as the information goes. This cannot augur well for the future of this branch of music education; it needs massive restructuring and subsidy under the guidance of an official hand if provision is to be seen to be fair.

6. It must be obvious that skilled performance is not for everybody; this is so simply because only a minority of learners will be prepared to make the investment of time to acquire the skills. It is astounding that not just the uninformed public but even many music educators have not sensibly absorbed this hard fact. Reliable statistics from the US indicate that when the performance option is freely available (i.e. built into the financial structure of the education enterprise) an uptake of up to 15% may be expected. The corresponding and well understood statistic is that only a small percentage of that number can be expected to carry any expertise acquired into later adult life. But that does not detract from the need to inculcate a performing mentality at a general or specialized level. David Elliott's praxial philosophy adverts helpfully to this fact but he focuses less on specialism than on the idea that performance (active music making) is within the capability of all, and should therefore be imposed as a uniform mode of music education, a view which has attracted much adverse critical commentary. Yet performance is the lifeline that guarantees the transmission of music from one generation to the next. It must be cultivated on a 'milk and cream' basis so that the culture bearers can be identified and given the opportunities appropriate to their talent and their commitment. The current state of music education in Ireland still indicates a substantial shortfall in provision. Serious performance tuition opportunities are not built into the general education system but neither are they adequately supported by the state as subventions to private enterprise. And the new phase of exploratory performance, which forms part of the revised curricula in schools, lacks the technical support of relevantly trained staff. Teachers cannot teach what they cannot themselves adequately do.

7. Talent education is a special case of performance. It is one of the commonly-held values of music education that talent must be supported, since it is well understood that, as in all other areas of human endeavour, abilities and particular aptitudes are not evenly distributed. The willingness to foster talent should never be interpreted as indifference to the needs of the majority. The special training of gifted persons, where it occurs by systematic interventions, should merely reflect the pragmatism of investment in the future of the art and not as undiscriminating élitism. While there is a plausible theory that 'talent will out', the current structures in Irish music education are inadequate for the

timely identification of giftedness and its subsequent and satisfactory support in its crucial formative stages.

8. It is remarkable that not a single participant at MEND played down the importance of performance. Even the third level academics, who might, of all interested parties, have been seen to stand to lose most from the over-indulgence of their students in performing pursuits, warmly endorsed its indispensability at all stages of music education, but most particularly in the case of those destined for the profession, even as non-performers. This in turn underlines the need for a radical review of the nature of performance, a campaign to have its features understood, accepted for what they are and pressed home at the level of political advocacy. The essential understandings are 1) that performance, in the traditional public perception of music education being performance education in a solo sense, is not for all though it is a crucially necessary component in the overall fabric of music education, 2) that this kind of involvement, being necessary for the artistic fulfilment of a large minority, but, more importantly, for the successful transmission of the benefits of music to all, now and in the future, must be separately supported as a specialism outside the general music education mainstream and 3) that a suitable but more modest programme of performance should be systematically developed and insinuated into general education without disturbing the holistic balance of the curricular provision.

9. It ought to be observed that it is arguably spurious to claim that the low level of interest in cultured listening by the population at large is attributable to unhealthy preoccupations with amateur performance, identified as a prevalent feature of musical activity and enjoyment in Ireland, as far as it goes. Performance is something that many people do because they want to; there should be no sanctions against it. And it is likely too that those who make such investments of time are probably also the most avid listeners and form the backbone of the concert-going public. On the other hand learners should not be unduly constrained to perform (the implicit reality of David Elliott's philosophy), since for the reluctant performer the difficulties are even greater and the rewards fewer than for those to whom performance is attractive. Harking back to Harry White's concern - 'we have ostracized the listener' – it should not be seen just as mere rationalization or, worse still, compromise, to suggest that the effective promotion of a balanced curriculum in compulsory general education (the American National Standards as a plausible prototype), in which performance, *inter alia*, is accorded no more than is its due, is the safest means of producing a musically cultured community. This is the basic building block of a satisfactory music education dispensation.

10. On the positive side, let it be said that performance has been well served in Ireland, in most cases for well over a century, by the ministry of a small number of city-based institutions. Their services have evolved into concerns about the transmission to future generations; a raft of wholetime courses, amongst them teacher training, have been developed and have accelerated in impact over the past decade. The Government announcement (January 2000) to set up a National Academy for the Performing Arts must be welcomed as giant step forward in political recognition that performance (as far as the music element is concerned) should be on the national agenda. There is still much ground to be covered before the APA grinds into operation. It is to be hoped that its deliberations will take account of the need to recognize the collective effort that went into the encouragement of performance in the last century, the developments that flowed from it and the desirability of allowing that wealth of experience to flow into and participate fully in the functions of the new umbrella institute. A submission (see Appendices), incorporating the coverage of the topic at MEND was submitted to the task force considering the proposals for such an institute and the enabling report presented at the launch reflected many of the recommendations made in the submission.

MEND Agenda V – Assessment

The inclusion of assessment in the MEND Agenda, although general in intent, had a predetermined focus on the problems relating to the Leaving Certificate (LC) examination and its ambiguous functions; these have been ongoing for some twenty years, with sources still further back in history, and are likely to go on causing concern as a flashpoint in Irish music education. As long as school music education is deemed the commanding vehicle for a universal dispensation, so the Leaving Certificate, as its culmination, will remain a cynosure. The invited contributions at MEND comprised a scholarly treatment of the subject of assessment by Professor Swanwick (Ref. III P iv) in the context of the new national curriculum in the UK, a valuable exposé by Seán McLiam (Ref. I P xiii), which courageously laid out the contentious parameters of the LC saga for subsequent discussion at the debates (Refs. I D iiia; I D iva; II D iiib; III D iib), and a windfall bonus from Professor Lehman (Ref. III P iii), whose commitment to and ideas on the importance of assessment arose from his intimate connection to the National Standards campaign in the US. While the individual contributions were, individually, admirably coherent, the synthesis did not convey a sense of uniformity of approach or of status in the three implicit systems, dubbing assessment a currently confused topic as to its underlying philosophy (as a statement of its nature and value). Britain, as far as statutory music education is concerned, is obsessed with the idea, and seemingly bogged down with overprescription and cumbersome, perplexing and time-consuming procedures which must be detracting from the educational process itself. On the other hand, the US, at least as far as 'pre-National Standards days' are concerned is characterized by laissez-faire; this seems to be confirmed by Paul Lehman's warning salvo (MEND 1996) in relation to a possibly successful implementation of the American National Standards: 'I see assessment as the supreme challenge and the defining issue for all music education in the coming decade'. Seen against this background the Irish system is indeterminate as to its concern with true intramusical assessment which, *inter alia*, should be used to inform the processes of teaching and learning.

Concentrating on school education in Ireland, historically there have been three assessment points – at Primary, Intermediate and Leaving Certificate levels. The primary examination, the only one associated with mandatory education, which did not assess music anyway, has long been dispensed with. It is arguable that the Intermediate Examination, certainly as far as music is concerned, has had the function of grading and sorting students into suitable senior cycle options (pass or honours, or some equivalent classification means) and has been usefully retained in this context. Thus the only really significant assessment (or evaluation as it characteristically is) is summative, at LC level, and seems to have no relationship to ongoing or incremental progress or to influencing the musical education of any particular cohort of students. This raises the question as to what its purpose is. Assessment is not an end in itself; it must have a link to the optimization of the teaching and learning processes. There is much fundamental wisdom to be drawn from the distanced comments of Swanwick and Lehman to point up the flaws in the Irish system, as far as it has progressed on this issue.

1. A distinction must be made between activities and outcomes; they are not interchangeable. Activities alone are not sufficient; there must be *measurable* outcomes to prove that the activities are reaching their targets. Clearly this is redolent of a political/resource agenda; this has always been relevant but has also been insufficiently exploited in Irish music education, sadly to its great disadvantage.

2. The defining features of satisfactory assessment are few but crucial. There are many reasons for and modes of assessment; each must be relevant to the circumstances. The criteria of quality, complexity and range are applicable but they are not of a kind; judgement of quality tends towards subjectivity, the other two being largely objective. Reliability seeks to establish uniformity between samplings. For pragmatic assessment in music, at one end of the spectrum the subjective element should be minimized (without compromising the validity of the result) or converted, as far as possible, into objectively measurable components; at the other, a case can be made for suggesting that music

education, as to teaching and assessment, should be handled only by specialists. In Ireland, as policy dictates, only the first of those options is feasible. But insistence on the subjectivity of the exercise should not be an argument against assessment in the first place. Routines of this subjective method in operation in Britain have been shown to have remarkably close correlations between results (statistics of the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music). But in the end, the contribution of subjectivity cannot be eluded as adding a small, tolerable but unquantifiable margin of error in results. It is notable that Professor Swanwick, for all his criticism and subsequent skilful manipulation of methodology into manageable steps, could not, in the end (nor should he have tried to), eliminate the subjective element in artistic appraisal. After all music is not like the exact sciences. As to complexity and range these can be specified in the enabling documentation (syllabus) of the curriculum, objectively provided for and monitored in continuous assessment or demanded explicitly in the procedures for summative assessments.

3. It is doubtful whether the niceties of Professor Swanwick's concerns, about measurable progress in music education, have unduly troubled the Irish mind intent on producing a statistical profile of summative achievement which, incidentally, has been and presumably still is subject to political review and moderation. Nor is there a reason to believe that Leaving Certificate examination results are not internally consistent and reliable. What is of much more concern is the function of an assessment which, though it may ostensibly be shown to measure cumulative progress in music education (albeit as possibly a single benchmark at the end of 12 years of tuition), is locked unavoidably into a system of credits, relative standards and confusion over curricular time allocations for comparable achievement – all concerned with its very objective value as a criterion of suitability for entry to *general* third-level education. If the curriculum is being manipulated to that end, while simultaneously undertaking unprecedented augmentation of the performance elements, as seems to be indicated, it seriously calls into question the credibility of senior cycle school music to produce a meaningful profile of musical achievement which can guarantee an advance on previous efforts. If the assessment statistics of the LC are used to modify the internal musical attainment targets downwards to make the subject more user-friendly; and if they are instrumental in converting senior cycle music into a dead-end which fails to offer a secure entry to third-level music for those who score highly – then they are informative, if they are being heeded, though they may be contributing little to the advance of musicianship in the population. The obvious conclusion is that a single syllabus, albeit with inbuilt options, is inadequate for the wider aims of music education in Ireland, unless the shortfall in provision is selectively made up through some other state-supported agency. This is particularly the case where performance is concerned. These are issues that must be addressed by the educators most intimately involved and through their professional representative bodies. It is not a question of settling for minimum standards or that anything goes when the future of the whole sense of Irish musical culture is in question. The detail of these concerns, with copious comment, is fully treated in the MEND sessions listed above in the opening paragraph of this section.

MEND Agenda VI – National Music (Multiculturalism)

Abbreviations:

ITM - Irish traditional music
WAM – Western Art Music
MC – Multiculturalism

The assertion that music is a universal experience is not the same as the claim that *all* musics are universally experienced. The case of Irish traditional music is an interesting one. That it has broken into the charts of global commercial popular music, and with a substantial holding, is established fact. As the indigenous music of this island it might seem appropriate that it should have a place in every Irish ear, heart and mind. That was certainly David Elliott's expressed understanding at MEND, nor was it surprising that he, as an outsider, should have had this expectation. But it is not so. There are complex historical reasons why traditional music has a cult-like though vibrant presence in the Irish music scene; it is beyond the scope of this report to address them. Nevertheless, a comment on the state of music education in Ireland, if approached from a school perspective, might very well bypass traditional music without being guilty of too grave an omission for, in relation to the hedonistic abundance of the music securely woven into the seam of the community, there is but a token presence in formal education. In addressing any enquiry into music education in Ireland this phenomenon had to be confronted. It therefore became a matter for serious deliberation within the MEND initiative; the invitation to the traditional (ITM) lobby to participate and contribute was acknowledged as a much-appreciated gesture. That they were pushing an open door as far as the delegates to MEND were concerned soon became obvious, but the outcomes were far from defining a breakthrough as to strategies to insinuate an enhanced component of native music into formal education. This was puzzling; it seemed at first that, with MEND, its time had come. Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin was identified by the promoters of MEND as the main protagonist and natural advocate for ITM. But he was so unshakeable, and not without justification, about the secure place of ITM in community settings that he was undismayed at its virtual absence from formal education, a fact that he did not regard as particularly discriminatory in a passionately resentful way. On mature reflection the writer is convinced that the MEND result could not have been otherwise and for reasons that neither spell failure for MEND intentions, nor cause any undue alarm

1. i) Traditional music seems to function most comfortably in the community where it enjoys the charm of informality which seems to evoke and to accommodate the full spectrum of its expression as a social, gregarious multi-functional activity encouraging and thriving on audience participation. Although it is not implied that it cannot be otherwise on occasion, and for its purposes, its more usual manifestations as popular music for easy enjoyment – practically-based, non-academic, non-literate, improvisatory, non-notational, non-conceptual, non-contemplative, indissolubly integrated - seem to place it in a polar position to WAM, the methodology of which dominates the education scene. Despite Professor Ó Súilleabháin's confidence that it could merge in a mutually fructifying way into formal education, the question has to be asked as to whether the price would be too high for both genres being considered, particularly in the case of ITM, as being at the cost of threatening its freshness and its freedom to develop outside the constraints of formal settings. In other words, is it going to lose too much of its essence by being formalized?

2. The question might be asked - is ITM not more natural in its community setting where it can function for the pleasures of those who seek it. There is always a danger with mandatory elements in education that they might produce an adverse reaction, as happened in some instances with the campaign for the preservation and restoration of the Irish language in the middle of the twentieth century.

3. Does ITM need to be imposed since, as a culture, it is in no danger, in its popular forms, of facing extinction? And its less popular forms are well served in research through the University of Limerick, as Professor Ó Súilleabháin has pointed out. In some ways ITM is an ideal and paradigmatic form of musical experience since it has a plausible claim, a sizeable following and all without formal imposition – an attractive combination. And yet Irish children should all be more aware of their musical and cultural heritage, and its skill-base, calling for a more systematic approach to its inculcation. It is another interesting phenomenon that ITM was the subject of much cross-cultural (so-called native/ascendancy) interest at the turn of the twentieth century, as can be ascertained

from the history of Feis Ceoil, the national music festival, founded in 1896,[173] so socio-cultural and socio-political barriers to its general acceptance are not easy to adduce.

4. There are significant differences in the way ITM and WAM are dispensed in education. Dr Veblen's paper (Ref. II P vi) gives evidence of a charming if quasi-bucolic naïveté in the methodology of transmission of ITM which would be ill-at-ease with the saturating academic and practical modes of WAM, fed by systematic evolution over centuries of inclusion in formal settings. In spite of Professor Ó Súilleabháin's assurances that the two are not incompatible, do we need the not inconsiderable challenge of forging an adaptable interface? As a genre ITM is not universal, though it is potentially more so through the possibilities opened up by technology and commercialism; it does not have the now tarnished pretentiousness of WAM, in seeking to be all things to all men. Should it not just take its place as one of the many genres that contribute selectively to the overall condition of universality and remain in its natural habitat? These are questions for ongoing debate.

5. The pressures for inclusion of ITM in formal education in Ireland are not as importunately strong as those for its close relation, Multiculturalism, in global contexts. This was another of the concerns that forced ITM into the agenda of MEND. If, as is doubtful, there is accommodation within the music education curriculum in Ireland for the inclusion of worthy additions, it would seem reprehensible that ITM might be bypassed in any such campaign by multicultural modules, which, in the Irish context, have far less claim to the attentions of our dominantly monocultural western society.

6. There is a rapidly growing research base for ITM, notably in the University of Limerick through the agency of the Irish World Music Centre located there. It is notable, however, that very little of the research so far undertaken there, or indeed anywhere else, is education- or methodology-oriented towards ITM. This must be interpreted, *prima facie*, as the most reliable indicator of low prioritization on the part of the lobby from which a new and proactive agenda might be expected to issue.

7. Following on from vi) above, expertise in teaching ITM is community-based at present, as Dr Veblen typically describes, and lacks the sophistication and technical assurance of established teacher training modes, either practical or academic, associated, again typically, with music education using WAM as its basis. And, after all, as folk music this should not be unduly expected of it. It therefore suffers from the double drawback of paucity of time-honoured, agreed and efficient methodology (Dr Veblen's authority again) and its not unexpected absence from the curriculum for teacher training, such as it is. This comment is, of course, also applicable to multiculturalism, though *it* has the advantages accruing from a global movement, supported by American initiatives and material resources.

8. One of the most interesting aspects of ITM, in considering its applicability or adaptability to formal education settings is its unashamed performance base. Whether this is to its advantage, in this instance, is equivocal. Without it there could be little future for its convincing presence in formal education. Imported into formal education with all its other misalignments [see [i] above], calling for absorption and reconciliation, it could threaten to dominate and destabilize the curriculum, where the availability of time must always be one of the most relevant of all issues when optimizing education. Is it any wonder that Professor Ó Súilleabháin's response was not without tentativeness as to a clear way forward?

[173] A monograph on this subject by the author, Frank Heneghan, is available by application to the Director of Feis Ceoil, 37 Molesworth St, Dublin 2 or by emailing <heneghan@indigo.ie>.

MEND raised the issue of ITM to a level of urgency that has paved the way for a more thorough and searching analysis of the parameters involved, especially as to its educational implications and possibilities. Although it has a less saturated hold on the mind and affections of the community than that assured, by massive commercial promotion, to 'pop' (American-style and -derived), it still has a satisfactory presence characterized by hands-on performance opportunities and much sought-after social serendipity of immediate if hardly over-sophisticated gratification. Its deeper artistic meanings may be for the professional to discover, but as useful art its utilitarianism is supreme. It is worthy of its place in the educational mentality but it is doubtful if it could be considered a self-styled vehicle for maximizing educational return across the wider spectrum envisaged in formal education; in this it could run into difficulties were it to place education under siege. The leading question is - what has ITM to bring to formal education and to gain from it; currently there is too much ambiguity and conjecture in the answers proffered.

MEND Agenda VII – Third-level Music Education; Teacher Training; The Academy for the Performing Arts

The acceptance of widespread professionalism in music is fairly recent in Ireland. Almost until the last decade of the twentieth century wholetime courses in music were university-based and dominantly academic, as if no other sense of musical professionalism was worthy of the name. There was a bitter harvest from this stranglehold, which dichotomized academic and practically-based musicians into roles of mutual suspicion, bred from the exclusiveness of their specialisms. This troublesome élitism, with its roots as far back as Hellenic models of music philosophy, is still with us and has been highlighted as a MEND Finding which needs to be addressed. There are, of course, three main categories of third-level music specialism – 1) the academic/musicological, 2) performance, and 3) teacher training (general and instrumental [including vocal]), but these overlap a great deal, especially nowadays when such studies are job-orientated and must therefore be as eclectic as possible, both to attract students in a competitive situation and to equip them with versatility.

Third-level music education cannot exist in its own right; it is evolutionary and derivative. It is inevitably and indelibly coloured by what is happening at lower levels, or should be. And we may take it that the scant provision in Ireland until the 1980s was ample evidence of second-level music that was similarly deprived and unsure of its aspiration. But there has been an efflorescence to the point where delivered standards have to be questioned because the incoming cohorts still reflect second level education which is inadequate, simply because most schools do not offer music at senior cycle (much less performance) and those that do are largely content with standards arguably lowered and compromised by the LC crisis of the 1980s and its fallout. Preparatory education (for third level) through private enterprise is not sufficiently available, accessible and affordable. In the final analysis third level education can deliver only in relation to the entry standards of its students and the breadth of their pre-third-level experiences. This is particularly true of the performance and instrumental teaching streams (where the problematic psychomotor skills, *inter alia*, are called for, at proficient levels, to start, being notoriously slow to acquire in the first place); the former, for reasons already alluded to (see Agenda IV – Performance above), is a much sought-after option in third-level music education for those who have had the benefit of good performance tuition and feel they can reach the standards required. Realistically it might be argued that the number of wholetime courses for musicians is adequate for the currently expected standard of entry but not so in relation to the combined need for a more comprehensive dispensation at all lower levels, both in schools and in the community, and the teachers to service it. Put another way, the comparatively small number of places available (in relation to the national population) is difficult to fill with candidates of reasonable calibre; the best invariably come from the schools of music, but they are not sufficiently numerous to guarantee an impressive overall profile. This buyers' market competition between the institutions offering music is such that the universities offer performance options, that they do not teach, to attract performers (normally the upper crust of candidature) into their courses, but the resulting double specialism is beneficial. EU (and other) opportunities, and lack of confidence in the resources available in Ireland for the highest levels of performance expertise, ensure a steady and emaciating

haemorrhage by emigration of many of the finest talents at under-graduate and post-graduate levels, a large proportion of which is lost forever to the national enterprise.

The notion of third-level music education must pragmatically be focused on employment. Much has been written about job opportunities that do not fall into the teaching stereotype; it is the writer's view that these are often impractically conjectural, at best applicable to the most talented and imaginative candidates (who are probably not going to find it difficult to secure employment anyway), relatively few in number and, most damaging of all, unflattering to the dignity and fascination of the teaching function which it should not be the policy of counsellors to denigrate, even by implication. It is healthy and characteristic for young musicians (especially performers) to look beyond teaching as their first option but the realities have to be faced; those to whom teaching is unattractive as a prospect ought to be made to rethink in the light of statistics alone. Most of the practically-based colleges in the world are faced with the problems caused by enrolling more students than the job market for performance (exclusively or partially) can comfortably accommodate, and have the perennial task of quasi-psychological counselling of the so-called failed performers, who have to be conditioned to accepting employment, usually as teachers, that is far from their starting aspiration. In the end the teaching scene must be probed as infinitely the most promising for employment, especially should official attitudes to music education be influenced appropriately. It is arguable that Ireland is ripe for such an enlightened approach to music education.

As has been suggested, if there are problems in third level music education in Ireland, they must be traceable to their roots at lower levels. It is arguable that this complex manoeuvre has not been satisfactorily completed to establish, in real perspective, what the fundamental issues are. The exercise calls into play many of the parameters already alluded to. Philosophy, curriculum, standards and assessment must all be considered systematically, and eventually brought into a working relationship in which balance and relevance are guiding principles. We have seen, through a tortuous route, that curriculum underpinned by consensus-backed philosophical principles is a desideratum. But a curriculum can be validated eventually only in its delivered form; otherwise it is merely an aspiration. The delivery of a curriculum can only begin to be guaranteed if it is tied to standards, which in turn must be confirmed as realistic by assessment. Paul Lehman argued convincingly at MEND (Ref. III P iii) for this enabling nexus; it is indispensable and ineluctable. Furthermore he argues, pinpointing a burning issue that was separately well aired at MEND, that 'standards provide a basis for insisting on qualified teachers. Having standards enables us to bypass the argument about whether music should be taught by classroom teachers or specialists. If the music curriculum is expressed in terms of activities rather than in terms of outcomes, then it's difficult to argue that the teachers need a high level of musical skills. But if we expect to teach specific skills and knowledge as outlined in challenging standards, then we need teachers who possess those skills and knowledge. There are some places in the U.S. where music is taught primarily by specialists and other places where music is taught primarily by classroom teachers. If a district expects classroom teachers to teach to standards, then it has to ensure that the teachers they hire possess those skills. Discussions about specialists and classroom teachers become irrelevant because the label is irrelevant. What counts is the results.' Sound advice but is it practicable? And how does this seeming digression impinge on third-level education in Ireland?

Looking first at academic third-level courses, if they can be assumed still to exist in their pure form, they are currently responding to a double agenda. First there is the training of those who wish to proceed to worthy careers and pursuits outside of teaching and performing; traditionally they should define the real essence of what these (pure) courses should comprise. Harry White sheds no tears about the superannuation of the old 'Oxbridge' model, but the value of disciplines lost, whatever about their practical value over the widest spectrum of applications, is surely lamentable? But these courses must also keep an eye on the job market, defined largely in terms of school music education, but only at second level, where teacher specialism is the norm. Here they are responding to curricula which are themselves changing radically, reacting to philosophical and political agendas which are also protean, to standards which are vague, inconclusive and deteriorating in relation to the pressures of *their* double agenda, described above (LC). And assessment, such as it is, at LC standard, is not

aimed at charting the content of third-level courses in music, as has been made clear by the NCCA spokesman. In fact it is unclear whether assessment, as practised in Ireland in that context, has any purely musical function. There is, then, the worrying fracture in the continuum between second and third level music education, which goes hard with those seeking admission to the latter on the basis of school-acquired skills, and on the trainers of the trainers, too, who are trying to re-establish the connection with this severed and disadvantaged group. And now, to add a new twist to the confusion, school music is ostensibly concerning itself with a broadening of the performance base, adding new challenges for the architects of academically-rich third-level courses (traditionally unconditioned to this new demand), simply to keep them relevant to the job market. Clearly some rationalization is called for, first, to establish what exactly third level education is supposed to be responding to.

Performance training at third level in Ireland, in the form of fully constituted wholetime (4-year) courses comparable with those in the rest of the developed world, has a rather short history of little more than a decade. Outstanding achievement in performance by young Irish student-artists in the past has been attributable to small pockets of inspired teaching which has been recognized in the ease with which they have gained admittance to prestigious performance institutions and courses in Europe and in the US; but this has not been the norm. These new courses are labouring under the burden of the historical fact that Ireland does not have a tradition of outstanding performance. Because scholarly travail is singularly unproductive in matters of a philosophy and curriculum defining *performance* studies, most courses seem to get by with an understanding that what is required is abundant talent, which is easy to recognize when it occurs, an inspirational teacher, unrelenting practice, and mere adequacy in the non-performance modules of the course. Truly, performance courses are a law unto themselves, as far as their unspoken aims are concerned or interpreted by those who thrive on them. They are almost invariably the first option of those with superior performing talents; and, as has often been observed, 'talent looks after itself'. But there is huge downside to performance courses, and Ireland is particularly prone to the effects of this dilemma; but that is not to imply that they should not continue to be sought after and supported for their eventual potential in the overall scheme of things. The problem in Ireland is that, because performance at any level worthy of pursuit in a third-level sense has been and is absent from the school experience and from the concerns of state support, it has been abandoned to the benign devices of private enterprise and to the limited provisions, by necessity, that have been possible through these means. Thus, while many aspire to excellence in performance, truly only a few have the opportunities and the encouragement at the crucial stages. The harvest from this culpable neglect is visited upon wholetime courses hungry for students and fighting for survival in the belief that there are better times in store. Because there are few accredited music schools in Ireland, ideas about philosophy, curriculum, standards and assessment in relation to performance are only imperfectly understood and applied; the arbitrary standards, because unrelated to a time scale, which usefully proceed from the graded examinations of a system such as the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, are no substitute for the workings of an officially-supported indigenous system applied nationally. Clearly third-level performance courses are dogged too by the inadequacies of the infrastructure of their recruitment sources. All eventually comes back to second level and the wider context of what is happening or not happening in schools; and it had always been within the MEND rationale that school music education would have to be the norm from which other provisions, as necessary, would evolve and derive their relevance.

Having highlighted the difficulties and ambiguities under which pure academic and performance studies have to operate, it is possible to consider the multi-faceted and internally disparate residue of teaching options aimed at primary and second-level education, in and outside of school. First it must be observed, provocatively, that it is probable that the reconfirmed policy decision to rely on class teachers rather than on specialists for primary school music education under the revised curriculum (1999) is probably a matter of fiscal expedience rather than of considered educational logic. The fear of change and of giving hostage to the strength of the philosophical arguments adducible has taken refuge in the historical norms of straitened educational budgets which may no longer be valid as reasons for inaction. It is too soon to pass judgement on the much publicized and ambitious intentions of the 1999 curricular revisions. The reality, however, is that third-level courses for primary school

teacher training have always, of necessity (time constraints), had but minuscule offerings in music methodology, though the survival of the music specialism does hold out hope and may be taken as turning a blind eye towards the various unofficial local subterfuges aimed at maximizing the potential of that specialism. Many compromises, showing considerable fertility of imagination, were advanced at MEND (see McCarthy - Ref. III P vii). And there are other lifelines built into the arrangements (such as education centres) that, at least, give an indication that a serious and sincere attempt is being made to upgrade education across the board. But the grandiose idea of a curriculum informed by philosophical principle, defined by standards and outcomes and tested by assessment, is too sophisticated to be suggested to or applied by teachers who are themselves typically uninitiated in such refinement of approach. The virtual absence of music as a specialism in primary school, apart from the still valuable token offered in training colleges, which nevertheless must act arbitrarily in practice, is a serious drawback to progress in recognizing music as a significant component in education; this is especially so when measured against the relative allocations of time to the subject in teacher training. We are in a transition period when new teacher support initiatives are to be implemented, and these are to be welcomed, but we are still far from the situation when music specialists who are musicians, by calling, will be admitted to schools; to them it must seem inconceivable that current provisions can do more than advance musical awareness infinitesimally. Irish music education is thus still faced with the task of making up ground at second-level where music is, nevertheless, reduced to an expendable option. This raises the question as to whether real progress is being made which would also clarify the potential for teacher employment, in turn encouraging students privileged with music specialisms, however acquired, in their second level years to consider third-level studies in music as an option.

We are now left with the crucial residue of third level music education which is itself, whether overtly or by simple inference, focused on employment in education at pre-third level. Because the graduates from such courses are by definition, music specialists, primary school teaching is closed to them in current circumstances. University graduates who are accepted, through various mechanisms, by the Registration Council for Secondary Teachers, have some prospects and those who take the dedicated baccalaureate in music education seem to be very well placed for employment in second-level schools; this latter course is, nevertheless, having difficulties in filling its quotas, an indication either that secondary school music teaching is not seen as a promising employment option, or of a dearth of suitable candidature, probably the latter. There are claims that the uptake for senior cycle music in secondary schools has increased dramatically under the provisions of the reformed syllabus/curriculum implemented in the 1990s, but this only confirms that it is now an ‘easier option’, completing the vicious circle that bedevils the recruitment to third level studies of candidates with basic attainment. Harry White reported ominously on North American practice in this respect, which now regards the freshman year as remedial in many instances. And there are well-populated ‘foundation’ courses in Ireland, too, aimed, at the cost (or benefit) of an extra year, at making up the shortfall in second-level music education by recognizing it for what it is.

Those who are destined to teach performance at all levels, depending on the calibre of their innate gifts and the sophistication of their training, normally come through performance-rich courses; they may be professional performers who enjoy some teaching, the ‘failed’ performers already alluded to, or those, of more modest ambition though no less commitment, who graduate from specialized courses in instrumental (including vocal) music teaching. [Alarmingly, the charlatans who are trading without qualifications of any kind, deceiving the gullible public, have been and still are a feature of performance education in the community; they must be alluded to here as a cohort ripe for exposure and elimination from the scene.] Some graduates may be lucky enough to find employment (wholetime or part-time) in dedicated music schools: others may choose or settle for the solitary role of the private music teacher. A word must be said in their praise. Teachers of practical music have had to contend with a kind of second-class citizenship, which is unmerited in the majority of cases, but which nevertheless has tended to reduce their self-image, while opening their profession as a sanctuary for the unqualified charlatans, referred to above, who beguile the unsuspecting public. And yet the best of these worthy musicians have provided, over the years, and for derisory fees, the training in performance which has not otherwise been available and which is so indispensable to the

health of the whole music education enterprise. Until this branch of music education is subjected to fundamental reappraisal in Ireland in a way which recognizes its indispensability to the comprehensive curriculum, in both its general and specialized aspects, and its worthiness in philosophical terms, while defining attainable standards confirmed by assessment, it is the writer's view that music education will continue to be problematic and unconvincing in its delivery.

While third level music education may be expected to continue on its path of growth and achievement (albeit arguably under-achievement), which is not being gainsaid in this analysis, it should be prepared to consider ongoing reappraisal of its goals, both on an institutional basis and in relation to relevance and balance within the whole corpus. A forum exists for such exchanges (heads of third-level music departments) but its deliberations could be focused more precisely if its agenda were open to bilateral discussion with representatives from its crucial recruitment source area at lower levels, where the idiosyncratic problems are more pressing and prototypical, as the MEND analysis has been attempting to show. Alternatively, and perhaps even more fruitfully, the services of the Music Education National Forum, inaugurated during the final sessions of MEND, or of some like umbrella body, might be pressed into service to ensure that all interested parties have an input. There is no area more in need of the collective wisdom of all its members or their representatives than that of performance, where a chasm exists between the standards aspired to and expected at third level and the general health of the discipline in the community. While the existence of a vibrant performance base is no guarantee that the aspiration of holistic music education is being met, as witness the US dispensation for the whole of the twentieth century, its absence can only be interpreted as evidence of uncaring attitudes and of policies uninformed as to the guiding philosophy of the performing arts and unwilling to accede to its considered demands. The long awaited announcement of the establishment of a National Academy for the Performing Arts (APA) in January 2000 raises hopes that these issues can now, at last, be addressed.

Political advocacy for the APA was ably canvassed with impeccable timing, which married the undoubtedly glamorous idea of a national institution with the dramatic upturn of the nation's economic fortunes. Although it is arguable that a case should first have been made for the state-sponsored upgrading of general and performance education at lower levels, the fashionable top-down strategy has been known to work in terms of its inspirational potential to influence the whole dispensation by establishing an aspirational model. It is to be hoped that the considerable efforts which brought about this exciting development can be applied in turn to the ancillary areas that must now be built up to complement the proposed activities of APA. In particular, the existence of the APA will, when it becomes a reality, highlight the lacunae in the national provision for performance education at lower levels, as indeed this will indubitably become a major concern of the management of APA on the question of its own viability.

As already mentioned, a separate monograph, representing the many views expressed at MEND on this issue, was submitted to the task force carrying out the feasibility study for an APA. Amongst the tasks that could very well come within the eventual remit of this national institution, a number immediately arise from the most cursory survey of the current state of performance-based music education in Ireland.

1. Spurious understandings of the nature of performance together with attitudes to and policies on performance in general music education are at the root of the whole (global) music education dilemma, and centred in the feasible extent of school experience. During the past 30 years in the US the spectrum of options covered minimal (or even zero) performance to maximized (total) involvements, neither of which is ideal and both of which have been justifiably criticized. The Reimer/Elliott confrontation, extending as it did onto the world stage, and its Irish derivative, the White/ Reimer/Elliott exchanges, through the agency of MEND, traversed most aspects of this core issue. Hopefully curriculum development agencies within the APA, in their wider brief, will be able to take this matter up as a pressing concern for clarification and help to normalize it in the popular and indeed the professional educational mentality, while ensuring that

performance studies develop apace from their currently neglected status at lower levels, with very necessary subsidies from within the national education budget.

2. Either meaningful performance experiences have to be incorporated in school, which is clearly impossible in currently available time allocations and because of the established norms of Irish school music education, or acknowledged as a specialism for which school still has some residual responsibility in drawing attention to what it cannot itself provide and stressing its importance for the sizeable minority that should have such extended options. If performance is to be a part of music education its implications just cannot be ignored by the main provider and by the resourcing agency for general education, viz. the Exchequer. The APA may have a function in monitoring this situation and in making provision, even in its own interests, for servicing the area so identified and delimited. This, of course, is to suggest that the APA activities will stray outside those normally associated with the training of performers exclusively at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. But, if teacher training is assumed to be open to it there may very well be confrontation, rather than mere competition, with other institutions, already legitimately providing this service in a market saturated in relation to current demands (that is, those backed by acceptable entry standards). This situation will have to be monitored sensitively.

3. The APA will have another legitimate reason to extend its brief to garner support for these currently problematic lower levels, since it too is dependent on them for its recruitment if it is to have a distinctively *Irish* character (and no other is honestly feasible as a priority concern for Irish music education, if the intent of the advocacy campaign is to be taken seriously). The notion of talent education (one of Bennett Reimer's 'values held in common' [ISME Amsterdam: *Universal Philosophy of Music Education* Paper Section 17.1.4]) and the possibility of a feeder school for the APA will, again, call for the sensitive negotiation and collaborations mentioned copiously in the official documentation, if a solution that avoids the tag of élitism is to be achieved. Obviously the APA must be a party, though neither a dominating nor the only one, to any survey of the overall structure, taking all levels into account, of performance education in Ireland. At scholarly levels it seems appropriate, too, that the APA should provide leadership in issuing statements, from time to time, on the philosophy and the psychology of performance, a much neglected area of research.

4. The APA will open up new vistas of possible involvement and achievement by young people in performance, but there are risks that must also be taken into account and acted upon so that postulants understand the problems inherent in this tempting profession. The performing field has only limited employment opportunity, based simply on the levels of audience interest and support. The idea of institutions committed to excellence is admirable, but if the 'reject' level is high there is the obvious danger that many still talented young musicians will be left scarred and embittered, with a reluctance to face alternatives with enthusiasm. There may be little alternative to this refining fire for sublimating the ultimate culture-bearers in this sophisticated profession but the collective problems of the whole cohort are very real and recognized internationally in third-level teaching institutions. The 'failed performer' syndrome is, of course, not a reason to demur on plans for an APA. The dilemma is there anyway and is not attributable to the Irish APA, specifically, as its cause; but it has to be faced nonetheless. Balancing the output of performers to the job market, particularly an indigenous one, is particularly perilous in Ireland. In spite of the nebulous talk of other satisfying employment possibilities for performers outside the limited possibilities of performance itself as a sustaining profession, teaching is pragmatically the most obvious outlet, invoking the direct applicability of performing skills, albeit ideally with the aid of additional craft arising from methodological training. There is thus an intimate link between performing and teaching so strong that one respected approach to performance teaching, even at the

highest levels, is on the understanding that the skills being inculcated should be transferable in a regenerative way . . . in other words, that performers in training should be able demonstrate that they can teach what they can do. At a more systematic level it has become standard practice that performers are expected to take some teaching methodology courses as part of their training. The need both for additional employment opportunities for (all) performers and, in Ireland, for the setting up of a lower level performance base in education which satisfies the ambitions of a significant minority is to identify a complementarity that could well be turned to good account in furthering an enlightened educational rationale. Whether the APA, as enjoying the favour of official recognition, should have unbridled and overwhelming powers to develop this potentially fruitful idea to its own ends, without taking into account the destabilization of pre-existing arrangements, is another matter, which again calls for sensitive collaboration rather than rampant disregard of the still serviceable provisions which paved the way for the successful APA campaign in the first place.

5. The establishment and the maintenance of the APA represent a major national investment of confidence and resources. It seems axiomatic that its supremely dominant involvements should be with Irish students, while those from abroad should, of course, be welcomed too, as a supplementary dimension, and accorded parity of esteem in their studies. This raises the question of critical student numbers for a satisfactory image as a fully complemented conservatory; in the writer's view this is, predictably, a problem area. While no musician would be expected to disavow the idea of the long-awaited APA, the danger of virtual cannibalization of the provisions of other respected and well-established third-level performance providers is very real. The well-founded resentment resulting from such an unchecked procedure could be a very negative feature in Irish performance education. The binding together of all interests in the field should be a commanding concern of those charged with the task of ensuring the general acceptance of the APA as the epochal and unifying development it ought to be. Its management structures must be seen to transcend internecine dissonances by adopting a conscious policy, in advance, aimed at minimizing them, recognizing what has already been achieved in the field, and negotiating relationships which are healthy, open, collaborative and democratic. This was compellingly argued in Dr Ritterman's address on the subject at MEND (Ref. II P iv). At this stage the APA still has a challenging campaign of advocacy to address in its own regard; this should never be allowed to compromise its own image as seeking what is best for the collective movement forward of performance in Irish music education.

6. If the eventual stability of this new institution is to be made secure, the real need, then, is to boost the performance base in lower-level education, and to train the teachers to minister to it; otherwise, the simultaneous attention to the glamorous pursuit of training performers will be threatened at source. But that is not to suggest that it is the sole prerogative or responsibility of the APA exclusively to do all or any of these things. What is needed is the collaborative efforts of all the agencies of music education and of the music-loving public to mount a campaign for the amelioration of the performance dispensation at the feeder level; if successful this could satisfy both amateur and professional demands equally. Eventually the enabling nexus of philosophy, curriculum, standards and assessment will have to be invoked and applied sequentially so that the political will can be stimulated by the evidence of a convincing and systematic approach, assisted by the importunate pressures of a national campaign. The APA would have a leadership role to play in this campaign. Here American experience and practice can provide useful guidelines; Paul Lehman's realism is persuasive. He is insistent that when philosophical principles have evolved into curricular options, it is crucial to focus, not on activities, but on outcomes (the delivered curriculum), which in turn must be validated by reliable assessment. It seems to the writer that if the APA, by consensus with its social partners in music education, were to promulgate a statement of what (the significant

minority of) young Irish persons should be able to do as performers to ensure the viability of the performance function at higher levels (and therefore the healthy survival of music as an activity endorsed by public approval and demand), it would clarify a much confused scenario once and for all. If, in addition, it were to take steps to put into place a nationally agreed system of assessment which would test those standards, an unanswerable case, based on statistical evidence, could be made for a performance education dispensation which could work towards normalization of those statistics to the expectations of a developed and artistically-aware society.

MEND Agenda VIII – A Forum for Music Education

In November 1985 Dr Ciarán Benson, Chairman of the Steering Committee overseeing the research leading to the *Deaf Ears?* Report, the stimulus for MEND, said: 'by any standards the state of music education in Ireland is not a happy one'. Judging by the plethora of complaints still to be heard, in spite of some encouraging developments such as revised school curricula and the promise of the APA, the question must be asked whether anything has changed appreciably. Nor is the claim made for MEND that by a single (or multiple) act of association and convocation it could, by collating the views and suggestions of the music education lobby, no matter how representative and innovative, bring about change, unless its presence could somehow be perpetuated as a continuing reminder and a collective conscience. And this reality was not lost on the delegates to the heralding pre-MEND Conference in 1994, when they effectively drafted the agenda for the MEND initiative – an agenda robust enough to withstand the test of time and to endure virtually intact to the very end of the public phases. In it provision was made for the establishment of a permanent forum for music education and this was, in due time, enacted and endorsed in November 1996. In fact, no such body, dedicated uniquely to the interests of music education rather than to music itself, had existed in Ireland before 1996. It was hoped that when the proceedings of MEND had been rationalized into a common expression of needs, hopes and aspirations, the results of the analysis could act as a working document and be used to revitalize the agenda as a catalyst for change and for collective action. It seemed that to allow the pointedly relevant commentary from this massive and unprecedented exercise of music education concern to languish for want of a continuing voice would be to squander the collected wisdom of every agency of ME in Ireland and to betray the interests of the caring public.

Although the group decision to establish a national forum for music education was really no more that a spontaneous act of common sense, it could not have anticipated the plethora of concerns that would find expression during the ensuing conferences and would call for rationalization and the services of a forum. Nor could it have divined the endorsement that almost contemporaneous events (1992-94) in the US would bring to it. It had happened that the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in America, a body that subsequently provided massive support to the fledgling forum in Ireland, had only recently scored, through its coalition for music, an epochal victory, in literally forcing the US Government and Legislature to include the arts in the Goals 2000 legislation for education, a symbolic decision which has changed the course of music education forever in that country; and it has helped, in other ways described in this report, to bring into focus many of the ultimate issues in music education for the benefit of those who are ready to learn from vicarious experience.

For the purposes of this comment under the above main heading (*The State of Music Education in Ireland* as part of the Irish context [Heading 10] in a philosophical sense) the rationale and specification of a possible forum for music education, as a national need, are sketched.

1. When the provisional decision of the pre-MEND delegates was endorsed during the conferences, it became necessary to look into models of such associations throughout the developed world. A repetitive pattern emerged which soon revealed its own internal logic. Campaigns for the amelioration of music education generally, and in the most successful cases, drew leadership from the professionals in the field, whose vested interests are, of course, obvious and necessary, though not lacking in altruism on that

account. It was, nevertheless, not always easy to disentangle the workings of the fora considered to isolate or separate issues which broadly concerned the educators and the learners as discrete groups. There are, of course, many issues on which their interests coincide. The sense in which a forum for music education was understood in Ireland was, it is believed, broadly concerned, initially, with the furthering of issues dealing exclusively with the processes of music education rather than the group interests of music educators. Although this understanding could change with time, it is necessary to be clear about it, at any particular juncture, since it has a significant effect on the workings and style of the forum concerned.

2. The ephemerality of MEND is sealed if the report and its recommendations are not read, discussed and evaluated. It should again be stressed that MEND, in this final form of post-analysis reporting, is a vicarious statement of the views of an overwhelmingly representative group of persons (including distinguished contributors in a global sense) concerned about the future of music education in Ireland. There then needs to be an executive body to extract the most promising material and to work out strategies for progress on agreed desiderata.

3. The MEND report has attempted to grapple with the teeming and fertile pool of ideas on the many aspects of music education in Ireland which the Agenda sought to place in order. There is a need to continue the process of sifting these ideas and of seeking further exchanges on those deemed the most valuable in current circumstances.

4. The idea of a forum is to exercise some control over the processes of the advocacy campaign in its broadest sense. It is necessary to take into account the interaction, interdependability and interpenetration of issues that may all have a common purpose, at the deepest levels, but could be incompatible as to their timing. Prioritization of issues related to a common goal is a major group task in seeking to bring order and timeousness to overall effort.

5. One of the Findings of MEND was that there is a negative burden in education which is due to lack of mutual understanding and tolerance between the main subdivisions of music education, namely academic and practical streams; this is endemic and is, possibly predictably, manifest in both the teaching and the learning cohorts. One of the benefits of a forum would be to bring these and other disparate groups together ‘around the same table’ to educe harmonized and rationalized views and to resolve dissension and confrontation between them.

6. In a more positive sense a forum would promote dialogue and encourage the music education lobby voluntarily to accept democratic principles by which decisions and strategies could be informed by the views of all, the most persuasive presumably earning majority support. The forum would then have the function of representing those majority views to the authorities through the good offices of democratically elected representatives.

7. Experience in the US has shown that a truly representative body committed to music education, once established and respected, can enter into major and influential coalitions with like-minded groups and natural allies empathizing with the policies and strategies of the parent group. The techniques of advocacy have been well developed and applied in the US; Ireland has much to learn from the sequences and documented success of this type of activity.

A codetta should be appended here by way of stating that the other sources of comment on the state of music education in Ireland (MEND Findings and Bennett Reimer’s global priority issues) have been explored in considering the MEND 8-point Agenda alone, with the possible exception of Bennett

Reimer's concerns about the place of Popular Music and Multiculturalism in music education; but this joint topic was dealt with separately and under its own heading. Suffice it to say that, not without an element of surprise, the continuing influence of western art music, in music education in Ireland, received overwhelming support at MEND, transcending, without coming in conflict with, the interests of coterie groups. This endorsement had less to do with the music itself than with its peripheral techniques in educational methodology which were deemed indispensable to and generally applicable by informed, sensitive and reflective practitioners. Neither popular music nor multiculturalism was disavowed as worthy of a place in the repertoire, which was generally circumscribed, for all admissions, by the overriding influence of the time factor and the need to have readily applicable quality criteria. These were found, through painstaking analysis, to derive most naturally from artistic considerations, eschewing the excluding and more extreme rigours of pure aestheticism, allowing for the functional and utilitarian aspects of music (accommodated by Referential and Contextual theory), when these coexist with more conventional artistic qualities. A general theory of art which is open to all cultures is assumed, if this is not already incontrovertibly apparent by definition. It may not be surprising to find MEND in support of moderation but it must be useful to find this endorsement proceeding, not from rule of thumb or ready cliché, but from a serious and sincere appraisal of the controlling parameters.

19.7.11 A Way Forward for Irish Music Education

It would be disappointing for the reader if, after the considerable travail of MEND itself and its prolonged analytical sequel, some suggestions as to a strategy for the future were not forthcoming. There were many recommendations from MEND under the different key-concept classifications (see Section 17.1); these can be consulted selectively. But the real value of MEND, the writer believes, was hidden in the copious documentation it generated and offered for interpretation. The interpretative act is by nature fraught with doubt and challenged by ambiguity; it is subjective too and calls for choices to be made from the richness of possibilities presented to it. The writer is humbled by the wealth of material submitted; it has challenged his endurance and his powers of refinement to the utmost but he has reached denouement without any feeling of diffidence about speaking out. He counterbalances the interpretation offered here with the hope and invitation that it may stimulate reactions, favourable and otherwise, and even counterpositions which will eventually lead to more deeply considered decisions and the progress based on them. In following the now familiar procedure of relating everything to the MEND Agenda, the reader will immediately notice one significant change; the last item on the Agenda (Forum for Music Education) has been advanced to pride of place.

19.7.12 National Forum for Music Education

MEND, itself, as its title suggests and as its progress evidenced, was a national initiative. Considerable effort was expended in ensuring that virtually every agency of music education in the country was involved; this was successfully accomplished, as the lists of delegates and participating institutions will show. It was not unreasonable to assume, therefore, that its outcomes would have national significance and should have the ministry of a dedicated body, capable of commanding the respect of government, for the furtherance of any revised objectives based on them. Such a forum was consciously planned to be autonomous from inception, not being required to acknowledge a debt to MEND or to be bound in any way by its findings. This was an obvious gesture to true democracy which did not, however, rule out the forum's probable eventual interest in MEND outcomes as being an expression of the aspirations of the nation's music educators and the wisdom of some of the world's most distinguished contributors to the lore of music education.

The forum was duly established.[174] But it has to be reported that, following a year of genuinely enthusiastic activity, it was aborted by default, and without the mandate of the large membership, on the basis of one (the fourth) plenary meeting which was poorly attended (for reasons that were entirely plausible). This reflected no credit on those responsible and the suggestion that the reconvening of the forum should await the MEND final report was hardly convincing in the light of the group's complete independence, as outlined above. However, it is of little consequence as to how the music education forum orders its business provided it exists in the first place, nor is it important who is credited with the idea. Out of the still smouldering ashes of the 1996 forum a new body was established, presumably at first with no particular aspiration to supplant the earlier one. The Forum for Music in Ireland (Fóram don Cheol in Éirinn), which ostensibly, from its title, took a markedly different direction (music rather than music education) from that agreed as the dedicated focus (music education specifically) of the original forum, has developed along lines that would seem to indicate that it could very well absorb the considerable work of the forum for music education (MEND outcome) amicably, without the need to have two bodies in existence in a counterproductive way that would send out a very questionable message - to those interested in the progress of music in all its forms, if not to politicians, who are seldom impressed with bifurcated advocacy of the same cause. It should be taken as positive that an active forum still exists; it is the intention of the writer to submit the completed report of MEND to the Forum for Music in Ireland for its consideration.

19.7.13 Philosophical Issues. Balance, Relevance and Time Management in Implementing the Curriculum

The policy of seeking out fundamentals and of approaching music education from the stance of the copious corpus of philosophical scholarship inspired by it may seem to have dominated MEND almost as a preconception. The spectrum of seemingly conflicting views examined in relation to this seminal philosophical stage was so bewildering that it represented an enormous challenge in the analysis of MEND contributions to essay some kind of rationalization; but there seemed to be no other way to proceed. Certainly until this course was attempted there could have been no trustworthy foundation for viewing the Irish music education dispensation as to the reliability of its basics. In the event the writer believes that the cumbersome exercise did lead to helpful clarification. The enthusiastic reader is recommended to review the contributions of Colwell, Elliott, Lehman, Reimer and White as encapsulating the most pertinent material. Undoubtedly the fruits of the Elliott/Reimer confrontation, including their own lengthy post-'*Music Matters'* apologias, were supremely helpful in bringing into focus the crucial parameters on which there seems to be residual contentiousness and on which decisions and informed choices are demanded of those who would chart curriculum and the course of music education pedagogy and methodology in Ireland.

It is important to take into account, from the very outset, that two promising cornerstones exist, on which the educational edifice of music in Ireland is built and on which it can and must be strengthened. They are 1) that the value of music is officially accepted as a desideratum in education, general statutory education being seen as the vehicle through which this value should be inculcated and 2) that a national curriculum exists to be implemented, and modified from time to time - mandatory, if problematic, in early education, largely optional and somewhat less quantifiable in second-level (with low uptake). This may not be a totally satisfying situation from the point of view of music educators, but neither should it be dismissed as of little value. There is a secure starting position from which to continue building.

[174] Although it was termed the Music Education National Forum, its title as an association was never finalized; the membership did, however, agree that the title should contain the words Music *Education* and not just Music, since the education brief was being especially endorsed.

19.7.14 The Elliott and Reimer Philosophies Revisited as Models for Irish Music Education

As between Elliott's and Reimer's philosophies of music education, they were considered choices for close scrutiny at MEND because one (Reimer) was the generally accepted classic and the other (Elliott) was an up-to-the-minute self-styled counterposition. It was assumed too that they could, together, throw light on the many positions punctuating a possible continuum between them. Apart from the feasibility of rationalizing their points of difference, it was first a question of discriminating between the boldly confident and provocative novelty of the one (Elliott) and the chameleon-like but admirably prudent revision of accepted wisdom of the other (Reimer). Nor was the choice going to be the clear-cut result of an adjudication which endorsed the one over the other as a panacea for Irish music education.

If Elliott's praxial philosophy has to be called into question in an Irish context, it is because it cannot respond satisfactorily to any of the three determining criteria of a workable curriculum – **balance, relevance and effective time management**.

Abbreviations:

MM – Music Matters (Elliott, 1995)
A Philosophy – A Philosophy of Music Education (Reimer 1970/rev. 1989)

David Elliott

1. It is impossible to disregard the insistence in *MM* that active music making, by implication performance (but with under-developed references to other activities such as improvising, conducting, composing and arranging), should dominate over every other 'activity' (inferring listening *per se*, appraising and academically-orientated pursuits). Some of Elliott's critics take this up aggressively. There is the deceptive attraction that Elliott might be effectively rationalizing and possibly offering a solution to the dilemma of performance in general education by refusing to regard it as a specialization (at its proficient stage). (Note that, nowhere in the entire documentation, and not just in Elliott's, dealing with performance, has the writer ever got the vaguest sense of what it actually means to be even a competent performer. As a teacher skilled in the area of performance teaching, he suspects that any definition would be open to much honest disagreement.) And Elliott, in face-to-face discussion with the writer, also effectively refused to acknowledge the overriding importance of the skill-acquisition factor, which determines basic and subsequent success in performance. This in turn, whether accepted or not, distorts the time element, since the psychomotor sequences in acquiring the technical command to perform are implacably time-dependent. Thus Elliott is caught between the Scylla and Charybdis of constraining those who do not wish to perform (out of lack of interest but perhaps, also, from an intuitive awareness of the time demands) to do so, while simultaneously destabilizing the curriculum, for when **time** is disproportionately allocated **balance** is threatened.

2. Elliott's commitment to total multiculturalism is arguably explicit in his claim as to the 'innate equality of all music cultures'. While this stance is unequivocally post-modern, and has also been challenged by the writer, the plain truth about multiculturalism, some distinguished advocacy notwithstanding, is that it is not a fully tested approach to music education (at least MEND did not evoke this sense), with a proved record of widespread application and successful implementation. Many of the advantages adduced in advocacy statements are not directly relevant to Ireland; the main drawback is, however, the **time** factor since, in its overt commitment to active music making, it has a potentially disproportionate time-dependence. Its repertoire is dauntingly diverse, so its inclusion in any representative way (and no other seems to make sense if ethnocentricity is to be

avoided) would demand more containment skills, and the will to use them, than are currently obvious.

3. Until usefully challenged by Reimer, Elliott played down the pure act of listening (i.e. without a concomitant activity such as having the listener simultaneously perform). Although he claims to have given listening more priority than any other topic in his praxial philosophy (a claim that is not being challenged) it is circumscribed as having a diminished function in the sense of contemplative and analytical, or concentrated listening of any kind to the *separate* performance of *others*, characteristic, as Reimer reminds us, of the greater part of musical activity in human discourse, being in fact the truly universal experience in that form, isolated from the activity of music making itself , as generally understood. Furthermore to suggest that familiarity with the repertoire of the great exemplars of music, in any culture, should arise first from personal involvement in the performance of such music would be unacceptable even if it were not so far-fetched as to call into question whether this is the sense that Elliott actually wished to convey. While there would have been merit in reacting against an exclusive listening programme, such as there is reason to believe existed in the American curriculum . . . to replace it with activities that virtually dispense with it is equally to be avoided. The fact that Elliott eventually, under pressure, revalidated listening as a separate activity does not fully compensate for the jaundiced view which *MM* seems to portray.

4. The idealism in Elliott's philosophy should not be gainsaid. After all, there is nothing immediately exceptionable in the aspiration to inculcate the highest levels of musicianship through the direct hands-on experience of the widest diversity of music as intentional action. But is the idea lacking in pragmatism? It is ir**relevant** to all but the most limited notion of a delivered curriculum because of the overweening demands of skill-acquisition; it wants, too, for the precious input of **time**; and, because the skill/time parameter is so dominant, **balance** of activities must also suffer. Overriding all is the question of **teacher expertise**. Elliott's philosophy in action, under ideal conditions (implying a super-race of inspiring teachers, all with double-specialisms – instrumental and general music education, not to mention unprecedented spectra of diversity) could address the undoubted difficulties inherent in the comparably idealistic American National Standards of recent promulgation (idealistic, that is, unless their implementation assumes a closer collaboration between practical and academic teachers in *collectively* delivering the curriculum - a situation that has not obtained in the past). And let it be noted that Elliott himself has admitted that he envisages such a new breed of highly qualified teachers. The problem of **relevance** arises again. In the Irish socio-cultural context there is no immediate or, let it be said, long-term prospect that teachers individually capable of teaching an academic *and* practical curriculum will be available in number. The inspirational rationale of the BMusEd course (jointly taught by DIT, RIAM and TCD), which combines this expertise, but for second-level teaching only, is a hopeful sign for the future, though its current intent is not quite focused on that mould (and its output of graduates is small). While the praxial philosophy could have relevance to the American scene if it were adaptable to the grand idea that *two* cohorts of specialized teachers would address the curriculum, it is difficult to see any relevance in applying it to the Irish non-specialist-taught primary curriculum. And if it cannot be envisaged in primary education there would seem to be very little logic in imposing a performance- or 'activity'-dominated regime at second-level if the need for continuum is taken seriously - as it ought to be following the grim warnings of the *Deaf Ears?* Report.

There is no evidence, that the writer is aware of, that the *MM* philosophy of David Elliott has evolved, as Reimer's *Philosophy* did, into a methodology uniquely associated with his name. And, without any implied disrespect, it is unlikely that this could happen in these days when every opinion is open to challenge and when the level of philosophical scholarship is at an unprecedented high in his field of operation. Although his book, *Music Matters*, now appears in the bibliography of Irish official

documentation on school music education, there is no reason to believe that his ideas have seriously influenced cross-curricular thinking, since most of the ground work for revision had been completed before he came to Ireland as a long-term visitor. As stated, his ideas are bold, refreshing and provocative, at best, if pointedly iconoclastic and therefore overweening at times, and self-devaluing in terms of their ready acceptance. While the writer regrets that he cannot go along with the quintessential substance of Elliott's recommendations for school music education, as explained above for the Irish context, he is quick to acknowledge that David Elliott has done a great service to music education, thereby realizing one of his own ambitions, in opening up the topic of music education philosophy, appropriately at the turn of the millennium, for radical reappraisal. His philosophy has been an incredibly useful sounding-board against which to test the validity of other ideas, and not only that, but in stimulating the refining processes which have sharpened the focus on many of the burning questions in music education.

Bennett Reimer

It must be observed that Bennett Reimer has had 'several bites at the cherry'. This is not by way of criticism but rather to point up how astutely he listens to his own advice: 'Aesthetic education, then, is not a dogma, or a fixed set of beliefs and actions, but an ever-changing, ever-developing position' (Ref. II P iii, p 5). Reimer would probably be the first to admit that his thinking has not remained static since the publication of his epochal *A Philosophy of Music Education* in 1970. Its position was still secure in the 1990s when David Elliott mounted the first serious challenge, which developed into the mutually bruising exchanges analysed in this report. But the confrontation was also not only fructifying to the revised thinking of both but benefited the field of music education philosophy enormously. Reimer's aesthetic theory has always enjoyed the natural advantages of being couched with extreme literary elegance, which is immediately appealing. It is still eminently plausible, of course, all the more so since Reimer continues to defend it ably from the stated stance of its never having been deflected from its artistic integuments, but its original containment within a Formalist understanding has seen it progressively pushed, in educational thought, to the conservative right of centre. Reimer has, with formidable and admirable skill at times, himself taken up the challenge of justifying it in the context of the three ineluctable and still unanswered questions which music education in developed western societies has irreducibly focused on at the turn of the millennium, and which he himself has articulated in his reply to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness*. They concern the place of Popular Music, Multiculturalism and Performance in the music education of the new millennium. But although his thoughts are immaculately clear as to how classically-defined aesthetic education stands in this unresolved mêlée, he admits, with a candour that could be construed as disguising indecision in a less distinguished scholar, that solutions are not imminently at hand. The admittance of the *repertoire* of 'pop' and multiculturalism is expertly covered under the quality criteria which he suggests; this writer has attempted to boost this methodology against the suspicion of aesthetic-shy readers by insisting that the criteria of music as art are safe, cross-cultural, non-Reimer-derived and arguably unexceptionable as to the status of the vast majority of musics, provided they can acquiesce in notions of graded excellence and a socio-cultural index of *musical* integrity. On the infinitely more contentious questions of their place in formal music education, their relevance to, time demands and balance in the curriculum, Reimer, obviously conscious of the rough and tumble of the ongoing philosophical debate on the global stage, which seems to favour increasing diversity, is constrained to political correctness and contents himself with marvelling at and indulging Harry White's impatience with it. This adds little to what the writer has himself been able to infer from the presentations at MEND, the substance of which has already been put forth.

There are a few aspects of applied philosophy on which Reimer comes close to dissembling. They concern the all-important place of performance in music education and the attempt to reposition the aesthetic in the centre ground of music education philosophy. Mindful of Reimer's willingness to modify his stance, and his consummate skill in effecting this, seamlessly, on issues that are not absolutely crucial to the stability of his aesthetic theory, we find him in his 1996 Amsterdam address (*Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music Education?)* masterfully giving hostage to theories

of Referentialism and Contextualism by way of accommodating the widest possible spectrum of formerly suspect musics on the basis of their function and utility. This admission (for that is what it is) that music in high art (in whatever culture and not necessarily that of WAM) needs to adapt to the idea that thresholds that are set too high, on the basis of cognition and hyper-sensitive affect, exclude much music and the modest aspirations of the masses, is helpful, if painful for Epicureans. This is accurately to place a finger on the pulse of current concerns and must surely underpin Marie McCarthy's appeal for bridges between school and the community. The commanding concern of contemporary music education strategy is, without devastating compromises, to make school music more relevant to the music that dominates societal perspectives, rather than the converse, in the achievement of which it has greatly diminished powers. Put another way, pragmatism now seems to be demanding that general music education should start from a common denominator of what level of musical enjoyment and capability best conforms to the definition of universality of experience and should take that as the given from which to work, if music education itself is to aspire to universal acceptance. This should not be seen as capitulation to the forces of commercialism but rather as a challenge to professional and reflective music educators, at philosophical and executive levels, who, by being prepared to engage in an informed, systematic and disciplined way with musics of all genres, can develop and evoke in their students discriminatory powers born of naturally evolving maturity which no fiat can produce. As might be expected, Bennett Reimer, eschewing any idea of a biased 'hidden agenda', has succinctly defined such an approach:

> And while any overt imposition of musical values would be distasteful to most music educators and most students, the entire music education enterprise is built on the assumption that musical tastes can be improved, that musical experiences can be deepened, that musical enjoyment can be refined, that musical significance can be made more available to all people. These assumptions, all of which are very healthy and beyond criticism, do imply a movement toward "better" musical experiences of "better" music. The question is what makes music, or any art, "better"?[175]

And Reimer has answers to that question too. He has, like so many influential music educators of our time, conscious of the palpable failures of contemporary music education generally to commend itself and its canons to the majority of learners, embraced the idea of continuing compromise. The writer is convinced that, provided the sizeable minority who evince a more actively searching attitude to music are identified and selectively nurtured in relation to their interest and commitment, the future of the music that they are expertly and democratically trained to value is as secure as it needs to be. Music educators must shoulder the responsibility for the task in hand and work to an eclectic understanding of the philosophy of music education, and the criteria deriving from it, to ensure that **relevance, balance and time management** in the curriculum prepare their charges (all of them, and not just the specially talented) adequately to exercise discerning judgement to arrive at considered values.

Judging by the spate of dissatisfaction, on the question of performance training, that has recently (2000-2001) received much coverage in the media in Ireland, it must be assumed that MEND outcomes on this issue were accurately divined. The one area of music education that has not been adequately addressed, in spite of a promising attitude in the 1995 Government White Paper, is specialized performance at the crucial lower levels; in the writer's view this is because its significance is not fully understood. Reimer's pronouncements on the subject, although some are somewhat equivocal, are nonetheless helpful in focusing on both the similarities and differences between the American and Irish systems. Performance training was the subject of massive misunderstandings and misguided targeting between Reimer and Elliott; the scope for misinterpretation seems to single it out as an area of maximum confusion. Elliott accuses Reimer, through MEAE, of neglecting the performance element in general music education. Reimer, disdaining to explain the true relationships between his philosophy and MEAE in its ideal concept, neither admits nor denies the alleged failures of MEAE in its narrower form and then goes on to claim, apparently, that the levels of performance training in the US and the outstanding achievements associated with them are exemplary in global

[175] Reimer, *A Philosophy (*rev. 1989), p.134

terms and are attributable to MEAE. This is not borne out by the considerable history of performance in the US which predates his philosophy and MEAE by more than half a century. In his address to MEND, Reimer implies that the new American National Standards are a triumph for the principles enshrined in MEAE, but elsewhere that the old ideas of the dominance of performance in education were misguided and that the National Standards would achieve the eclectic balance of diversity and involvements in which the old either/or, academic/practical division failed abysmally. While there is more than a grain of truth in these statements, it takes more than a grain of salt to accept them unequivocally. As already stated, the American system is faced with the nightmare scenario, in seeking to implement the terms of the National Standards, of crash-training, even if it were possible, specialist teachers who combine the two specialisms already in existence separately (school general and performance), or negotiate an agreement where the separate specialisms are recruited to teach the curriculum (performance included) in tandem. And such matters are, in any case, subject to state-by-state control, if not to more microcosmic variations. The message for Ireland is that performance was valued over all other activities in the US, and by implication, that this will continue to be the case, except that it will now be mandatory, presumably, at exploratory levels, for all students, and at expert levels as a generally available option to be taken up by a minority. This could be a highly desirable model, as to the idea itself, for Ireland, except that we do not have a comparable teaching force of specialists. Reimer accuses Elliott of reverting to the flawed system of the past by promoting a performance-dominated general curriculum, whereas Elliott refutes this interpretation. From an Irish perspective it might be said that Reimer cannot claim that the performance regimes in the past were ideal (an interpretation he would not deny); neither can he claim with any accuracy that the approach to performance teaching in the future is as yet fully formulated in detail as to how the teaching force will deliver it. But Reimer, with characteristic prudence, summarized the current interim position in his MEND address: 'As the profession learns how to put the standards into effective operation over the next several decades (for it will take that long to accomplish their aspirations, the quality and relevance of music education will finally begin to approach the potentials its visionary thinkers have dreamed of.'

In conscientiously following Reimer's advice to contextualize a philosophy of music education to the specifics of the Irish circumstances it is necessary to pronounce against what can be interpreted as the current position of his own philosophical stance, and on the following grounds:

1. The universality of music as experience and faculty is the most promising starting point for any advocacy campaign to establish and maintain music as an essential component in education. The pure aesthetic model (Reimer's original position) cannot establish an unanswerable case without some modification by way of admitting a wider spectrum of music, based on function (utilitarianism) and broadly defined socio-cultural value, to the repertoire. The precise position of Reimer (and MEAE) on this issue is not clear; Reimer does, however, helpfully advance adaptable criteria to address the issue (see *A Philosophy*, rev. 1989, p.133 *et seq.*).

2. Reimer has recently highlighted performance as one of the three commanding issues in contemporary music education but also as the one most adaptable to ready solution. However, the history of music education in the US since 1970 does not offer convincing proof that performance has been well served in the sense of its always existing in an ambience of holistic music education, the current aspiration. Neither MEAE, in its narrower sense as promoting listening rather than performance, nor traditional performance studies (typically devoid of ancillary musicianship in the US) erroneously inferred as arising from MEAE in its broader applications, answers to current needs, either in the US or in Ireland. The American National Standards and the Irish Reformed National Curriculum both envisage a broader dispensation in which performance is combined with the other essential components of music education (listening, composing, appraising) in a holistic approach. The teaching expertise available in the US is infinitely more sophisticated than that in Ireland, but it has not, as yet, been adapted to the implementational demands of the stated aims in the National Standards. Thus, while the

Reimer philosophy recommends performance as a balanced component in music education, if we are to take MEAE as the enabling method based on the philosophy, it is currently in need of physical overhaul to adapt the teaching force to the new task. The problems are the same in kind in the US and in Ireland but the realities of the teaching expertise available are just not comparable.

20 MEND Findings and Recommendations

20.1 Towards Recommendations from MEND

It is again stressed that the fundamental consideration in defining a conceptually enduring system of music education is to have a serviceable underlying philosophical position. If MEND achieved nothing else, in advancing the case for a healthy music education dispensation in Ireland, beyond drawing attention to the imperfect understanding of philosophical principles by the vast majority of music educators (a condition not peculiar to Ireland) it would have done a great service, provided its recommendations are heeded. Having used the copious documentation at its disposal, from the Elliott/ Reimer/White debate in particular but drawing also from distinguished sources at MEND itself and from the secondary sources identified *en route* in the analysis, the most significant discovery from MEND was that philosophy itself is protean, time-dependent and contextual. It is therefore not at all to dismiss the wealth of philosophical wisdom urged upon us to find that nothing quite fitting the Irish context emerged, nor could it have been expected to have been so since the professional philosophical lobby consulted were not versed in the detail of the Irish case, nor did they need or claim to be so. A plethora of useful material, obviously more general and fundamentally definitive than specific, and more valuable on that account, accrued from the documentation and discussion but, in the ultimate, it had to be trimmed to the Irish case. In particular it should be acknowledged that a debt is owed to David Elliott and to Bennett Reimer for their presentations of what seemed at first to be polar philosophical positions which naturally fuelled the expectation that in the middle ground a vast field of related philosophical wisdom would be traversed and defined. It was fortuitous that the timing of their acrimonious exchanges on the world stage should have coincided almost exactly with that of the MEND initiative. The writer also is grateful to Harry White for being the catalyst which, more than any other agency, focused the Reimer/Elliott debate in an Irish context, resulting, for the writer, in the course of his subsequent work, in the discovery of a veritable trove of primary and secondary source material that formed the basis of the philosophical analysis which he believes to be quintessential to the outcomes of MEND. From this point onwards, therefore, the emerging truths about Irish music education are being processed to appear in the form of recommendations. These recommendations will not only draw from those that were specifically made at the debates themselves (and reported under each heading in the appropriate sections) but must also take account of derivative suggestions which arose logically from the analysis. Again the MEND Agenda is used as the framework for presenting this material. However, the findings from MEND that frame the recommendations are as follows:

20.2 MEND Findings

1. There was little evidence at MEND of a **consistent philosophical stance** underpinning music education strategy in Ireland, apart from what has been tacitly imported as part of various methodologies favoured from time to time. There is a need for greater awareness and discrimination in this respect

2. Without the benefit of ongoing philosophical dialectic, prospective teachers have been starved of opportunities to engage in philosophical discourse and to apply considered philosophical principles to their teaching situations. The **route for philosophical underpinning to communicate** effectively from original thinkers to the taught cohorts is therefore inhibited.

3. There is a damaging dichotomy between academic and practical streams of music education in Ireland. This appears as mutual lack of understanding and intolerance between professional groups but also impinges on the learners, especially when questions of curricular **balance**, **relevance** and prioritizations of **available time** are concerned.

4. **Performance** as a component in music education is seriously misunderstood as to its potential (and limitations) vis-à-vis other components in the curriculum, its technical and interpretative demands, and its time constraints.

5. **Time management** of the curriculum demands constant reappraisal as to realistic estimates and expectations of quality, diversity and range in the *delivered* curriculum.

6. Teachers who are relevantly trained are the single most valuable resource in (music) education. There is concern that **teacher training** for music education in Ireland is neither adequate nor always relevant to the demands of the published curriculum; this is particularly so in relation to the revisions of the last decade at all levels of school music education. This must be reflected in progressively lower student standards – expected and/or achieved. The lack of teacher specialization in primary school music contexts necessarily limits or defines the standard and quality of the educational outcomes and must reflect into higher levels.

20.3 MEND Recommendations

MEND Agenda I - Philosophical Considerations

General

1. Music education in Ireland should be underpinned by an informing philosophy. If this is to reflect the universality of music and music making as experience and faculty, it should itself aspire to universality of appeal and it should, at least, be based on a considered statement of minimal consensus. The philosophy should also take into account generally agreed understandings as to the nature and value of music/music education, appropriate involvements and diversity in what is offered in the curriculum. There should be ongoing collective invocation of fully informed (and ideally detached) judgement on matters germane to music education and support for the values arising therefrom.
   Promotion of the universality issue is assisted by making **SCHOOL music education the preferred vehicle of transmission**; all other provision should be seen as related to and deriving from that basic dispensation.

Contextual

2. On the understanding that pure aesthetic theory (even that of Absolute Expressionism [Dewey, Langer, Meyer, Leonhard, Reimer]) is too restricting as a basis for contemporary music education with universal appeal, a philosophy which is open to referential and contextual applications should be adopted alongside one taking into account formal and praxial principles. Socio-cultural, functional/utilitarian dimensions in the educational experience should be valued provided the bias is typically towards musical (artistic) intrinsicality over other considerations. The experience being a function of the repertoire, there are eminently serviceable criteria for making judgements of suitable music for the curriculum - based on inherent craft, sensitivity ('feelingfulness'), imagination and authenticity (See Reimer, *A Philosophy*, rev. 1989, p. 133 *et seq.)*

3. If music is to be part of the arts programme, it is unexceptionable that the conduct of the curriculum should conform to artistic theory. There should be a place, as demanded by circumstances, for the application of pure artistic theory, but the more adaptable the programme seeks to be the more flexible it should be in admitting a wider range of musical experience. It should be noted that respect for aesthetic theory is not the equivalent of conforming to the canons and/or repertoire of western art music alone; it is therefore not necessary to disavow it in the interests of supporting other musical genres.

4. The criterion of quality/excellence is typically ineluctable in choosing educational materials and should be the guiding principle.

5. Product and Process are inseparable in music. Music education should seek to respect the importance of both and keep them in constant balance both in practice and in inculcating attitudes.

6. Music education should seek to match musical challenge with the musicianship to respond to it (See Elliott, *MM*, p.132). The recognition of creativity in learners at all

levels should reflect their ability to manipulate materials with increments of skill and originality above the norm, and should be rewarded on that basis.

7. Variety (repertoire) and involvements (activities) in music education should reflect the demands of the class culture. In the Irish context performance and listening should be in a balanced relationship. The possibility of either demanding specialist status should be carefully monitored and provided for. In particular the importance of the special place of performance in music education should derive from a validly popular attitude to it which has been honoured from time immemorial. Ministry to performance in general music education should not be confused with or equated to its specialist demands (see Performance below – MEND Agenda IV).

8. While music education should generally focus on the musical experience itself, as far as possible, it should be remembered that learning *about* music is a valid and necessary pursuit, which should be encouraged. Perusal of American comment on this issue led to agreement that verbalization (use of language and concepts) cannot be dispensed with if this branch of music education is to be adequately covered. Richard Colwell, a major contributor to MEND, is quoted by Reimer in defence of direct learning experience: 'Development of aesthetic perceptual abilities in the arts does not automatically result from performance experiences; the teachable aspects in such developments are knowledge-intensive and dependent on direct, focused learning experience. . . .' [176]

MEND Agenda II - The State of Music Education in Ireland.

Advocacy of music education in Ireland should aim at establishing a condition of music education

9. which recognizes school music education as the prime vehicle for inculcation in which

10. Balance, Relevance and Time Management are in a compatible relationship which sets achievable targets, protects standards and interfaces satisfactorily with other areas of music education.

11. which ensures that music education is available, accessible and affordable for all, on a countrywide basis.

12. which recognizes the defining characteristics of performance as a branch of music education and affords it appropriate support across its spectrum, distinguishing between its exploratory and specialist modes and their characteristic demands.

13. in which deleterious discontinuities are identified and removed. The fractured continuum between second- and third-level music education is a current case in point.

14. in which practical and academic components of the curriculum are brought into balance and compatibility which characterizes holistic education.

15. which is underpinned by well-understood philosophical principles and supported by ongoing methodological research.

16. in which all genres of music are initially afforded parity of esteem which is, however, subject to the refining processes of quality assurance and relevance for the ongoing educational need. In particular there is a need (as much socio-cultural as aesthetic) to

[176] Richard Colwell, quoted in Reimer, *David Elliott's "New Philosophy" of Music Education: Music for Performers Only* (Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Spring 1996, No 128), p.76

close the virtual gap between western art music and popular genres if the school experience in music and the realities of music in community life are to be complementary and compatible. **This is one of the commanding challenges of contemporary music education**.

17. In which the norms of western art music are respected, especially in the area of methodology (**Specific MEND unanimous recommendation**)

18. In which the repertoire and practices of other musics (popular, traditional and multicultural) are reviewed on an ongoing basis as to their timing and suitability for inclusion in the overall dispensation.

19. In which teacher training is relevant to and adequate for the delivery of the curriculum.

20. In which the scope and intent of third-level education in music is subject to ongoing rationalization to ensure the most democratic provision and the optimization of the resources available.

21. In which specialist teaching services are provided and readily available as the need arises.

MEND Agenda III- Continuum in Music Education

22. That the curricula for primary and second-level (junior and senior cycle) music education be systematically reviewed on and ongoing basis (this is provided for in the NCCA documentation) and, if necessary reformed, for theoretical (documented) and practical continuity - and that this exercise be completed by a committee drawn from representation of all the parties involved.

23. That an effective continuity be developed linking second-level (LC) with third-level music education which does not arise merely from a lowering of standard of entry to third-level with the cumulative and downward-spiralling effect of this on the eventual standards reached by graduates. The possibility of developing a two-credit LC music option should be reconsidered, failing which special provision (by subvention) should be made for providing booster studies in music for suitable candidates, particularly in senior cycle for those identified as likely to pursue third-level studies in music. The 1995 White Paper on education referred to such a provision (see McCann - Ref. I P vi).

24. Talent education should be a feature of the overall music education dispensation. This should proceed along lines which recognize giftedness, disproportionate over-achievement and personal commitment as worthy of special provision. Talent education should not discriminate or be seen to discriminate against the general stream but should be based on the understanding that the profession itself and the overall educational dispensation benefits from the selective encouragement and support of giftedness.

MEND Agenda IV – Performance

25. The subdivision of Performance into competent as distinct from proficient and expert levels should be recognized as defining the level at which it must be treated as a specialization. Effective performance cannot be divorced from ideas of skill acquisition and the time frame necessary to achieve the psychomotor facility, *inter alia*, to support it. Considering the provision, in theory at least, that has been made in the school curriculum in the last decade of the millennium to boost music education at all levels, and in third-

level through the proposed ministry of the Academy for the Performing Arts (APA)**, the only serious lacuna in Irish music education (again in theory only) is the lack of support, by government subvention, for the performance function at lower levels**. Effective performance typically cannot be achieved in the school ambience, considering the curricular time frames in question. An outgrowth of proficient and expert performance is necessary to support the global enterprise. This must be seriously considered as a specialization deserving of support in the overall interests of music education. **This should be encouraged by way of setting up arts centres throughout the country or by subventions to existing institutions to ensure an adequate distribution of services countrywide.** The peripatetic scheme, if it ever functioned effectively, is ripe for replacement by more permanent structures. Such a provision would merely mirror similar activity throughout the EU, Ireland being the least developed system in this respect within the union (see *Deaf Ears?* Report 1985).

26. Proficiency in Performance should continue to be demanded for third-level entry to music education (**another agreed MEND recommendation**) but this should now be seen against the background of widespread provision of expert performance teaching at lower levels and on the understanding of its being generally available, accessible and affordable.

MEND Agenda V – Assessment

27. Assessment is an underdeveloped resource in Irish music education and there is evidence that it is being inappropriately applied as to its aims (See Ref. II D iiib). The fact that assessment in music can be subjective by nature should not inhibit its being carried out in the first place. Initiatives in this regard should be pragmatically based and should not be taken to levels of obsessive preoccupation with the assessment procedures themselves which can tend to interfere with and detract from the teaching process (See Swanwick - Ref. III P iv for a simplified model worth exploring). It should be used judiciously to test the standards implicit in curricula, and to inform the teaching/learning process; it should always be musically orientated. Assessment is a useful tool across a wide spectrum of applications (See Lehman - Ref. III Piii for an impressive exposé of this theme); without assessment the idea of standards is meaningless, accounting for much of the malaise in Irish Music Education.

MEND Agenda VI - National Music (Multiculturalism)

28. The possibility of the increased presence of Irish Traditional Music and Music of the World's Cultures (multicultural repertoire) in schools should be kept under constant review by a dedicated sub-committee of the Forum for Music. The outcomes of MEND deliberations and analysis are inconclusive on both counts.

29. Pedagogical interaction, in a dedicated sub-committee, between the traditional and formal systems of education should be encouraged to lubricate the processes of cross-fertilising current educational provision with the most promising dimensions of the ITM (Irish Traditional Music) enterprise.

30. The research base dedicated to **methodology** for the enhancement of Irish traditional music modules in formal education should be strengthened at the University of Limerick

The **relevance** of **ITM** is axiomatic but there would be **difficulties of time and balance** in the curriculum. There seems to be a certain complacency emanating from the aficionados, tending to

confirm that ITM is secure and well served within the community, is available to all who consciously seek it, is community-oriented and informal by nature, and might best be left to be promoted in this way, as currently successful. Such an outcome, if not taken further, would reconfirm ITM as a quasi-cult music and would be in conflict with the basic thrust of MEND, which relies on the idea of the school vehicle as the enabler of universal experience, where this is called for in relation to any branch of music.

Multiculturalism as a component of Irish music education has to be considered under the headings of **relevance, balance and time** constraints; it is problematic under all three counts. Its profile in countries that are far more multicultural that Ireland (the US is typical) is far from convincing; there is reason to believe that its progress, following considerable early advocacy from third-level research and ethnomusicological sources of influence, is ripe for reappraisal after a period of exploratory activity and initial enthusiasm (see Bennett Reimer's response to Harry White's *A book of manners in the wilderness)*. The American National Standards (Music Content Standards), which must be regarded as of extreme significance to the progress of music education in the US, as indeed elsewhere, are equivocal to the extent that no specific mandate for the inclusion of multicultural music education is offered. Multicultural music education, with its potentially infinite scope which is, withal, currently lacking in agreed method and a case history in education, is expensive if it is to be supported in an authentic way which selectively employs culture bearers to enhance the school experience and/or effectively trains teachers to provide the 'best match' scenario. Its current relevance to the Irish case is highly questionable except in a spirit of tokenism, which is, however, far from the intent of its most ardent devotees.

It should be noted that there is an implicit understanding in promoting both ITM and Multiculturalism that the experience should be largely based on experiencing the repertoire at first hand, thus predicating performance as the preferred vehicle of instruction. This would obviously be problematic in the Irish context, definitively impossible in primary school settings, and not appreciably more feasible at second-level. The MEND preconception therefore still holds that, of the two, ITM is infinitely more likely to succeed, as indeed it has more priority by right, should a campaign for its enhanced presence in formal education be considered worthwhile.

MEND Agenda VII - Third-level Music Education; Teacher Training; The Academy for the Performing Arts.

31. Standards of entry to third-level music education should be maintained and should not reflect the problems of the lower standard currently built into and therefore attainable (typically) from the Second-level Senior Cycle (Leaving Certificate) curriculum. Skills in performance should continue to be esteemed highly in prospective candidates for all third level courses in music. Facilities for the inculcation of these performing skills should be more widely available to ensure fairness to the candidature on a countrywide basis (see MEND AGENDA IV - Performance above).

32. Rationalization of all third-level music courses should be undertaken by a dedicated sub-committee to ensure the widest range of discrete options; the results should be presented in composite form for the guidance and benefit of prospective candidates.

33. Teacher Training should be perceived and provided for as an ongoing professional evolution in three distinct phases: - (i) pre-service, (ii) induction/probationary with links to parent institutions, and (iii) continuing professional development assisted by rationalized and co-ordinated in-service modules.

34. The newly-established Academy for the Performing Arts (2000), to be functional within five years, should be the flagship committed, above all, to multi-lateral collaboration with all educational institutions in the state committed to the promotion of music, as is

implicit in its promulgated brief. Its functions should be carefully monitored to ensure that it does not unnecessarily destabilize current provision. The Academy should establish liaisons and be influential at all levels of performance training and assessment.

35. Courses committed to the (continuing) professionalization of musicians should be more available. These should, in general, widen the knowledge base in philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, methodology, advocacy for music education and other promotional skills, research method, ethics and so on. Such a programme could be spearheaded by the Forum for Music (see MEND Agenda VIII below) in collaboration with the Academy for the Performing Arts and other interested agencies acting for the profession.

36. Philosophy of Music Education modules should be considered for inclusion in the curriculum for all music teacher training programmes.

37. There is a need for specialist music education services to schools if standards are to be set and maintained. The intimate relationship between promulgated (intended) curriculum and the levels of specialism required to deliver it should be invoked in reviewing the entrenched government position on the primacy of the class-teacher input to child-centred education at primary level. If curriculum is tied to (and synonymous with) standards expected its ongoing review should be coupled with enquiry into ways and means of making specialist music education services available at all levels. The current situation as the culmination of a history of neglect is unacceptable. (See Lehman - Ref. III P iii for compelling logic on this issue).

38. There were consistent calls at MEND for the promotion of research-based materials for school music teaching based on Irish folk music themes. The work of Dr Albert Bradshaw in this respect was cited as particularly germane and worthy of further encouragement and development.

MEND Agenda VIII - A Forum for Music Education

39. The successful outcome of MEND deliberations depends on the continuity inherent in the workings of a permanent forum for music education in Ireland. Such a forum was established in November 1996 as part of the MEND proceedings and as mandated by the delegates to the MEND conferences. While the forum is theoretically still extant (2001), its work having been arrested in late 1997 by default in reconvening its plenary membership, there seems little point in its coexistence with the similarly dedicated but more recent (1999) Forum for Music in Ireland (Note the affinity between the titles). The recommendation, which existed in embryo from the early days of the MEND Heralding Conference in 1994, therefore stands that:

A PERMANENT FORUM FOR THE PROCESSING OF ISSUES RELATED TO MUSIC EDUCATION IN IRELAND SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED, MAINTAINED AND SUPPORTED BY ALL AGENCIES OF MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE STATE.

21 Appendix 1. TOC for Debates and Lectures

Detailed Table of Contents for Section 17 (Analysis I) and 18 (Analysis [II] of Presentations, Debates and Related Materials) leading to Findings and Recommendations.

17 ANALYSIS (I) 96
17.1 Key Concepts 96
17.2 Introduction 98
17.3 Introduction to the Elliott/Reimer Case 100
17.4 Reimer's Universal Philosophy of Music Education (*Should there be a Universal Philosophy of Music?*) 101
17.5 Commonly-held Values about Music Education (Reimer) 102
17.6 Four Philosophical Positions 103
17.7 Formalism 104
17.8 Praxialism 105
17.9 Referentialism 106
17.10 Contextualism 108
17.11 Functional/Utilitarian approaches to Music Education 109
17.12 Bennett Reimer in Ireland 110
17.13 The Irish Context 111
18 Analysis (II): Presentations, Debates and Related Materials 117
18.1 Philosophy of Music Education 117
18.1.1 Overview of Music Education Philosophy 117
Ref. I P viii See Document 108 in Proceedings
The Conceptual Failure of Music Education in Ireland
Professor Harry White (University College, Dublin) 117
Ref. III K See Document 300 in Proceedings
Phase III Keynote Address 'the common sense of all music'. Remembering Percy Grainger
Emeritus Professor Sir Frank Callaway
Honorary President of the International Society for Music Education
Callaway International Research Centre for Music Education
(CIRCME) The University of Western Australia 119
Ref. III P ii See Document 302 in Proceedings
The Role of Philosophy in the Development of Professional Music Educators
(The title of this presentation was modified from 'Philosophies of Music as a Basis for Teacher Training')
Professor Harold Abeles - Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York City 123
Ref. III P viii See Document 308 in Proceedings
'A book of manners in the wilderness':
The Model of University Music Education and its Relevance as Enabler in General Music Education in Ireland
Harry White, Professor of Music, University College, Dublin, Ireland 126
The Reimer/Elliott Reviews of Harry White's Paper - *A book of manners in the wilderness*. 133
Bennett Reimer's Response 133
Reimer on the 'popular' versus 'classical' dilemma 136
Who [*sic*] is music education for? 137
David J. Elliott and Kari Veblen: Response to Harry White's paper - *A book of manners in the wilderness.* 138
Conclusion - White/Reimer/Elliott 150
Ref. III D ia See Document 351 in Proceedings
Who Needs a Philosophy of Music Education? Reflections on an Irish Context 151
18.1.2 Contextual Philosophy 154

Ref. II P iii See Document 203 in Proceedings
Aesthetic Education: Past, Present, and Potential for the Future
Dr Bennett Reimer (Professor of Music Education at Northwestern University, Evanston, Chicago, Illinois)....154
Ref. II P viii See Document 208 in Proceedings
Music Education, Music Performance, and the Irish Music Educator
Professor David Elliott (Professor of Music and Music Education, University of Toronto; currently [1995] visiting Professor at the University of North Texas)....156
The Elliott book, *Music Matters*, has been extensively reviewed.
The following is a sample of views to give a flavour as to how it was greeted by the profession. 168
Albert Le Blanc, Professor of Music, Michigan State University....168
Eleanor Stubley, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. 168
Natalie Sarrazin, University of Maryland, College Park....169
Jere T. Humphreys, Arizona State University....169
David Aspin, in The International Journal of Music Education, Number 27, May 1996, pp 51-56. 170
Aspin on Value and Judgement....173
The Reimer/Elliott Documentation (Review/Rebuttal) on *Music Matters*....174
The Inseparability of Product and Process....191
In summary, Elliott's response to the Works of Music/ Product/Process criticism makes the following additional points....198
Towards Rationalization 204
Rationalization 214
Ref. II P ix See Documents 209a & 209b in Proceedings
Issues in Progress about Changes in Music Education in Ireland (Document 209b)
Professor Richard Colwell (Chair of Music Education at the New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Massachusetts) 214
Recommendations 219
The shorter lecture given by Professor Colwell at the culmination of Phase II of MEND (12 November 1995) is summarized below. The paper generally follows the salient points in the definitive paper (not read) but there are some additional comments and recommendations that are worth noting. See Document 209a in Proceedings....221
Conclusion (Philosophical) 222
18.1.3 Composing (Creativity: Buckley I P iii): Performing: Listening 222
Ref. I P iii See Document 103 in Proceedings
The 'Composer' in the Classroom. The Demystification of the Concept of Creativity.
Mr John Buckley (Irish Freelance Composer) 222
Recommendation....222
Ref. I D ia See Document 151 in Proceedings
The Identification and the Encouragement of Creativity in Music.
Towards a Non-Threatening Definition 222
Ref. I D ib See Document 152 in Proceedings
The Listening Process. The Core Curriculum for the Inculcation of Basic Awareness, Appreciation and Literacy....223
18.1.4 Time Management 224
Ref. III D ib See Document 352 in Proceedings
Time Constraints in Music Education.
Politics and Strategies for Acceptance and Implementation of an Effective Music Curriculum 224
18.1.5 Dichotomy....224
Ref. II D ia See Document 251 in Proceedings
Philosophies of Music Education and the Great Divide....224
Recommendations 225
18.2 State of Music Education in Ireland....227

18.2.1 General Provision....227
Ref. I D iia See Document 154 in Proceedings
An Appraisal of Current Primary and Pre-School Provision as Music Education Strategy in Ireland....227
Ref. I D iiia See Document 157 in Proceedings
Second-Level Music Education.
The Feasibility of Senior Cycle Music Uptake as Long-Term Target....228
Ref. II D iic See Document 256 in Proceedings
Second Level Music Education in Ireland: Towards a True Continuum....231
Recommendations....233
Ref. 2 II D ib See Document 252 in Proceedings
Pre-School and Primary Education.
The First and Critical Testing Ground for Philosophy of Music Education in Action....234
Recommendations....235
Third-Level Music Education....236
18.2.2 Music in the Community....236
Ref. I P v See Document 105 in Proceedings
Private Enterprise as an Antidote to Regional Inequality in Music Education
Mr Aidan O'Carroll....236
Recommendations....237
18.2.3 Private Enterprise and Semi-State Provision....237
Ref. I D iib See Document 155 in Proceedings
The 'Non-State' Sector. Private Enterprise and Community Activity in the Promotion of Music as Educational Process....237
18.2.4 Materials for Music Education....239
Ref. I P ii See Document 102 in Proceedings
Listening as Quintessential Key to Musicianship.
Dr Albert Bradshaw (Mt Temple School)....239
18.3 Continuum in Music Education....240
Ref. I D ic See Document 153 in Proceedings
The Fractured Continuum in Music Education....240
Ref. II D iva See Document 260 in Proceedings
Continuum in Music Education Curriculum: A *Sine qua Non*....241
Recommendations....243
Ref. III P vii See Document 307 in Proceedings
The Establishment of a Primary-Secondary Continuum in Irish Music Education
Dr Marie McCarthy, Associate Professor, Music Education, School of Music, University of Maryland at College Park (USA)....243
Ref. III D iva See Document 357 in Proceedings
The Continuum in Music Education: Satisfying Basic Principles in Irish Schools.
The Search for Suitable Teaching Materials....248
Recommendations....250
18.4 Performance....251
18.4.1 Performance and Élitism....251
Ref. I D iiib See Document 158 in Proceedings
The Centrality of Performance and the Élitism Stigma. Towards a Reconciliation....251
Ref. II D ic See Document 253 in Proceedings
Performance: Definitions and Strategies to Empower a Universal Faculty....252
Ref. III D iiib See Document 356 in Proceedings
Making Music. Performance as Dominating Element in Music Education.
A Realistic Approach to the Definition and Challenge of Performance at Competent, Proficient and Artistic Levels....252
Recommendations....254
18.4.2 Specialization....254

Ref. I P vii See Document 107 in Proceedings
Specialization in Music Education
Mr Shane Brennan (St Finian's Schola Cantorum) 254
Ref. I P xi See Document 111 in Proceedings
The Growing Ascendancy of Performance in Music Education Contexts
Mr William Halpin (DIT) 255
Ref. II D ivc See Document 262 in Proceedings
Specialization in Music Education: The Illusion of Real Choices 256
Recommendations 257
18.4.3 Music Schools 257
Ref. I P xii See Document 112 in Proceedings The Rôle of the Music School
Dr Ita Beausang (DIT) 258
Recommendations 259
18.4.4 Performance in Third Level 259
Ref. I P xv See Document 115 in Proceedings
Performance in Context as a Component in Balanced Third-Level Education
Professor Gerard Gillen (St Patrick's College, Maynooth) 259
Ref. I P xvi See Document 116 in Proceedings
Mandatory Performance in Third-Level as Enabler in Music Education at Lower Levels
Dr Eric Sweeney (Waterford Regional Technical College) 260
18.4.5 Professional Training in Performance (including a National Academy for the Performing Arts) 261
18.5 Assessment 262
18.5.1 General Comments on Assessment 262
Ref. III D iib See Document 354 in Proceedings
Towards a Balanced Perspective on Assessment in Music Education.
The Compatibility of Music with Other Standard-Setting Subjects.
The True Aims of Assessment and Evaluation. 262
Recommendations 263
18.5.2 Assessment in the National Curriculum (UK) 263
Ref. III P iv See Document 304 in Proceedings
Problems and Possibilities in Assessing Musical Progression
Keith Swanwick, Professor of Music Education, Institute of Education, University of London 263
Recommendations 271
18.5.3 The Leaving Certificate Crisis 272
Ref. I P xiii See Document 113 in Proceedings
The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision as Ongoing Vehicle for Change in Attitudes to Music Education in Ireland
(Modified Title: The Proposed New Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus: Perspectives and Attitudes)
Mr Seán MacLiam (NCCA and St Patrick's College, Drumcondra) 272
Recommendations 275
Ref. I D iva See Document 160 in Proceedings
The Leaving Certificate Syllabus Revision 276
Ref. II D iiib See Document 258 in Proceedings
The Leaving Certificate Music Syllabus Dilemma: Assessment with Multiple Aims 277
Recommendations 279
18.5.4 National Standards (USA) 279
Ref. III P iii See Document 303 in Proceedings
National Standards and the Realities of Achievement in Music Education
Paul R. Lehman (Professor of Music, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Past President, Music Educators National Conference (USA). Chair, Music Standards Task Force.) 279

Ref. III D iia See Document 353 in Proceedings
The American National Standards as Aspiration.
An Appraisal of their General Applicability 285
18.6 National Culture, Biculturalism and Multiculturalism 286
18.6.1 A Note on Multiculturalism 286
18.6.2 National Culture: Biculturalism versus Multiculturalism 287
18.6.3 National Culture - Review of Presentations and Debates 289
Ref. I P x See Document 110 in Proceedings
Multiculturalism as an Approach to Music Education
Emeritus Professor Hormoz Farhat (Trinity College, Dublin) 289
Ref. I P ix See Document 109 in Proceedings
Looking at the Music of the World: A View from Ireland
Mr Mel Mercier (University College, Cork) 290
Ref. I P/D N See Document 120 in Proceedings
Irish Traditional Music in Education
Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin (Irish World Music Centre, University of Limerick) 291
Ref. I D iiic See Document 159 in Proceedings
The Rôle of National Music and its Potential Multicultural Extensions. 293
Ref. II P ii See Document 202 in Proceedings
Irish Music Education and Irish Identity: A Concept Revisited
Dr Marie McCarthy (Associate Professor, Dept of Music Education, The University of Maryland [USA] at College Park) 294
Ref. II P vi See Document 206 in Proceedings
Children of Ireland, Children of the World:
Appropriate Music Curriculum for Ireland in the 21st Century.
Dr Kari Veblen (Commission on Community Music, International Society for Music Education) 296
Ref. II P vii See Document 207 in Proceedings
Perspectives on Music(s), Culture, and Tradition with Special Reference to Contemporary Music Education.
Dr Ramon Santos (Professor of Composition, Theory and Musicology at the University of the Philippines) 298
Ref. II D iiia See Document 257 in Proceedings
Traditional Music and Formal Education 301
Recommendation 302
Ref. III P v See Document 305 in Proceedings
Music, the Universal Language: A Multiculturalist's Perspective
Patricia Shehan Campbell, Professor of Music, The University of Washington (Seattle) ... 302
Recommendations 308
Ref. III P vi See Document 306 in Proceedings
A Strategy for the Promotion of Traditional Music in Formal Music Education Contexts in Ireland
Professor Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin 309
Ref. III D iiia See Document 355 in Proceedings
Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in Music Education:
Attainable Ideals, or a New Threat to an Overloaded Curriculum? 313
Recommendations 315
18.7 Music Education at Third Level 316
18.7.1 Options 316
Ref. II D iiic See Document 259 in Proceedings
Third-Level Music Education in Ireland:
Vocation, Choices and Philosophies in Conflict. 316
Recommendations 316
18.7.2 Professional Training 317

Ref. III D ivb See Document 308 in Proceedings
To Triumph or to Perish on the Rock of Relevance.
Evolution or Revolution in Third-Level Music Education in Ireland. 317
Ref. I P xiv See Document 114 in Proceedings
Music Teacher Education: Understanding Teacher Knowledge.
Ms Mary Lennon (DIT)....317
Recommendations 318
18.7.3 Teacher Training....319
Ref. I P vi See Document 106 in Proceedings
Teacher Training as a Priority in a National Campaign for a Better Provision in Music Education
Ms Gabrielle McCann (Trinity College, Dublin)....319
Recommendations 319
Ref. I D iic See Document 156 in Proceedings
Third-Level Training in Music; its Spectrum and its Possibilities.
The Professional Dimension in Teacher Training....320
Ref. II D ivb See Document 261 in Proceedings
Teacher Training:
The Transition to Professionalism and a New Crisis for Philosophy in Action....322
Recommendations 323
18.7.4 The Conservatoire Aspiration (A National Academy for the Performing Arts?) 324
Ref. I D ivb See Document 161 in Proceedings
The National Conservatoire Aspiration....324
Ref. II P iv See Document 204 in Proceedings
Performing Music, Knowing Music.
Dr Janet Ritterman (Director, Royal College of Music, London)....326
Ref. II D iia See Document 254 in Proceedings
The Conservatoire Aspiration.
Educational Contexts of Music in Process of Transmission 329
Recommendations 331
18.8 Forum for Music Education 333
Ref. I D ivc See Document 162 in Proceedings
A National Forum for Music Education in Ireland 333
Ref. II P v See Document 205 in Proceedings
The Rôle of the Music Educators' National Conference (MENC) in American Music Education: Current Changes and Challenges
Ms Dorothy Straub (MENC)....334
Ref. II D iib See Document 255 in Proceedings
A National Forum for Music Education; A Strategy for MEND Continuity 336
Recommendations 338
19 Rationalization 339
19.1 Rationalization – Towards A Contextual Philosophy for Music Education in Ireland. ..339
19.2 The American Philosophical View on Music Education.
Towards a reconciliation of the Reimer/Elliott Counterpositions....345
19.3 Music Education as Aesthetic Education 347
19.4 The American National Standards (1992-1994) 353
Music Content Standards 353
19.5 Multiculturalism (MC)....361
19.6 Residual Dissonances....366
19.7 The Irish Context 375
19.7.1 Some basic understandings about music and music education. 375
19.7.2 Involvements and Diversity in Music Education. 376
19.7.3 The Philosophical Stances on music education 377
19.7.4 Towards a Universal Philosophy of Music Education....378
19.7.5 Philosophy in action. Standards, Curriculum, Method 382

19.7.6 The Relevance of American Music Education Practice....385
19.7.7 Music as Art and in the Arts Programme....389
19.7.8 The Conceptual Confusion about Performance....391
19.7.9 Diversity. The Role of Popular Music and Multiculturalism in Music Education....393
19.7.10 The Current State of Music Education in Ireland....398
MEND Agenda I – Philosophical Considerations....399
MEND Agenda II - The State of Music Education in Ireland....399
MEND Agenda III - Continuum in Music Education....400
MEND Agenda IV – Performance....401
MEND Agenda V – Assessment....405
MEND Agenda VI – National Music (Multiculturalism)....406
MEND Agenda VII – Third-level Music Education; Teacher Training;
The Academy for the Performing Arts....409
MEND Agenda VIII – A Forum for Music Education....416
19.7.11 A Way Forward for Irish Music Education....418
19.7.12 National Forum for Music Education....418
19.7.13 Philosophical Issues. Balance, Relevance and Time Management in Implementing the Curriculum....419
19.7.14 The Elliott and Reimer Philosophies Revisited as Models for Irish Music Education....420
David Elliott....420
Bennett Reimer....422
20 MEND Findings and Recommendations....426
20.1 Towards Recommendations from MEND....426
20.2 MEND Findings....427
20.3 MEND Recommendations....428
MEND Agenda I - Philosophical Considerations....428
General....428
Contextual....428
MEND Agenda II - The State of Music Education in Ireland....429
MEND Agenda III- Continuum in Music Education....430
MEND Agenda IV – Performance....430
MEND Agenda V – Assessment....431
MEND Agenda VI - National Music (Multiculturalism)....431
MEND Agenda VII - Third-level Music Education; Teacher Training;
The Academy for the Performing Arts....432
MEND Agenda VIII - A Forum for Music Education....433
21 Appendix 1. TOC for Debates and Lectures....434