The Dialectic of Modernization:
Implications for Music Teacher Education

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By
Malinda Wiard Essex, M.A.
Graduate Program in Music

The Ohio State University
2010

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Timothy A. Gerber, Advisor
Dr. Jan Edwards
Dr. Kevin Boyle
Abstract

This study offers a philosophical theory for the persistence of tradition and elusiveness of change in music teacher education. Deeper understanding of the dialectic of modernization (the tension that exists between tradition and change in modern society) better equips those in the field to reconcile tradition and change in order to bring about desired reform, consequently keeping music education relevant and thriving. The questions guiding this study are: (1) Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time?, (2) What are the obstacles impeding implementation of recommended changes?, and (3) Is this phenomenon unique to music or can music educators look elsewhere to understand the problem?

The underpinnings of the study lie in sociology, U.S. history, and education. This broad perspective is required to fully understand the dialectic of modernization. Works of Tönnies, Wiebe, and Dewey offer examples of the dialectic of modernization in sociology, history and education. Additional examples from relevant literature in U.S. history, professional research journals, professional practice publications, conference proceedings, and historical documents aid in the synthesis of a cohesive theory.

Three facets of dialectic emerge as primary reasons for the unchanging nature of music teacher education. These facets include: (1) identity, (2) structure, and (3)
purpose. Dialectic occurs within and between each facet, hindering change in music teacher education. In addition, the cycle of interdependence, which typifies music education, creates overwhelming implications for the entire system if any one area attempts change. The study offers the works of Dewey, Greene, and Allsup as examples of reconciling tradition and change in music education, as opposed to binary, either/or choices.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Today … it behooves us to inquire whether the retention of any form of musical tuition in the curriculum of our schools is not a mere survival of routine, and, if so, whether it is not time we replaced this tradition by a more vital incentive to progress. Whether this take the form of a desire to strengthen musical taste and to prepare for the study of classical and modern masterpieces, or for hygienic considerations, is not material. The essential thing is that we should know exactly why we are to retain music in our current curriculum. We can later – assuming we are satisfied as to the public utility of such retention – proceed to inquire as to whether this generation is in advance of the preceding ones. Should it appear that absolutely no progress has been made, it is our business to ascertain the cause of this status quo, and thence set about devising means for securing a better record for the coming generation.¹

– Emile Jaques-Dalcroze, 1905

These words of Dalcroze foreshadow the struggle music educators have faced for over one hundred years. The juxtaposition of the terms tradition and progress, and the phrases in advance of and status quo, indicate that even in 1905 music educators felt caught between convention and innovation, tradition and change. In his native Switzerland, Dalcroze called upon his colleagues to look beyond tradition to a progressive vision of the future. Music teacher educators today find themselves in a similar situation: recognizing the need to advance into a changing world while remaining

loyal to tradition. Emile Jaques-Dalcroze set forth a research agenda that is relevant still today: “To ascertain the cause of this status quo, and thence set about devising means for securing a better record for the coming generation.”

In the United States, traditions in the field of music teacher education are largely based upon the singing school, which eventually led to the establishment of a music curriculum in the public schools of Boston in 1837. Early public school music education embraced as its fundamental goal the teaching of music reading. This, in fact, “became the paramount question of the age.” There were those, however, who soon challenged this tradition. In 1905 (the same year in which Dalcroze wrote the opening passage), Samuel W. Cole expressed that “the real purpose of teaching music in the public schools is not to make expert sight singers nor individual soloists. A much nobler, grander, more inspiring privilege is yours and mine; to get the great mass to singing and to make them love it.” It was during these first decades of the 20th century that the name of the profession shifted from “vocal music” to “music education.”

Forward thinking individuals, those who looked to the future for inspiration instead of past tradition, challenged not only curriculum but the system for preparing those who delivered this emerging form of music education to students. The earliest recognized music educators in the country were primarily self-taught or the products of

---

4 Birge, 113.
5 Birge, 162.
7 The term forward thinking is used here to denote the source of an individual’s inspiration in terms of time. Its use is not intended to engender any positive or negative connotations.
singing schools and publisher-sponsored summer schools. By the beginning of the 20th century however, normal schools and teacher colleges were educating classroom teachers for public schools. These teachers were expected to teach all subjects, including music, even though they had no extensive preparation to do so. This change in the responsibility for delivering music in public schools shifted the role of the music teacher (who taught solely music) to one of music supervisor. The music supervisor’s role was to oversee the delivery of music lessons by the classroom teacher, often times providing the lessons that would be taught to students and occasionally instructing students in order to assess their progress. Despite their supervisory position, they usually had no formal preparation in the normal schools. New forms of music teacher and music supervisor preparation were needed to address these changing roles. Music educators again were forced to choose the source of their inspiration – past tradition or a vision of the future.

Even in these early years of U.S. public school music education, forward thinkers began to examine critically traditional methods of music teacher education in order to develop high quality music teachers. The status quo was routinely questioned in an attempt to advance music education into modern times. For example, in 1915, Waldo Pratt urged music educators, “For the sake of our own self respect and to maintain the honor of our work in the eyes of the world, we need repeatedly to ask questions like,

---

8 Music supervisors were primarily found in large public school systems. Classroom teachers who taught in small town and villages (often in one-room school houses) were often the sole providers of musical instruction despite their level of preparation.
‘What are we here for?’, ‘What are we about?’ and ‘What good is there in what we are doing?’ Paul Broomhead makes a similar statement in 2004, when he writes,

Great teachers are not content to merely perpetuate the status quo. They continually strive to develop a solid theoretical foundation for their teaching. This commitment requires them to answer important what and why questions regarding music education. Producing such mindful teachers must be a primary goal of music teacher education.11

Esther Gatewood, in 1925, advocated for teacher preparation in addition to musical preparation. She observes, “The musical training of the teacher and the training for teaching are two distinct things, although intimately related…. Successful music development will depend upon teaching as well as upon the teacher’s knowledge of the facts of music, and of the two it is the former which is in immediate need of attention.”12

This topic remains an issue today, reiterated by Sara Hamilton when she states, “The students largely completed a music “core” and then began a music education “core,” which physically separated music knowledge and skills from music teaching.”13

Carl Gehrken (as quoted by King) noted of the music teacher education curriculum in 1933, “These courses depend almost entirely upon the individual experiences of the men and women who give them.”14 Yet again, in 2002, Maud Hickey and Fred Rees addressed the issue of programmatic inconsistencies:

---

Music teacher education programs across institutions are not necessarily the same. While course content and degree program requirements are similar across the country, student profiles, professorial expertise, institutional resources, political realities, and budgetary constraints are different, particularly for colleagues whose institutions vary from major research universities to smaller teachers' and liberal arts colleges.15

These examples of music teacher educators span generations, and represent those who have contributed to the process of critical examination as they attempt to answer the persistent question posed by Dalcroze: Is this generation of music teacher education in advance of proceeding ones? If the current literature is an indication of the answer to this question, one must assume little advancement has occurred.

**Need for the Study**

The discourse found in professional journals, symposia, and conferences is rife with calls for improving the state of music teacher education. Upon first examination, one would assume these continued calls lead to a steady advancement of methods, curriculum and the organizational structure of institutions related to music teacher education. Further investigation reveals not a progression of new proposals in response to societal change, but a recycling of persistent arguments in response to the challenge of changing a developing field. These recycled arguments do not seem to be an issue of recycled thinking. On the contrary, those writing articles and organizing symposia are

often the same type of forward thinking individuals as Dalcroze – those who attempt to “secure a better record for the coming generation.”

The continued existence of calls for change, often addressing similar topics, indicates that the desired changes have not been brought to full fruition. For example, in 1968, Music Educators National Conference (MENC) commissioned a report on teacher education in music, focusing on undergraduate education. This commission consisted of highly respected music educators from across a wide geographic, musical, and academic spectrum. A report of their recommendations was made after four years of study with the intention of strengthening teacher education and the resulting music education offered to prospective music teachers.\textsuperscript{16} In his charge to the commission, Wiley L. Housewright observes as a primary reason for the project,

there is an enormous disparity between the preparation for teaching and the practice of it. Many experienced music teachers recall the disillusionment they suffered during the early years of their teaching when they discovered that their real problems had never been analyzed in methods classes.\textsuperscript{17}

In comparison, Colleen Conway describes the same disillusionment felt by a beginning teacher almost four decades later.

The energy and time I spent in college focused on studying music theory compared to the amount of time I spent studying various theories and methodologies of teaching music is almost an exact opposite ratio of the energy I expend now in my classroom on teaching students versus teaching music…Many

\textsuperscript{17} Wiley L. Housewright, Charge to the Commission in \textit{Teacher Education in Music: Final Report} (MENC, 1972), I.
music teachers find out too late that less of their energy is spent on being a *musician* than on being a *teacher*.\footnote{Colleen Conway, “Becoming a teacher: Stories of the first few years,” *Music Educators Journal* 91 (2004): 45-50.}

Similarly, the Tanglewood Symposium was held in 1968 to “reappraise and evaluate basic assumptions about music, … develop greater concern and awareness of the problems and potentials of music activities in our entire culture, and to explore means of greater cooperation in becoming more effective” in the fields of music education and subsequently, music teacher education.\footnote{Robert Choate, Introduction, *Documentary Report of the Tanglewood Symposium* (Washington, D.C., MENC, 1968).} The Tanglewood Declaration highlighted critical issues identified in the symposium, including recommendations made on behalf of the music educators and consultants in attendance. The significance of the Tanglewood Symposium and resulting declaration is evident in the literature of music education in the years since it was held.\footnote{See such authors as, Michael Mark, MENC: From Tanglewood to the Present; June Hinckley, Why Vision 2020?.} Estelle Jorgensen underscores its importance when she observes that is has been “adopted as credo by many North American music teachers.”\footnote{Estelle Jorgensen, Music Multiculturalism Revisited, *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 32 (1998): 77-88.}

In light of the interdependency within the field of music education, all points of the Tanglewood declaration are related to music teacher education. Point eight, however, directly addresses teacher education as follows:

*Programs of teacher education must be expanded and improved to provide music teachers who are specially equipped to teach high school courses in*
the history and literature of music, courses in the humanities and related arts, as well as teachers equipped to work with the very young, with adults, with the disadvantaged, and with the emotionally disturbed.22

This statement reflects the members’ attitudes concerning the preparation of teachers to work with a diverse population of students. Cultural diversity among students is echoed in point seven of the declaration, in which the music education profession is called upon to assist “in the solution of urgent social problems as in the ‘inner city’ or other areas with culturally deprived individuals.”23

MENC issued a similar statement in 2003 on inclusivity in music education. Its topic echoes that of point eight of the Tanglewood Declaration thirty-five years earlier. This document states as its concern:

By law and by custom, those involved in the delivery of education in our nation strive to bring education to the entire populace. Excluding some Americans from music education denies them access to one of the core academic subjects, music, as an essential path toward meeting their educational needs, breaking social and economic barriers, and accommodating diverse learning and teaching. Music education must involve and serve individuals from all demographic strata in our society.24

MENC identifies “all demographic strata” as a target for service. The Tanglewood Declaration cites the very young, adults, disadvantaged, emotionally disturbed, and culturally deprived as deserving of music education. These documents, written thirty-five years apart, parallel one another in their calls to increase access to music education.

23 Ibid.
Twenty years after the first teacher education commission, a task force was convened to develop recommendations for music teacher education. This 1987 document, *Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process*, proposed “a new model in music teacher education.”

This model proposed:

The establishment of strong bonds among this nation’s elementary and secondary school music educators, and college music and music education professors – bonds through which new ideas can flow and cooperative ventures can evolve [into] an expanded view of the process through which one becomes a good teacher - a process that begins prior to the college program of preparation and extends throughout an active career.

This proposal’s charge is repeated in the thoughts of the 2001 College Music Society’s (CMS) Institute on Music Teacher Education. Participants recognized that if curricular change is to occur, all members of the music community must be engaged from the outset. The institution’s group report on teacher preparation graphically represented this notion in a triangle (see fig. 1). The CMS institute reiterates the goal set in 1987 of establishing strong bonds and cooperation among all stakeholders in music education.

26 Ibid.
27 Hickey & Rees, “Developing a Model for Change in Music Teacher Education.”
The similarity of these calls for change does not suggest an inability to offer forward-thinking reforms in music teacher education. The examples do, however, reveal a failure to enact similar, repeated calls for change. This failure often goes unnoticed in the day-to-day operations of teacher education institutions where the opportunity rarely exists to examine music teacher education in its historical entirety. The problem evident in these examples can go unnoticed until a senior colleague makes casual note of similarities between the present and past. Such observations are seldom accompanied by action. Gerrity points out, in regard to middle-level general music, that many music education scholars have advocated change for years, yet, “For one reason or another,
many teachers have ignored these suggestions.”

This observation demonstrates two points. First, the scope of research is often limited to the researcher’s musical area. At times, this scope will include larger segments of music education, but seldom does it encompass the entirety of music education. Second, although a reluctance to change is recognized, a compelling reason for it has not been identified. A formal, interdisciplinary examination and theory as to why change is difficult to achieve has not been offered. These continued calls for change illustrate that challenging the status quo is, in fact, a reliably present component of the status quo. Change is and has been an almost continuous topic in music teacher education since at least the turn of the 20th century. Evidence of change, however, is fleeting.

The evidence of change that does exist is often isolated and does not spread to the entire system, largely due to a lack of consensus among peers, variations in institutions, and a lack of fluidity across the music education community.

This can be seen in innovations such as electronic portfolios, service learning, and the transformation of field and student teaching experiences in numerous colleges and universities.

Many people talk and write about them, some undergraduate programs incorporate them, but their overall effect on the entirety of music teacher education has been negligible. For

30 Hickey and Rees, “Developing a Model for Change in Music Teacher Education.”
instance, the University of Minnesota’s undergraduate music education program has undergone two revisions since 1990.\textsuperscript{32} Ball State University also revised its curriculum and program.\textsuperscript{33} These institutions enacted considerable change, but both were in response to meeting requirements of outside forces. This follows a pattern of the most noticeable changes in music teacher education coming as the result of mandated federal, state, and institutional requirements.\textsuperscript{34}

Change has occurred in the philosophies of music education as well. The philosophy of aesthetic education was introduced in the 1950’s and brought to full fruition by Bennett Reimer in the 1970’s. As a response, David Elliot proposed a praxial philosophy in the 1990’s. Both have been the source of much debate and both have become key schools of thought in music education.\textsuperscript{35} In spite of these important philosophical additions, undergraduate preparation continues to focus primarily on the development of methods to teach music, as opposed to the development of a teaching philosophy. As a result, it remains difficult to detect the direct influence of either Reimer’s or Elliot’s philosophy in the actions of beginning teachers. Linda Thompson affirms this when she states, “Educational theories and philosophies may provide for engaging discussions, but unless these ideas are placed in the context of the preservice

\textsuperscript{32} Jeffrey Kimpton, “What To Do About Music Teacher Education: Our Profession at a Crossroads,” \textit{Journal of Music Teacher Education} 14 (2005); Personal conversation with Dr. Scott D. Lipscomb, Associate Professor and Division head, University of Minnesota, October 15, 2009.


teacher’s beliefs and view of self-as-teacher, the teacher candidate will most likely accept these theories only if they affirm or support existing belief structures.” 36 Ultimately, if this line of thought is followed, a music education philosophy is adopted only if it fits with previously held beliefs of the teacher, thus leading to no real change in thought or practice.

Changes that have occurred are often overshadowed by the persistence of traditional methods in music teacher education. John Kratus provides evidence of this in his comparison of degree requirements at Michigan State University from 1959 to the present day for the B.M. in Music Education. 37 He argues that the present day requirements date largely back to 19th century European music conservatories. This tie, Dr. Kratus proposes, hinders the advancement of music teacher education.

David Williams observes similar patterns. He notes, “The current system that both prepares pre-service teachers and maintains in-service teachers appears intent on preserving the status quo.” He goes on to warn that this tie to tradition “could be protecting the very thing that is destroying us.” 38 Music educator and philosopher Bennett Reimer demonstrates his agreement that music education may be its own worst enemy when he writes, “Music is thriving in America … music education is not.” 39

Reimer’s statement is all the more relevant when one considers the modernization and growth of the thriving commercial music industry in relation to tradition-based school music programs that often find themselves threatened.

Continued calls for change and a recognition that music education (and therefore music teacher education) is in danger dictate a need for further investigation into why music teacher education remains so unchanged, so tied to tradition. What are the obstacles impeding implementation of recommended changes? Is this phenomenon unique to music or can music educators look elsewhere to understand the problem?

This study is needed to open a dialogue concerning these questions. Change is a perpetual topic of discourse in music teacher education. There also exists a limited amount of discussion on the role of tradition in music, music education and to a lesser degree music teacher education. The reasons for the profession’s inability to achieve meaningful change, however, are largely unexamined, especially from an interdisciplinary perspective. This study proposes a theory to answer why this continues to occur. Ideally, this theory would lead to a re-evaluation of the process of modernization in music teacher education, resulting in a synthesis of tradition and

change, which is needed to benefit the field of music teacher education and music education as a whole.

**Statement of the Problem & Research Questions**

The ongoing nature of calls for change from respected sources provides a compelling argument that change is needed in music teacher education if music education is to remain a vital part of school curriculum. The purpose of this study, then, is to offer a logically articulated theory to explain why music teacher education has remained relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change. Stated in the words of Dalcroze, the intent of this inquiry is “to ascertain the cause of this status quo.” A broad perspective is required to understand this problem. Along with music education, the disciplines of sociology, U.S. history, and education are explored to construct the theory, offering an original, interdisciplinary synthesis.

The primary question this dissertation seeks to answer is: “Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time?” Three secondary questions will help to focus the research and theory development. These questions include: (1) What aspects of music teacher education demonstrate this unchanging nature? (2) What other examples of this phenomenon can inform music teacher education? and (3) Are there successful instances music teacher educators can refer to in order to better reconcile tradition and change?
Tradition, Change, and Dialectic

Tradition, as referred to in this study, is best explained by examining Thomas S. Kuhn’s, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Kuhn observes that a scientific community cannot practice its trade without some set of “received beliefs.” These beliefs form the foundation of the “educational initiation that prepares and licenses the student for professional practice.”

Time spent in preparation for professional practice helps ensure that the beliefs are received deeply by students.

Charles Leonhard echoes Kuhn’s description of the scientific community when he describes “the circularity of music programs.” Beliefs and traditions are disseminated deeply and thoroughly in music education as “collegiate institutions prepare music teachers who go out to prepare music students to become students in collegiate institutions. The musical horizons, skills, and attitudes of music students entering collegiate institutions are shaped by their public school and private teachers at the collegiate level.”

This process of dissemination becomes problematic when “the limitations in the preparation of music teachers are inevitably passed on to the students of those teachers.”

---

44 Ibid.
Kuhn explains that beliefs become the basis for achievement in communities, thus “supplying the foundation for its further practice.”\textsuperscript{45} These achievements become paradigms – a set of principles and methods by which specific communities operate. They help to create avenues of inquiry, formulate questions, select methods with which to examine questions, define areas of relevance, and even create meaning. Paradigms offer the promise of success “because they are more successful than their competitors in solving a few problems that the group of practitioners has come to recognize as acute.”\textsuperscript{46}

As John Kratus’ research showed earlier, the curriculum of music teacher education today closely resembles that of 19\textsuperscript{th} century European music conservatories. This suggests that the traditional, or paradigmatic, mode of music teacher education in use today is addressing the problems recognized as acute by 19\textsuperscript{th} century European practitioners.

Beliefs, traditions, and paradigms are often referred to as foundations. Wayne Bowman’s description of the use of this term in music education closely mirrors Kuhn’s description of paradigms.

In the current music education practice, “foundations” apparently means three things. First, foundational studies are concerned with grand theory, with essentials and essences, with the factual, with truth. A good foundation is, on this view, absolute and unshakable rather than value-based or political. It is impervious to change or challenge. Foundations are “knock-them-dead” accounts of music and music education that every music educator must be able to articulate. This is so, secondly, because foundations are concerned with inspirational descriptions – the stuff from

\textsuperscript{45} Kuhn, \textit{The Structure of Scientific Revolutions}, 10.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, 23.
which ironclad advocacy arguments can be crafted. From this there follows one clear answer to the query “Foundational to what?”: *foundational to the status quo*. To be foundational, thus, is to identify support for *what is*, currently, and for *what has been*, historically. And third, as suggested above, foundations is a “grab bag” for everything music education-related beyond techniques and methods instruction: leftovers.\(^{47}\)

Kratus’ data, Bowman’s description of foundations, and the persistent, similar calls for change exposed earlier show that music teacher education is strongly tied to tradition. Hildegard Froelich supports this observation when she writes,

Thomas Kuhn pointed out that certain fields are more prone than others to holding on to old practices when they either stick to old paradigms or do not agree on any one in particular. Music and music education are among those fields, something music educators have in common with many other areas in the humanities. But I also believe, along with Paul Woodford, that among the humanities and the fine arts, music teachers represent a particularly conservative workforce. There are many explanations for this conservatism. One reason, I suggest, hails from the fact that as music students we have been taught from early on in life to revere the musical repertoire of the past almost like a religion. Our conservatory training, too, espouses the message that to like classical music means to be a good person. Listening to other types of music makes one perhaps a little less good?\(^{48}\)

Music teacher education’s tie to tradition exists, however, in a changing world.

One need only examine a historical time line to grasp the amount of change that has taken place since the curriculum of 19\(^{th}\) century European music conservatories was created.

The twentieth century alone is a period of immense change in areas such as agriculture,


technology, and economic organization. Folke Dovring writes of the “acceleration of progress,” in which change occurred more rapidly in the post-industrial world due to a newly found “degree of continuity as well as a measure of accumulated material resources.” Kuhn points out that while the Industrial Revolution is certainly a benchmark for progress and change, “rapid alteration in the rate of change had occurred often before in human history.” Both authors’ viewpoints confirm that change is and has always been an integral part of human history.

Monroe Beardsley argues that change is also an integral part of music. “Music is change, and in a sense it is nothing more than change in its myriad forms and ways, and in this respect it is a mirror or match for some of the most fundamental features of our personal lives and social histories.” In fact, Beardsley describes tradition and change as being an organic component of music. “That something remains constant (for some time) is a fundamental and pervasive character of our experience, too.” Beardsley pinpoints the problem facing music teacher education when he states: “Music, we might say, is in essence continuation: the question is always where it will take us next.” As musicians, music teacher educators know that constancy and change, or unity and variety, are necessary aesthetic components of a composition. They know too much constancy results in a poor experience for both the performer and listener. The need for change is

52 Ibid, 71.
53 Ibid, 70.
essential in music. So, music educators innately ask the question, “Where shall we go next?”

Tension arises when this innate musical need for change, found in the midst of an ever-changing world, meets with the paradigms/traditions of music teacher education, thus creating dialectic. Dialectic is defined as “an argument involving tension between two elements.”\(^5\) Thomas Regelski has studied the dialectic between the ideal and practical and Estelle Jorgensen has written extensively on dialectic relationships found in music education.\(^5\) In her book *In Search of Music Education*, she examines “the questions and challenges that have to do with the relationship of musical form and context, great and little musical traditions, transmission and transformation, continuity and interaction, making and receiving, understanding and pleasure, and translating theory into practice”.\(^5\) Jorgensen and Regelski offer insight into the dilemmas facing music teachers and music education. This study examines the dialectic between tradition and change. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, the reasons for dialectic tension will be explored.

Modernization, as will be discussed later, is characterized by a tension between tradition and change. Terms such as nationalism, industrialization, mechanization, urbanization, growth, and development suggest an atmosphere of almost dizzying

change. In the midst of such transformation of society, humans find solace in tradition.  

The dialectic of modernization, then, is defined as the tension that exists between tradition and change in modern society. Understanding the reasons for this dialectic in modern society and in the field of music teacher education will better equip educators to reconcile tradition and change, in turn keeping music education a relevant and thriving part of the school curriculum.

Methodology

Methods of inquiry vary from field to field, but all aim to contribute new knowledge or confirm existing knowledge. Some types of research, specifically empirical, have narrowly defined steps and procedures for arriving at reported results. Others, specifically philosophical, are more enigmatic, “with as many kinds of inquiries as there are categories of philosophy.” A lack of specific, recognized steps does not mean that philosophical research is less worthy of scholarly consideration than other modes. Eleanor Stubley observes that “our zeal for objectivity and reliability has often emphasized truth at the expense of relevancy, value, and perhaps most importantly, understanding.” She goes on to argue that all methodologies are human constructions

and often, due to their procedural focus, represent ways of not seeing truth (or at least complete truth).

Philosophical research seeks truth not through strict procedures and statistical data but through thinking and reflecting on what we mean.⁶⁰ Gerard Knieter suggests that the primary tools of philosophy are dialogue and the question “why.”⁶¹ Despite this lack of specificity in procedure, philosophers such as Estelle Jorgensen, Gerard Knieter, Eleanor Stubley, Susanne Langer, and Roger Phelps, offer guidelines for conducting philosophical studies.

Jorgensen’s four symptoms of the philosophical are representative of the methodological framework offered by those in the field of music education. She speaks of four features, or symptoms, of “doing philosophy” that are common in philosophical work “despite differences in individual style, rigor, or orientation.”⁶² These symptoms each serve a function in creating understanding. They include: (1) clarifying terms; (2) exposing and evaluating underlying assumptions; (3) relating parts as a systemized theory that connects with other ideas and systems of thought; and (4) addressing questions that are characteristically philosophical.

Clarifying terms enables philosophers to sharpen, refine, and critique ideas being expressed. Knieter reiterates the importance of language in its ability “to transform, to
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clarify, and to bring greater depth to understanding all human experience.”\textsuperscript{63} Stubley suggests that, “by clarifying the language used to describe experience, it exposes the concepts, ideas, and assumptions underlying our constructions.”\textsuperscript{64} These authors, therefore, all believe that language is critical in conducting philosophical research.

Jorgensen’s second symptom of the philosophical is exposing and evaluating underlying assumptions, in which “critical and analytical thinking are utilized in reasoning from effect to cause.”\textsuperscript{65} Critical thinking is the ability “to judge the relative worth of actions and ideas” while analytical thinking requires the philosopher to take a situation or idea apart.\textsuperscript{66} Stubley notes that this type of thinking “opens the door for the creation of new ways of seeing which enable the perspectives of different lenses to work together to form a better, more comprehensive understanding.”\textsuperscript{67}

Susanne Langer argues that logical analysis must be followed by logical construction. According to Langer, the connecting of ideas about and to a subject is the true purpose of philosophical work.\textsuperscript{68} She goes on to note that implications follow the construction of a concept or theory. This is synonymous with Jorgensen’s third symptom, relating parts as a systematized theory that connects with other ideas and systems of thought. Synthesis occurs by establishing connections, often through examples, which bring about a broader perspective of the world. These examples become a type of evidence and may also include “logical argument, appeals to authority,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{63} Kneiter, “Researching and Learning Philosophy in the Music Education Doctoral Program,” 272.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Stubley, “Philosophy As A Method of Inquiry,” 44.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Jorgensen, “On Philosophical Method,” 93.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{67} Stubley, “Philosophy As A Method of Inquiry,” 44.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Langer, Problems of Art.
\end{itemize}
This symptom is marked by ideas that are brought together in a new, integrated whole. It is “methodical and careful,” “ordered but insightful.”

The fourth symptom, according to Jorgensen, is addressing questions that are characteristically philosophical. These questions may be ontological, epistemological, axiological, ethical, logical, political, aesthetic, or artistic. The “common point of reference is their challenge to the validity of extant ideas and practices: they systematically ask whether these ideas and practices are well grounded. They bypass the peripheral and trivial issues, going to the core of why things are as they seem to be.”

Langer points out that this is one of the fundamental differences between philosophical and scientific questions. While philosophical inquiry focuses on the why, scientific inquiry focuses on truth as defined by empirical testing procedures.

Through the writings of Jorgensen, Stubley, Kneiter, Langer and Phelps, a framework of methodology can be devised for use in philosophical study. This study will be guided by an ontological question having to do with the nature of reality, which asks, “Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time?”

Clarification, analysis, and synthesis will be utilized in this study to connect ideas and examples across the disciplines of sociology, history, and education. The bases of the analysis will be foundational works from these disciplines, each addressing dialectical aspects of modernization and change. Examples will come from the works, as well as
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relevant literature in U.S. history, professional research journals, professional practice publications, conference proceedings, and historical documents. The construction of a cohesive theory, which offers a more comprehensive understanding of the problem, will then lead to implications for music teacher education. The organizational structure of this study resembles the structure of other philosophical studies in which the works of multiple scholars are analyzed, synthesized, and applied to new theory development.72

Delimitations

This study focuses solely on undergraduate music teacher education inasmuch as it can be isolated from the entirety of music education. Complete isolation is nearly impossible due to the circular nature of music education, in which preK-12 music education not only prepares students to enter music teacher education programs, but also is effected by music teacher education. Music teacher education is defined in this study as the process through which methods, curriculum and the organizational structure of institutions combine to prepare musicians at the undergraduate and graduate levels to teach preK-12 music. Calls for change and their resulting recommendations are found in formal declarations, policy statements, and general discourse of professional research journals, professional practice journals, and conference proceedings.

Foundational literature and dialectical examples from sociology, history, and education are drawn from the late 19th century to the present in order to highlight the

longevity and wide range of applicability. This varied perspective is then applied to music teacher education from the time of its formal inception at the beginning of the twentieth century.

This study does not aim to measure the *amount* of change and/or permanence in music teacher education per se; rather, it aims to analyze the *reason* for the persistent nature of calls for change, the similarity of calls over time, and the relative unchanging nature of music teacher education in the face of these calls. In order to achieve this analysis, examples and evidence of the unchanging nature of music teacher education will be identified, but the identification of these are not the object of this study. The unchanging nature of music teacher education is symptomatic of the phenomenon. The primary goal of this study is to identify the reason(s) *why* persistent, similar calls for change continue to exist over time.

**Outline of Study**

An analysis of three works provides the research context for this study. These works, from the disciplines of sociology, U.S. history, and education, were chosen for their foundational contributions along with their ability to demonstrate the dialectic of modernization in multiple settings. The analysis of professional research journals, professional practice publications, conference proceedings, and historical documents from the field of music teacher education offer further examples throughout the study. Implications to the field of music teacher education are revealed through examples within the discipline. Chapters two, three, and four of this study analyze examples of this
argument in sociology, U.S. history, and U.S. education. Each chapter begins with a foundational work in each of these disciplines that presents a view of the dialectic of modernization at work. In chapter two, Ferdinand Tönnies’ *Community and Society (Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft)* offers a sociological perspective of the forces of tradition and change. The construction of teacher identity is then examined within the context of this perspective, along with the professionalization of music educators. The theory of Gemeinschaft and Gesellchaft is used throughout the rest of the study as a basis for establishing dialectic. Chapter three examines *The Search for Order* by Robert Wiebe, a description of the process of modernization in U.S. history at the beginning of the 20th century. Wiebe’s work offers a springboard for examining the dialectic of modernization in U.S. history, including issues of race and its effect on the structures of housing and education. The dialectic is further discussed in music education and music teacher education, specifically in the areas and structures of curriculum and admission policies. John Dewey’s work, *Experience and Education*, brings in the perspective of U.S. education and is the basis for chapter four. It provides a framework for the discussion of purpose, specifically in higher education. Within each of these chapters, additional examples from the disciplines will further illustrate the dialectic of modernization. The analyses offered in each chapter will be cumulative, offering additional examples while incorporating previous ones in order to build a theory.

---


74 Robert Wiebe, *The Search for Order*.

Chapter five synthesizes the works of all three authors to form a completed theory. The entirety of sources and examples from within and without music education are considered fully to explain why music teacher education remains relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change. The study concludes with discussions of possible next steps to reconciling tradition and change with implications for music teacher education.
Chapter 2: Identity

Ferdinand Tönnies’ *Community and Society
(Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*

The first edition of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* was published in 1887. Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) wrote in a difficult, old German dialect and only a small circle of people read the book. Subsequent editions and translations, however, gained more and more attention, eventually earning an international reputation for Tönnies. Today, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (translated into English as *Community and Society*) “is one of the few classic treatises in sociology – a classic in both form and content.”\(^{76}\) It is recognized as exercising “considerable influence on the development of sociological and ethnological thought.”\(^{77}\)

*Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* has not been without criticism. Along with its old-fashioned Germanic style of writing, Tönnies’ concepts were thought by some to be

\(^{76}\) Rudolf Heberle, preface to *Community and Society*, by Ferdinand Tönnies, (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2002), x. Throughout this document, the original German terms of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft will be used. The English terms of community and society do not convey the depth of meaning found in the orginal terms.

too difficult and too large to be readily understood.\textsuperscript{78} He has also been accused of using the ideas of more prominent writers, such as Hobbes, Kant, Marx, and Nietzsche.\textsuperscript{79} Perhaps most pejorative are accusations of Tönnies being sexist, discriminatory, tied to an idyllic past and pessimistic about capitalistic modernity.\textsuperscript{80} Tönnies himself tried to refute these observations, stating that for him, “Gemeinshaft represented the youth, and Gesellschaft the adulthood, of society.”\textsuperscript{81} Christopher Adair-Toteff contends that Tönnies’ treatise is often misunderstood. He claims it really presents an “astute diagnosis of the modern age [leading] him to develop a blueprint of the future.”\textsuperscript{82}

The lasting contribution to sociology of \textit{Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft} has come primarily in its analysis of the “disorderly mass of human phenomena.”\textsuperscript{83} This is evident in the amount of research based on Tönnies’ concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Studies related to these concepts exist in the field of sociology, but also extend to disciplines beyond, especially education.\textsuperscript{84}


\textsuperscript{83} Blunt, untitled review, 1888.

\textsuperscript{84} For examples of such research, see: Stephen Vaisey, “The Search for Belonging in 50 Urban Communities,” \textit{American Sociological Review} 72, (2007); Steven Brint, “Gemeinschaft Revisited: A
In the discipline of music, musicological and ethnomusicological studies cite the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft in passing, as if they are part of a standard descriptive vocabulary. Music education, however, is largely devoid of any mention of Tönnies or his concepts. Paul A. Haack and George N. Heller applied the structures to their analysis of the history of music education in Kansas during the nineteenth century, but no other studies addressing Tönnies’ concepts have been found in the literature.

The entirety of studies concerning Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft both support and challenge the dichotomy presented by Tönnies. The fact, however, that his theory remains the subject of research well over a century after its introduction speaks to its “permeation of general theory” and his impact on sociological understanding.

Tönnies’ work is particularly fitting for this study because he “was adept at seeing things in opposition, but he was also at ease in reconciling elements that seem forever diametric.” This chapter will use Tönnies’ theory, interwoven with examples from various sources in music education, as a foundation for answering the question posed by


87 Vance, untitled review, 1942.

this study which asks, “What other examples of tradition and change can inform music education?”

The Concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft

Ferdinand Tönnies uses over forty different words and phrases to describe each of the terms Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Their English translation, community and society, offers only a glimpse into their meaning. To gain an understanding of the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, one must spend considerable time studying the writing of Tönnies. This chapter begins with a fundamental explanation in order to understand the theoretical bases of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Deeper analysis will follow to show the relationship of Tönnies’ theory to specific aspects of music teacher education.

Before examining each individually, it is helpful to compare Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft alongside each other. At the core, Gemeinschaft is natural, organic, and characterized by commonalities. Gesellschaft is artificial, mechanical, and individualistic. Gemeinschaft-like qualities can be found in families (mother/child and brother/sister relationships), villages, and communities, and is characterized by common possessions, common friends, and common beliefs. Properties of Gesellschaft are found in the highly regulated, doctrine-driven life of society, industry, and science. Its roots lie
in the “trading practices of medieval merchants, who took calculated risks to secure profit.”  

Tönnies offers this description as a summary of the concepts:

Two periods stand thus contrasted with each other in the history of the great systems of culture: a period of Gesellschaft follows a period of Gemeinschaft. The Gemeinschaft is characterized by the social will as concord, folkways, mores, and religion; the Gesellschaft by the social will as convention, legislation, and public opinion.

Further classification is offered by Tönnies in order to synthesize the entirety of his writing, as illustrated in the following figure (see figure 2).

---
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Of particular interest to this study is Tönnies’ attention to the arts. He states that art is “based upon memories,” but continues to clarify that these are memories “of instruction, of rules followed, and of ideas conceived in one’s own mind.” 92 Furthermore, he indicates, “Belief in the work and the task unites the artistic wills.” 93 These observations will play a key role in establishing the relationship between Tönnies’ theory and music teacher education later in the chapter.

The concepts of natural will (Wesenville) and rational will (Kürville) hold a significant role in the establishment of Tönnies’ Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Natural will is associated with Gemeinschaft and can “be understood as a real or natural,” or the “psychological equivalent of the human body.” 94 Rational will, however, is associated with Gesellschaft and is described as conceptual and artificial. It is “a product of thinking itself and consequently possesses reality only with reference to its author, the thinking individual.” 95 Both types of will are the impetus for human action. The difference lies in whether the action stems from knowledge of the past or prediction of the future. In other words, “Natural will can be explained only in terms of the past. … Rational will can be understood only from the future developments with which it is concerned.” 96

Tönnies explains these concepts extensively in his text. He furthers the readers’ understanding by offering deeper descriptions. He writes of natural will:

92 Ibid, 232.
93 Ibid, 232.
94 Ibid, 103.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid, 104.
[It] has to be understood as inborn and inherited. Through the mixture of paternal and maternal elements and through the particular nature of surrounding conditions, it obtains the principles from which it develops into a new and different form or at least into a form which certain modifications. Its development corresponds with every phase of physical development; the same amount of strength and unity that is found in the organism is also found in the natural will.  

In its simplest form, natural will can be understood as “the warm impulses of the heart.”

Today, these impulses are represented in expressions such as, “gut feeling,” “gut reaction,” and “gut response.” While these phrases move the impulse lower in the body, they still convey the organic characteristic of natural will.

Conversely, rational will is associated with the intellect of the brain. Tönnies describes it in the following way:

Thinking, however, establishes itself as the ruling power; it becomes the deity which gives motion to inert substance. Thus, it should be conceived as separate and free from the original will (from which it nevertheless originated), containing and manifesting will and wishes instead of being contained by them and manifest in them. A rational will can exist because the results of thinking with regard to future action can persist and acquire a seemingly independent existence, although they do not possess any reality except through the creating and conserving thought.

Adair offers further clarification, stating that natural will “represents the traditional and unchanging essence of the community.” He adds that rational will is the “modern
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individual’s will”, and that it is exerted in a “calculating” rather than “arbitrary” manner.\textsuperscript{101}

More recently, musician and author Stephen Nachmanovitch reiterates the very concepts of natural and rational will when he describes what he calls intuitive and reasoned knowledge. His depiction is very much like that of Tönnies:

Reasoned knowledge proceeds one step at a time, and the results of one step can, and often do, overturn the results of the previous step—hence, those moments when we think too much and can’t firmly decide what to do. Reasoned knowledge proceeds from information of which we’re consciously aware—only a partial sampling of our total knowledge. Intuitive knowledge, on the other hand, proceeds from everything we know and everything we are. It converges on the moment from a rich plurality of directions and sources—hence the feeling of absolute certainty that is traditionally associated with intuitive knowledge. … Feeling has its own structure, just as thinking has its own structure. …When we speak of “trusting your gut,” it is to this activity, intuition, that we are referring our decisions.\textsuperscript{102}

Natural and rational wills play a key role in the decision-making process. Teachers are often called upon to make immediate decisions, as well as those that unfold in the long-term. Both types of decisions are informed by knowledge of the past and prediction of the future—natural and rational will.

Tönnies’ concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, along with natural and rational will, offer a foundation on which to build this study. They speak to the origins of the struggle between tradition and change within modern society and present a

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid, 59-60.
framework to examine the effects of the phenomenon on music teacher education. The remainder of this chapter will establish parallels between Tönnies’ theory and the difficulty found in formulating a music teacher identity. In addition, professionalization will be discussed as a form of Gesellschaft. Both of these examples will begin to reveal the dialectic of modernization.

Identity Formation – The Role of the Home: Gemeinschaft

According to Tönnies, Gemeinschaft begins in the home. Relationships between mother and child, and brothers and sisters, represent a “Gemeinschaft of blood.” The bond between a mother and her child “is most deeply rooted in liking or in pure instinct.” It begins as a physical connection but develops into a psychological one as the child grows and moves toward physical separation. This separation can be “counterbalanced,” however, “through remembrance of the pleasures which they have given each other.”

Siblings forge a Gemeinschaft only in part through instinct. In this case, “the intellectual force of memory is the foremost in creating, conserving, and consolidating” the bond. The memories grown children hold of their mother often include their siblings. Tönnies observes, “For where children of the same mother, in living with her,
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are also living with each other, the reminiscences of each of them about pleasant impressions and experiences will necessarily include the persons and activities of their brothers or sisters.”¹⁰⁷ He goes on to say “the greatest possible similarity of nature and equality of strength may be expected among brothers [and sisters] even though differences in intelligence and experience, as a purely human or mental element, may easily be perceived.”¹⁰⁸

The suggestion that Gemeinshaft is first formed in the home is important to the formation of identity. For many individuals, music is clearly a central part of their identity. When music is a significant part of the early home life, the origin of this identity becomes clear. Many music education majors and “parents typically begin the processes of socialization toward music by encouraging and influencing a general interest in music”.¹⁰⁹ This early influence means “undergraduate music education majors are typically socialized as musicians when they are children, likely because most of them know music only through performing at that age.”¹¹⁰ In his research of preservice music teachers, Daniel Isbell, found that “family members were viewed as exerting the most positive influence” on the choice to study music education.¹¹¹ This supports Tönnies’ theory that the remembrance of pleasures in the home stays with a child as s/he matures and become an influencing factor in decision making. Isbell’s research, in fact, suggests

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.
¹⁰⁸ Ibid.
¹¹⁰ Isbell, “Musicians and Teachers,” 164.
that “the influence of all people and experiences” were positive for those choosing to pursue a career in music education. This encompasses people outside the family who often include school and private music teachers.¹¹²

The beliefs, customs, mores, and traditions established in the home become an expression of Gemeinschaft. When associated with music, they become part of the instruction and rules upon which the art is based. Tönnies describes customs and mores as “an often-repeated common activity, which, whatever its original meaning has become easy and natural through practice and tradition and is therefore considered necessary.”¹¹³ Therefore, when music is a common activity in the home, it becomes easy, natural and necessary in a person’s life outside the home.

When a child receives repeated positive messages about music from parents, siblings, teachers, and associated experiences, it is not difficult to imagine that s/he may choose it as a career. Several studies suggest that a primary reason for career choice in music education is a love of music, including sharing music through performance, listening, and creating.¹¹⁴ At its core, it is often a decision based on feeling and passion

¹¹³ Tönnies, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, 205-6.
for music. Tönnies defines passion as an impulse that is deep and important.\textsuperscript{115} Lori-Anne Dolloff describes the emotional response in this way:

It is hard to deny the powerful affect that we experience when we participate in intense, moving musical experiences. We would all agree that music and music making is ripe with emotional potential. This emotional connection to music … is often an important fact in why we came to music and music teaching in the first place.\textsuperscript{116}

This coincides with Marcone’s description of the reason people choose to enter a career in the arts. He writes,

They do not enter the arts for economic reasons. They do not enter because of the practicality of the field or for the daily material rewards. They enter because they are drawn by a desire and a feeling, because their need to be creative far exceeds their need for economic stability. True, some musical occupations offer more stability than others. Successful music educators, however, did not choose their field for stability and monetary satisfaction. Music is chosen for the excitement and the emotional rewards.\textsuperscript{117}

These feelings are echoed in the research of future music teacher’s first remembrances of wanting to be a teacher. Responses such as, “I was so excited and happy and proud at how amazing we sounded . . . and I was thinking that music was the greatest thing ever,” and “I had no doubt that whatever my life decision would be: it

\textsuperscript{115} Tönnies, \textit{Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft}, 117.
\textsuperscript{116} Lori-Anne Dolloff, “‘All the Things We Are’: Balancing our Multiple Identities in Music Teaching,” \textit{Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education} 6 (2007): http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Dolloff6_2.pdf
\textsuperscript{117} Marcone, “Choosing a Career in Music,” 36.
would have to involve music,” reflect the passion involved in the choice to study music.\textsuperscript{118}

These deep seeded feelings are an expression of one’s natural will. Natural will, as Tönnies describes it, “has to be understood as inborn and inherited.”\textsuperscript{119} Therefore, the choice to pursue music as a career is in large part a result of one’s past, which includes the home and the relationships therein. Music, according to Tönnies, is work that “belongs to the realm of natural will,” because it is not performed simply as a means to an end. In such, it “is an expression of Gemeinschaft.”\textsuperscript{120} Musical identity and Gemeinschaft, therefore, both originate in the home.

**Gemeinschaft: Being**

As a person matures and physically leaves the “Gemeinschaft of blood” found in the home, s/he often seeks to replace it with “Gemeinschaft of mind.”\textsuperscript{121} Gemeinschaft of mind “implies cooperation and coordinated action for a common goal” in a setting where “human beings are related through their wills in an organic manner and affirm each other.”\textsuperscript{122} Instead of the kinship formerly described, this type of friendship is “conditioned by and resulting from similarity of work and intellectual attitudes. It comes
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most easily into existence when crafts or callings are the same or of similar nature.”123

This is similar to the environment a future teacher finds in a school of music.

A collegiate school or department of music, where most music education programs are housed, contains students who likely share similar attitudes, beliefs, and passions about music. This type of community illustrates Gemeinschaft of mind. Tönnies writes, “The more the constitution and experience or natural disposition, character, and intellectual attitude are similar or harmonize, the more probable is understanding.”124

Tönnies includes language as another component of Gemeinschaft. Over time, many authors have argued that music is a language, either by strict definition or as metaphor.125 If this is accepted, it offers yet another characteristic of Gemeinschaft among musicians, for Tönnies states, “the real organ of understanding is language. [It] enables expressions of pain and pleasure, fear and desire, and all other feelings and emotions to be imparted and understood.”126

A school of music not only provides a community of like-mindedness, but a common locality. Brian Roberts describes this sense of community – both in space and mind – found among music education students:

123 Ibid, 43.
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Music education students typically view themselves as belonging to a specific social group on campus. Depending upon the particular university, they typically refer to themselves as “music students” and as belonging to the “Faculty”, “School” or “Department” of music. They display a sense of belonging, and group spirit. Most of their time is spent together as a group of music students and they share many of the same pressures and experiences, both academically and musically. … Music students appear to develop a strong sense of isolation from the rest of the campus and most seem to focus their attention on the social action within the music school; it appears to them as an “insider group.”

He continues,

Music education students frequently report that their life is totally encompassed within the music school building. While some leave the campus to sleep, and others merely go to their on-campus residences, they report almost universally the breakdown of the independence of “sleep, play and work” where they spend so much of their time at the music school with friends from only the music school and where “play” of the non-musical variety seems hardly possible except on rare occasions.

Therefore, as a result of experiences prior to and upon entering a school of music, future teachers have had occasion to be a part of all three forms of Gemeinschaft as described by Tönnies: (1) Gemeinschaft of blood (2) Gemeinschaft of mind, and (3) Gemeinschaft of locality.

These three forms offer the “real foundation of unity, and consequently the possibility of Gemeinschaft.” In them is “to be found the sources of all kinds of understanding.” This understanding, however, is built largely on a musician’s identity.

130 Ibid.
As cited earlier, many students enter colleges and universities having experienced the influence of parents and teachers in the formation of their identity as a musician. This musician socialization continues in the new community found in undergraduate studies. Research supports the idea that music education majors are socialized as musicians and performers. Roberts writes that students are already living the life of a musician in the music school – in fact, a music student is a musician. Wayne Bowman describes the unique identity of a musician in the following way:

At the center of all music making and musical experience lies a “we,” a sense of collective identity that powerfully influences individual identity. “I am,” then, not so much because “I think” or because “I perceive,” but because “we are,” and more particularly I want to assert here, because “we are, musically.”

In fact, the very act of being admitted to a school of music requires the student to be a musician. The admissions criteria in most schools of music require considerable proficiency on a traditional western instrument, playing traditional western music. This process allows for schools of music to act as “gatekeepers,” allowing those who qualify for the label of musician to enter.
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This identity is then perpetuated by the curriculum found in most music teacher education programs. “The balance of time on musician tasks compared to education tasks is very lopsided in favor of the musician.”\textsuperscript{133} Scheib states, that “For music education students in undergraduate music programs, greater emphasis is often placed on the formation and/or solidification of the musician/performer identity.”\textsuperscript{134} The imbalance of the preparatory curriculum and its long-standing nature was discussed in chapter one of this study in the comments of Wiley Housewright and Colleen Conway.\textsuperscript{135}

The topic was the subject of a dissertation dating back to 1937, in which Edna McEachern, of Teachers College, Columbia University, evaluated the education of school music teachers in the United States. In comparing approved curricula set forth by both the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), she found two primary differences. McEachern writes:

The chief difference between the two curricula lies in the relative amount of time given to music and non-music subjects. The curriculum sponsored by the National Association of Schools of Music gives more time to music and relatively less time to non-music subjects. The curriculum sponsored by the Music Educators National Conference gives more time to non-music subjects. As to the music subjects proposed by the two organizations, the Association appears to make somewhat greater provision for music content. This is evidenced by the amount of time given applied music and music theory electives. The Conference, on the other hand, appears to make greater provision for the professional aspects

\textsuperscript{135} This topic is also discussed further by Bowman, 2007; Dollof, 2007; Froelich, 2006; Roberts, 2004. It will be addressed further in chapters three and four.
of school music. This is evidenced by the amount of time given music methods and student teacher.\textsuperscript{136}

Today, the curriculum of most schools of music is designed to meet the requirements of NASM in order to receive accreditation. This will be discussed further in chapters three and four, but a review of the discourse concerning curriculum suggests many undergraduate teacher education programs continue to maintain the musician identity of students before developing the teacher identity.\textsuperscript{137} Music education is not alone in placing an emphasis on content knowledge. Today, many education degrees require future teachers to earn a bachelor’s degree in their discipline before beginning teacher preparation in a master’s program. Most music education programs, however, do not separate content and professional knowledge into two separate degrees. The key difference between music and other education degrees is that those entering another field of education do so to \textit{become} something – in this case, a teacher. While they may choose to teach social studies, most do not identify themselves as already being a historian. Those who enter music education, however, likely begin their undergraduate education labeling themselves as a musician or performer. They enter the program already \textit{being} something - a musician. This label only strengthens by the time they graduate.\textsuperscript{138}

Musician identity is certainly central to the preparation of a music teacher, but can cause many “preservice music teachers to have difficulty developing integrated identities that include elements of musician and educators.”

In terms of Tönnies’ theory, the Gemeinschaft of blood, Gemeinschaft of locality, and Gemeinschaft of mind are fully established by this time, making it difficult for a person to step into another identity. Tönnies notes, staying together in Gemeinschaft is a natural phenomenon, “while in every instance special reason has to be given for separation.” While future music teachers are not being asked to fully separate from their musician identity, they are being asked to step outside what they are, into what they might become. This can cause a crisis of identity.

**Gesellschaft: Becoming**

Due to the years spent in development, most undergraduates are comfortable claiming the musician identity for themselves. They understand the expectations, rules, beliefs, and customs that exist within the community. Most undergraduates are also very familiar with the role of music teachers. Their understanding, however, is likely limited to the models they have encountered in their formative years. Given the circular nature of music education, these models likely adhere to a “transmission model of teaching,”
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140 Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, 52.
where music teachers pass on their knowledge of and passion for music. This mode of teaching can be very effective in developing musicians and offers inspiration for students who want to become music teachers. It does not, however, in the instance of music, usually offer a *teacher* model. This is reflected in the small number of students who make their decision to become a music teacher solely based on a love of teaching children. As discussed earlier, most future music teachers are motivated by a love for music and a desire share it with others.

Consequently, “Preservice music teachers enter programs with definite beliefs about teaching, students, and subject matter. These beliefs are often deeply seated and traditional.” Gemeinshaft of mind, therefore, is not only established for one’s identity as a musician, but quite possibly as a music teacher. Thompson explains that all new experiences are filtered through previously held belief systems. This can lead to “replication of past or known practice rather than exploration of new possibilities.” For students in music teacher education, then, those parts of the curriculum that coincide with preexisting beliefs are usually accepted and those that are different or conflict are often dismissed. This system of development resembles what Paulo Freire calls “the

---

142 In this example, “teacher” refers to a traditional classroom teacher, in either and elementary or secondary setting. Models of this type allow students to observe common expectations, rules, beliefs, and customs of a typical (or notably inspiring) classroom teacher.
144 Thompson, “Considering Beliefs in Learning to Teach Music,” 32.
145 It is important to note that there are three identities being discussed at this point: (1) Musician, which has been clearly explained, (2) music teacher, which can be best described as a musician who passes on their knowledge and love of music, and (3) teacher, defined as a classroom teacher/general educator.
146 Ibid.
banking system” of education, in which students receive deposits of information from the teacher. This system is an effective way to pass on skills and trades, but it does not engender individual inquiry and praxis.\textsuperscript{147} As a result, the circularity of music education persists.

Gemeinschaft of mind, along with those of blood and locality, makes it difficult for undergraduates (and practicing teachers) to embrace a teacher identity for two reasons. The first has already been revealed as the deeply entrenched, organic self that is initially established in the home. Characterized by its beliefs, customs, and mores, this natural will is sustained and solidified by one’s association with other musicians outside the home. Undergraduates feel a strong sense of community, understanding, and concord among those who claim a musician/performer identity.

The second reason it is difficult for undergraduates to embrace a teacher identity is that many feel there is an either-or choice to be made. “Am I a musician?” or “Am I a teacher?” often become the questions future teachers ask themselves.\textsuperscript{148} In some cases, it can become “like a war, where the teaching self and the musician self battle it out for control over the person.”\textsuperscript{149} While this may seem extreme, the amount of discourse devoted to the musician/teacher identity struggle implies this is a crisis felt by many future and practicing teachers.\textsuperscript{150} Despite differing opinions regarding the severity of the

\textsuperscript{148} Dolloff, “‘All the Things We Are’: Balancing our Multiple Identities in Music Teaching,” 2007.
\textsuperscript{150} Examples of this topic can be found in: Pellegrino “Connections Between Performer and Teacher Identities in Music Teachers,” 2009; Cecilia A.R. Torres, “The Construction of Identity and Musical
struggle, divergence between the two identities is apparent. Otherwise, “there would be no point or validity to drawing a distinction between ‘musician’ and ‘music educator,’ or between ‘music specialist and ‘music education specialist.’”\textsuperscript{151} This decision, then, requires a person to choose between the known (musician), and the relatively unknown (teacher). Tönnies’ theory of Gemeinschaft explains the tie to the known. His theory of Gesellschaft, aides in understanding the difficulty one might have embracing the unknown.

A person may use terms such as natural, organic, and deep to describe his connection to music. Musicians are all tied to words such as feeling, experience, create, practice, habit, and art. These are all expressions of Gemeinschaft and natural will. Educator, however, brings to mind terms such as reason, enlightened, science, organization, and thinking. These characteristics of Gesellschaft and rational will, while valuable, can seem in direct opposition to those of musicians. Tönnies recognizes these two forms of will can coexist and mutually serve each other. He indicates, however,

To the extent each aspires to power and control, they will necessarily contradict and oppose each other even though their separate component as expressed in norms and rules of behavior are comparable. If rational will desires to order and define everything according to end, purpose or utility, it has to overcome the given, traditional, deeply rooted rules in so far as they cannot be applied to such purposes, or to subordinate them if possible. The more decisive rational will or purposeful thinking becomes and concentrates the knowledge, acquisition, and application of means, the

\textsuperscript{151} Bowman, “Who is the ‘We’?” Rethinking Professionalism in Music Education,” 2007: 114.
more the emotions and thoughts which form the individuality of natural will are in danger of withering away. And not only this, but there is also a direct antagonism, because the forms of natural will try to repress rational will and oppose its rule and domination, whereas rational will tries first to free itself from natural will and then to dissolve, destroy, or dominate it.152

According to this explanation, then, a person struggling between the musician and teacher identity may feel that in order to become a teacher (and accept its beliefs, customs and mores), s/he must give up being a musician (and its beliefs, customs, and mores). Thus, dialectic is created - a struggle between two elements. In this case, the two elements are the musician identity, which is based on tradition, and the teacher identity, which represents change.

The discourse found in professional journals reflects the difficulty many people experience when attempting to meld the two sides of this dialectic. Eunice Boardman observes,

We must … be willing to discard familiar practices, search for new processes, and consider implications of new information. In other words, we must be brave enough to continue to alter, expand, and refine our personal teaching schema. This is difficult to do; it is difficult to admit, even to oneself, that previously held assumptions may no longer be valid.153

152 Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, 141-142.
Campbell and Brummett reiterate the need for bravery when they call for a willingness to “step out of the safety that has worked in the past.” In effect, these authors are suggesting that stepping into a teaching identity will be difficult, requiring bravery and a willingness to forego safety. One must leave behind what is known, familiar, and natural – Gemeinschaft – to enter an unknown world – Gesellschaft.

Tönnies describes the same process as a person’s rational will tries to establish opinions based on scientific evidence by abandoning the beliefs of his community. Society says acting “according to clearly understood reason” instead of “blind and stupid feelings” is a sign of maturity and wisdom. Examples of these contrasting motivations can be seen in the old and young, scholars and rural simplicity, the poet and the merchant. If they are always seen as dualities where one must be chosen over the other, as Gemeinschaft or Gesellschaft, “the tragic conflict necessarily evolves.”

When faced with the dialectic of tradition and change, future and practicing teachers can become caught between two worlds, neither of which they are fully accepted into. In declaring one’s self a (future) music teacher, one in effect leaves the Gemeinschaft of performing musicians. This declaration does not, however, automatically admit a person to the community of teachers. A music teacher, therefore, is neither wholly a musician nor wholly a teacher. While, s/he may self-identity as one or the other, s/he is not fully a part of either group.

155 Tönnies, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, 159.
156 Tönnies, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, 162.
Mixed messages in favor or opposition to one identity over the other come from family, friends, peer groups, and educational personnel. Roberts’ research of music education majors in Canada suggests that students in music education hold a less prestigious position than performance majors. Dolloff voices the messages received when she writes,

Society has already informed our incoming music teacher education students that there is something different about being a teacher of music. In fact many of us can relate stories of being ostracized by colleagues, not taken seriously by administrators, not included in the “academic” parts of school. Some of us may have even seen ourselves as “different” from teachers of other subjects.

While schools (places of employment) offer support for the teacher identity after graduation, new music teachers can find it difficult to situate him or herself into the role of a teacher who can accept the support. A new teacher must decide whether to transform herself into a teacher (as defined by the school) or refer to the models who inspired her, likely parents and private or public school music teachers. The result of this decision is often a reliance on one’s musician identity. Since this has been a source of acknowledgement in the past, it may continue in this new setting. Linda MacArthur supports this when she writes that “A musician may therefore define him or herself by how well he/she achieves and these experiences then carry over into one’s identity as a

---

159 Dolloff, “‘All the Things We Are’: Balancing our Multiple Identities in Music Teaching,” 16.
This mindset is possibly a contributing factor to the great amounts of time and effort many music teachers spend preparing students for public performances. Timothy Gerber gives evidence of this tendency and its effect on school music programs when he describes “teachers who so despise [teaching general music] that they have converted their general music classes into choruses.” According to Gerber, “few undergraduate music education majors sincerely want to become middle school teachers: they usually aspire to the more glamorous, prestigious positions of conducting a high school band, choir, or orchestra.” Leading ensembles serves to sustain their musician identity and validates their place in the school community. Roberts explains this tendency to choose known forms of affirmation when trying to confirm one’s identity: “An identity is very hard and frustrating to support without the ratification of others. Identities sought but not supported can lead people into considerable personal distress.” In order to avoid this personal distress, music teachers seek to confirm their competency through what has already been proven to be an area of strength – their musicianship. Musicians have been rewarded emotionally for who they are, so they continue to seek to strengthen their identity through performance (or the performance of their students.).

---

163 Ibid, 37.
164 Doloff, “‘All the Things We Are’: Balancing our Multiple Identities in Music Teaching,” 2007.
Psychologists Edward Deci and Richard Ryan affirm this phenomenon in their theory of self-determination. They propose that competence is one of three human needs necessary for effective functioning and psychological well being.\(^{165}\) Therefore, music teachers seek to maintain their self—psychologically, professionally, and musically—by affirming their competence as a musician. Charles Dennis describes this tendency in 1949 that still occurs today. He writes:

> In us the musician has almost invariably overshadowed the educator. Prestige, good salaries, favorable school conditions have come to those able to take groups of youngsters and mold them into playing and singing groups which challenge comparison with professional organizations. Emulation on the part of many others has been inevitable, projects have been organized to further stimulate professional standards, while community pride has often dictated the trend of local musical development toward the “thrill” classification. Many school administrators, avid for good public relations and sensitive to their own tenure, have given impetus to the movement. This phenomenon has given all of us reason for pride—these are our boys and girls! The most talented of them enter colleges where, even though music heads frequently speak disparagingly of their preparation, they make possible symphonic, choral, and concert organizations undreamed of in many of these same schools twenty-five years ago, and also become units in marching bands, whose maneuvering at football games send the crowds into ecstasies. They graduate, go into music education, tighten the performance standard another notch, and the spiral continues upward.\(^{166}\)

When sustaining the role of a musician can bring so much success and recognition, what need is there to embrace the role of a teacher?


While music teachers may assume the *role and duties* of a teacher, it is likely not who they consider themselves to be.\textsuperscript{167} The musician identity has been established and embedded. In effect, a lifetime has been spent becoming and being a musician, living a life of Gemeinschaft among family, friends and musicians. In most music teacher education programs, two years are spent preparing to teach music. Upon graduation, new music teachers must enter the Gesellschaft of society, playing the role of a teacher. A school system very likely chooses a music teacher based on their musicianship, however, they are “not equipped in any real sense to support it in the socially constructed ways [s/he] have become used to.”\textsuperscript{168} Teachers are expected to make rational decisions, based on reason, science, and educational theory. Musicians are known for adhering to their feelings and the calling of their art. Therefore, music teachers feel the pull of musician and teacher, nature and reason, known and unknown, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft.

**Professionalization: A Bridge to Gesellschaft?**

In chapter one, a brief history of music teacher education was presented. When music education first appeared in public schools, the teachers were self-taught, or received training in itinerant singing schools or publisher-sponsored summer schools. At the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, normal schools began formal programs of teacher education for classroom teachers (who were also trained to teach music). The music education from public schools, the teachers were self-taught, or received training in itinerant singing schools or publisher-sponsored summer schools. At the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, normal schools began formal programs of teacher education for classroom teachers (who were also trained to teach music). The music education professionalization is a bridge to Gesellschaft.

\textsuperscript{167} Dolloff, “‘All the Things We Are’: Balancing our Multiple Identities in Music Teaching,” 2007.
supervisor role was born to oversee the delivery of music education by classroom teachers in large school systems. This shift reflects larger changes that were going on in the United States during the same time. The late 1800’s and early 1900’s were a period of industrialization in the U.S. and much of the world. Chapter three of this study will discuss the results of these changes in depth, but one outcome of the industrial revolution was the need to create formalized structures for the recognition and development of professional competency. Professionalization became a means for distinguishing who was properly prepared and capable of performing jobs from those who merely claimed competence. Professionalization became a source of social organization and structure in a changing world. Specific structures offered labels and acknowledged the identities to those who belonged.

It is worth noting here that the process of professionalization and professions have been in place since at least the fifteenth century, when they referred only to the occupations of divinity, law, medicine, and occasionally the military. Not until the industrial revolution of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did professionalization became a widely used social structure. Debate remains as to which occupations truly meet the criteria of a profession. It is not the intention of this study
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169 The term “trained” is used here to signify that these teachers were trained to use specific activities and methods to deliver music instruction, as opposed to music educators, who are prepared to teach music in its entirety to students.


to contribute or comment on such a debate. Professionalization is pertinent to this discussion when it is understood in its prescriptive form – “a means of achieving some desired state [which is] used by individuals as a token of their own self-esteem [and] by occupational elites as they seek to improve pay, status and conditions.” This was the primary intention of those who used it during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Professional organizations were a means of achieving legitimacy for specific occupations and those who were recognized as competent. Professionalization, then, offers an avenue for music teachers to establish a legitimate, unique identity separate from performing musicians and general teachers.

This definition and purpose reveals the motivation behind the professionalization of music teachers. Professional organizations for music teachers and supervisors came into being in 1876 with the establishment of the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA). This was the same time period that organizations for teachers were taking root, lead by educators such as Horace Mann, T.W. Valentine and D.B. Hagar. While the MTNA was not successfully maintained as an active organization, music teachers, and later music supervisors, were not content to go unrecognized among professionals. The Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC) grew out of the music division of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1906. The words of Frances Elliott Clark, the first president of the MSNC, epitomize the desire for professionalization to remedy a

---


crisis of identity. She states, “We music supervisors were in an anomalous situation. We were not accepted as ‘musicians’ by the professionals, nor as ‘educators’ by the intellectuals. We stood on the doorstep, as it were, of both houses.” In the birth of MSNC, she states, “We had made our Job a Profession.”\textsuperscript{174} This organization still exists today as the Music Educators National Conference (MENC).\textsuperscript{175}

Globally speaking, the professionalization of music educators was, and still is, an attempt to be recognized as competent professionals who perform a service to society. It offers a platform on which to display “specialized knowledge and often long and intensive preparation including instruction in skills and methods.”\textsuperscript{176} It creates a space for music teachers within the Gesellschaft of society.

Within music education, music teacher educators sought even more specialized professionalization within MENC. In 1984, The Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE) became an official structure within the MENC. Just as professionalization legitimizes professions within society, SMTE was formed to recognize music teacher educators within MENC. The founding members of SMTE felt they had become “pawns in the political and academic chess game which teacher education and certification [had] become.”\textsuperscript{177} In remarks to those who later voted unanimously to establish SMTE, Charles Leonhard stated that he believed such an organizational structure would be “the most promising route to influence,” and “would give . . . us official status within the

\textsuperscript{175} Mark and Gary, \textit{A History of American Music Education}.
\textsuperscript{176} Freidson, \textit{Professional Powers}, 25.
MENC.” He goes on to state it would enable music teacher educators “to speak with an influential collective voice to [their] own departments and schools of music, to NASM, to NCATE, to certification boards, and to state departments of education.”\textsuperscript{178} Leonhard and those who formed SMTE sought to be recognized as competent professionals among other professionals, where their specialized knowledge and long and intensive preparation would be recognized.

In this way, professionalization creates a space within a space. The Gemeinschaft associated with the musician’s identity is able to live on within the Gesellschaft of society. In the case of MENC, the structure of the organization offers a means of achieving legitimacy, status, and advocacy. It serves to engage music education and music educators with society at large, supports research, and aims to represent high standards for music education. Its formation was the result of reasoned thinking and “united, rational wills.”\textsuperscript{179} MENC itself is a representation of Gesellschaft. It carves a place for music educators within organized society. SMTE creates a structure for music teacher educators within MENC.

Consequently, Gemeinschaft lives on, for musicians, and subsets of musicians. The following categories represent the varied interests of those who populate the professional organization: band, chorus, future teachers, general music, higher education, administration, research, jazz, and orchestra.\textsuperscript{180} One could argue each of these groups

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{179} Tönnies, \textit{Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft}, 177.
\textsuperscript{180} Music Educators National Conference, http://www.menc.org
represent a space, within a space (MENC), within a space (society). This mirrors Tönnies’ description of the development of Gemeinschaft, in which the growth of a large group results in its separation into smaller groups. The large group, however, “can still exert influence and act through its representative members.”\footnote{Tönnies, \textit{Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft}, 52.} He goes on to describe the best and worst case scenarios of such a large group. This lengthy quote is relevant, as it closely describes the structure and struggles of MENC.

If we, therefore, assume a scheme of development with lines radiating from a center into different directions, that center itself represents the unity of the whole. The whole, as will, is related to itself, and such will must, therefore, be present in that center in an eminent way. But new centers come into existence at points along the radii. The more energy they need to expand into this periphery and to maintain themselves, the more they will drain away from the former center. Consequently, this will necessarily become weaker and less able to exert influence in other directions, unless it can in turn derive energy from some original center.

If however, unity is maintained, and each secondary center of separate identity maintains a primary center,

They are, ideally, always present in the center from which they derive. Therefore, they fulfill their natural distinction or calling if they approach it corporally and assemble in one place. That will be necessary if circumstances demand concerted action for mutual aid within or without. Therein lies a power and authority which extends, by whatever means, over life and limb of all.\footnote{Tönnies, \textit{Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft}, 52.}

The center, in this instance is MENC, and it represents the whole (in theory) of music educators. New centers, or subgroups, have come into existence over time. These
subgroups have individual leadership, goals, and agendas. At times, they have lost sight of the whole (MENC) or felt unrepresented and splintered off, draining energy from the center. Ideally, however, they retain the mission and calling of the center and assemble in one place (state and national conferences.) This allows for a strengthening of purpose and professional status in order to better advocate for the whole. Organizationally, this is the purpose of such a professional structure.

Within the structure, however, exists a community of musicians. It is in this community that music teachers connect again with those who share common customs, beliefs, and values. It is in this community that Gemeinschaft of mind exists again. If one compares the professional discourse in a music teacher’s professional practice journal with the discourse in a journal published for general educators, the difference between concerns of music educators and general teachers becomes apparent. A brief survey reveals the divergent topics. Figure 3 lists topics derived from the articles published in one school year of representative publications from each profession.

These lists, while offering only a glimpse into the professions, illustrate the difference in concerns, interests, and values among music teachers and general teachers. Note: it is not that music teachers are un Concerned with such topics as social responsibility and student excellence. Their daily responsibilities and needs cause them to be more concerned with topics such as rehearsal methods and curriculum. A music teacher’s position within a school causes her to be aware of teacher concerns, but her identity causes her to gravitate toward musical concerns.
Ultimately, when faced with the question of who they are, most music teachers answer according to their musician identity, their Gemeinschaft. Professionalization allows an entry into the world of general education, society as a whole, and Gesellschaft. Professionalization also allows for an oasis within this setting. It is as if musicians can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Educators Journal, 2008-09, published by MENC</th>
<th>Educational Leadership, 2008-09, published by Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural music/world music</td>
<td>• Teaching social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audiation</td>
<td>• Teacher learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The changing voice</td>
<td>• Supporting English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating a gospel choir</td>
<td>• Student literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chamber/Orchestra rehearsal strategies</td>
<td>• How teachers learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using practice charts</td>
<td>• Data collection and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Podcasting</td>
<td>• Student ownership of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elem./Sec. General music curriculum</td>
<td>• Expecting excellence in learning and teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment in the music classroom</td>
<td>• The positive classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minority students &amp; faculty in higher education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. Journal Topics**
stay huddled together, sharing in their Gemeinschaft, while they move into the world, all the while protected by the hedge of professional structure, MENC. This action permits music teachers to hold onto the traditions associated with their Gemeinschaft while existing within a structure of progressive, modern, changing times.

Summary

Ferdinand Tönnies’ *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* is recognized as a classic treatise in the discipline of sociology. It serves as the foundation for this chapter and will inform much of the analysis throughout this study.

Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft represent two contrasting facets of being. Gemeinschaft is natural, organic and characterized by commonalities, while Gesellschaft is artificial, mechanical and individualistic. Families, villages, and communities are representative of Gemeinschaft-like qualities. Gesellschaft-like qualities are found in the highly regulated, doctrine-driven life of society, industry and science. Natural and rational will represent the motivation behind each entity.

Gemeinschaft begins in the home, primarily through mother-child and sibling relationships. This is also purported to be the first source of musical socialization. Therefore, if music is valued in the home, it is part of the beliefs, customs, and traditions of the Gemeinschaft of the home. When these positive memories and experiences accompany participation in music, musical identity begins its formation.
If the feelings associated with musical identity are strong enough, one may choose to pursue a career in music. This often begins with admittance to a school of music, which requires a student to already be, at least to a certain degree, a musician. In such a program, music students live the life of a musician, participating in Gemeinschaft of the mind and Gemeinschaft of locality.

A music student chooses a career in music education may feel torn between his musician identity (what he is) and the identity of a teacher (what he may become). Dialectic is experienced for the first time, as tension between the two identities is felt. Often, a music teacher will choose as his primary influence the musician self, as seen in the propensity for performing and leading student performances.

Professionalization provides a means by which music teachers can enter society, or Gesellschaft. It also gives a platform to legitimize the preparation and expertise required of those in the profession. Within the structures of professionalization, in this case MENC, members may find an oasis of Gemeinschaft.

Preservice music teachers have a highly developed sense of Gemeinschaft, primarily associated with musician identity. This is challenged and dialectic is created when faced with acquiring a teacher identity, which seems to require leaving the safety of the known to venture into the unknown. Thus, from the outset, tradition and change seemingly stand in opposition to each other.
Chapter 3: Structure

Robert Wiebe’s *The Search for Order*

At the time of its publication, Robert Wiebe’s *The Search for Order* was recognized for its “conceptual reorientation” of modern American history.\(^{183}\) While some reviews heralded it as “the best book now in print on the history of the United States from Reconstruction through World War I”, others found fault with his analysis, calling it “too pat” and smooth in supporting his theme.\(^{184}\) Regardless of the degree to which readers agreed with Wiebe, most believed the book deserved “high praise and respectful attention.”\(^{185}\)

The book is chosen as a foundational work for this study because of its clear description of modernization and its parallels with Tönnie’s *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. While the work of Tönnies established dialectic, Wiebe establishes dialectic in modernization. This chapter will describe Wiebe’s narrative and analyze his exposition of the dialectic of modernization. In addition, in depth examples will be


\(^{185}\) Geiger, 400.
offered of the dialectic in modern U.S. history, specifically in the area of civil rights, which includes issues of housing and education. The length and depth of discussion on housing and education is necessary to fully understand the modern structures of each and the traditions that persist within. Finally, examples of the dialectic of modernization will be exposed in music education and music teacher education. The totality of these instances offer insight into the persistence of tradition in the face of change and the unchanging nature of music teacher education.

Wiebe’s book tells a historical narrative of the years following the American Civil War up to the conclusion of World War I in 1920. This was a period of great change in American society. After a period of relative stability in the social structures of American society, modernization was sweeping across the country. This revolution resulted in the breakdown of the homogeneous island communities that had been the backbone of the American social structure. These communities and their dissolution are at the core of Wiebe’s narrative. They operated on trust and clearly defined roles. Everyone had a part to play – farmers, wives and mothers, children, teachers, bankers, small business owners, doctors, clergy. Neighbors had similar values and goals. They celebrated the same holidays and suffered trials together. They lived in the truest sense of community. They lived in what Tönnies describes as Gemeinschaft.

Modernization interrupted these communities, however, in the form of international markets, national credit systems, and railroads. Additionally, mass
migration from within and without the borders of the U.S. was changing the population centers of the country from rural to urban concentration. As a result of these changes, a sense of chaos wracked the social structures of American society. This can be seen in the brutal treatment of striking mineworkers, newly freed African-Americans in the south, and the events and results of the Chicago Haymarket riot of 1886. Of course, all Americans were not involved in such overt forms of chaos. Nevertheless, an overriding feeling of “dislocation and bewilderment” seemed to grip the collective psyche of American citizens.\(^\text{186}\) He depicts the general state of the country in the following way:

America in the late nineteenth century was a society without a core. It lacked those national centers of authority and information which might have given order to such swift changes. American institutions were still oriented toward a community life where family and church, education and press, professions and government, all largely found their meaning by the way they fit one with another inside a town or a detached portion of a city. As men ranged farther and farther from their communities, they tried desperately to understand the large world in terms of their small, familiar environment. They tried, in other words, to impose the known upon the unknown, to master an impersonal world through the customs of a personal society. They failed, usually without recognizing why; and that failure to comprehend a society they were helping to make contained the essence of the nation’s story.\(^\text{187}\)

This description of life in American mirrors the dialectic set forth in chapter two. The life that was known in community was being challenged by the unknown life of an impersonal world. Wiebe is describing Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft and the struggle to reconcile the two. According to Wiebe, Americans were unsuccessful in their initial

\(^{186}\) Weibe, 12.
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attempts to establish Gemeinschaft in the impersonal society of Gesellschaft. The desire
to live a life without chaos lead American citizens to embark on a search for order. In
Wiebe’s narrative, this search leads to the establishment of structures of Gesellschaft.

The characteristics of modernized order, as described by Wiebe, include
bureaucracy, reason, rational, realism, thinking, scientific, and calculating. These terms
appear and reappear throughout The Search for Order and are the very terms Tönnies
uses to describe the characteristics of Gesellschaft. “The new middle class,” comprised
of businessmen and new professionals adopted these characteristics as tools for
establishing order in chaos. The end product was structures, meant to bring order in the
midst of the change of modernization. Mentioned earlier, these included international
markets, national credit systems, and railroads. In addition, professional organizations,
labor unions, bureaucratic systems of governing, and progressive social movements
provided a framework for achieving order.

According to Wiebe, some Americans believed that the establishment and full-
implementation of these structures would result in order. Wiebe’s writing, however,
present an argument “that the end result of order is not a better standard of living. Nor is
it freedom or democracy. There is no discussion of a new kind of fraternity or of a
refigured, national community. … The story for Wiebe is bureaucratic rationality, pure
and simple.”188
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Wiebe does, however, seem to suggest that a diametric choice was at hand—modernization or convention—change or tradition – Gesellschaft or Gemeinschaft. Historian Kenneth Cmiel provides this analysis of Wiebe’s opinion of the choice:

“Idealism” and “realism” were terms that Wiebe himself used constantly, and idealism, he claimed, had to adjust to mass, industrial society. Wiebe argued that all sorts of groups committed to small-town mores were out of touch, unable to grasp the emerging urban-industrial order. Only by breaking through such “idealistic” thinking could a more “realistic” approach surface. And realism was bureaucracy.189

This either-or approach to decision making is the same approach that created dialectic in chapter two. Music teachers often feel as if they must choose between musician (representing tradition) and teacher (representing change). Wiebe’s narrative places Americans in a similar dialectic – facing the tension between tradition and change, represented in the above quote as idealism and realism. Modernization and change are inseparable. “No matter how defined, modernization necessarily involves and experience of social change for the modernizing population. People must change their personality and/or their occupation and/or their values and/or their loyalties.”190 This unavoidable change, however, does not lessen ties to tradition. The dialectic of modernization, then, is defined as the tension between tradition and change, which is experienced in modern, changing society.

On the surface, it would appear that the chaos associated with the early twentieth century was largely put to rest by laws, regulations, and government programs,
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particularly in the areas of labor and race. Such an observation would suggest Americans were successful in their search for order and achieved meaningful change. Further inspection, however, reveals that the pull of Gemeinschaft and tradition are still strong. As discussed earlier, professionalization created a structure in which music educators could enter into Gesellschaft, but it also provided a counter structure for the Gemeinschaft associated with its members’ musician identities. In the same manner, other structures of Gesellschaft contain counter structures of Gemeinschaft, which work to undermine the order they were put in place to establish. Examples will be illustrated in this chapter to demonstrate that the response to changes brought about by Gesellschaft and modernization is often dictated by the traditions, values, and beliefs of Gemeinschaft, thus creating dialectic. This dialectic will be examined in American housing and education, along with music teacher education. In order to understand fully the dialectic, it is necessary to explore the traditions that existed prior to the changes of modernization. The analysis of these examples will aid in understanding of the phenomenon in music teacher education.

Race, Housing, and Education in the United States

A discussion of race in the United States may seem out of place in a study of this nature. However, while many different traditions exist within communities across the U.S., values and beliefs associated with race have proven to be a constant influence on peoples’ response to change. For this reason, it is of prime importance in the
understanding of structures, their success, and the traditions that either support or undermine their effectiveness. Music education and music teacher education, as they pertain to this study, are a product of American society and its history. They are to some degree a reflection of the attitudes, values, and traditions of at least a portion of the population - in a sense, an end. In order to understand and evaluate the end product, it is necessary to understand the means by which it was formed. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the attitudes, values, and traditions of the society that created music teacher education as it exists today.

Race, and to a lesser degree ethnicity, are key components of American society and have been since its inception. The civil war and Emancipation Proclamation brought the issue of race to the forefront in the nineteenth century, centering in the south. The twentieth century brought with it Jim Crow laws and lynching, Freedom Riders and bus boycotts – again focusing issues of race in the south. Historian Jacquelyn Dowd Hall observes that the “dominant narrative” of the civil rights struggle “begins with the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, proceeds through public protests, and culminates with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.”¹⁹¹ The focus of the civil rights narrative may last for only eleven years, but for the one hundred years between the civil war to the voting rights act, race has been an issue of the south. This ongoing struggle and the lasting attitudes are what Dowd Hall refers to as the “long civil rights movement.”

The racial politics of the south were often as clear as the “white only” and “colored” signs that hung over the water fountains. In contrast, northern states seemed to be immune from such racism. It was, after all, the home of Paradise Valley, a neighborhood on the Lower East side of Detroit that became the home of much of Detroit’s growing black population in the first half of the twentieth century – a population that multiplied thirty times between 1910 and 1940 as a result of the Great Migration.192

The migrants who named Paradise Valley likely recognized both the hope and irony it represented. The north was not the land of opportunity they had hoped it would be, but it offered enough promise that “black newcomers continued to arrive in the wartime and postwar eras with high expectations.”193 What was the crux of these high expectations? For many it was the availability of jobs. Employment brought with it the promise of steady income, a home, and education for their children. Unlike the south, which lacked industry, northern states seemed to embrace all aspects of modernization, including new structures to address race relations and bring order to a changing landscape. These structures brought with them “hope that significant change was possible – that a combination of civil rights legislation, education and dialogue between whites and blacks, and an overall climate of prosperity would calm racial tensions and eventually eliminate racial divisions.”194
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Structures, however, are the exoskeleton of society. They do not necessarily reflect the beliefs and values of the entire population. As Tönnies observed, Gesellschaft and its structures are constructed with reason and calculated thinking. Gemeinschaft is formed as a part of the natural organism. Therefore, a change in structure does not necessarily change the natural organism. This is reflected in Wiebe’s narrative: as the country modernized and changed, structures of Gesellschaft were put in place to create order, but the natural, organic desires of people did not change.

Barbara Fields supports this when she writes that race is constructed as an ideology on the basis of social and historical references (as opposed to class, which is based on tangible items of ownership).195 She goes on to explain why beliefs remain in place even in the midst of change. Fields writes:

Ideas live only in the minds of men and women and cannot escape the contagion, so to speak, of the material world these men and women inhabit. They seem to have a life of their own in that, providing a ready-made vocabulary for the interpretation of new experience, they subtly (and sometimes grossly) prejudge the content of the interpretation. But new experience constantly exerts a reciprocal influence. A vocabulary stays alive only to the degree that it names things people know. … There would be no great problem, if, when the things changes, the vocabulary died away as well. But far the more common situation in the history of ideologies is that instead of dying, the same vocabulary attaches itself, unnoticed, to new things. It is not that ideas have a life of their own, but rather that they have a boundless facility for usurping the lives of men and women.196
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Thus, race is constructed in the same manner as some aspects of Gemeinschaft, through memories of instruction, rules followed, and ideas conceived in one’s own mind. While race is certainly formed in Gemeinschaft of blood, it is often most evident in Gemeinschaft of mind and locality. The influence of friends, family, and location cannot be discounted. One person’s idea of another person (or group of people) is largely constructed by the social context within which the two experience each other – either directly or indirectly. While chapter two’s discussion of Gemeinschaft focused on the positive memories which aid in the formation of a musician’s identity, it is just as likely that negative memories could instill negative attitudes toward any number of targets, including people of differing races, thus creating traditions of practice.

Author and historian David Roediger recounts such an occasion from his youth when he writes about growing up in Cairo, Illinois. While his upbringing was not wrought with overt racism or even the presence of blacks, his childhood was filled with countless references to race, leaving no doubt that those around him believed blacks to be inferior. He believes, that were it not for the contradictory encounters he experienced, his attitudes and beliefs would still resemble those of his relatives and former classmates. Roediger’s work centers on race in the workplace, but his insights apply to race in all of American society. He writes that his early years taught him about “The role of race in defining how white workers look not only at Blacks but at themselves, the pervasiveness
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of race, the complex mixture of hate, sadness and longing in the racist thought of white workers, [and] the relationship between race and ethnicity.”

Thomas Sugrue documents this same tendency in his book, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis*. He writes of an assignment given to children at the all-white Van Dyke School in northeast Detroit in the mid-1940’s. Sixth grade students were asked to write essays on “Why I like or don’t like Negroes.” One child wrote a list of reasons reflecting many of the sentiments expressed in the essays. Contained in the list were reasons such as blacks “are mean…not very clean…they don’t like white people…they leave garbage in the yard…and they start riots.” These children were not raised in the midst of Jim Crow laws or civil rights demonstrations. Sugrue, however, highlights the source of their attitudes as family and friends – the same source of Gemeinschaft associated with the positive attitudes toward music discussed in chapter two. He writes, “Most of the students at the Van Dyke School had never lived near a black person. Few spoke from experience. But the children, fearful of the prospect of blacks as neighbors, expressed attitudes that they had heard again and again from their parents and friends.”

As mentioned, structures of Gesellschaft often contain counter structures of Gemeinschaft. Structures serve a purpose, as in the case of this study, to offer order or entre into a changing society. Structures, however, do not necessarily change the attitudes, values, and traditions of those who populate them. Even in the midst of an

---
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industrial revolution and an obvious need to adapt to changing times, Wiebe writes, “men in confusion clutched what they knew.”

Values, attitudes and traditions – Gemeinschaft – are deeply rooted and often dictate one’s response to the changes of modernization.

Court decisions and legislation have often been instrumental in providing structural changes in public education in the United States. Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954) addressed school segregation in every geographic area of the country. This case, along with others, addressed school bussing and funding and aimed to end traditions that allowed segregation to persist.

The intention to overcome traditions that produce inequities cannot be discounted. Upon close examination, however, they are just as remarkable for the change they did not achieve. Tradition is still de rigueur in many cities and communities throughout the country and many of these traditions are upheld with counter structures. Cities such as New York, Chicago, Boston, and Detroit continue to suffer from the inequities Brown and the Civil Rights Act intended to overcome.

Access to education is largely determined by housing. Access to housing is in turn largely determined by income, which is determined by employment. Therefore,
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education is linked to traditional housing patterns that were established at the start of urbanization in the early twentieth century. These patterns were determined by race and ethnicity throughout the century, despite the modernization of society. Restrictions in the housing market by realtors, homeowners, developers, and loan programs such as FHA and VA largely blocked access to black families. The suburbanization of America and the accompanying changes was primarily only for those who had access to employment and income. If one was denied access to suburban housing, one was also denied access to employment, income, and education. This proved to be devastating to those living in decaying urban cities.  

The results of these traditions are still evident today. Statistics show that “schools…in the Bronx are no less segregated now, while thousands of other schools that had been integrated either voluntarily or by the force of law have been rapidly resegregating both in northern districts and in broad expanses of the South.”

When suburban districts are compared to major cities, there is persisting evidence of dual systems within states, both in terms of race and economics. In Chicago, for instance, per pupil spending for the 2002-2003 school year was $8,482. In comparison, suburban district Highland Park/Deerfield spent $17,291 per pupil – more than twice the


amount of Chicago. The ethnic composition of the districts was just as lopsided. Highland Park/Deerfield consisted of 10% black and Hispanic, 90% white and others. Chicago schools had only 13% white and others, 87% black and Hispanic.\textsuperscript{207} These statistics suggest that traditions of housing and education still dictate the national landscape today, even in the face of mandated change.

Overt racism aside, these traditions run deep. The Gemeinschaft of blood, mind, and locality have been proven to outlast and overshadow structures of Gesellschaft. While legal remedies offer an appearance of order for the change associated with modernization, they do not necessarily offer long-lasting cures for the influence of tradition. This is evident in two ways.

First, laws such as the Civil Rights Act are often viewed as a cure-all. They are culminating victories in long-fought battles for change. There seems to be a belief that if the letter of the law is followed, nothing more is required. The law then, becomes the limit of change instead of a starting point for change. This attitude can block further innovation in thinking and actions.

Second, and perhaps most importantly, mandates for change can be merely exercises in legal writing. Laws cannot educate or erase negative attitudes and beliefs. They cannot change Gemeinschaft of mind. In the case of race, Joyce King labels these attitudes as “dysconscious racism.” She describes this as “an uncritical habit of mind (including perceptions, attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs) that justifies inequity and
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exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given.” Dysconscious racism causes any change to the status quo to be seen as a challenge to the self-identity of those who hold the prevailing attitudes and beliefs. Without addressing the traditions, attitudes and beliefs that perpetuate the status quo and the need for structural change, inequalities continue to persist.

According to Wiebe, the first two decades of the twentieth century were characterized by the sweeping changes of modernization. Order (or at least the promise of it) was brought about by newly formed structures that embodied Tönnies’ concept of Gesellschaft. Modernization and change continued, however, throughout the twentieth century, as did the development of new structures. The examples of housing and education suggest tradition plays a significant role, either in the formation of structures or the reactionary counter structures. Tradition is evident as underlying motivation in the structure, or in response to the structure. Either way, it can stand as an impediment to change.

The effect of traditions in shaping existing patterns of housing and education today can be seen in music teacher education, specifically admission policies and curriculum. It is not the intention of this analysis to suggest overtly racist tendencies in music teacher education. Music education and music teacher education, however, are products of a society largely dictated by racially based traditions. This discussion intends to uncover the traditions as they appear in music teacher education, their effect, and the

seemingly unbreakable ties that cause them to persist. Sugrue writes, “The consequences of hundreds of individual acts or of collective activity…gradually strengthen, redefine or weaken … social structure.”\(^{210}\) It is in these individual and collective acts that attitudes and traditions are born and perpetuated, their origins often unknown to those who carry them on. Examining the history of music teacher education provides us only with a picture of the outcomes. In order to better understand current practices in music teacher education, the circumstances surrounding the decisions that lead to those practices must be examined.\(^{211}\) This chapter aims to provide the historical synthesis necessary to recognize the origin of practices that may hinder change and often hide within otherwise benign structures.

**Music Teacher Education**

Since tradition plays an essential role in response to change, it is necessary to be aware of the traditions that led to the music teacher education programs of today. And, in order to fully understand the traditions of music teacher education, the tradition of music education must be explored. As noted by Charles Leonhard, music education is circular.\(^{212}\) Within this circularity is interdependence. In many cases, music education exists to re-create itself. This is confirmed in an open letter from the National Association of Schools of Music in which concern over a shortage of music teachers is expressed. The letter states:
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If we don’t solve the teacher shortage, the consequences are serious: substantive, sequential music programs will be removed from the schools. Once such programs are gone, it is almost impossible to get them back. If this were to happen on a large scale, it would reduce the number of children and youth engaged with music study and, in time, reduce the number of those talented and prepared enough to have a chance to become music professionals, and the number of amateurs with sufficient knowledge and interest in music to pursue it as a player or listener throughout a lifetime.\textsuperscript{213}

Each component of the music education depends on another for its existence, and is responsible for sustaining another component.

Figure four illustrates this circular interdependence. In this diagram, the factors on the right side (auditioning candidate and pre-service teacher) fall under the control and traditions of institutional music teacher education programs. Those on the left side (practicing teacher and student) fall under the control and traditions of the teacher and public schools.

The remainder of this chapter will examine the historical origins of this cycle, from public school music programs to those traditions of institutions which house music teacher preparation programs. Specifically, the traditions of admission policies and music teacher education curriculum will be analyzed. The unchanging nature of music education and music teacher education are evident in these areas. Discussion of the cycle will flow backwards, starting with the curriculum of music teacher education programs and its historical foundations. This method of analysis allows for an understanding of the effect of traditions on preceding components.

Public school music education first appeared in Boston in 1837 and quickly spread to other large cities, such as Cincinnati and St. Louis. At the time, a divide existed in the country between “poor man’s and rich man’s music’s.”214 Originally, colonialism had brought disdain for Britain, including its music. American citizens were drawn to domestic music, which consisted of a mix of folk songs from the oral tradition and written hymns. A growing, prosperous upper urban class, however, was moving away
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from the egalitarian ideal upon which the country was founded. “They began to yearn for cultivation of such fine arts as were customarily approved by royal, noble, clerical and wealthy classes on the other side of the Atlantic.”

In the early 1830’s, a small group of private citizens, along with European immigrant musicians set out to “make America musical in the exact image of contemporary Europe.” This movement resulted in the creation of large orchestras, choral organizations, chamber music ensembles, and audiences for famous European performers. The need for music education in public schools was created then, in part, to educate future audiences.

The beginning of the twentieth century saw ever-deepening ties to European ways. Modernization in transportation and communication caused more and more Americans to look across the Atlantic for influence in city planning, architecture, universities, and scholarship. All things European were in vogue. This coincides with a drive to make what was once considered a new American style of music old and unfashionable. At the time, works belonging to the European canon were purported as vehicles for the elevation of all listeners. If one was exposed to quality music, one could take part in a universal good previously limited to only the higher classes. Charles Seeger describes this democratic argument in the following passage:
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Before the altar of the concert stage all men were equal and all music divine. But face any of these protagonists with folk or popular music! If it were European it might pass. But if it were American, it was not music at all! Thus European and new-European urban fashions in the written fine art were authoritatively pitted, in the name of democracy, against the truly democratic, but unwritten (or badly written), Euro-American and emerging American folk and folk-popular idioms.218

According to this line of thinking, listening to European music was more democratic than limiting oneself to the folk and popular music of America. Attitudes such as these contributed to the elevation of western, European music over the folk and popular American music.

This movement also brought about the establishment of Conservatories of Music in the United States. The American version of these European schools of music first appeared in Ohio, at the Oberlin Conservatory in 1865. Soon after, conservatories opened in Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago, and Baltimore.219 Music conservatories originated in Europe as charitable institutions for orphaned and illegitimate girls. They provided vocal and instrumental instruction, offering students a pious, legitimate avocation.220 Later, they became centers for training musicians in performance, composition, and criticism. This later tradition was continued in the conservatories of the United States.
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Oberlin was not only the first conservatory in the country, but the first institution to offer a bachelor of music education degree in 1921.\textsuperscript{221} This came in part as a response toward professionalization and the need for more stringent and standardized preparation of music teachers and supervisors. The confluence of the popularity of European fashions, the conservatory tradition, and the emergence of formal music teacher education cannot be discounted when examining the Euro-centric traditions of music education today.

Dialectic of identity among music teachers was thoroughly discussed in chapter two. The emergence of degrees in music education from the conservatory traditions reinforces the depth of musician identity. Music education degrees grew from degrees in music. Courses in music education were added to the curriculum for performers. Consequently, music education did not detract from a musician’s identity but added a new component. Those possessing the first degrees in music education from conservatories considered themselves not only musicians, but now also teachers of music. They now needed a construct in order to distinguish themselves from informally trained teachers of singing schools and the teachers who included music instruction in the general classroom. MSNC provided a structure to in which to distinguish the preparation and needs of music teachers from performing musicians.

Professionalization, as discussed in chapter two, provided an entry to society as a whole. Music educators particularly desired respect among other teachers. In 1920,  

Edgar Gordon, the president of MSNC, advocated for a stronger liberal arts background with the hopes that “Broadly trained teachers of music, imbued with the scientific spirit will quickly command the respect of those similarly trained in other fields.”²²² In spite of these added requirements, Gordon also supported “a broader and better musicianship among public school music teachers.”²²³ Yet, a liberal education was not enough to complete a music educator. This only addresses the overall knowledge base. No, in addition to content knowledge (music) and general knowledge (liberal arts), a complete teacher must also possess professional knowledge of the teaching-learning process.

Hobert Burns speaks of this trinity of preparation in the following statement:

> If we . . . are right in our judgment that in no profession is liberal education more important than in teaching, it certainly follows that we should design a teacher education curriculum which is basically achieved in and through the arts and sciences. But, at the same time, we realize that liberal education is not equivalent to teacher education. A liberal education for teachers means not only an undergraduate curriculum which does something more than familiarize our . . . students with the arts and sciences, it also means joint specialization in academic and professional subject-matters – in academic knowledge of the subject to be taught, and professional knowledge of the teaching-learning process.²²⁴

Hence, from the start of the formal programs of instruction, music teachers have tried to meet the requirements of musicians, teachers, and society. Their professional
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declaration of independence from performing musicians brought about a comparison to
general educators and other professionals. It was as if the Gesellschaft of society said, “If
you’re not going to be a performing artist, you have to assume the requirements of the
scientific, modernizing world.” Therefore, from the advent of formal music teacher
education, the dialectic was set: musician or educator, tradition or change? Music teacher
education has spent nearly a century trying to reconcile the two. The beliefs, values, and
traditional practices of music, musicians, and a western-European culture color the
response.

Since its inception, the curriculum of music teacher education programs is
reflective of the aforementioned influences. Universities, liberal arts colleges, and
teachers colleges housed programs of music teacher education. These institutions granted
a variety of degrees leading to certification in teaching, including (but not limited to)
Bachelor of Music Education, Bachelor of Music in Music Education, Bachelor of
Science in Music Education, and Bachelor of Arts in Music Education. The difference in
degree titles is more indicative of the program’s place within the structure of the
university than the curriculum content. Historical records show marked consistency in
course requirements. Slight variances occurred between types of institutions, with liberal
arts and teacher colleges having slightly higher course hour requirements in their
respective specialization. A comparison of accrediting guidelines from the National
Association of Schools of Music (NASM) over almost sixty years reveals little change in
course requirements and distribution across content, general, and professional knowledge
(see figure 5)\textsuperscript{225}. Since these are the minimum requirements for accreditation, music teacher education programs follow them closely, despite variation in types of institutions and formal degree titles. The guidelines from 1953 are selected due to the growth in music education degrees in the decade prior. In 1941, NASM reported that six hundred seventy-six bachelor of music education degrees were granted. By 1952, this number had grown to 1,730.\textsuperscript{226} This growth reflects the growing importance of NASM guidelines as they pertain the preparation of more and more music educators.

Aside from being more descriptive, there are few changes between the 1953 and the 2009-2010 NASM guidelines. One change consists of including music teaching methods in the 2009-2010 category of basic musicianship and performance. This move from the professional knowledge category of 1953 allows for additional courses offered by the educational unit. Most striking in these guidelines is the persistent difference in hour requirements between content and professional knowledge. The program guidelines contain over two times more music content than professional knowledge. Brian Roberts notes of this imbalance, “If they are compared as discrete sources of knowledge, the course load of education studies represents a miniscule percentage of a music teacher’s knowledge base in comparison to the overwhelming proportion of music studies.”\textsuperscript{227}

\textsuperscript{226} NASM, 1953.
\textsuperscript{227} Roberts, “Who’s in the Mirror?”: 36.
NASM, 1953 | NASM, 2009-2010
--- | ---
**General Culture (33% of the total [120 semester hours] required for an undergraduate degree.)**
- Non-music subjects
- Any psychology course other than Educational psychology
- Music literature, appreciation and/or history
- The basic survey type of course, where required: a. Humanities; b. Social Sciences; c. Natural sciences.

**General Studies (30-35% of total required hours)**
Students are expected to have:
- The ability to think, speak, and write clearly and effectively
- An informed acquaintance with fields of study beyond music such as those in the arts and humanities, the natural and physical sciences, and the social sciences
- A functional awareness of the differences and commonalities regarding work in artistic, scientific, and humanistic domains
Awareness that multiple disciplinary perspectives and techniques are available to consider all issues and responsibilities including, but not limited to, history, culture, moral and ethical issues, and decision-making.

**Basic Music and Musical Performance (47% of the total required hours)**
This area includes subjects such as the following in the area of music theory.
- Music reading
- Ear training and dictation (melodic, harmonic and rhythmic)
- Keyboard harmony
- Harmony (part writing)
- Form and analysis
- Instrumental and/or vocal arranging
- Counterpoint
- Composition
- Conducting
- Ensembles, large and small
- Major performance area
- Minor performance area
- Functional piano facility

**Basic Musicianship and Performance (at least 50% of total required hours)**
- At least one major performance area, which includes technical skills, understanding and ability to perform the repertory, ability to read at sight, and professional standards
- Keyboard competency
- Artistry, technical skills, collaborative competence and knowledge of repertory
- Conducting and musical leadership
- Arranging
- Aural, verbal, and visual analyses, and aural dictation of the common elements and organizational patterns of music
- Knowledge and skill in compositional, performance, analytical, scholarly, and pedagogical applications of musical forms, processes, and structures
- Historical, cultural, and stylistic context of music
- Composition and Improvisation
- History and repertory
- Technology
- Functional performance on keyboard, voice, and instruments appropriate to the student’s teaching specialization
- Specialization areas and age level are determined by institutions, but courses must be included to ensure:
  - Musicianship, vocal, instrumental, and pedagogical skills sufficient to teach all areas of specialization
  - Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for area of specialization
  - Experience in solo performance, as well as large and small ensembles.
  - Laboratory experience in teaching beginning students individually, in small groups, and in larger classes

**Prof. Education (20% of the total req. hrs)**
- Music education methods and materials
- Observation and student teaching
- Professional educational courses aside from music education

**Prof. Education (15-20% of total required hours)**
Courses normally offered by the education unit that deal with:
- Philosophical and social foundations of education
- Educational psychology
- Special education
- History of Education

---

**Table 5. NASM Accrediting Guidelines**
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This supports the earlier observation of a continuing development of musician identity throughout undergraduate music teacher education. Another minor change is the addition of technology in the 2009-2010 requirements. Otherwise, the curriculum requirements and distribution are nearly identical.

An added comparison comes from the 1937 dissertation of Edna McEachern. Her *Survey and Evaluation of the Education of School Music Teachers in the United States* supplies further confirmation of the continuity of curriculum in music teacher education. In it, she provides the areas of instruction covered in the one hundred-ten institutions she surveyed. They include:

- History and appreciation of music. Including the musical periods of:
  - Romantic
  - Modern
  - Contemporary
  - Polyphonic
  - Medieval
  - Ancient

- Theory of music
  - Sight reading
  - Ear training
  - Harmony
  - Counterpoint
  - Composition
  - Form and Analysis
  - Orchestration

- Performance Skills
  - Applied music
  - Conducting

- Music Education

---
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- Psychology of music
- Music Methods
  - Primary school music
  - Intermediate school music (vocal and instrumental)
  - Junior and senior high school music (vocal and instrumental)
- Elements common to all grades
  - Student teaching
  - Observation

- English
  - Speech, English literature, Composition, Contemporary literature

- History
  - American, Modern European, Medieval, Ancient

- Art Appreciation

- Modern Languages

- Laboratory Sciences
  - Physical, Biological

- Education Courses
  - Principles of teaching
  - Educational psychology
  - Philosophy of Education
  - History of Education

- Mathematics

All three sources, spanning seventy-three years, provide notably similar snapshots of music teacher education curriculum. This, despite the numerous commissions, reports, and recommendations outlined in chapter one which called for changes in the structure of music teacher education curriculum.

Doubtless, some change has occurred within individual courses, but this varies widely and is largely based on the institution and instructors. This has been the case throughout
music teacher education. In 1933, Chauncey King quotes Karl Gehrkens as stating music education “courses depend almost entirely upon the individual experiences of the men and women who give them.” Almost seventy years later, Fred Rees and Maud Hickey make the same observation:

Music teacher education programs across institutions are not necessarily the same. While course content and degree program requirements are similar across the country, student profiles, professorial expertise, institutional resources, political realities, and budgetary constraints are different, particularly for colleagues whose institutions vary from major research universities to smaller teachers' and liberal arts colleges.

As a result of this tendency, any change that does take place is isolated and often temporary. Systemic change does not take place and traditional structures remain.

Admission Requirements

The effects of tradition are not only seen in music teacher education curriculum, but the admission policies to schools and departments of music. In virtually every institution, a major in music education first requires admission to the school/department of music. Before one can become a music teacher, he/she must first prove he/she is a musician, thus virtually requiring a musician identity upon entering an institution. This is further evidenced in a comparison of audition requirements between conservatories, which aim to prepare professional musicians, and institutions offering undergraduate

\[^{230}\text{Rees and Hickey, 2002.}\]
\[^{231}\text{From this point on, schools of music will refer to all varieties of organizational structures which house music teacher education programs, including departments or faculties of music.}\]
degrees in music education. Virtually no difference exists between the audition processes. The process of admission for undergraduates in conservatories and music education programs usually consists of an audition on a major instrument and often a written test of knowledge in music theory and historical repertoire.\(^{232}\) This is arguably the most exclusive structure related to music education. With few exceptions, the audition process of today mirrors the audition process of past centuries. Candidates must perform selected literature on selected instruments. In this way, schools of music “control the pool of all applicants for music education degree programs.” In addition, “they control the orientation and value set associated with the types of music that will ultimately form the professional knowledge that the teacher takes into the classroom.”\(^{233}\)

The current NASM guidelines confirm this observation. There are no separate criteria for admission of undergraduates who intend to obtain a bachelor of music education. These students must take part in the required audition, examination, or other evaluation, and demonstrate musicianship (basic knowledge of music theory).\(^{234}\)

The exclusive nature of these requirements begins, however, long before the audition takes place. Preparation for admission to a school of music takes place prior to the collegiate years. Years of study precede the process. As discussed in chapter two, music education candidates have likely already spent a lifetime becoming musicians. There is virtually no way a student could meet the requirements of admission without extensive prior musical training. This often results in strikingly similar demographics

\(^{232}\) See appendix A for the list of institutions compared and links to their audition requirements.\\(^{233}\) Roberts, “Who’s in the Mirror?”: 36.\\(^{234}\) NASM, *Handbook 2009-2010*, 79.
among music education students, which in turn results in strikingly similar public school music programs. Betty Anne Younker and Maud Hickey note this pattern and its implications:

Survey students on stage [at a school of music concert] and one will note that the vast majority are White, come from middle to upper level income families, and had the private music tuition necessary to prepare for a successful audition at top-ranked conservatories. While marginalization and diversity occurs within multifaceted forms, we resonate with many of the students who are ‘like us’, i.e. those who began studying music privately at an early age, were successful in the performance-based ensembles in schools, were leaders of sections; first chair students and selected soloists. We were encouraged to continue with our music, and, as a result, became music majors who ended up teaching students in public or private-based music programs who are very much like us. So the cycle continues.\textsuperscript{235}

This preparation has long been recognized as a necessary part of admission to programs. In its 1958 \textit{Standards for the Evaluation of the College Curriculum for the Training of the School Music Teacher}, MENC devotes a separate heading to “Pre-College Music Training.” The guidelines state:

It is obvious from the study of any set of recommended schedules such as these that the successful completion of a good music teacher education curriculum at the college level demands that the student shall have had previous musical training. For this reason it is recommended that high school music teachers study these schedules carefully and try to guide high school student who anticipate making music education their major field in college into the most valuable music study sequences possible. It is suggested that it is desirable that the student’s high school training provide him opportunity to acquire some knowledge and develop some proficiency in the following areas:

A: Musical performance, including, if possible, the development of some degree of functional piano facility, of some proficiency on minor instruments as well as the major instrument, and of a variety of instrumental and vocal ensemble experiences, large and small.

B. Basic music (fundamental theory)

C. Music history and literature

MENC makes the same statements in 1965. These sources would appear dated, if not for the unchanging nature of admission requirements in that time.

Admission requirements, then, are exclusive on three levels. First, they exclude those who are not able to “pass the test” for admission. Second, the test itself is exclusive in that it is designed for only those who are willing and able to study primarily western, European instruments and literature. Finally, admission requirements exclude those who do not have the means and opportunity to spend years studying and preparing for the test. All three levels stem from traditions dating back to the birth of conservatories in the United States and prior to that, in Europe. Julia Eklund Koza describes the audition process as an affirmation of Whiteness that “jeopardizes school music programs, the people in them, and the people they shut out.”

---


In addition, Hildegard Froehlich refers to these practices as institutional gatekeeping and claims they not only limit who is permitted to study music education but also the curriculum taught. She writes:

I believe it is necessary, for instance, to articulate to what extent our role as institutional gatekeepers bars us from a truly individualized form of instruction that allows us to reach and teach anyone who wishes to learn, a creed more easily paid lip service than acted upon. Do we really want the gates of academia open to all who ask for entry, or are we more comfortable teaching only those who fit into the academic world that we have helped to conceptualize and frame? Couched more philosophically and in broader terms, can we be transformers of cultural values and traditions when our role as gatekeepers lies in representing and transmitting agreed-upon educational and musical values that have shaped the institution of which we, the teachers, are an integral and contributing part?\(^{239}\)

This statement suggests that the structural traditions of schools of music and higher education seep into college faculty, causing them to uphold the very same structures many call to be changed. In some cases it would seem that those teaching future music educators cannot see the trees (the changing needs of music education) for the forest (the traditional structures of schools of music.)

The traditional needs of schools of music and collegiate music teacher education can be met only by continuing the traditions that supply students. Changing any part of the cycle would lead to a complete breakdown of the system. Consequently, traditions persist, change is avoided, and exclusion continues.

School Music Programs

The school music program is sandwiched between two elements of tradition – past practices and future expectations. Schools of music expect school music programs to produce students who are prepared to meet their admission requirements. If this does not occur, institutions will at best lack quality students, and at worst lack virtually all students. Teachers, therefore, must construct programs that will inspire and prepare students for the possibility of a career as a music educator. Thus, public and private school music teachers are driven to perpetuate the status quo.

This is evidenced in the unchanging nature of school music programs. In the last sixty years, school music programs have remained virtually unchanged. In fact, the programs that emerged in public schools following World War II began to take root decades before. The only noticeable differences in programs during and after World War II were due to the establishment of the K-12 educational system and wartime shortages of materials and personnel.

Public school music instruction is divided into primarily two components, elementary and secondary. Both have remained consistent over time. Secondary schools, however, are the greatest source of preparation for collegiate study and therefore play a crucial role in the cycle of perpetuation. For this reason they will be the focus of this historical perspective.

Vocal music has already been established as one of the earliest forms of school music. At the turn of the twentieth century, “chorus singing in high schools [had]
consistently moved toward higher attainment.”

High school orchestras began to appear during the same time, which coincides with the aforementioned rise in popularity of European art forms. One of the earliest documented school orchestras was in Richmond, Indiana, under the direction of Will Earhart. Established in 1898, it became the model for early instrumental music and was “duplicated in innumerable schools.”

High school bands followed soon after, with W. Otto Miessner reporting that he had organized one in Connorsville, Indiana in 1907. These early orchestras and bands were “dependent upon players who had acquired their skill from private teachers outside of the schools.”

In order for instrumental ensembles to flourish in schools, group instruction was needed. This change was the source of controversy when it was first introduced. Criticism centered primarily on the perceived inability of one teacher to instruct a group of students as successfully as one teacher with a single student. In addition, it was argued that the use of public funds for group instrumental instruction was illegal, unjustifiable, and subject to injunction. While class instruction eventually became standard in instrumental music, private lessons persist as an integral and sometimes required component of school music programs.

By the 1920’s, orchestras and bands were well established in schools. Bands in particular grew in popularity due to the “patriotism and martial spirit” that spread over

---

241 Ibid, 10.
the country as a result of World War I. In addition, bands appealed to the growing middle class and offered an artistic middle ground between classical orchestras and popular, folk music.\textsuperscript{244} Instrument and uniform companies, along with music publishers also contributed to the growth of school bands. They had a vested interest in seeing them flourish, for as school bands grew in popularity, so did their profits.

By the end of World War II, instrumental music was a thriving part of American secondary schools and closely resembled programs found in today’s schools. In 1945, MENC described the generally accepted structure of a high school instrumental program as:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Bands} \\
  \quad (1) Junior or second band \\
  \quad (2) Senior or first band (symphonic concert band) \\
  \quad (3) Marching band (usually drawn from second and/or first band) \\
  \item \textbf{Orchestra} \\
  \quad (1) Preparatory string class \\
  \quad (2) High school orchestra\textsuperscript{245}
\end{itemize}

This structure of bands is found in almost any high school in America today. Orchestras are not as prevalent, but this is a typical structure for those schools in which one exists.

The fact that high school bands and orchestra programs of today took shape in the early twentieth century and were solidified in the years immediately after World War II means their traditions reflect the values, beliefs, and attitudes of the first half of the twentieth century. These are the same values, beliefs, and attitudes that shaped the structures of housing and education, which were discussed earlier.


These traditions, coupled with the time they were established, imply that school music programs exclude students who cannot or choose to not exist within their boundaries. Students whose values differ may simply choose to not participate in instrumental or vocal music programs. Students who lack the resources necessary to participate are also excluded regardless of choice. As a result, the students who do participate often represent a narrow range of socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds.

James Mursell noted the exclusion of students as early as 1943. In this lengthy quote, he writes of the possibilities of music to include, but its practice of exclusion.

Music may be an agency for democratic living by providing rich and significant experiences and activities in which all may share. No one will wish to deny that differences in musical ability exist. No tests or other pretentious apparatus are needed to demonstrate such a truism. But in the first place such differences, so far as we know, have almost nothing to do with differences of racial, social, or economic status. The Negro, the Indian, the Mexican, the child from a poor home or an underprivileged neighborhood is not handicapped musically by nature. Musical activities can cut across all such distinctions: and there is apt to be less prejudice here than in most other doings in the schools. Furthermore, while it is true that some will go further and faster than others, music has an extraordinarily universal appeal. And so the aim of a good music program should be, first and foremost, inclusive. Its work should be planned, its materials should be chosen, its procedures should be devised to reach everyone both at the elementary and secondary levels. Here lies one of the weakest points of American school music. We have been greatly interested in developing superior performing groups, both instrumental and vocal, in our high schools. This in itself is a laudable ambition. But in actual practice it has meant the exclusion of a majority of pupils above the seventh or eighth grade from all significant musical experiences and participation. One hesitates to use the word exploitation, but often music in the secondary school – and particularly instrumental music – seems to verge toward it. In the long run this is a self-defeating and suicidal policy, and a direct negation of the popular hope which supports our work. Music teachers will build a far sounder and more certain future for themselves by
trying to bring music to everybody in the schools than by concentrating on a small percentage of star performers.  

Mursell’s observations are significant not only because they came so soon in the development of public school education, but also because they are still accurate today. Today, similar concerns trouble music educators and cause them to ask, “What systems of reasoning and music teaching practices serve to include some students but exclude others?” and “What practices within the music classroom serve to include students in or exclude students from the discursive space, allowing their voices to be heard and their experiences affirmed?” The traditional structures of school music were being questioned in 1943 and are still in 2009. Traditions have been challenged for decades. Change has been proposed for decades. Yet structures of exclusion persist.  

The historical and sociological examples presented thus far suggest the underrepresentation of minorities and underprivileged students is a direct result of the cyclical traditions of music education. The cycle depicted earlier in figure five illustrates the flow from high school music programs to music teacher education programs. Consequently, if a group of students are underrepresented in high school, they will be underrepresented in collegiate programs. Research suggests that student career choice is influenced by roles models of the same race and ethnicity. Therefore, if fewer minority teachers exist, fewer minority students will choose to enter music education.  

\[248\] Michael J. Bates, “Factors Involved in the Selection of Music Teaching as a Career Choice by 11th- and 12th-grade African-American Students,” (DMA diss., The University of Memphis, 1997); Vicki R. Lind,
effects the cycle again when graduating teachers enter the field of teaching, as most “prefer to teach in schools that are culturally similar to those of their own cultural background.” As a result, the traditions of music education exclude minority and underprivileged students twice – first on the basis of differing values and lack of opportunity, and second because of a lack of role models. Both of these work together to create a barrier to change.

Originally, the structures of music education were designed to create well-prepared students for collegiate programs of music teacher education. Exclusion was necessary to ensure the best, most qualified students entered programs. This was an effective method in the first years of the twentieth century as candidates were chosen from a primarily homogenous pool of possible applicants. Since the structures of society permitted only those with similar values, beliefs to enter into the profession, the exclusive nature ensured excellence and recognition for standardized preparation.

As society grew and modernized, however, more and more people were excluded. No longer did the established, traditional structures exclude only those who were not talented enough, they now excluded those who lacked opportunity and/or resources for appropriate preparation. Becoming a music teacher requires admission to a school of music, which requires the skills and knowledge of a musician, which can often only be

---


obtained only through a combination of quality public schools music programs and private instruction. Both quality public school music programs and private instruction require a certain degree of affluence. Thus, traditional admission requirements exclude not only those who cannot pass an audition, but also all those who do not have the opportunity or resources to prepare for it. In addition, students who do not embrace traditional western, European instruments and literature are largely excluded from the audition process. This means entire groups of students are excluded from becoming music teachers before they even enter high school (and probably before.)

These practices resemble those of housing and education because they are based on traditions that were deemed appropriate by society. Modernizing society brought changes in what was considered appropriate, however. In housing and education, law and legislation mandated change. Scholars, symposia, and declarations have called for change in music education. In both cases, tradition dictates the response of those called upon to change.

To achieve the changes in housing and education, people were asked to alter their practices. A change in required practice does not, however, alter values, beliefs, and traditions. Change in music education would require a complete alteration of the cycle involving teachers and students at the secondary and collegiate level. Not only would this not change the values, beliefs, and traditions of music educators, but also it would threaten the entirety of the system. In response, most of those involved choose to allow traditions to persist.
Music teacher education achieved structural order very early in its formal existence. These structures, however, soon became havens for traditions, which dictated its response to proposed change. The unchanging nature of music teacher education is evident in the years since its inception. Curriculum and admission requirements dictate who enters programs of music teacher education and what teachers in secondary school music programs offer, causing a series of related traditions, which heretofore remain relatively unchanged. These traditions work together to exclude new voices that might offer alternate values and beliefs.

Consequently, music teachers and music teacher educators recognize the unique democratic, inclusive characteristics of music, but they find themselves constrained by traditions, which exclude large groups of students and teacher candidates. Modernization creates opportunity for increased democratic practices and the need for such practices to be placed into sustainable structures. These structures, however, are overshadowed by the counter structures embodied in deeply held traditions. The result is dialectic – tension between the potentially egalitarian structures of a modernizing society (Gesellschaft), and counter structures found in the traditional practices of music education (Gemeinschaft).

Summary

A secondary question of this study asks what other examples exist to demonstrate immunity to change despite persistent calls. Robert Wiebe’s *The Search for Order* aids in answering this question, along with an analysis of housing and education in twentieth
century America. Wiebe writes a clear description of the process of modernization and the establishment of structures intended to bring about order in a changing society. The decades of focus in Wiebe’s narrative, 1877 through 1920, were a time of great change in the United States. Modernization caused a shift in population centers from small island communities (which resembled Tönnies’ Gemeinschaft) to anonymous urban centers (which contain the characteristics of Gesellschaft). This shift caused a great deal of chaos in personal lives and public organization, leading to what Wiebe refers to as a “search for order.” The establishment of structures, such as international markets, the railroad, and bureaucratic systems of governing brought about the order that was lacking in modern society.

These structures, however, were often undermined by counter structures, which hindered the complete changes necessary to bring order. Just as race plays a primary role in modern society, it plays a role in the effectiveness of structures, including those of music education. Values, beliefs, and traditions tend to dictate one’s response to change. When these contain attitudes concerning race, they can cause tradition-based, exclusionary responses. This is demonstrated in the history of housing and education in twentieth century America.

Laws and legislative structures were erected to democratize both elements, but traditions and counter structures challenged their effectiveness. The effect has been long lasting and is still evident today in housing patterns and the demographics of public
schools. While legal remedies offer sought after order, they do not change the underlying values, beliefs, and traditions.

These examples help to inform the analysis of music teacher education, in that they offer alternate perspectives of the issue facing music teacher education. Traditions have played an integral role in the formation of music education in the United States. European and early American practices helped create formal music education, and in turn created a need for formal music teacher education. By the early twentieth century, structures (based largely on the conservatory tradition) were in place and music education was growing.

Music education became a cycle of traditions, encompassing students and teachers across k-12 and collegiate institutions. This interdependent cycle was soon so tied to traditions that change in one of its components became a threat to the entire system. Consequently, tradition dictated the response to calls for change in music teacher education. The structure, which first excluded students and teacher candidates based on ability, became exclusionary based on one’s access to preparation and/or values.

The changes associated with modernization created a need for the structures of music teacher education, but the counter structures of tradition contribute to its unchanging nature. Again, music teacher education finds itself facing dialectic. Harbored ties to the Gemeinschaft of tradition collide with recognition of the need to meet the challenges of a changing society.
Chapter 4: Purpose

John Dewey

John Dewey (1859-1952) is arguably one of the most influential philosophers in education. His prolific writings have impacted thinking outside the discipline of education and around the world for over a century. Dewey spent most of his later career at Columbia Teachers College, but the decade he spent at the University of Chicago was a formative time for his later writings. The social climate of Chicago during the 1890’s led Dewey to adopt an attitude of urgency in his approach to the reform of education. He had “been gripped by the same hope for industrial democracy that animated his friends and fellow Chicagoans Jane Addams and Henry Demarest Lloyd – the spirit, one might say, of Hull House and Winnetka.” Dewey established a much-studied laboratory school at the University of Chicago in which he wrestled “intellectually with the problems of forging a pedagogy that might advance the cause of workplace democracy” and “sought to build a community that would . . . prefigure the

reconstructed industrial society he, Addams, Lloyd, and other Chicago democrats envisioned."252

Dewey’s philosophical approach was one of reconciling tradition and reality. He believed “both were essential, and each was to be used to illuminate and to criticise the other.”253 Upon his death, a Columbia University colleague wrote this description of Dewey’s approach:

He was neither the mere traditionalist, blind to the new world and to our new intellectual resources . . . nor the mere contemporary experimentalist, confining his bibliography largely to his own writings. He was what may be called an “experimental traditionalist,” or a “traditional experimentalist.” I prefer the former emphasis, for I think that Dewey’s enduring contributions to philosophy is not to be found in those places where he exhibits himself primarily as the critic of a too narrow tradition. To be sure, the immediate impact of his thought on American civilization came from his liberating it from the rigidities and stratifications of the narrow Puritanism of his youth. . . . But Dewey’s enduring contribution is to be found where he extends and broadened the classic tradition, by setting it in the context of the wider experience of modern knowledge.254

It is for this philosophical approach that his work is chosen as a tool of analysis in this study. In his essay, Experience and Education, John Dewey neither condemns traditions nor glorifies modernization. He does, however, observe the pros and cons of each to arrive at a philosophical approach in which the best of both can coexist.

Dewey’s writing offers insight into two of the secondary questions of this study, as he provides examples of the unchanging nature of education and suggestions of how to

252 Ibid, 403.
254 Ibid, 7-8.
successfully reconcile tradition and change. Examples of the unchanging nature of music teacher education, primarily those pertaining to higher education, will be examined alongside Dewey’s examples from education. The analysis of material which leads to answering these questions will aid in answering the primary question, “Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time?”

Experience and Education is composed upon the principle “that education in order to accomplish its ends both for the individual learner and for society must be based upon experience.” The challenge that still continues today, is in discovering the connection which actually exists within experience between the achievements of the past and the issues of the present. We have the problem of ascertaining how acquaintance with the past may be translated into a potent instrumentality for dealing effectively with the future. We may reject knowledge of the past as the end of education and thereby only emphasize its importance as a means.256

This leaves educators to solve the questions of, “How shall the young become acquainted with the past in such a way that the acquaintance is a potent agent in appreciation of the living present?”257 Music teacher educators face this same question today. The continuing calls for change presented in chapter one suggest it has yet to be resolved, neither in the education of undergraduates nor among themselves.

256 Ibid, 23.
257 Ibid.
Experience and Education

Experience and Education was published as part of the Kappa Delta Pi lecture series in 1938. While not as well known as some of Dewey’s other writings, it “summarizes and clarifies the chief canons of his educational thought.” In this essay, Dewey recognized that “all social movements involve conflicts” and the fact that conflict existed in education was a sign of its health. He wrote with the belief that

It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties.

Experience and Education was written to address the ongoing conflict between traditional and progressive education. Dewey sought to resolve the issue that educational philosophy must be an either-or enterprise. Debate surrounded educational approaches which seemed to either (A) impose traditional adult standards, subject-matter and methods from above and from outside, or (B) touted “the idea that education should be concerned with the present and future . . . with


\[\text{259} \text{ Dewey, Experience and Education, 5.}\]
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the past [having] little or no role to play."\textsuperscript{260} Education and Experience’s intent was to ascertain “how acquaintance with the past may be translated into a potent instrumentality for dealing effectively with the future.”\textsuperscript{261}

In order to achieve this, Dewey emphasizes the role the “principle of the continuity of experience”, or the “experiential continuum”, plays in determining the inherent value of different experiences. According to Dewey, “this principle rests upon the fact of habit, when habit is interpreted biologically.”\textsuperscript{262} His description of the continuity of experience and habit is contained in the following excerpt:

The basic characteristic of habit is that every experience enacted and undergone modifies the one who acts and undergoes, while this modification affects, whether we wish it to or not, the quality of subsequent experiences. For it is a somewhat different person who enters into them. The principle of habit so understood obviously goes deeper than the ordinary conception of a habit as a more or less fixed way of doing things, although it includes the latter as one of its special cases. It covers the formation of attitudes, attitudes that are emotional and intellectual; it covers our basic sensitivities and ways of meeting and responding to all the conditions which we meet in living. From this point of view, the principle of continuity of experience means that every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after.\textsuperscript{263}

Dewey’s biological interpretation of habit is very reminiscent of Tönnies’ concept of Gemeinschaft. He extends it, however, to suggest that Gemeinschaft is not static, but fluid, always being influenced by experience.

\textsuperscript{260} Ibid, 22.
\textsuperscript{261} Ibid, 23.
\textsuperscript{262} Ibid, 35.
\textsuperscript{263} Ibid.
Another central point in achieving balance between past and future is the meaning of purpose. Dewey believed experience, and its subsequent valuing, led to purpose. The meaning of purpose, “how it arises and how it functions in experience,” is important to understand. He describes it in the following manner:

A genuine purpose always starts with an impulse. Obstruction of the immediate execution of an impulse converts it into a desire. Nevertheless neither impulse nor desire is itself a purpose. A purpose is an end-view. That is, it involves foresight of the consequences which will result from acting upon impulse.

This description of the origin of purpose presents another parallel with Tönnies, this time with the concept of natural will. Consequently, it is impulse, or natural will, that is the seed of purpose.

In order for impulse and natural will to become a purpose, however, they must be accompanied by “foresight of consequences,” which requires the intelligence gained on the continuum of experience. Purpose, therefore, begins with the Gemeinschaft of natural will, but is tempered by the Gesellschaft of intellectual experience. This process appears to be an impediment to realizing change in music teacher education. Gemeinschaft and natural will have already been established as being vital to the identity of musicians. Their values, beliefs, and attitudes are fundamental in the response to structures of change. Likewise, natural will assumes a substantial role in the establishment of the purpose of music teacher education. This leaves little room for
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foresight of consequences, resulting in conflicting philosophies and an often unclear purpose. Dialectic is again the outcome.

The remainder of this chapter will examine instances and results of unclear purpose in music teacher education and their contribution to the unchanging nature of music teacher education. This will aid in answering the primary question of this study, “Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time?”

Who?

A purpose differs from an original impulse and desire through its translation into a plan and method of action based upon foresight of the consequences of acting under given observed conditions in a certain way.266

The purpose [of music education] is nothing less than to provide an education in music for all children everywhere in the country – “Music for every child, every child for music,” as Karl Gehrken phrased it in 1923 in a statement that has been used as a motto ever since by the Music educators National Conference.267

Dewey’s description of purpose is helpful in evaluating Allen Britton’s statement concerning the purpose of music education. If “music for every child” is truly the purpose of music education, then there must be a plan and method of action to achieve it.

266 Ibid, 69.
A plan and method of action must accompany the desire to provide music education for every child. Two questions arise when one considers this desire. Namely, does the motto adopted by MENC truly include every child, no matter age, location, and/or ability? And, perhaps more importantly, what exactly is included in a musical education? Evidence is lacking to clearly answer either of these questions.

Chapter three discussed at length the exclusive structures of music education and music teacher education at both the secondary and collegiate levels. These structures limit music education’s ability to reach every child by perpetuating cultural and socio-economic barriers.

The entire education system can limit access to music education by limiting time and resources allocated to programs. Schools that face academic challenges (which are often those who also face economic challenges) are often forced to choose between providing music classes or additional time for instruction in subjects such as reading and math. Of the schools surveyed in the 2008 National Assessment of Education Programs in the Arts, only fifty-seven percent reported that music was offered at least three or four times per week in grade eight. The remainder (forty-three percent) reported music was at most offered twice a week, some not at all. These schools fall short of


the MENC standard for scheduling that states “every music class meets at least every other day in periods of at least forty-five minutes.”

A gap in instructional time can lead to a gap in musical achievement. This is evidenced in the results of eighth graders assessed in both the areas of both music and visual arts:

- Students eligible for reduced or free lunch scored lower than students not receiving aid
- Black and Hispanic students scored lower than White and Asian/Pacific Islander students
- Public school students scored lower than private school students
- Students in urban schools scored lower than students in suburban schools

These statistics speak not only to access but to the quality of music education provided. In fact, it is estimated that “between nine and twenty-seven million students in the United States do not receive an adequate music education, as defined by MENC, the primary professional organization in the field.” These deficits are recognized in the statements cited in chapter one, which call for music education to be more inclusive and offer evidence of music education’s ineffectiveness in meeting its goal of “music for every child.” Both the 1968 Tanglewood Declaration and MENC’s 2003 position statement give voice to music education’s continuing desire to be more inclusive. As of
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272 Janice N. Killian and Vicki D. Baker, “The Effect of Personal and Situational Factors in the Attrition and Retention of Texas Music Educators,” *Journal of Music Teacher Education* 16 (2006): 42. An “adequate music education” is defined as the standard set by MENC in the previous citation.
yet, however, this desire has not been translated into an effective plan or method of action. Barriers from within and without music education stand in the way of including every child. Dewey’s observation that desire differs from purpose is demonstrated here. Music education’s desire may be to provide music for every child, but its actions do not fully reflect this.

What?

Adding to its lack of clear purpose is the ongoing debate over what, exactly, is entailed in a music education. This issue is somewhat unique to music education. In other content areas, there is seldom much question about the intended ends. For example, the aim of reading is clear – students should be able to read and comprehend a variety of genres of literature. Debate takes place over the best method to achieve this aim, but the goal is virtually without question.\footnote{In reading, a great deal of debate has centered on the methodologies of phonics and whole language. Articles addressing this include: Karin L. Dahl and Patricia L. Scharer, “Phonics Teaching and Learning in Whole Language Classrooms: New Evidence from Research,” \textit{The Reading Teacher} 53 (2000); Linnea C. Ehri, Simone R. Nunes, Steven A. Stahl, Dale M. Willows, “Systematic Phonics Instruction Helps Students Learn to Read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel’s Meta-Analysis,” \textit{Review of Educational Research} 71 (2001); James F. Baumann, James V. Hoffman, Jennifer Moon, Ann M. Duffy-Hester, “Where are Teachers’ Voices in the Phonics/Whole Language Debate?: Results from a Survey of U.S. Elementary Classroom Teachers,” \textit{The Reading Teacher} 51 (1998).}

No Child Left Behind forced states to clarify the goals for many core subjects. As of March 2010, states were working together to create a “common core” that will in
Some educators believe this is not the most effective route to school improvement. Judyth Sachs writes:

While any attempt to develop a ‘one size fits all’ version of standards may be attractive to governments, it may not be in the best interests of teachers teaching in remote areas, in difficult schools, or in multi-age settings where their competence will be judged on the basis of some idealized notion of what competent or excellent teaching might be.

Interestingly, Sachs’ disagreement with standards centers on their effect on teachers, not students. Other educators believe standards have the potential to undermine “efforts to create multicultural curricula and pedagogies” due to the narrowing of what is considered “official knowledge.” Attention to standards and their accompanying tests can also drive “teachers to focus their energies on raising the scores of those low-achievers whose scores they believe can be brought up significantly, writing off the lowest achievers, and abandoning progressive curricula and pedagogies.”

The consequences of not meeting standards have forced schools to largely shift resources and efforts from determining what should be learned to how to learn. From uniforms to same-sex classes, outcomes based to problem based, authentic to directive, methodologies abound, all with the intention of increasing student achievement and meeting standards. These debates have now extended into pre- and in-service teacher
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preparation, where discussion is taking place concerning how to staff schools with the highest-quality teachers.\textsuperscript{278} In spite of numerous opinions, all can be traced back to the purpose of increasing student learning and achievement in order to prepare them for productive lives as citizens.

Music education, however, is not included in high-stakes testing and in most cases has no mandated measures of federal or state accountability. While many value this freedom, is not always helpful. Music educators are given the opportunity to decide what they will teach and how they will teach it. One may think this task would be fairly simple, considering the century long history of MENC. It has yet proven to be quite difficult, and remains unresolved today.

One attempt at clarifying music education’s purpose came with the 1994 adoption of the National Standards for Arts Education. “These voluntary standards describe the knowledge, skills, and understanding that all students should acquire in the arts, providing a basis for developing curricula.”\textsuperscript{279} National standards were written to “ensure that the study of the arts is disciplined and well focused, and that arts instruction


has a point of reference for assessing its results.” According to Reimer, they represent “what students should know and be able to do” in music. The nine content standards in music are:

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, analyzing, and describing music.
7. Evaluating music and music performances.
8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts.
9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture.

The creation of arts standards came as a result of a push for standards in core subjects, which began in 1992. Standards and assessments were first written in math, English, science, history, and geography. The arts followed when they received federal funding from the Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

While the music standards have been discussed at length, their implementation has been less than complete. Bennett Reimer observes, “We have succeeded magnificently in standards one and two, singing and playing, for those students who have
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elected to pursue these areas. Comparatively, we have accomplished dismayingly little with the other seven standards.”\textsuperscript{283} This viewpoint is supported by research in which pre- and in-service teachers often express support of the national standards in theory, but find it difficult to implement them in their entirety due to a lack of time and resources.\textsuperscript{284} Paul Lehman agrees that “too many schools still lack the staff, time, and other resources required to implement the standards fully.”\textsuperscript{285} Regardless of the reason, the national standards have not provided a clear, indisputable purpose for music education.

Standards, both in education and music education, seem to exist on the traditional notion of officials “that schools can be manipulated from without to meet predetermined goals.”\textsuperscript{286} They have offered an avenue of legitimization on a national stage and been a useful tool for advocacy, but in many ways, they represent an outer structure of modernization, whose implementation is dictated by past traditions, values, and beliefs.

\textbf{Why?}

The questions of “Who?” and “What?” seek to clarify Karl Gehrkins’ motto of “Music for every child, every child for music.” Since its inception however, music

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item Bennett Reimer, “Reconceiving the Standards and the School Music Program,” \textit{Music Educators Journal} 91 (2004): 34.
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\end{footnotesize}
educators have also sought to provide a convincing answer to the question of why music education is important in the lives of human beings. In a report presented to the Boston school committee in 1837, the introduction of vocal music was “recommended on the basis of three utilitarian reasons – intellectual, moral, and physical development.”287 The benefits of music were evidenced in intrinsic and extrinsic outcomes, just as they often are today.288 The committee accepted the proposal, but the question remained. In its first year of publication, a 1915 issue of the Music Supervisors’ Journal contains an article in which Waldo Pratt writes, “For the sake of our own self-respect and to maintain the honor of our work in the eyes of the world, we need repeatedly to ask questions like, ‘What are we here for?’ and ‘What are we about?’ and ‘What good is there in what we are doing?’”289

Almost a century later, Paul Broomhead raises the same questions. “Great teachers are not content to merely perpetuate the status quo. They continually strive to develop a solid theoretical foundation for their teaching. This commitment requires them to answer important what and why questions regarding music education.”290 In the same vein, Estelle Jorgensen observes that “In our time, music educators face intractable challenges that merit a thorough going analysis of what music education should be about

An awareness of the importance of clear purpose is evident in these calls for critical examination. Awareness, however, does not necessarily bring clarity of purpose. The depth of feeling and identity associated with music and musicians can make it difficult to voice a clear reason for its inclusion in education. Intense feelings and strong identity are the very reasons a clear philosophy is needed. Charles Leonhard states, “Having a reasoned philosophy enables a teacher to behave rationally rather than on naïve impulse or ingrained habit.” The tendency for music teachers and music teacher educators to rely heavily on habit and tradition make a reasoned philosophy vital to moving music education into the future.

A clear philosophy is important not only in determining the actions of teachers in the classroom, but in strengthening music education’s place in society. In discussing the “central problems” of music education, Keith Swanwick writes:

The crux of it all seems to be that we badly lack any kind of conceptual framework. The consequences of this are twofold. In the first instance we miss a sense of direction in teaching, or indeed, may cheerfully take wrong directions. In the second place we are unable to look after ourselves when negotiating our way through the thickets of the educational administration and politics, at whatever level in the system we may happen to be. Fundamentally we have no rationale that bears examination and stands up well against the views of different pressure groups.
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The philosophy of music education has been a part of the discourse in the field for over a century. In the last fifty years, it has been the topic of books, articles, and entire journals. Yet, in any gathering of music educators, an array of reasons is given for why music education is important. Undergraduate students are routinely asked to write papers expressing their philosophy of music education. This amalgamation of reasons leads to a wide range of methods. Interestingly, despite differences in reasons and methods, the results are strikingly similar. With few exceptions, every school music program in the United States has as its end goal high-quality performing ensembles, where “the main aim is often to get a programme of music in shape for public performance, rather than to provide a rich musical and educational experience.”

This disconnect between philosophy and outcome supports the view that music educators “are often more interested in positing practical answers to the issues they face than in raising questions about the underlying assumptions and methods they have espoused.” The difficulty music educators have in answering “Why music education?” may be linked to the “practical-minded” people who are attracted to music education. They are often “less interested in theorizing than in doing.” Charles Leonhard adds, “Music teachers often grow impatient with theoretical considerations and commonly accept practice more readily than theory.” Teacher preparation furthers this tendency, as undergraduates are “trained as technicians to follow prescribed instructional methods
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[and] often feel ill-equipped to grapple with the difficult philosophical and practical challenges they face.”

This issue has been identified as a deficiency in the entirety of teacher preparation. Tony Wagner, a member of the education faculty at Harvard University, writes:

I’m beginning to see, however, that we educators are handicapped when it comes to leading efforts to improve teaching and learning. People in a host of other professions – business, law, medicine, engineering, architecture – have been trained to analyze and solve problems as a matter of everyday practice. We have not. Once out on the job, these professionals are called upon to use their analytic skills on a daily basis and are rewarded as they become more skillful problem solvers. None of this is routine in the education profession. In our graduate schools, we still teach aspiring principals and superintendents much more about management than about how to make change.

Wagner is not suggesting that teachers are not trained to solve the day-to-day micro problems that arise in classroom. His point is that preparation is lacking to address problems on the macro, systemic level. If this is not occurring in graduate schools of education, it likely is not occurring in undergraduate music teacher preparation programs. Thus, music teachers and music teacher educators have not developed the characteristics needed to consider complex philosophical issues. This is not to say that philosophies have not been offered. Many philosophies have been presented in an attempt to answer the question of why music education is important. While most do not directly address music teacher education, they are inextricably linked to the preparation of music teachers. In light of the circularity of
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music education, philosophies encompass all those involved, from students to teachers, teacher candidates to teacher educators, and the systems in which these people operate.

Two prominent and opposing philosophies have garnered much attention in the last forty years. Published in 1970, Bennet Reimer’s *A Philosophy of Music Education* is viewed as a handbook for those espousing aesthetic education. Conversely, David Elliot’s *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* (1995) “centers on the notion of music as practice.”

Based on the ideas of authors such as James Mursell, Foster McMurray, Harry Broudy, and Susanne Langer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* “provided scholarly justification for arts programs in the schools.” Reimer’s “ability to communicate, to make a point convincingly, and to construct a philosophy that could accommodate almost any activity . . . made his philosophy preeminent.” According to Reimer, “the charge and the mission of aesthetic education . . . is to improve the aesthetic quality of every person’s life at every stage of his development.” This is to be achieved by developing the “seven major behavior categories [that] are relevant to the arts and aesthetic education.” Of these, perceiving and reacting are considered central. Producing,
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conceptualizing, analyzing, evaluating, and valuing “support and enrich aesthetic perception and aesthetic reaction.”

Reimer’s philosophy of music education was embraced in the 1970’s as a number of organizations attempted to apply it to practice. Curriculum projects, such as the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) Aesthetic Education Program, the Cleveland Area Project, and Harvard Project Zero sought to further the aesthetic movement in music education. CEMREL also published *Toward an Aesthetic Education*, a collection of scholarly papers presented at the biannual MENC national convention advocating for the development of music education as aesthetic education.

Even before David Elliot challenged Reimer’s philosophy, it had lost some of its influence on the trajectory of music education. One reason relates to Jorgensen’s observation of the nature of music teachers. They did not fully consider the implication of such a philosophy when embracing new trends and methods and became more interested in doing rather than theorizing. Teachers “had accepted the philosophy without full understanding of its curricular implications.” Consequently, a disconnect grew between the philosophy and curriculum. Dewey’s “foresight of the consequences”
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was not considered, resulting in an impulsive acceptance of philosophy. This, in turn, blocked the emergence of clear purpose.

A lack of commitment to the philosophy also became apparent when federal support for aesthetic education ended. Richard Colwell observes that when this occurred, “the music educator turned to his old friend, performance as the sine qua non. With education under attack, this was no time to be tied to ideas one didn’t completely understand and which didn’t seem to rank very high in the competitive aspects of SAT scores and quality automobiles.”

Note that neither of these reasons is due to a lack of belief in aesthetic education. They are the result of a lack of commitment and understanding on the part of those whose job it was to implement the curriculum. Reimer’s philosophy required changes in the values, beliefs, and traditions of music education. Without a clear plan and method of action that is fully understood, previously held values, beliefs, and traditions will dictate the response to change and ultimately the end result.

David Elliot first began to question Reimer’s philosophy of aesthetic education in regard to jazz. Elliot believed Reimer’s ideas and focus on listening were too limiting, especially when they were applied to genres other than Western art music. Elliot writes,
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“For jazz is a way of performing; a way of being in music. Participation, not contemplation, is the hallmark of the jazz aesthetic.”

In 1995, David Elliot further developed this new philosophy of music education in his book *Music Matters*. It was written in direct response to Reimer’s philosophy and made specific objections to “the notion of music as an object, the idea of musical perception, and the conception of musical experience.” Elliot contends that music education as aesthetic education is too limiting and is mistaken about the essence of musical experience. His philosophy takes into account the sociological and multicultural factors of different cultural groups around the world and the role music plays in their society.

At the core of Elliot’s philosophy is his contention that music is a “diverse human practice” and must, therefore, be experienced as a practice, or praxis. He views music as a four-dimensional concept, consisting of “(1) a doer [musicer], (2) some kind of doing [musicing] (3) something done [music], and (4) the complete context in which doers do what they do.” Experiencing music through praxis can potentially engage musicers in “flow,” a psychological state characterized by complete immersion and abandon. Psychologist Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi describes flow as:

Situations in which attention can be freely invested to achieve a person’s goals, because there is no disorder to straighten out, no threat for the self

to defend against. We have called this state the flow experience, because this is the term many of the people we interviewed had used in their descriptions of how it felt to be in top form: “it was like floating,” “I was carried on by the flow.” It is the opposite of psychic entropy – in fact, it is sometimes called negentropy – and those who attain it develop a stronger, more confident self, because more of their psychic energy has been invested successfully in goals they themselves had chosen to pursue.  

Elliot believes the outcomes of flow, such as a stronger, more confident self and the accompanying growth, self-knowledge, and raised self-esteem, affirm the value of music in education.  

David Elliot’s viewpoint “has influenced thinking, writing, and teaching among music educators internationally.” It remains doubtful, however, that most teachers cite praxial philosophy as the heart of school music programs. If the multicultural and sociological aspects are overlooked, the outcomes of the philosophy seem to be more in line with the traditional, performance based outcomes of music education. The concept of praxis, however, had been exemplified in school performing ensembles long before Elliot’s concept of musicing. While praxis is an undeniable component of music education, a praxial philosophy does not necessarily aid in clarifying the purpose of music education. The multicultural and sociological focuses of Elliot’s ideas are often lost in translation from theory to practice in the classroom. This interpretation puts the cart before the horse, aligning philosophy with already established practices, sidestepping

Dewey’s requirement of “foresight of consequences” and views the consequences in hindsight.

It is not the intention of this study to advocate for one philosophy over another or disregard the philosophies of others. These philosophies are examined as examples of music education’s inability to identify a clear purpose. This failure can be traced back to a lack of plan and method of action. As noted earlier, music teachers are often more interested in doing rather than thinking, which causes a rush to action, disregarding the intent of theories and methodical plans of action. John Dewey discusses this very progression of events when he writes:

Overemphasis upon activity as an end, instead of upon intelligent activity, leads to identification of freedom with immediate execution of impulses and desires. This identification is justified by a confusion of impulse with purpose; although, as has just been said, there is no purpose unless overt action is postponed until there is foresight of the consequences of carrying the impulse into execution – a foresight that is impossible without observation, information, and judgment.318

It is possible that music education, perhaps since its inception, has suffered from a confusion of impulse over purpose. By the time educators and scholars recognized the need to fully examine its purpose, impulse had become ingrained and reflected in values, beliefs and traditions. Consequently, philosophies are offered, standards are written, and mottos are held high, only to be caught in the dialectic of modernization, where tradition contends with change in a modernizing society.

Purpose, Music Teacher Educators, and Higher Education

Music teacher educators are often divided between two worlds. In one world is the development of music educators to teach in schools. This world, as discussed in this and previous chapters, is filled with dialectic and choices. There are many paths to preparing music educators, but the influence of tradition, values, and beliefs of both teachers and students often lead to similar outcomes. The second world in which music teacher educators exist is that of academia. This world is often at odds with the identities of both musicians and educators. Research, promotion and tenure, and theory do not necessarily fit neatly into the process of preparing music teachers. They are, however, primary to the role and responsibilities of music teacher educators in colleges and universities. In addition, music teacher educators must ensure their preparatory programs meet the requirements of accrediting agencies and state licensing departments. At times, the dissonance between these two worlds can distract music teacher educators from realizing and achieving clear purpose.

Chapters two and three of this study discussed the influence of NASM on the curriculum of music teacher preparation programs and the resulting perpetuation of musician identity. The organization enters the present discussion for its role in establishing purpose. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in conjunction with NASM, is largely responsible for accrediting music teacher education programs in institutions of higher education, whether they are housed in colleges of education or autonomous. In matters of content knowledge, NCATE defers
to the learned society of a discipline.\textsuperscript{319} Therefore, NASM sets the standards for music teacher education.\textsuperscript{320}

As noted in chapter three, the curriculum for music teacher educators is wide-ranging, containing courses in music, education, and liberal arts. There is general agreement among faculty that the NASM standards are mostly sufficient in meeting the preparatory needs of preservice music teachers.\textsuperscript{321} Conflict arises, however, when state or federal agencies mandate change in teacher preparation. In recent years, this is evident in the additional requirements in areas such as reading and special education. Music education faculty are not necessarily opposed to the concept of additional instruction in these areas, but they are frustrated with the addition of courses to an already overloaded curriculum and the fact that these classes are often taught by non-music educators who are unable to place the information in relevant context.

Another example of mandated change in teacher preparation is found in Indiana, where proposed legislation would greatly alter music teacher education and licensure. Under the proposed Rule Revisions for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA), “a content area major would be required for new teacher licensure, and in-depth training

\textsuperscript{320} Current and past NASM standards are found in chapter three.
and experience in methodology and pedagogy would be reduced in teacher training programs and not required in alternate routes to licensure.”

Mandates from above often obscure the purpose in music teacher education. NASM standards must be met for accreditation and state standards must be met for licensure. Lack of alignment between the two causes music teacher education programs to include all but meet the needs of no one. Students cannot grasp the focus and purpose of such a wide-reaching program and faculty cannot adequately address the needs of all interested parties.

Such a situation calls for clear leadership from the professional organizations discussed throughout this study. While individual organization have mission statements, a unifying purpose is lacking. Don Ester and David Brinkman write:

“It seems that MENC, SMTE, CMS [The College Music Society], and NASM might work extremely well together to accomplish a worthy goal if that goal can be clearly articulated and specific objectives can be identified and agreed upon. It is reasonable to conclude that each of these organizations is aware of the problem but waiting for clearer guidance, perhaps feeling unsure of which direction to go and what changes to make.”

The problem Ester and Brinkman refer to is a shortage of music teachers, which, in light of the circularity of music education, is directly linked to preK-12 music education and
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teacher education.\textsuperscript{324} The suggestion that MENC, SMTE, CMS, and NASM \textit{might} work well together \textit{if} a clear goal and specific objectives can be identified suggests they are not already.

The mission and function of these organizations are similar but vary in focus and implementation. To compare, MENC states its mission “is to advance music education by encouraging the study and making of music by all.”\textsuperscript{325} The College Music Society (CMS) is “a consortium of college, conservatory, university, and independent musicians and scholars interested in all disciplines of music. Its mission is to promote music teaching and learning, musical creativity and expression, research and dialogue, and diversity and interdisciplinary interaction.”\textsuperscript{326} Three purposes are given for the Society for Music Teacher Education. They are:

1. Improve the quality of teaching and research in music teacher education.
2. Provide leadership in the establishment of standards for certification of music teachers.
3. Serve as an arm of MENC in influencing developments in music teacher education and in the certification of music teachers.\textsuperscript{327}

Finally, the NASM was founded

\textsuperscript{327} Society for Music Teacher Education, “Purposes of the Society,” \texttt{http://smte.us}.
For the purpose of securing a better understanding among institutions of higher education engaged in work in music; of establishing a more uniform method of granting credit; and of developing and maintaining basic, threshold standards for the granting of degrees and other credentials.  

All of these statements have at their core the advancement of music and music education, but each organization has very separate agendas. Sharing of research, plans, and methods of action occur most often through common members and publications. Rarely does it occur formally with the intention of alignment of purpose. Music education faculty, who often belong or are connected to all four of these organizations, again find themselves without a centralized point of focus and purpose.

The promotion and tenure process of most colleges and universities place music teacher educators in yet another instance of dialectic. Undergraduate students require superb teaching models if they themselves are going to become highly effective teachers. Embodying such a model requires extensive time and effort on the part of faculty. High quality teaching, however, is not always valued in current models of promotion and tenure. The “publish or perish” axiom has long described the life of non-tenured faculty. It continues today, sometimes at the expense of quality teaching in the classroom. This is evidenced in studies showing that tenure-track and mid-career faculty feel they cannot emphasize their work in teaching or service scholarship within the existing promotion

Research, teaching, and service are all components of evaluation, but in most cases, the promotion and tenure process is as follows:

Promotion to professor tends to be based primarily on assessments of the impact of a faculty member’s scholarship in a particular discipline. The larger the number of publications, particularly in top disciplinary journals, or the greater the number of published books, the easier the case is made. Once that threshold is achieved, simple data are then introduced to demonstrate that teaching and service are, in effect, “adequate.” Or else the data are interpreted so broadly as to allow the use of adjectives such as “good,” “acceptable,” or even “rank-appropriate.”

If one reviews hundreds of such promotion cases, as does any provost, it becomes clear that promotion to full professor tends to be reserved for those whose research impact is clearly superior. The faculty member whose primary impact and distinctive contributions are in the areas of dissemination of knowledge through teaching or service to the university or professional associations will tend to be passed over for promotion to full professor – unless a department can find a way to “fudge” a demonstrated level of research impact.

Efforts to reform this system of evaluation exist, especially since the publication of the Carnegie Foundation’s *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* in 1990. This document challenged institutions to change policies of tenure and promotion to include the domains of discovery, teaching, integration and application. It resulted in a great deal of dialogue on the subject, but the results have been mixed. While the need for reform is acknowledged, the structures of academia are strong and traditions are
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difficult to change. The previous quote is a description of the system twenty years after the publication of Scholarship Reconsidered. Even now, the suggestion to assess the “impact of faculty activities” is still seen as revolutionary.

As a result, music teacher educators receive mixed messages regarding their purpose. They are called upon to prepare undergraduates to teach music to all students at all grade levels, promote music teaching and learning, improve the quality of teaching and research, influence developments in teacher education, participate in acts of service for their profession and institution, and publish research in top disciplinary journals. It is virtually impossible for any one person to perform all these tasks at a high level. Consequently, those that are deemed most important by employers often take precedent. In the case of college faculty, publication becomes the currency of the profession.

Music teacher educators who fit comfortably into the circular Gemeinschaft of music education are pulled into the equally tradition-laden society of academia, where knowledge and skill are measured by a different set of criteria and those who set the currency control advancement. Therefore, the inclusion of modern music teacher education in colleges and universities causes dialectic in the purpose of music teacher educators.


In advancing the discipline of music education, music teacher educators further themselves from their original identities as musicians, adding another facet of dialectic. No longer is there only tension between one’s identity as a musician and teacher, there is the added pull of an academic identity.

When Allen Britton wrote that music education’s “purpose is nothing less than to provide an education in music for all children everywhere in the country,” he presumably spoke of the entirety of music education, including music teacher educators. The intent of this purpose seems to be genuine, but no clear path has been forged to achieve it. The outward structures of music education, representing intent, are created to move it into the future. The practice of music education, however, is still deeply rooted in the traditions, values, and beliefs of a Gemeinschaft of musicians. Dialectic, therefore, forms between the two, resulting in unclear purpose.

The journey to become a music educator begins in the home. Gemeinschaft and natural will work together to instill deeply set values and beliefs, which drive natural impulses and desires. Dewey notes, however, “Natural impulses and desires constitute in any case the starting point.” He goes on to state:

There is no intellectual growth without some reconstruction, some remaking, of impulses and desires in the form in which they first show themselves. This remaking involves inhibition of impulse in its first estate. The alternative to externally imposed inhibition is inhibition

through an individual’s own reflection and judgment. The old phrase “stop and think” is sound psychology. For thinking is stoppage of the immediate manifestation of impulse until that impulse has been brought into connection with other possible tendencies to action so that a more comprehensive plan of action is formed.  

Dewey is describing the emergence of rational will from natural will. Music educators find this difficult because their development as musicians is linked to the development of natural will. To become a better musician, one must grow in their ability to listen and respond to one’s natural will. Dewey contends, however, that for intellectual growth, one must learn to curb the impulses and desires of natural will in order to stop and think. This is counterintuitive to being a musician. Musicians practice incessantly so that they do not have to stop and think. Once technique is acquired, faithfulness to the moment (natural will) and complete surrender to the process is the ultimate goal. This principle is key to David Elliot’s concept of achieving flow through praxial music education. This process is directly opposed to Dewey’s argument that one must stop and think in order to contain and direct natural will.

In an educational scheme, the occurrence of a desire and impulse is not the final end. It is an occasion and a demand for the formation of a plan and method of activity. Such a plan, to repeat, can be formed only by study of conditions and by securing all relevant information.

If this is what is required to create clear purpose, including clear answers to the questions who, what, and why, it is no wonder music educators find it difficult to enact change.
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They are caught between their natural desire to listen to impulse and a learned need to study and formulate a plan.

In its most basic form, the dialectic facing music educators is one of stop and go. Gemeinschaft and natural will say go, Gesellschaft and rational will say stop. The heart of a musician says go with what feels and sounds right, the mind of a scholar says stop and think about the consequences. For music education, music teachers, and music teacher educators, this is the dialectic of modernization.

Summary

John Dewey is one of the most prolific philosophers in the history of modern education. His essay, Education and Experience, provides insight into how to resolve the roles of tradition and experience in modern society within the context of education. In particular, Dewey examines the importance of purpose in education. He writes that purpose begins with impulse and desire, but is formed out of a “foresight of consequences” which can only be determined through careful observation, knowledge, and judgment.

The purpose of music education, while seemingly determined over a century ago, is still unclear. Questions persist as to who should be taught, what is entailed in music education, and why it is important in the development of human beings. Attempts have
been made to answer each of these questions. The answers, however, lack consensus, and perhaps more importantly, are not supported by evidentiary practice.

Unclear purpose is additionally demonstrated by the professional lives of music teacher education faculty. While charged with the responsibility of preparing music teachers, they face the added pull of a scholarly life. The currency of academia is often one of research and publication, which can detract from the development of teaching models for undergraduates. The additional identities of researcher and scholar compound the dialectic faced by music teacher educators, further troubling the establishment of clear purpose.

The attempt to establish purpose in music education creates dialectic in music teachers and music teacher educators. This tension stems from the original musician identity, which is built upon the ability to listen to one’s natural will. Musicians who become educators, however, must learn to heed rational will. This requires the ability to stop and think, which is counterintuitive to musical training. Hence, music educators are caught between the most basic dilemma of stop or go - mind or heart – think or feel.
Chapter 5: Synthesis

Looking Within

The primary question this dissertation seeks to answer is: “Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time?” The preceding examples and analysis suggest the answer to this question lies in an ongoing dialectic of modernization. The modernization of society in the twentieth and now the twenty-first century has brought about undeniable change. This change, however, has occurred amidst human beings who hold strong values, beliefs, and traditions. The dialectic of modernization occurs when the values, beliefs, and traditions of human beings meet a changing, modernizing society.

In music teacher education, this dialectic is most prevalent in the areas of identity, structure, and purpose. Chapters two, three, and four of this study analyze these facets in depth. Each contains its own set of tensions, which at times overlap into the others, further deepening the dialectic. The entirety of facets and tensions creates the dialectic of modernization in music education – tension between the traditions, beliefs, and values of music education and the need to adapt to the changes of modern society.
Identity, the first facet of dialectic, has at its center the tension that exists between being a musician and becoming a teacher. Musician identity is formed very early in the home and deepens in the Gemeinshaft of blood, mind, and locality. Young people make choices based on values and beliefs, which grow and deepen in these communities. The musical community is deeply rooted in tradition, and the values and beliefs of young musicians spring from the same traditions. This process continues as students enter schools of music, music teacher education programs, and eventually jobs as music teachers, thus demonstrating the circular nature of music education. Those who choose to become music teachers are musicians. Their primary identity has already been established. Certainly, being a musician is not problematic in and of itself. It only becomes problematic when it stands in the way of becoming a teacher. The music teacher preparation curriculum does not aid in this transformation when only fifteen to twenty percent of curriculum is devoted to professional (teacher) education. Music teachers are often experienced performers. They carry this ability into their professional lives where their performances often take the form of leading ensembles. This adherence to their musician identity creates tension when entering the school environment.

The facet of identity is further complicated amongst music teacher educators. The identities of scholar and researcher place additional expectations and requirements on higher education faculty. Just as music education majors must divide time between the areas of musicianship, liberal arts and professional development, faculty must address research, teaching, and service. In both cases, it is difficult to develop fully in all areas, which results in unintended deficiencies.
Make no mistake; music teacher education is proficient at preparing music
teachers to train traditional musicians. But not every student wants to be a musician who
is trained in the traditions of western art music. In addition, modernizing society expects
schools to prepare students to be more than musicians. This divergence in what music
teachers are prepared to do and what is expected in the modern educational system
demonstrates the need for music teacher education to examine this issue, just as scholars
such as Housewright, Conway, and Choate have in past decades.339

Why, then, does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite
persistent, similar calls for change over time? Music teachers are musicians, first and
foremost. It is doubtful that any other role can usurp this primary identity, especially
when they are not nurtured in the same manner as their musician identity. Their strengths
lie in making music and training others to make music. Musicians are attuned to their
natural will. While this has its benefits in the teaching professions, other characteristics
vital to teaching students to live in a changing world often go undeveloped. Thus, music
teachers have not developed or do not value the thought processes necessary to envision
and plan for change. They are musicians who are trained to perpetuate the status quo.
Enacting change to meet the needs of a modernizing society falls beyond the scope of
preparation.

339 See references in chapter one related to Teacher Education in Music: Final Report, “Becoming a
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Structure is the second facet of the dialectic of modernization in music teacher education. This proves to be a complex issue requiring a broad perspective to fully understand the role of structures in modernizing society. Wiebe’s description of the development of structures in the early twentieth century suggests that their intended outcome was to create order in a rapidly changing country. Analysis of subsequent structures in housing and education indicate, however, that structures can give the appearance of modernization but do not necessarily change underlying beliefs, values, and traditions. For example, *Brown v. Board of Education* was not able to bring an end to segregated schools due to housing patterns that were upheld by local, state, and federal programs and laws. Efforts to integrate schools were often met with efforts to construct counter structures, such as neighborhood schools and bussing. Counter structures are formed to perpetuate traditions, at times under the guise of modernization. As the United States moved into the modern, suburbanized era, FHA and VA loans blocked the inclusion of blacks and other ethnicities. In the areas of housing and education demonstrate that these counter structures are often motivated by deeply held beliefs, values, and traditions related to race.

Traditions, beliefs and values of society are reflected in the structures of music education and music teacher education. The admission requirements of music teacher education programs are built upon Western European traditions. Initially, these structures admitted those who were well qualified to carry on these traditions. The pool of potential applicants was primarily homogeneous and admission requirements only excluded those who lacked ability. Modernization, however, created a heterogeneous
pool of possible applicants. Admission requirements now exclude not only those who lack ability, but those who have not had the opportunity to develop their abilities. Those who possess other abilities not valued in the Western European tradition are also excluded.

The curriculum of music teacher education programs furthers the structure of exclusion by preparing teachers to perpetuate the same traditions that exclude potential applicants. In practice, the cyclical structure of music education contributes to the exclusion of anyone who does not share the same values and beliefs of the Western European tradition. Although it is not deliberate, music education systematically excludes entire segments of the population due to its preoccupation with certain types of ability.

Change in music education is hindered by structures rooted in the Western European traditions of music and musical training. These still hold a prominent place in the process of teacher education and prove very difficult to change. Even when attempts at change and modernization are made, counter structures can emerge, perpetuating traditional values and beliefs. This is evident in the professionalization of music teachers, in which a structure (MENC) was created in order to legitimize and formalize music education in modern society. While MENC has helped in visibility and advocacy efforts, the traditions, beliefs, and values of early twentieth century music education hold strong. These are not necessarily problematic until they dictate the response to changes proposed in order to keep music education relevant in modernizing society.
Thus, the dialectic of modernization is found in the intricate, cyclical structures of music education. Educators realize the need for music education to remain relevant in a changing society and music teacher educators realize the need to prepare undergraduates for such an environment. In this, the need for a structure capable of producing such results is recognized. The counter structures perpetuating the traditions of music education, however, are so complex and interrelated that it is virtually impossible to change one without changing the whole system. The tension between change and tradition is rooted in the realization – consciously or subconsciously - that accepting change will likely alter the entirety of the system. Therefore, while the need is recognized, it is almost too overwhelming to consider, and traditions persist.

Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time? Changing music teacher education would require changing the entire, circular system of music education. As a result, calls for change and attempts to create effective structures of modernization are met with the counter structures of tradition.

The final facet of dialect examined by this study is that of purpose. Purpose, as defined by John Dewey, begins with impulse and desire but does not come to full fruition until it has been developed into a plan and method of action. This can only be formed out of a foresight of consequences. It is this very process in which dialectic occurs.
The Gemeinschaft associated with the musician identity is accompanied by an inclination to adhere to one’s natural will. Development as a musician is related to one’s ability to respond to natural will. Impulse and desire are characteristics of natural will. Therefore, musicians are keenly aware and responsive to the impulses and desires of their natural will. While this is beneficial in the arts, it can prove problematic when musicians are asked to meet the needs of a changing society. The impetus of natural will stems from knowledge of the past, but adapting to the changes in modern society requires the ability to apply this knowledge to what may lie ahead. Or, to use the words of Dewey, adapting to changes in modern society requires “foresight of consequences.”

There is no reason to believe that musicians are unable to develop the thinking and reasoning associated with rational will. Insufficient growth is more likely due to lack of attention and a perceived lack of importance. Regardless of the reason, tension exists between the impulse and desire of natural will and the necessary forethought of rational will. This contributes to the lack of clear purpose in music education and music teacher education.

MENC’s motto, “Music for every child, every child for music,” seems straightforward. Statistics suggest, however, that every child in the United States is not receiving a quality music education. Furthermore, disagreement exists as to what should be included in music education. Statements and calls for the inclusion of students of all backgrounds are supported, but traditional practices have not changed. Consequently, the desired ends cannot be achieved by current practices. Music educators say they want
music for every child, but they do not provide programs to deliver such a goal. The stated purpose of music education is in dialectic with its practices. It is therefore virtually impossible to achieve MENC’s stated purpose of music education. In order to be successful, a plan and method of action must support the desire of MENC to provide music for every child. The diverse population created as a result of modernization requires a reevaluation of the desire, which creates the need for a new plan and method of action. In doing so, the questions of who and what could be resolved and the purpose of music education made clearer.

Competing philosophies of music education create additional sources of tension in the field. While many philosophies offer compelling reasons for why music education is important, all are written in response to a system that already exists. As a result, adherence to a particular philosophy potentially requires changing the entire system of music education.

For instance, if Reimer’s philosophy of aesthetic education were to be embraced by all of music education, it would require a shift in the current ensemble-centric system. Teachers would need to devote additional time to listening and perceiving music, not just performing. This in turn would require a shift in music teacher education programs so that future teachers are prepared to offer such a curriculum to their students. On the other hand, if Elliot’s praxial approach to music education were universally instituted, teachers would need to be prepared to deliver a much more multicultural, sociological approach to
performing music, where the final performance may not be as important as the experience of performing.

This study has already proposed that the thought of changing the entire system of education causes music educators to retreat to tradition. Thus, philosophies that would require change are often set upon a shelf where they are admired for their scholarly thought but considered impractical to implement fully. Consequently, the question of why music education is important goes without a clear answer and the purpose of music education remains imprecise.

The purpose of music education is further blurred by professional organizations, accrediting agencies, and governmental oversight, each of which seem to have competing agendas. Each wants a voice in determining the direction of music education (or education), but the result is often a hodgepodge of ideas and initiatives with no clear focus.

Music teacher education faculty feels and sometimes contributes to unfocused purpose. In order to maintain position, faculty must meet the requirements of institutions that maintain academic traditions. These traditions do not always coincide with what is necessary to develop music teachers. Faculty, therefore, are caught in the modernization of music education. Inclusion in academia is necessary for the professional preparation of music teachers, but it requires faculty members to give up part of their identity as musicians and/or teachers. As a result, dialectic exists in the purpose of faculty, which is reflected in the purpose of music teacher education.
The words of Dewey speak to the importance of resolving the purpose of music education. He writes:

What we want and need is [music] education pure and simple, and we shall make surer and faster progress when we devote ourselves to finding out just what [music] education is and what conditions have to be satisfied in order that [music] education may be a reality and not a name or a slogan.  

Why does music teacher education remain relatively unchanged despite persistent, similar calls for change over time? The traditions of music education were established long before its purpose in education was ever stated. This has resulted in unclear purpose. The questions of who music education is for, what is included in music education, and why it is important have not been answered conclusively. Modernization has made these questions more difficult to answer as the dialectic between traditional practice and stated goals grows.

Looking Forward

A secondary question of this study sought to identify successful instances of reconciling tradition and change that may inform the process in music teacher education. Such instances are difficult to locate. One can pinpoint examples of change in society, but without deep investigation, it is almost impossible to measure the degree to which underlying traditions, attitudes, and beliefs have been changed. To do this, the case

---

would need to be studied in depth and over an extended period of time in order for the complexities of structures and counter structures to emerge.

The literature devoted to implementing change is vast, especially in the area of business. In fact, many models for implementing change in education are based on models first developed for business and industry. These models build in the reflection, foresight, and critical thinking that is often absent, albeit for lack of time and resources, from the thought-processes of educators. There are certainly instances of success among the programs and initiatives, but the longevity of such successes has yet to be demonstrated in most cases. In addition, none of these models has succeeded in changing the entire system of education to one in which all students are successful. While this study does not propose to suggest methods for achieving successful change in music teacher education, further research into models of systemic change in business is suggested as a means of locating a basis for possible plans of action.

There are, however, several authors who offer insight into the process of how to reconcile the dialectic between tradition and change. John Dewey, an ardent supporter of progressive education, did not discount the value of past experiences. He cautions, however, that the contents of education cannot be based solely upon the past. Preparing students for changing society requires a balance in which the future is informed by experiences in both the past and present. Dewey describes it in this way:

The achievements of the past provide the only means at command for understanding the present. . . . the sound principle that the objectives of learning are in the future and its immediate materials are in present experience can be carried into effect only in the degree that present experience is stretched, as it were, backward. It can expand into the future only as it is also enlarged to take in the past.  

This is an important and perhaps comforting point for music educators. Jorgensen observes, “Music educators are conflicted about how to transform society and still hold on to what they perceive to be the musical wisdom of the past.” Dewey’s thoughts propose that moving forward into the future does not require dismissal of past traditions, but an expansion of perspective to see past, present, and future in relation to each other. When this occurs, “we may reject knowledge of the past as the end of education and thereby only emphasize its importance as a means.” For music teacher education, the question then becomes: “How shall the young become acquainted with the past in such a way that the acquaintance is a potent agent in appreciation of the living present?” In other words, how can music teacher education instill the vast knowledge of past decades in a way that will inform the teaching of music in today’s society and the future?

This approach also offers reconciliation of natural and rational wills. Swanwick states that music educators “badly need to find a perspective that does not constrict but does guide our thinking and inform our feeling and intuition.” Dewey’s style of

---

345 Ibid.
thinking allows for just such a perspective, in which the feelings and intuitions of natural will can be guided and informed by rational will.

Maxine Greene seems to agree with Dewey’s thoughts when she writes, “It is because of people’s embeddedness in memory and history, because of their incipient sense of community, that freedom in education cannot be conceived.” She goes on to write about the importance of gaining perspective on traditional values and practices.

He was exploring the possibilities of seeing what was ordinarily obscured by the familiar, so much part of the accustomed and the everyday that it escaped notice entirely. We might think about the clocks that play such important parts in schoolrooms, or school bells, or loudspeakers blaring at the beginning and end of the day; about calling individual children “third-graders” or “lower track”; about threats to summon the remote principal; even about the Pledge of Allegiance, and about the flags drooping in the public rooms. Why should these phenomena be presupposed as a “basis” for thought and self-identification? . . . The point is to find a means of making all this an object of thought, of critical attention. . . . Part of the effort might be to defamiliarize things, to make them strange.347

How could such a perspective aid in achieving desired change in music teacher education? Just as Greene writes, the traditions, values, and beliefs of music education are so strong, so deeply entrenched that they are part of the accustomed and the everyday. From this perspective, they are music education. It is only by moving to another perspective that they can be noticed. When this occurs, the traditions, values, and beliefs become objects of thought. A space exists between the objects and the whole, making it possible to change objects without dismantling music education. This process is similar

to the Paulo Freire’s conscientization, in which one learns to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions in order to take action for or against them. 348

Along with expanding one’s inner perspective, Greene advocates a dialogical relationship between all interested parties. Much like the models proposed by *Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process* and the 2001 CMS Institute on Music Teacher Education, this would include all parties within the current system. Greene also proposes including those not represented in the current system. She writes,

I want them to make their perspectives available so that both I and they can see from many vantage points, make sense from different sides. I want us to work together to unconceal what is hidden, to contextualize what happens to us, to mediate the dialectic that keeps us on edge, that may be keeping us alive. 349

According to Greene, dialogue is necessary in order to uncover and contextualize all perspectives. This process is vital to unlocking the dialectic that contributes to the unchanging nature of music teacher education. A wide perspective of chronology, disciplines, and population seems to be key as music teacher educators seek to maintain the relevancy of music education in the next century.

Similarly, Randall Everett Allsup proposes a model of thinking in which the “oppositional or hierarchical nature of binaries co-exists peacefully without tension.” 350

Such thinking would cause the dialectic between tradition and change to undergo a shift in attitude. No longer would it take the shape of a battle between those who want change and those who hold to tradition. Allsup envisions “a nonhierarchical setting,” where “students and teachers may decide together the meaning of what they think and do, unrelated to standards handed down or measurements imposed.”\textsuperscript{351} In some ways, this would seem opposed to Dewey’s process of creating a clear purpose. It is similar, again, to the CMS and Music Teacher Education process that includes all interested parties. The key is in deciding the meaning of what they do. This involves stepping outside, as Greene suggests, so that the value of traditions can be judged clearly. Do they still hold value in music education today or are they valued for the mere fact that they are tradition? Critical questions and examination are required to discern which traditions can be justified in music education and music teacher education.

Another viewpoint of reconciliation comes from Bernice Johnson Reagon. She writes extensively regarding the straddling of two worlds. Reagon’s observations are of Black and White cultures. Her approach to straddling two cultures, when read from the viewpoint of tradition and change, offers insight into how music education might approach reconciling the two.

For those of us who straddle, there is a third place we go, and in that place, the rules and the structures of both cultures are suspended. We negotiate a new system, which itself is usually a moving and shifting system. It is a hybrid system. So, we don’t move totally from one place to the other place, but we construct a new network of rules, regulations, and standards that are a shifting blend. Therefore no system, neither the one of our birth

\textsuperscript{351} Ibid, 107.
nor the one we adopt through mastery, is sacred. Both systems become instruments or tools. We almost never get lost into worshiping the order of either system.\textsuperscript{352}

Whether or not music education is ready for a new system remains to be determined, but the notion of a hybrid system in which neither tradition or change is sacred (or taboo) coincides with the ideas of Dewey, Greene, and Allsup. Both tradition and change can be used as instruments to achieve the purpose of music education.

The consideration of these questions and approaches lead to a better understanding of the form change should take. Teachers, faculty, and even students recognize the need for change in music education and music teacher education. This, however, cannot lead to a categorical rejection of tradition. Tradition, in and of itself, is not the problem. Blind adherence to tradition and an unquestioning perpetuation of the status quo is the concern. Jumping on board the S.S. Change with no knowledge of its destination would be just as problematic.

The writings of Dewey, Greene, Allsup, and Reagon point to reconciliation of tradition and change, not an either/or binary, as a remedy to overcoming resistance to change. One of the first steps to reconciliation is to gain an understanding of why resistance exists. This study suggests that dialectic of modernization and the resulting tension between tradition and change is the cause of resistance. In music teacher

education (and music education as a whole), this is most evident in the facets of identity, structure, and purpose.

Conclusion

In the opening quote of this dissertation, Emile Jaques-Dalcroze called upon his readers to ascertain the cause of the status quo in music education. This study has attempted to answer his question with special focus on music teacher education. In doing so, insight has been gained which is likely applicable to areas outside music education in regard to immunity to change. The changes brought about by modernization are vast and unavoidable, but the reaction to these changes is often dictated by the traditions, beliefs, and values of individuals and communities. In the case of music teacher education, dialectic is found between change and tradition in identity, structure, and purpose. This dialectic of modernization impedes the implementation of repeated, similar calls for change in music teacher education.

It is hoped that the analysis and synthesis of ideas provided by this study will be an impetus to addressing the final portion of Jaques-Dalcroze’s agenda: to “set about devising means for securing a better record for the coming generation.” Music education is too important and its advocates have worked too hard to allow it to fade away into a faint, outdated remnant of twentieth century American society. A relevant path paved with traditions of the past, the context of the present, and a plan for the future must be forged to move ahead in the twenty-first century.
Poet Elizabeth Bishop writes of the Air Force Band playing on the steps of the capital. Their music, however, is not heard.

On the east steps the Air Force Band
In uniforms of Air Force blue
Is playing hard and loud, but – queer –
The music doesn’t quite come through

It comes in snatches, dim then keen,
Then mute, and yet there is no breeze.
The giant trees stand in between.
I think the trees must intervene,

Catching the music in their leaves
Like gold-dust, till each big leaf sags.
Unceasingly the little flags
Feed their limp stripes into the air,
And the band’s efforts vanish there.

Great shades, edge over,
Give the music room.
The gathered brasses want to go
Boom-boom.353

The traditions of music education cannot act as trees that block the music from reaching those who might receive it. This study attempts to provide room for the music so that the efforts of those who came before do not vanish into the air. The dialectic of modernization serves as a basis for understanding the need to reconcile change and tradition in music teacher education and music education as a whole. Without such

reconciliation, tradition may impede rather than enable music education to become a relevant and required element of American education.
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Appendix A: List of Schools Surveyed

Links to audition requirements for a sample of liberal arts colleges, national universities, and music schools in the U.S.

Liberal Arts Colleges offering undergraduate degrees in music education (Top 10 out of Top 100 with music ed/U.S. News and World Reports)

1. Bucknell University; Lewisburg, PA
   http://www.bucknell.edu/x1224.xml
2. Furman University; Greenville, SC
   http://www.furman.edu/depts/music/auditions/criteria.html
3. Connecticut College; New London, CT
   http://www.conncoll.edu/departments/music/
4. DePauw University; Greencastle, IN
   http://www.depauw.edu/music/prospective/guide.asp#repertoire
5. Gettysburg College; Gettysburg, PA
   http://www.gettysburg.edu/sunderman_conservatory/admissions_aid/audition-requirements/
6. St. Olaf College; Northfield, MN
   http://www.stolaf.edu/depts/music/admissions/StOlaf10MusicAudReq.pdf
7. Wheaton College; Wheaton, IL
   http://www.wheaton.edu/Conservatory/audinstructions.php
8. Lawrence University; Appleton, WI
   http://www.lawrence.edu/admissions/apply/conservatory/conreqs.shtml/
9. Illinois Wesleyan University; Bloomington, IL
   http://www.iwu.edu/music/admissions/audition.shtml
10. Austin College; Sherman, TX

National Universities offering undergraduate degrees in music education (Top 10 out of Top 100 with music ed/U.S. News and World Reports)

1. Northwestern University; Evanston, IL
2. Johns Hopkins University; Baltimore, MD
http://www.peabody.jhu.edu/auditionrepertoire
3. University of Michigan – Ann Arbor; Ann Arbor, MI
   http://www.music.umich.edu/departments/mused/auditions_ug.htm
4. University of Illinois- Urbana-Champaign; Champaign, IL
   http://www.music.uiuc.edu/admissionsAuditionReqs.php
5. University of Wisconsin- Madison; Madison, WI
   http://music.wisc.edu/admissions/undergrad/application
6. Case Western Reserve University; Cleveland, OH
   http://music.case.edu/prospective/ba/audition.php
7. Pennsylvania State University – University Park; University Park, PA
   http://www.music.psu.edu/prospective/ugauditionreqs.html
8. University of Florida; Gainesville, FL
   http://www.arts.ufl.edu/music/students/audition_requirements.aspx
9. University of Miami; Coral Gables, FL
   http://www.music.miami.edu/Undergraduateauditions.html
10. Ohio State University – Columbus; Columbus, OH
    http://music.osu.edu/sites/default/files/Audition_requirements_08-09.pdf

Top Ten Music Colleges in the Nation (U.S. News and World Reports)

1. Curtis Institute of Music
   http://www.curtis.edu/html/30220.shtml
2. Longy School of Music
   http://www.longy.edu/conservatory_admiss/audition_dates.htm
3. VanderCook College of Music
   http://www.vandercook.edu/PDF/audition_sheet.pdf
4. Cleveland Institute of Music
   http://www.cim.edu/assets/downloads/college/auditions.pdf
5. Berklee College of Music
   http://www.berklee.edu/admissions/general/audition_guidelines.html
6. New England Conservatory of Music
   http://necmusic.edu/apply-nec/audition-requirements
7. Manhattan School of Music
   http://www.msmnyc.edu/admission/audition/
8. San Francisco Conservatory of Music
   http://www.sfcm.edu/prospective/auditions.aspx#requirements
9. Mannes College of Music
   http://www.newschool.edu/mannes/subpage.aspx?id=2892
10. Conservatory of Music of Puerto Rico
    http://www.cmpr.edu/admisiones/index.html