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Justifications for music education have been studied only by examining historical trends in statements of aesthetic versus utilitarian values, and not from the perspective of evaluating the justifications' usefulness. A number of prominent writers in the music education field, while supporting aesthetic values as important for music education, have expressed doubts about the effectiveness of aesthetic justifications when used for convincing outsiders of the importance of music in the public school curriculum. These doubts, along with a preponderance of aesthetic justifications in the recent music education literature, led to the present study, which conducted a theoretical examination of the usefulness of aesthetic justifications for music education.

The study addressed three research problems, namely: (1) the attitudes of the clientele groups of the public schools in terms of their values toward music as a subject in the schools; (2) the attitudes of the groups within the music education profession in terms of their values for music in the public schools and for the profession itself; and 3) the likelihood that justifications based upon "aesthetics" as a
system of values would be accepted by the groups both inside and outside the music education profession.

A philosophical-sociological perspective was chosen for the theoretical analysis because the problems of the study concern the manner in which values are accepted or rejected by groups of people. The particular sociological theory chosen combined the symbolic interaction theory of George Herbert Mead and the sociology of knowledge as described by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann.

Conclusions: Problems arise in justifying music education using aesthetic theory because (1) the symbolic universe of aesthetic theory is complex and is not well-understood by music educators or the clientele of the public schools; and (2) aesthetic theory represents gestures of a reference group with norms and values not usually found in the music educator or clientele groups.
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CHAPTER I

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY, AND LINE OF ARGUMENTATION

Introduction and Purpose

Justification of school music programs has been discussed at length in the music education profession.\(^1\) Publications, from the 1967 Report of the Tanglewood Symposium\(^2\) to the recent Beyond the Classroom: Informing Others,\(^3\) have attempted to define and justify the place of music in society and also in the public school curriculum. The Music Educators Journal alone has printed hundreds of articles discussing the values that music provides to students.\(^4\)

First efforts at justifying music as a subject in the public schools occurred when a special committee of the Boston School Board recommended in 1837 that music be tried in the


\(^4\)Jones, "Study of Values."
curriculum on an experimental basis. The board members cited intellectual, moral, and physical advantages to be gained from singing.\textsuperscript{5} Students were to be prepared "for usefulness and happiness in coming life."\textsuperscript{6}

Such advantages and other non-musical values are generally labelled \textit{utilitarian} in the literature. Strictly musical values, such as the idea that music "is related to the the experience of life at the deepest levels of life's significance,"\textsuperscript{7} or that it is "expressive of subjective reality,"\textsuperscript{8} are labelled \textit{aesthetic}.\textsuperscript{9}


\textsuperscript{6} Birge, \textit{History}. From the report of the special committee of the Boston School Board, quoted on p. 47.


\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{9} This dichotomy of utilitarian and aesthetic is complicated by the fact that in the broadest definition of the term utilitarian, all justifications may be considered utilitarian. Aesthetic justifications will claim some good effect or utility from experience of the beautiful or the aesthetic, or they would be of very little use as justifications. Furthermore, good effect on human beings, whether that effect be physical, moral, social, intellectual, emotional, mystical, spiritual, or aesthetic, is the aim of utilitarianism. Though there may exist aesthetic theories which ascribe no human benefit from aesthetic experiences, the use of the term aesthetic in conjunction with justifications entails the proposition that aesthetic justifications are a subset of utilitarian justifications. However, since the reduction of this dichotomy to a set-subset relationship is not usually made in the music education literature, the prevailing limitation of utilitarian to non-aesthetic or non-musical values will be preserved in this study.
According to Miller, utilitarian values prevailed for music in the public schools throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. He notes a trend, between 1917 and 1947, away from utilitarian values and toward aesthetic ones. Jones and Mark both indicate that aesthetic justifications did not become common until around 1960. Mark cites Allen Britton's article in *Basic Concepts in Music Education* (1958) as a pioneering effort in an aesthetic direction. Schwadron, Reimer, and more recently Swanwick have stated an aesthetic case more extensively, a trend which continued through the 1970's. The 1980's have seen more of a balance, however, 

---


15 Reimer, *Philosophy*.


17 Jones, "Study of Values," and Mark, "Evolution."
with both aesthetic and utilitarian arguments being common.\textsuperscript{18}

Hooper,\textsuperscript{19} Miller,\textsuperscript{20} Mark,\textsuperscript{21} and Jones\textsuperscript{22} have studied justifications, but their research has been confined to tracing trends in statements made by music educators about the values music provides in the schools. No study has been found, however, which systematically assesses the purposes for which these justifications have been stated. Furthermore, no study has been found concerning the effectiveness of such justifications, that is, concerning the acceptance of the arguments by the various groups actually involved in school policy-making.

The issue of justification raises a series of questions with sociological, political, economic, and philosophical implications. Why are justifications such an important concern for music educators? Are there different values which underly justifications? How do justifications relate to the funding and teaching of school music? Who are the proper target groups for justifications—-who actually makes the decisions about funding and curriculum? What is the socio-political makeup of


\textsuperscript{20}\textsuperscript{20}Miller, "Influence of Progressivism."

\textsuperscript{21}\textsuperscript{21}Mark, "Evolution."

\textsuperscript{22}\textsuperscript{22}Jones, "Study of Values."
these target groups? Are there different groups within music education in terms of beliefs about justifications? What factors influence the acceptance of justifications by the groups to which they are directed? Which arguments are more effective: aesthetic or utilitarian?

From these questions three related problems emerge, which will be the focus of this research: (1) what are the attitudes of the clientele groups of the public schools in terms of their values toward music as a subject in the schools? (2) what are the attitudes of the groups within the music education profession in terms of their values for music in the public schools and for the profession itself? and (3) are justifications based upon aesthetics as a system of values likely to be accepted by the groups both inside and outside the music education profession? Taken together, these three problems comprise the main purpose of the study, which is to make a theoretical examination of the usefulness of aesthetic justifications for music education.

Need for the Study

As mentioned above, a number of perspectives exist from which to view justification as an activity undertaken by music educators. There are, in the body of music education research, normative studies which trace justification statements in the journals, empirical studies on attitudes toward values for music in the schools and in the profession, philosophical studies which develop or derive principles and value statements
for music education from philosophical and aesthetic writings, and sociological studies which examine the different groups within music education.

For the present research purpose, however, these existing studies do not fully answer the questions posed above. The normative studies trace the publication of justification arguments, but do not look at their effectiveness. The empirical studies survey attitudes but do not interpret their findings with the usefulness of justifications in mind. The philosophical studies develop principles but do not examine the acceptance of those principles by the different groups involved. Finally, the sociological studies look at groups within music education but not at factors which influence the acceptance of values by those groups.

A review of the literature reveals a proliferation of aesthetic justifications for music education. This researcher was unable to find a systematic analysis of their effectiveness, however, further suggesting a need for the present study. A philosophical-sociological perspective was chosen because it offers a useful means to examine the research problems, including makeup of school clientele and music educator groups, issues of aesthetic values, and the acceptance of those values by the groups.

Clarification of "Music Education"

A distinction will be made in this study between the terms music education, the music education profession, and music in
the public schools. Music education will be defined as the process of teaching and learning music, as practiced by music educators. The specific situations where music education takes place include churches, homes, leisure settings, private studios, colleges and universities, private schools, and public schools. All those people who teach music professionally and who are concerned with the process of teaching and learning music are music educators, making up the music education profession.

Music education is sometimes used in the literature to mean only music in the public schools, which is a single aspect of music education at large. Because of the differences between justification issues for the public schools and for the profession, this distinction will be observed.

Background of the Study

Even though this study proposes a theoretical examination of the usefulness of aesthetic justifications for music education, there exists a body of evidence which needs to be examined in order to support or refute the theoretical conclusions. This body of evidence consists primarily of the studies mentioned above. Normative studies tracing justification statements in the music education journals will be reviewed in Chapter Two. Empirical studies of the attitudes of school related groups will comprise the discussion in Chapter Three. Philosophical studies which derive or develop principles for music education or for justifying music in the public schools
will be examined in Chapter Four. Chapter Five will review sociological studies which investigate the various groups within music education, while essential concepts of the sociological perspective chosen for the study will be described in Chapter Six. Chapter Seven will then consist of a theoretical analysis of the research problems using a sociological perspective, drawing evidence from the studies reviewed in Chapters Two through Five.

One of the philosophical studies, that of Robert Smith, has named a number of difficulties involved in attempting to use aesthetic theories to justify music education: (1) aesthetic theories are likely to supply principles for music education, but aesthetic theories often contradict each other; (2) aesthetics as a field of philosophy is to some philosophers a questionable pursuit; (3) aestheticians and music educators view music and aesthetic experience from vastly different vantage points; (4) value statements, which are at the heart of justification, pose philosophical difficulties; (5) the truth of value statements is difficult to verify; and (6) the complexity of dealing with value statements makes them poor candidates upon which to base principles for music education.

As Smith claims, a good defense for music education should be easily understood by the people being addressed, and also

readily accepted by them. A good justification needs to consider its audience, the group or groups of people to whom it is addressed, and their values. People tend to agree with positions which are congruent with their own belief systems, and tend to disagree with arguments that conflict with their norms and values. Thus, prior to arguing one's case, one would need to know the norms and values of those people to whom the argument would be addressed.

One approach to studying groups of people, and the manner in which information, language, knowledge, habits, norms, and values are created, distributed, and processed in society is presented by George Herbert Mead, in his philosophy and in his theory of symbolic interaction. Mead defines interaction as communication by symbolic gestures, which are understood and defined in the context of social groups. Mead's philosophical position will herein be called social relativism.

Social Relativism

Social relativism reflects a philosophical perspective that places itself somewhere in the middle between the two polarities of absolutism and relativism. Absolutism implies universal and immutable meaning. An absolutist explains differences of opinion as the result of inadequate perceptions. For example, an absolutist theory is embodied in Machlis'
statement that "the mature music lover has no fear of knowledge about music. He realizes that the true source of the musical experience is not in himself but in the sounds." In this view, truth is absolute, residing in objects of the observable world (the sounds). Therefore, the absolutist may claim that the experience produced by the sounds will be beneficial to the listener as long as the music is of high enough quality. The listener's perceptual skills, however, must be developed and trained in order to perceive the aesthetic value in the sounds.

Relativism claims that truth resides in our perceptions of the world (not in the sounds but in the way we hear them). The relativist may not claim that aesthetic experience is inherently beneficial. Instead, experience is relative to a person's individual perceptions and therefore not subject to any guarantees of quality. This view, therefore, would be opposed to the absolutist idea that aesthetic value is a characteristic of well-written music which must be present in order to produce aesthetically valuable experiences in the listener.

Relativism, taken in its most extreme formulation as solipsism, results in a world view in which each person's reality is unique and independent of every other person's reality. This position is tantamount to rejecting shared meanings (communication) and shared experience (culture). Such a view, then, does not seem fruitful for looking at music teaching, an activity which depends on both communication and

---

culture. Absolutism, on the other hand, implies that there exists only one version of reality, that absolute principles govern nature and mankind. The belief in absolute "laws of nature" was widely accepted in the nineteenth-century world of Newtonian physics. Since science has moved into the twentieth century, however, new theories have been formulated to challenge absolutism.

These theories have taken a middle ground in the debate between relativism and absolutism with the argument that truth is relative to social contexts. A statement of this concept as it applies to the history of science has been proposed by Thomas Kuhn. Kuhn points out that science thrives when it is based upon acceptance of a paradigm by the scientists. A paradigm is a theory or set of assumptions which is accepted by the scientific community as true for the time being. The paradigm is part of what Kuhn calls the disciplinary matrix, which includes not only the theoretical paradigm, but the prevailing attitudes, habits, and values of members of the community. All of these elements of the disciplinary matrix together guide the actions of the group, and all of the elements are subject to change over time. The paradigm is not an

26Among these thinkers are George Herbert Mead in the fields of philosophy and social psychology, Jan Mukarovsky in philosophy and aesthetics, Robin George Collingwood in philosophy and aesthetics, and Thomas Kuhn in philosophy and the history of science.

absolute theory of reality; it holds true for only as long as major doubts about it are suppressed.

Paradoxically, it is in the interest of scientific progress (actually productivity) to neglect those views that oppose the paradigm. In their everyday work, scientists do not have the time to question the paradigm constantly. Rather, it defines the boundaries of their questions, and within these boundaries scientists may be very efficient.

When anomalies accumulate past a certain point, however, a crisis of confidence is produced. New theories surface, and an alternative paradigm is chosen. It is a tribute to the cohesiveness of the scientific community that it quickly abandons the old paradigm and begins to enforce the new, ensuring a minimum amount of undirected work. A notion of progress seems to emerge. According to Kuhn, however, the new paradigm is not necessarily an improvement over the old:

An apparently arbitrary element operates in the selection of one paradigm over another. Philosophers of science have repeatedly demonstrated that more than one theoretical construction can always be placed upon a given collection of data.28

The new paradigm is not more true in an absolute sense, but the anomalies which plagued the old paradigm will seem to resolve themselves when viewed from the new perspective.

It should be asked, then, how one can reject the absolutist position but still allow for agreement on perceptions. It is possible, in the view of social relativism, to have

28Kuhn, Structure, 4.
objective meaning. If people agree upon the interpretation of a perception, their common interpretation will be objectively verifiable within the group. The meaning attached to the perception will be consistent and objective for the people who are in agreement. The scientific paradigm represents just such an agreement.²⁹

Since, in this view, objectivity is based at least in part upon agreement among people, groups of people must be studied to ascertain how they determine objective truth. Each person's view of the world is a product of the truths gained from the people with whom he or she comes in contact. This statement is, in fact, a central thesis of Mead's work, and represents the essence of social relativism.

Mead addresses the dilemma of absolutism/relativism by his philosophy of the act.³⁰ Since each human act is the product of a particular person or group of persons at a particular time

²⁹Aesthetics is not a paradigmatic field, as Max Dessoir, in his Asthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft, trans. S. A. Emery (Detroit: The Free Press, 1970), laments on p. 1: "Aesthetics has never fared well. A late arrival in the world as a younger sister of logic, it has been treated with contempt from the start. Whether as the doctrine of an inferior knowledge or as the science of the sensuous unveiling of the Absolute, it has always remained something subordinate and incidental. Perhaps on this account and perhaps because of an obscurity in the subject itself, aesthetics has never been able to claim either a sharply defined field or a reliable method." For a discussion of the lack of a paradigm in musicology, see Jacob Opper, Science and the Arts: A Study in Relationships from 1600-1900 (Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1973).

and place, Mead postulates, truth may be agreed upon by those people at that time in that place. Truth is relative to the situation, but may be objectively agreed upon in that situation.

An outgrowth of Mead's philosophy is his theory of symbolic interaction.\(^{31}\) It describes the process by which individuals develop in the context of the social groups of which they are a part. Interaction takes place by means of gestures which must be learned by a person who wishes to be accepted into the group. These gestures, which may consist of actions, knowledge, habits, values, modes of dress, and language, enable communication to take place. Taken out of context, or viewed without the benefit of the context of the social group, gestures are not meaningful, and as such are likely to communicate a different meaning than was intended.

Based upon the ideas of Mead and others\(^{32}\) subscribing to the same theoretical framework, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann


have developed a comprehensive sociology of knowledge.\textsuperscript{33}
Like Mead, they explain knowledge as being a property of social groups. A social group is a group of people who possess a common bond of some sort. The group, and the roles that its members take, may be defined by that common bond. The students, administrators, and parents of a public school, for example, are three groups defined by their roles as students, administrators, and parents.

The concept "defined by their roles" refers to the bond that holds a social group together--the body of knowledge that the group possesses in common. This body of knowledge consists of all the mannerisms, language, modes of dress, norms, and values which are shared by the members. It is their agreed-upon objective reality. Every member's version of objective reality will be slightly different, however, because each person is a member of many social groups. As such, each is the possessor of a number of bodies of knowledge, all of which affect the rest. But within the context of one of these groups, its own body of knowledge is considered to be objective. An individual wanting to be recognized as a member of the group will have to take the role defined by that group. He

\textsuperscript{33}Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967). Berger and Luckmann represent the integration of various strains of anthropological, historical, sociological, and philosophical influences into a single comprehensive body of systematic theoretical reasoning. The discussion of social groups is taken primarily from concepts in Chapters I and II.
or she will have to share and exhibit the body of knowledge, especially the norms and values, of the group.

The group with which one shares norms and values is called a reference group. The norms and values may be thought of as the belief system of the reference group. The concept of reference group is central to this study, because the likelihood of a group of people agreeing with a justification is determined by that group's agreement with the perceived belief system of the person making the argument. In an example pertinent to this research, a school board member will not likely believe a justification unless he or she shares the norms and values of the reference group of the music educator. While it is possible for an individual to change reference groups, such a change is not easily accomplished by coercion.

Depending on the degree of their attachment to the norms and values of the reference group, individuals may be motivated to behave in congruence with those norms and values. For "aesthetic music educators," the realm of aesthetics and aesthetic experiences defines a reference group, which, over time, becomes institutionalized as a body of knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes. This institution then becomes an entity which can guide the actions of its members, and also must be defended from attack by outsiders.


35 Clark, Reference Group Theory, 12.
The process by which any institution is defended, or justified, is called **legitimation**. An institution carries with it a body of knowledge which is separate from the general stock of knowledge of society. It is this knowledge (including all gestures: cognitive information, behavioral rules, codes, attitudes, etc.) that must be protected in order for the institution to survive.

When many bodies of knowledge arise within the common stock of knowledge of society, each carries the potential for becoming a socially segregated subuniverse of meaning. Legitimation, then, is the process of maintaining the reality of this subuniverse. Ultimately, the institution is legitimated by becoming a symbolic universe of meaning unto itself, which is judged according to its own reality and not by the reality of the common social world--the objections of the everyday world cannot touch it.

In the music education profession, the term *aesthetic education* defines such a legitimated institution. What is problematic is that the symbolic subuniverse of aesthetic meanings is indeed esoteric as compared to the common social stock of knowledge. As such, entrance to the institution requires effort and study, which tends, in turn, to alienate outsiders who do not understand the institution's meanings.

---

37 Ibid.
For example, a music educator believes in, and by knowledge and training is a member of the symbolic subuniverse based upon aesthetic values and meanings. He or she will maintain the self-image of "aesthetic music educator." An outsider who shares the same norms and values as the aesthetic educator will see the group members as "those who believe as I do," and will be motivated to become a member of that group. An outsider who disagrees— who does not share the norms and values of aesthetic education—will not be motivated to join the group, and in fact may be alienated by the implied threat to everyday reality represented by this new, esoteric subuniverse.

This example theoretically predicts a certain degree of alienation within the music education profession over the subuniverse of aesthetics. The same prediction holds for those persons outside the music education community (the clientele groups of the public schools) who will be unlikely to want to share this specialized subuniverse of meaning which is outside their own everyday universe of discourse.

Summary of Line of Argumentation

Research Problem I: Justification to Groups Outside Music Education

Bryant reports a wide variation among school board members' opinions about objectives for music in the schools. In

light of social relativism, these differences may be interpreted as differences in norms and values of reference groups. Indeed, the adults in the study who had a musical background in common tended to agree upon objectives, which would indicate that knowledge of the gestures of music tended to put people in a common reference group.

In terms of justifications for music in the public schools, the implication is that the decision makers should ideally be people with musical backgrounds. In her study of the history of Milwaukee public school arts policy, Troiano supports this point with her contention that "the existence of arts policies [in Milwaukee] has depended on the existence of influential arts advocates on the school board."40

It is one thing to be an arts (or music) advocate; it is quite another to use the language and meanings of aesthetics to support that advocacy. In choosing a justification, those seeking support for music education must take into account the norms and values of the decision makers. Arguments based on values foreign to the target group are not the best candidates for effective justifications.

Such a situation, in which the support of a clientele group is being solicited, can be interpreted in light of social

---


40 Ibid., 127.
relativism as follows. Since knowledge is interpreted in the context of social groups, the clientele of the public schools would have to be familiar with the language of aestheticians in order to understand philosophical aesthetic arguments. Furthermore, the reference group of aestheticians has certain agreed-upon norms and values, theoretical information, language, writing style, modes of thought, and other behaviors that identify its members as aestheticians and help determine their view of reality. The public school clientele, therefore, would need to be familiar with these identifying behaviors of aestheticians, as well.

Outsiders, then, (1) will not fully understand the meanings of this "aesthetics" group unless they learn many of the insider gestures, and (2) will not want to become insiders unless they share the norms and values of the aestheticians. In the case of the clientele groups of music in the public schools, it is unlikely that either of these conditions will be met. In the terminology of legitimation theory, the esoteric nature of the subuniverse of aesthetic meanings is a possible cause of alienation for outsiders.

Research Problem II: Justification to Groups Within Music Education

The same two points made about outsider groups can be made about groups within the music education profession. First, a diversity of groups make up the profession as a whole, including band directors, general music teachers, choir directors, orchestra directors, college music education professors, and
private studio teachers. Each group has certain gestures, norms, and values, that are shared only within the group. As Charles Leonhard points out, differences between these groups cause divisiveness in the music education profession:

The enterprises of musical education, and the music and arts community generally, are marked by divisiveness and competition when they should be unified and mutually supportive. We have myriad organizations all with benign motives: MENC, NASM, ABDA, CBDNA, ACDA, NAJE, the Orff Association, the Kodaly Association, the Alliance for Arts Education, the Arts Alliance, the Art Coalition and Arts Councils, each plowing its own row and never forming a cohesive force for political and social action in support of the arts and arts education.  

Second, different reference groups exist with regard to attitudes on aesthetic values, and those people who do not share the same particular values will not change reference groups easily or by coercion. Kacanek studied music educators' agreement with selected statements by music educator Bennett Reimer about aesthetic music education, and found general agreement with Reimer's statements. Secondary performance group directors in the suburbs, however, showed much weaker agreement than did other groups, a fact which Kacanek attributes to a "performance orientation" which is somehow opposed


42Harold S. Kacanek, "A Descriptive Analysis of Wisconsin Music Educators' Agreement with Bennett Reimer's A Philosophy of Music Education" (doctoral diss., University of Kansas, 1982).
to the "aesthetic orientation." Not all of the music educators sampled, however, indicated strong agreement with Reimer. In fact, a phenomenon often observed in attitude surveys of music educators is a split between public school and college teachers on attitudes toward objectives, suggesting the existence of different reference groups within the music education profession.

In addition, a third problem in attempting justification to groups within the music education profession may be found in the terminology used to describe the processes of motivating music educators, explaining what they do, and justifying what they do. These fundamental issues are often described together in the "catch-all" phrase "philosophy of music education." Philosophy is seen as important for music education because:

1. It inspires and lightens the work of the music teacher.
2. It serves to guide and give direction to the efforts of the teacher.
3. It helps the music teacher clarify and explain the importance of music to his colleagues and to laymen.45

In the literature reviewed for this research, however, names for these three philosophical purposes are often interchanged. For example, Smith refers to the second function above--

43See Chapter Three below.

44See also Reimer, Philosophy; Harold F. Abeles, Charles R. Hoffer, and Robert H. Klotman, Foundations of Music Education (New York: Schirmer, 1984); Jones, "Study of Values"; and Smith, "Esthetic Theory."

developing principles to guide instruction—as rationale-making, but Leonhard uses the term rationale to refer to the third purpose, that of defending the music program. According to social group theory, a common language must be agreed upon by all group members if the profession is to function as one group. For the sake of clarity in discussing issues of justification, therefore, in this research the terms ideology, rationale, and justification will be used to distinguish the three philosophical functions of music education.

As in philosophical function number one, an ideology "inspires" and "lightens the work" of the music educator. A rationale for music education—that is, a logically derived and ordered set of principles seeking to explain the processes of teaching and learning music—may be found in the language of function number two, above, "which guides and gives direction" to the teacher. Finally, a justification for music in the public schools is, as in function number three, an effort to "clarify and explain the importance of music to [the educator's] colleagues and to laymen."

Ideology

Webster defines ideology as follows: "a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group, or


culture [as in] <bourgeois ideology> <medical, legal, and other professional ideologies>.

The term ideology was only found in a few sources, although its designated meaning—an underlying belief system—has been sometimes attributed to rationale in the music education literature. As Robert Smith states:

Music educators who assert that there is a need for a statement of the rationale of music education often seem to be demanding something which will provide a basis for agreement within the profession, a program of action to present to other educators and the public, a ground for assurance that music education is important, and a brief for the allotment of more time and money for the school music program. All these good things can be provided with certainty only by an ideology. A rationale and a set of principles may or may not provide some of them.

An ideology is thus a set of guiding thoughts which can serve as a basis for action in the context of the standards of the group holding those beliefs.

Rationale

Webster defines rationale as "1. an explanation or exposition of controlling principles. 2. the underlying reason: rational basis: JUSTIFICATION, GROUND <the rationale of the law>.

For clarity's sake, this researcher proposes that the emphasis be put on the rational nature of rationale. The root word rational implies logical or reasoned thought. Logical principles can be used to justify something, as in definition number two above, but if principles do not meet standards of

---


49 Smith, "Esthetic Theory," 86.

50 Webster's, s.v. "rationale."
logical consistency, they are not rationales. For music education, then, a rationale would be a logically ordered construct of controlling principles which describe and govern the teaching and learning of music.

As a philosophical activity, rationale-making is the proposal of logically structured hypotheses which explain the teaching and learning of music. The rationale, or theory of music teaching and learning, will not be complete, however, until it is tested by observation. But as Kuhn asserts, a theory is never complete; it is always in a dialectic process between hypothesizing and observing. The process of proposing rationales needs to be balanced by observing their results.

A rationale, then, is a theory. It should be noted that the concept of a "rationale for music education," as used by Smith and others in the literature, tends to imply more than simply a theory. It implies a theory for all of music education, which can serve as an underlying explanation and set of principles which guide practices for the profession. If such a theory existed it would become a paradigm, by Kuhn's definition of the term. If accepted by the group of music educators, a rationale, along with an accompanying ideology, could serve as the paradigm and disciplinary matrix for the profession.

\[51\] Kuhn, Structure.

\[52\] See discussion in Smith, "Esthetic Theory," 77-91.
A careful distinction thus needs to be made when using the term **rationale**. A **rationale**, when the term is used alone, is a logically ordered theory which explains some aspect of music teaching and learning. A **rationale for music education** implies a paradigm, widely accepted by music educators, which logically explains the teaching and learning of music in general.

As mentioned above, **rationale** and **justification** are used interchangeably in some of the music education literature reviewed for this study. In another example, Abeles, Hoffer, and Klotman, in discussing the purposes of using philosophy in music education, state that:

> Every music teacher needs a clear rationale for music in general and specific music courses in particular. No music teacher should ever assume that everyone realizes music should be a vital part of a school curriculum.

They use the term **rationale** in its sense of the underlying values which **justify** the teaching of music.

### Justification

In contrast to **rationale**, the primary implication of **justification** is defense. Webster defines **justify** as: "1. to prove or show to be just, desirable, warranted, or useful: VINDICATE." **Justification** is then defined as "1. the act or an instance of justifying: VINDICATION: DEFENSE."

---

53 See Abeles, Hoffer, and Klotman, Foundations; Surplus and Dooley, *Informing Others*, xv; and Smith, "Esthetic Theory."


55 *Webster's*, s.v. "justify."

56 Ibid., s.v. "justification."
definition of **justify** emphasizes the root word **just**, meaning right or blameless. A justification is a defense of a just cause or proposition. Rational or logical consistency and structure are not required.

An ideology, or set of beliefs, is the basis for personal action. It may also be the basis for a justification. In fact, an ideology is the means for justifying actions to oneself, and may be called a personal justification. Personal belief, however, does not imply logical derivation of ideas, so an ideology is not automatically the basis for a rationale.

A rationale, or set of rational, explanatory principles, may also be used as a justification, but its main function is explanation. A rationale may explain without defending; a justification may defend without using rational thought. A rationale may not convince others who do not think logically; a justification may appeal more to emotion than to reason. A good rationale should meet criteria of logical consistency; a good justification must be judged by its effectiveness in convincing others of its position.

**Research Problem III: The Likelihood of Group Acceptance of Aesthetic Justifications**

An investigation of the first two research problems suggests that problems exist in using aesthetic justifications for music education because of the diversity of reference groups involved in the justification process. Furthermore, an analysis using legitimation theory has predicted a conflict between
the symbolic universe of meaning represented by aesthetics and symbolic universes representative of other values. These predictions are made for groups both outside and inside the music education profession. Inside the profession, a lack of consistency in using the philosophical terminology often associated with justifications adds another obstacle to the acceptance of aesthetic justifications by groups of music educators. The focus of this study is the systematic investigation of these predictions.
CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATIONS FOR MUSIC
IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND FOR THE
MUSIC EDUCATION PROFESSION

Part of the evidence for this study is research which examines justifications for music in the public schools and for the music education profession. Most of the studies found are surveys of opinion and trends concerning value statements in the professional literature. No study was found which uses a theoretical perspective to address the issues of creating and using justifications.

Jones surveyed justifications for music education as gauged by major articles in the Music Educators Journal. A follow-up study published in the Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education extends the time period of his investigations from 1950 to 1977. Jones reports that statements of the value of music shifted from expressions of "utilitarian" to "aesthetic" goals during that time period. This shifting to claims of "aesthetic" values for music education


represents one of the justifications for the present study.

On another important issue for this research, Jones quotes Leonhard and House on the uses of philosophy in music education:

1. It inspires and lightens the work of the music teacher.
2. It serves to guide and give direction to the efforts of the teacher.
3. It helps the music teacher clarify and explain the importance of music to his colleagues and to laymen.3

As discussed in Chapter One, music educators often refer to these three purposes in their discussions of philosophical issues. The first purpose, according to Smith,4 would be best served by an ideology. The second fits this study's definition of a rationale, and the third describes the process of justification. Again, as proposed in Chapter One, "music education philosophy" will refer to these three activities: the making of ideologies, rationales, and justifications.

A third issue of import for this study regards the acceptance of philosophical reasoning by music educators and laymen. Jones emphasizes the necessity of relevance for a philosophy:

If a philosophy of music education performs these three services for the music teacher, it will do so best if the basic values within the philosophy are sound, and are relevant to its society. . . . if a philosophy is to


exercise its influence on society and education, . . . the philosophical values upon which it is based must reflect the values of that society.  

He contends, therefore, that music educators cannot expect aesthetic theory to furnish them with their beliefs about their profession; any such philosophical base must rest naturally under the group which uses it. The same implication applies to using aesthetic theory to justify music education to laymen. If the values of aesthetic theory (or any theory) are not already part of the society being addressed, they will not be accepted when imposed from without.

In his two studies, Jones reports that values citing "aesthetics" and "creativity" became predominant in the *Music Educators Journal* by 1967, and continued to dominate the writings through 1977. As was proposed earlier, this proliferation of aesthetic justifications invites a theoretical study of their usefulness. The point needs to be made, however, that predominance of aesthetic justifications in the *Music Educators Journal* does not necessarily indicate that those justifications are the ones most commonly used by practicing music educators. Jones does not address this issue, and the question must be asked whether article content in the *Journal* accurately reflects thinking of the entire profession.

---

Hooper addresses this question in her content analysis of the *Music Educators Journal* from 1957-1967. Her study is a correlation of theoretical topics and types of authors who write about those topics. Two findings stand out: No significant correlation was found between "music as an aesthetic experience" and any author category, and yet classroom teachers were found not to contribute significantly to theoretical discussions in the journal. It seems, therefore, that Jones' preponderance of aesthetic justifications can be attributed to all types of authors except classroom teachers.

The fact that Hooper groups her authors into categories, such as (1) college professors of music education, (2) writers from outside music, (3) classroom teachers, (4) officers of the Music Educators National conference, and (5) supervisory personnel, demonstrates her belief that authors from each group tend to share perspectives and ideas. The fact that a number of positive correlations are found between certain groups of authors and certain issues further strengthens the underlying contention of the present research, that reference groups do influence what is held as knowledge by their members.

Mark also traces "The Evolution of Music Education Philosophy from Utilitarian to Aesthetic." In addition to

---


noting the same trend Jones observed, he also says that most writers in the "utilitarian" era (pre-1958), "understood the aesthetic value of music, but did not think of it, in itself, as justification for music education." These writers emphasized "the way that music influenced the individual's behavior to make him a better citizen."

One of the important distinctions made by the aesthetic education movement, according to Mark, was a shift in perspective. Instead of believing that aesthetic experiences contribute primarily to making a person a healthier member of society, writers from this movement began to advocate the value of aesthetic experience for its own sake:

"Around the middle of the 20th century, music education philosophers no longer expressed the need to relate aesthetic development to societal needs and goals. From that time on, the prevailing philosophy of aesthetic education has supported the teaching of music for aesthetic development without expressing the value to society of the aesthetically developed individual."

Considering the earlier statements by Jones, Leonhard, and House about the importance of relevancy of a philosophy to the society it serves, Mark has identified a problem with the "aesthetic education" movement: If the stated goal of "aesthetic education" emphasizes only the benefits which accrue to the individual, how can that movement be justified to the society? It seems to this writer that there is a "value to society of

---

9 Ibid.
10 Ibid., 20.
the aesthetically developed individual," but this social value must be emphasized in justifications to the society.

Kidd's study also traces elements of the aesthetic education movement in music. He analyzes publications of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) between 1960 and 1970 in order to determine the curricular philosophy embodied in those documents. His research includes examination of publications and transcripts of interviews with MENC presidents from that time.

He concludes that there were five curricular emphases during the 1960's: (1) aesthetic education; (2) experimental curricula; (3) introduction of popular, folk, and non-Western music into the classroom; (4) expansion to meet the needs of "minority" and "disadvantaged" students; and (5) interest in new technology in music education. Kidd's research supports that of Jones, Mark, and Hooper in identifying aesthetic ideologies, rationales, and justifications as pre-eminent in the philosophy embodied in the professional literature beginning in the early 1960's.

Rather than surveying music education opinion, Wolff investigated justifications by examining research on the non-musical outcomes of music education. She reviewed studies on


the benefits of music education on cognitive learning, social and emotional growth, and physical growth and learning, concluding that:

While it is true that most of the research related to the nonmusical outcomes of music education has produced positive results, the conclusions drawn generally remain unconvincing. This is due largely to obvious inadequacies in the experimental designs and also to the incomplete and equivocal descriptions of the experiments themselves. . . . the results of this research are not persuasive. Whether this is due to the mechanical matters mentioned above or to specious hypotheses is not clear, but it may be said with safety that definitive evidence of the nonmusical outcomes of music education is yet to be provided.13

Wolff's study was the only one found which analyzes research to draw conclusions about utilitarian justifications. No such studies were found concerning aesthetic justifications, however, either from a review of research or a theoretical analysis.

Another non-survey study was undertaken by Troiano,14 who researched the history of public school arts policy in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, from 1870 to 1930. Her purpose was to determine the rationale for the inclusion of drawing and music in the curriculum over this time period. Troiano concludes that school arts policy is not a function of economic prosperity, but rather of predominant socio-political trends in the community. The major implication from the study is that:


school arts advocates must exist on the local school board and be able to support arts policy with rationales [by the present study's definition: justifications] which are in congruence with the current social concerns of the other makers of school policy. [school board members]¹⁵

Her point that justifications must be "in congruence with social concerns of the other makers of school policy" is evidence of the validity of reference group theory: that values are not imposed on a group from outside the group.

The final study to be reviewed here is not a survey of opinions or justifications, but examines the process by which decisions about curricular matters are made. As such, it is the one study found which concerns the process of justification. Markowitz¹⁶ investigated the political behavior involved in curriculum decision-making, specifically concerning music in the schools.

She notes a multitude of factors which influence curricular decisions at three levels: the societal level (decisions of federal and state legislators, school boards, universities, publishers, and other public and private pressure groups); the institutional level (administrator decisions); and at the instructional level (teacher decisions). These groups influence the content of established subject areas as well as the inclusion of so-called "elective" subjects, such as music in the public schools.

¹⁵Troiano, "History of Arts Policy," ii.

She reports that, despite federal intervention and pressure groups on the state level, most decisions on curriculum are still made on the local level. As such, local school systems offer the most promising situations for research into the study of patterns of political behavior in curriculum decision-making.17

In her review of literature, Markowitz identifies a number of problems which exist in the socio-political institution comprising the local school system. She quotes Gross, who recognizes:

certain dysfunctions existing in the organizational structure of the school which distinguish schools from other large-scale organizations. Two of these blocks to effective functioning are: (1) lack of agreement on organizational goals and (2) lack of consensus on the role definitions associated with educational position, e.g., superintendents, principals, curriculum supervisors, and teachers.18

Interpreted from the perspective of social relativism, the lack of agreement on organizational goals indicates a number of different reference groups within the system. The lack of consensus on role definitions of school personnel is also evidence of differences in norms and values within and among these groups with regard to objectives.

According to other writers cited by Markowitz, such objectives as do exist are often ignored when decisions are made

concerning curriculum policy. Orlich and Sheamis contend that organizational purposes and policies of many local school systems have not been clear or consistent. They analyzed hundreds of school philosophies and found that decision-making in local schools "was seldom based on a well thought out philosophy and realistic goals that directed action." She refers to Alfonso, Firth, and Neville's conclusion that:

"Often the consideration of goals is an isolated and academic exercise and is not really used to direct a given plan... [and, therefore] goals must be more than platitudes in order to make them worthy of involvement and consideration within the change process."

Markowitz indicates that goals are often vague and cites Beauchamp, who asserts that teachers do not have the time to participate in developing goals for entire curricula:

"The conventional impression of the job of the teacher is that his sole responsibility is to develop instructional strategies and carry them out with his class or classes. To think of involving teachers additionally in anything as complicated as a curriculum system... is impossible unless ways and means are found for teachers to participate... unencumbered by teaching responsibility."

---


20 Ibid., 4.
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Markowitz concludes that:

Although teachers have been represented in the literature as critical agents in curriculum development, it appears that established role patterns in schools have restrained teachers' access to curriculum decision-making power.\(^{24}\)

Markowitz thus portrays the socio-political system of curriculum decision-making as follows: Role definitions of school personnel involved in these decisions are vague. Teachers are too busy teaching to worry about goals for curriculum planning, and are politically not empowered to make decisions about overall curriculum. There are conflicts between teachers and administrators because teachers are expected to carry out policies which they have not had time or opportunity to help formulate:

Administrators and teachers have failed to work together in a consistent manner in order to establish clear curriculum priorities. This has resulted in institutional fragmentation and personal alienation.\(^{25}\)

For the purposes of the present study, Markowitz would say that justifications are best directed at school board members and school administrators, since they make most of the decisions about curricula without input from teachers.\(^{26}\) The implications of Markowitz' research are not promising, therefore, for the justification of music in the schools by teachers. Since, in her view, teachers are at the bottom of the

---


\(^{25}\) Ibid., 64-65.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 34.
political ladder of curricular decision-making, their power to effect change is limited.

Chapter Summary

Research by Jones, Mark, Hooper, and Kidd all emphasizes the fact that aesthetic arguments became predominant in the literature of music education in the 1960's, and continued to be prevalent through the 1970's. These aesthetic ideologies, rationales, and justifications are still an important part of music education thought in the 1980's. Even so, their usefulness has not been studied.

Several authors emphasize the need for relevancy to society in the development of philosophical value statements for music education, and yet Mark contends that the aesthetic education movement has cut the tie between musical values and societal needs. Furthermore, Hooper raises the question of whether or not the professional literature accurately represents the feelings of the majority of practicing music educators.

Hooper, by her assumption that groups have identifiable opinions, also reinforces the view of the field of music education presented in the present research: that of social relativism. Troiano gives further evidence of the validity of social group theory: that justifications will not be accepted if they are outside the values already held by the group making the decisions. Also, several writers appeal for more clarity when dealing with the purposes of music education philosophy.
and its three functions: as an ideology, in making rationales, and in formulating justifications.

Markowitz contends that most curriculum decisions are made at the local level, under a hierarchical system involving societal, institutional, and instructional dimensions. Since teachers are involved primarily only in instructional decisions, they are at the bottom of the political ladder, and therefore unempowered to influence the curriculum. This lack of influence can produce conflict with administrators. Furthermore, teachers are too busy with lesson plans and instruction to spend much time working on goals and larger curriculum issues.
CHAPTER III

SELECTED RESEARCH ON ATTITUDES TOWARD
VALUES USED IN JUSTIFICATIONS

The previous chapter considered research surveying trends in justification arguments, primarily as stated in major articles in music education journals. This chapter reviews research done on the attitudes of school-related groups (parents, students, school board members, music teachers, other teachers, principals, and superintendents) toward the aesthetic objectives used in many of those justifications. Since the studies to be reviewed here analyze attitudes of groups, they offer insight into the validity of looking at justifications from the perspective of social group theory.

In addition, certain findings of the studies examined in this chapter help to answer the research problems of the present study, regarding: (1) the attitudes of the clientele groups of the public schools in terms of their values toward music as a subject in the schools; (2) the attitudes of the groups within the music education profession in terms of their values for music in the schools and their values for the profession; and (3) the likelihood of justifications based on "aesthetics" as a system of values being accepted by groups both inside and outside the music education profession.
The discussion is divided into two sections. The first section includes studies that primarily investigate school-related groups outside the music education profession while treating music educators as a single group among these other groups. The second section reviews studies which look at different groups within music education.

Attitude Studies Considering Music Educators as a Single Group Among School-Related Groups

Bryant investigated the importance of objectives for secondary school music programs as shown by the opinions of school-related groups. He formulated a list of objectives based on the recommendations of "experts" (college music education professors) and asked for opinions on the importance of the objectives from five school-related groups: superintendents, principals, music teachers, students, and school board members.

He reports that his group of experts turned out to be the group that differed the most from the other original sample groups selected for the study. He was therefore forced to modify his questionnaire before sending it out because the objectives recommended by the experts were not evenly distributed among content areas; in particular:

1) a number of the most highly rated objectives were from the areas of interpretative elements and listening skills,
2) no objectives were identified from the areas of historical knowledge or sociological objectives, and 3) objectives

---

relating to jazz and popular music, keyboard experience, and vocal technique were omitted from those outcomes identified by the panel of experts as more appropriate for secondary school music programs.²

In other words, the "experts" completely ignored several issues which Bryant felt were important to include, and which in fact were considered important by several of the groups surveyed.

According to their list of recommended objectives, Bryant asserts, the "experts" comprised a distinct sixth group. They were concerned with "response to music" as opposed to "technical skill" or "factual knowledge," rating of lesser importance "the sociological objectives representative of lay opinions."³

In addition, the experts have "no objectives rated 'more important' in common with superintendents, principals, or school boards."⁴ Of all the groups, Bryant's study concludes, the music education professors are the most isolated in terms of their preference for objectives.

In addition, some objectives that Bryant extracted from publications of the MENC [Music Educators National Conference] and other related sources did not fare well:

The CMP [Contemporary Music Project] advocated composition--this was the very least rated objective by all the groups taken together. The Yale Seminar advocated creativity and keyboard skills--this was among the less valued objectives among all five groups. MENC Music in General Education outcomes were not highly endorsed by the five groups, specifically those relating to historical knowledge of music, and improvising on simple melodies (also included in MENC The School Music Program: Description and Standards).⁵

²Bryant, "Importance of Objectives," 363.
³Ibid., 395. ⁴Ibid., 397. ⁵Ibid., 403-404.
His study, then, presents evidence that there is a possible split between some of the so-called "innovative" ideas in professional music education circles and the opinions of other school-related groups.

Four of the five groups Bryant questioned proved relatively homogeneous in terms of agreement within the group, but the school board members showed a great deal of internal variation. They rated eleven of the fifty objectives over the entire 1-9 range (maximum to minimum possible). Bryant states that this variability "prompted a concern for the certainty of the school board members' opinions over a large part of the music curriculum," but a further interpretation in light of social group theory is that the school board members had the widest variation of background and experience related to music:

The variable of extent of prior musical experience of the superintendents and school board members was reflected in their opinions of specific music objectives... [and] the opinions of principals who had participated in prior musical experiences differed from those who had not done so.

Previous musical experiences, it seems, could have had an effect on the opinions of individuals because of socialization into a "musical world" and the learning of musical gestures. Indeed, the student groups showed a degree of socialization into their teachers' world--that of the musician:

---

6Bryant, "Importance of Objectives," 377.
7Ibid., 404.
Students and teachers together valued ensemble performance skills, such as ability to sing or play in tune, application of dynamic and tempo markings, and production of a characteristic sound on an instrument, higher than any other groups.8

In general, the objectives involving more technical musical language (those mentioning form, harmonic rhythm, etc.) were rated higher by the music teachers than by other groups, and lowest by superintendents and school board members. Conversely, principals, superintendents, and school board members valued objectives concerned with the development of general appreciation, modest performance ability, and extrinsic (utilitarian) outcomes of music education.9

Bryant's work reinforces the choice of a social group perspective for this study, because he presupposes that people's opinions will be affected by the groups to which they belong. In addition, his results include evidence that (1) a panel of college music education professors may represent an isolated group in terms of opinions about objectives; (2) certain MENC goals may be poorly supported by all groups in a given sample; (3) school board members represent a wide variety of opinions; (4) prior musical experience affects opinions of superintendents, principals, and school board members; (5) students and music teachers value ensemble performance objectives; and (6) principals, superintendents and school board members favor modest performance ability, music appreciation, and utilitarian outcomes of music education.

8Bryant, "Importance of Objectives," 364. 9Ibid., 405.
Similar to Bryant, Clay\textsuperscript{10} investigated opinions of school-related groups about music education programs, and about objectives outlined by the Music Educators National Conference. He reports general agreement among all groups regarding MENC goals such as (1) requiring music in the elementary schools; (2) identifying musical behaviors relevant to the needs of students; (3) expanding music programs for adults; (4) ensuring that schools allocate sufficient time and staff for comprehensive music programs; and (5) developing music programs challenging to all students. These goals cannot be interpreted as solely representing aesthetic arguments, but his study reveals some support for the music program in general. On the other hand, he reports a negative thread running through the responses of all groups:

While large majorities of all sample groups attested to the general importance of music in public schools, a pervasive implication throughout the findings is that most of the persons sampled seem to believe that participation in music is not essential to enjoyment and importance. If this implication can be found to have credence, the true essence and position of music in public schools may yet remain to be determined.\textsuperscript{11}

A study specifically relating to aesthetic values was conducted by Hanley\textsuperscript{12} in Ontario, Canada. She had attempted to establish an "aesthetic programme" in schools under her


\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., 165.

\textsuperscript{12}Betty Anne Hanley, "Educators' Attitudes to Philosophies of Music Education: A Q Study" (doctoral diss., University of Minnesota, 1987).
supervision, and the difficulties encountered prompted the study:

The implementation of the [aesthetic] music programme was not smooth and never fully accomplished. The reaction of many teachers to the programme and their lack of acceptance of the basic premises (indeed, in many cases, teachers held conflicting points of view) made it impossible for the aims of the music programme to be achieved even at the school level. Discussions with principals and board members made it abundantly clear that few had any deep understanding of why music should be included in the curriculum although the majority avowedly and concretely supported its inclusion.

She asked her subjects to perform two Q-sorts on selected aesthetic statements, one for "present practice" and one for "ideal situation." The statements presented emphasize both the rationale and justification functions of objectives. In order to analyze the data, she interpreted the ordering of statements of each respondent as grounds for placing each person into one of four categories: absolute expressionist, formalist, referentialist, and hedonist. The first three categories are defined as Reimer suggests, while the hedonist is defined as one who values music for its immediate pleasure or fun.

The results show few significant differences between groups of school board members, music consultants, high school music teachers, high school non-music teachers, and three categories of elementary teachers (those who do not teach


14The Q-sort is a method of determining agreement with a set of statements by sorting the statements, each on its own index card, into ordered piles of agreement and disagreement.

music, those who do teach music but not exclusively, and full-
time music teachers). Most of the people fall clearly into one
category, with "absolute expressionist" being the majority.
In the sort asking for the "ideal situation," even more abso-
lute expressionists are identified (two-thirds of the total).
She reports that some must be categorized as eclectics, because
their answers fit a wide range of attitudes.

She also finds that educational role and amount or lack of
musical training are not significant factors in determining
attitudes. In this finding, her study varies from Bryant's and
others reviewed here. Her methodology must be called into
question, however, in that her sample size was small--forty-
eight people, six in each category. This in itself is not a
major flaw, but the respondents were not selected at random but
rather on the basis of availability to the researcher and
willingness to participate (the Q sorts were reported to take
an hour or more to complete).

Furthermore, some concepts in Hanley's statements seem to
this writer to be oversimplified. For example, "Music is a
change of pace" was listed as an item disagreed with by abso-
lute expressionists. It is quite possible, however, to believe
in the value of aesthetic experience and still to see music as
a change of pace from normal daily routine.

In addition, one of the respondents, when asked for an
opinion of why so many absolute expressionists appeared in

16Absolute expressionism is the aesthetic perspective that
Reimer chooses as the basis for his ideas on aesthetic education.
terms of responses regarding the "ideal situation," answered, "because of the resemblance of items [on the Q-sort] to Ministry documents and current jargon."\(^{17}\) The Ministry of Education of Ontario evidently publishes curriculum guides which are widely distributed to teachers, and which exemplify aesthetic education principles similar to Bennett Reimer's.

Even though the results of Hanley's study must be called into question on methodological grounds, she makes certain observations pertinent to the present research: She cites a philosophical base which is a compromise between absolutism and relativism, similar to that expressed by social relativism; she echoes other authors in her comment that music educators do not have time to be philosophers; and she notes a desirable balance between aesthetic and utilitarian arguments:

The newly emerging theme appears to be that it will be necessary to consider both the needs of the individual and the needs of society when engaged in future discussions about music education. In other words, there is a need for balance between aesthetic and utilitarian rationales.\(^{18}\)

Best, Sandlin, LaRue, and Whitelegg surveyed opinions of school-related groups about issues of the high school performing group. Best\(^{19}\) reports that band directors and community leaders in his sample appear interested in

\(^{17}\) Hanley, "Educators' Attitudes," 111.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 30-31.

fundamental objectives and aesthetic values in addition to what he calls the "superficial trappings" of the band program: pep rallies, parades, and civic group performances. Sandlin claims that music teachers and their principals show a significant difference in their opinions of contest-festivals.

LaRue, in his study of contest emphasis in band programs, reports that directors primarily prefer intrinsic musical values which contribute to good performance in the group, while students and directors both assign lesser importance to "broad musical appreciation." Parents from programs putting a major emphasis on contests see their role as broader than do parents from non-competitive groups, and value extrinsic (utilitarian) benefits more than other parents.

He states that the study gives evidence that contests can raise standards of performance, providing motivation for students in the programs he surveyed. Furthermore, he closes with these remarks:

It is notable that the opinions of all persons associated with the present sample of high school bands (directors, students and parents) lend only minor support to several of the justifications for the music program frequently presented in the professional literature as being important. It appears that such outcomes as


21 Peter James LaRue, "A Study to Determine the Degree of Consensus Regarding Outcomes of Band Participation and the Competitive Elements in Band Programs Among Band Directors, Band Members, and Members of Parent Booster Groups" (doctoral diss., University of Illinois, 1986).
learning to improvise and play by ear, developing an imagination, performing in small ensembles and performing outside of school do not loom large in the perceptions of directors, students and parents. These results raise questions concerning the extent to which authors of professional literature are in touch with the realities of the high school band program.²²

His comments thus lend credence to the assertion of writers discussed in Chapter Two that there is a divergence of opinion within the music education community about some of the objectives of music education.

Whitelegg's study is particularly important for the present research in that he overtly adopts a social group perspective, in the form of group conflict theory, as the basis for his study. In explaining conflict theory, he quotes Closer:

> As individuals perceive given situations differently from each other, their different perceptions group them according to alike and different norms and values. Through conflicting perceptions of a given reality, groups become clearly defined, thus making the analysis of conflict a tool for the identification of a social group.²⁴

He concludes that, in his sample, the population of band directors, school administrators, and parents are in general agreement about the purposes and activities of the band. In spite of minor disagreements, the groups "did not exhibit a

²²LaRue, "Degree of Consensus," 204.

²³Clifford Whitelegg, "An Investigation of Conflicts in the Perceptions of Band Directors, School Administrators, and Selected Members of the Community about their Respective Band Programs" (doctoral diss., North Texas State University, 1986).

level of conflicting perceptions that might be interpreted as showing polarization."  

He remarks, however, that his sample consists of three schools in one district, each with a successful, performance-based program, and the situation is thus relatively free of conflict. The differences that he reports between groups are: (1) the band directors feel that they are forced by public pressure into spending more time and effort with the marching band than they would like, and (2) students differ with adults of all groups in musical preference.

Punke developed an attitude-measuring instrument for use in determining opinions of music teachers and administrators in five areas: (1) public relations and the role of music in society; (2) music as a discipline of mind and body; (3) social benefits of those in performing groups; (4) music as an aesthetic art; and (5) music as a leisure-time activity. He reports that attitudes between administrators and music teachers are not significantly different in kind, but that music teachers value all of the categories more intensely than do other groups.

Punke also states that administrators regard winning athletic teams as more effective in public relations with the community than outstanding musical performing groups; on the other hand, administrators are aware of the aesthetic

25Whitelegg, "Investigation of Conflicts," 133.

implications of music. In addition, Punke reports that music teachers feel that students are not given enough opportunity to create music on their own.

Liddell replicated Punke's study in Mississippi, but added separate categories for school board presidents, superintendents, principals, and music teachers.\(^{27}\) He reports that music teachers again rate higher in every category except public relations, where their scores are comparable to those of the other groups. All of the non-teaching groups appear to be in general agreement, but the two groups found to be closest in agreement are the school board presidents and superintendents.

A recent investigation by Radocy\(^ {28}\) of attitudes of superintendents in Kansas reveals generally strong agreement that the arts should be available as electives in high schools, but not as required subjects. In the study, music was the most highly rated of the arts as an elective, and dance the lowest. In terms of support of personnel and resources, music (especially performing groups) appeared to be the dominant art form in Kansas schools. Radocy reports that superintendents also felt that voters probably would not support extra taxation for arts education.

\(^{27}\) Lewis Liddell, "A Comparison of Attitudes toward Music Education among School Board Presidents, Superintendents, Principals, and Music Teachers in Mississippi Public Schools" (doctoral diss., Mississippi State University, 1977).

\(^{28}\) Rudolph E. Radocy, "Through Superintendents' Eyes: Attitudes toward the Arts in Kansas Schools" (Lawrence KS: University of Kansas, July, 1987).
Jones surveyed Ohio music teachers, principals, and music education faculty on issues of public school music programs. He formulated a list of twenty issues, of which only one concerned the "purpose of music." Most of the others dealt with administrative issues such as extra pay for band directors, scheduling, and policy on extra rehearsals.

He reports that nineteen of the twenty categories correlate significantly with job category in terms of the "desired ideal"; similarly, responses to seventeen of the twenty categories match up in terms of "actual practice." A significant difference exists between music teachers and principals on ideal solutions for seventeen of the twenty issues; the high school teachers differ with the college teachers on ideal solutions for nine items; and college teachers are found to be more dissatisfied with existing practices than are principals or high school teachers.

In a study outside the field of music, Keen compared general philosophic positions with attitudes toward education. Using the philosophic positions of Idealism, Essentialism, Pragmatism, Existentialism, and Behaviorism as his categories, he determined respondents' attitudes towards education by questionnaire. He reports no difference between the attitudes of

Jones, Donald Wayne, "A Comparative Study of Selected Issues in Music Education as Represented by the Opinions of Principals, Music Teachers, and Professors of Music Education" (doctoral diss., Ohio State University, 1961).

parents and teachers towards education, and notes that philosophic position is also not a significant factor in attitude towards education. In fact, the general population in his research seems to have no clearly defined philosophic position at all.

Attitude Studies Considering Music Educators as a Collection of Groups

A number of studies were found which show evidence of separate groups within the music education profession in terms of attitudes towards objectives. Foremost among these studies for the purposes of the present research is the study by Kacanek, "A Descriptive Analysis of Wisconsin Music Educators' Agreement with Bennett Reimer's A Philosophy of Music Education."

Kacanek reports that Wisconsin music educators are in general agreement with Reimer's philosophy as represented by twenty statements selected by Reimer himself. The agreement runs from a low of 54% to a high of 98% on different statements, and the standard deviations vary from .41 to 1.31 on a Likert scale of one to five. He reports a questionnaire return rate of 68%.

His findings indicate that college teachers are consistently the highest group in Agreement in Theory (AIT) and Value in Practice (VIP), though in general for all groups agreement

31 Harold Solomon Kacanek, "A Descriptive Analysis of Wisconsin Music Educators' Agreement with Bennett Reimer's A Philosophy of Music Education" (doctoral diss., University of Kansas, 1982).
is higher in theory than for value in practice. The lowest
group for AIT is high school teachers from suburban areas, and
Kacanek interprets this information to mean that "perhaps the
pressure to perform, so prominent in more affluent suburban
areas, causes interference in theoretically accepting Reimer's
philosophy."  

One problem in the study is Kacanek's assumption that the
twenty statements selected by Reimer in fact represent the
ideals of the aesthetic music education movement. To this
writer some of the statements could easily be interpreted more
broadly. For example, statement number twelve, that "the music
education enterprise is built on the assumption that musical
tastes can be improved, that musical experiences can be
deepened, that musical enjoyment can be refined, that musical
significance can be made more available to all people," could
just as easily be supported by someone with a bias toward
musical performance. Also, Kacanek's study is designed in such
a way that he cannot measure the number of people who might
call themselves "eclectics," believing that aesthetic values
represent only some of the values underlying music education.

He does note, however, a number of difficulties in ascer-
taining the true attitudes of the respondents. For example,
the survey items were modified to "soften" the "absolute
nature" of many of Reimer's statements:

32 Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," 89.

33 Bennett Reimer, "Twenty Statements of Philosophy," in
Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," 169.
The philosophical process implies constructing statements which follow logically and systematically as do axioms and postulates in plane geometry. Therefore, within the context of philosophy, Reimer's statements are forced to appear as absolutes. However, in their appearance as statements in a survey out of context, their absolute nature probably should be modified in order to preserve their meaning or intent. That factor was considered for the final survey form.

This writer feels that such changes as Kacanek made on his survey do in fact change the way in which people respond to assertions about values. Kacanek's pilot studies were in general well-designed to improve the survey, but in "softening" items he did modify his questionnaire with the intent of changing the responses of the subjects.

As a case in point, Kacanek reports that the addition or exchange of a single word often changed responses from negative to positive. For instance, the statement "the function of music is" elicited a negative response from members of one pilot study, while "one of the functions of music is" drew positive response. This "softening" through lexical changes affected the results of the study.

The difficulties posed by such minute syntactical changes provide evidence for a point made earlier in this discussion. Kacanek's study was not designed to differentiate between those who favor aesthetic values as their primary focus and those supporting many different values including aesthetic ones. In other words, a person may believe that the most important reason for a student to be in band is to develop personal

\[34\text{Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," 46.}\]
confidence and social skills, and still admit that aesthetic awareness is one of the functions of the music program. In his study, this person would be reported to be "in general agreement" with Reimer, even though he or she supports utilitarian values first for music in the schools.

In response to another methodological problem, Kacanek eliminated the "undecided" option on the Likert scale on the final survey. The reason for this decision was that in one pilot study the mean was 3.1 with a standard deviation of .67. As Kacanek states, "everyone seemed undecided." And yet, on the final survey, some respondents circled the two middle options, forcing Kacanek to add a neutral category back into his statistical analysis.

The methodological problems encountered by Kacanek reinforce the contention of writers reviewed in Chapter Two that philosophical inquiry in music education is a difficult process, especially when dealing with opinions on matters of value. In addition, Kacanek makes a number of other points which support contentions of the present research.

First, he notes the futility of using philosophical arguments in the justification process, pointing out that "they [music educators] may not have had the background of understanding necessary to relate convincingly the complexities of aesthetic experience to practically minded school officials and parents. Evidence of social usefulness is and probably always

\[35\] Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," 46.
will be far easier to communicate to school boards than
abstract experiences."36 This assertion is one of the primary
arguments of the present study, one which will be reinforced in
Chapter Seven by the application of social group concepts.

Second, Kacanek reiterates a concern echoed by writers
reviewed in Chapter Two that the literature of the profession
does not represent the views of the majority of the members,
indicating that "practicing music educators at elementary and
secondary levels apparently have relatively little input into
the literature of their own profession which seems
enigmatic."37

Third, he finds evidence of a split between those in the
aesthetic education movement and those who advocate first
priorities on performing groups:

While criticism of performing groups can often be
found in various aspects of the educational community, we
should be aware that they continue to receive a greater
level of school and community support than any other
aspect of school music programs.38

The issues dividing these two positions are difficult to
discern. While authors reviewed in Chapter Two state that the
aesthetic education movement is in opposition to social values
for music education, Kacanek asserts that it is not necessarily

36Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," 15.
37Ibid., 21.
38G. McKenna and W. R. Schmid, eds., Tanglewood Symposium
Revisited: A Documentary Report (Milwaukee: University of
Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1978), 124, quoted in Kacanek,
"Descriptive Analysis," 7.
an argument against social values but rather a reaction to a long-held philosophical position:

Reimer's position represents a reaction against an emphasis on the extra-musical, socially based nature of school musical activities. He states that the nature and value of music education should reflect music's "true" nature and value. Therefore, concerns external to the nature of the art should not be the major thrust of music education. The music curriculum can and should be primarily justified on its musical merits.39

In fact, Reimer's statement five in Kacanek's survey mentions music education's "obligation to society to develop the aesthetic sensitivity to music of all people." Kacanek feels that the aesthetic educators are not anti-performance, just anti-utilitarian in their principles for ideologies, rationales and justifications.

The fact remains, however, that a number of writers mention this split between a performance emphasis and an aesthetics emphasis. Perhaps the close link between performing groups and the utilitarian functions of music (community service, social growth, etc.) causes this friction.

To summarize, Kacanek's research makes a number of points: (1) there is general agreement with Reimer's principles, but a higher agreement in theory than in practice; (2) college music education professors show the highest agreement, and suburban high school teachers the least agreement with Reimer's philosophy; (3) a number of methodological difficulties arise in trying to use philosophical terminology; (4) the complexities of aesthetic experience do not make for good justifications;

39 Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," 5.
(5) there is evidence of an ideological split between
performance-emphasis and aesthetics-emphasis groups; and
(6) the professional music education literature is dominated by
college professors.

Even though Barbour\textsuperscript{40} includes administrators as well as
music teachers in his study, he finds evidence of differing
groups among the music teachers. He traces the aesthetic
education movement and then surveys opinions of Oregon secon-
dary school music teachers and principals concerning innovative
statements made in professional publications:

A survey of the literature indicates that a thorough
revision of music education is underway [in 1968]. Many
groups have undertaken to evaluate present practices and
suggest more efficient and effective methods and proce-
dures of presenting music in the secondary schools. Most
of the initiative for these groups and subsequent innova-
tive statements have not come from persons in the public
schools. Scholars, professional musicians, and members of
the various organizations of musicians and music educators
have been responsible for most of the innovative
suggestions.\textsuperscript{41}

He alludes to the fact mentioned in other studies that the pro-
fessional literature is not reflective of the opinions of the
rank-and-file teacher. The purpose of Barbour's study, then,
was to discover the opinions of these teachers on values of the
aesthetic education movement, as well as the opinions of their
administrators.

\textsuperscript{40}Richard L. Barbour, "A Study of Perceptions of Selected
Innovative Statements in Music Education by Principals and
Music Teachers in Oregon Secondary Schools" (doctoral diss.,
University of Oregon, 1968).

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., 44-45.
The results of Barbour's research indicate that music teachers who agreed with the innovative statements were from smaller schools, had been in their present position longer, and communicated better with their principals. He explains this trend by reasoning that in the larger schools, performance pressure can cause burnout and create priorities toward performance rather than aesthetics. Principals who agreed with the statements also tended to be in more rural schools, but were also younger and had less experience.

In an appendix, Barbour notes the difficulty of this type of questionnaire:

1) the extraction of statements out of context may constrict their meaning; 2) the statements may be poorly written; and 3) comments may reflect the difficulty practitioners have with statements of a philosophic nature. He also notes that music teachers' comments written on the questionnaires often reflect hostilities towards the colleges and administrators, as well as general frustration with the public school job situation. Barbour thus reiterates a number of issues seen before in this review: (1) philosophical statements are difficult to handle; (2) a philosophical split exists between college professors and teachers in the field; and (3) a conflict also exists between performance orientation and aesthetic orientation in the music education community.

Kelly also studied attitudes of music teachers and administrators, using five categories of objectives: aesthetic development, skill development, social development, functional contribution (music as service), and democratic living. He is interested in whether beliefs translate into practice, and reports that in the case of the teachers of performing groups in his sample, they often did not:

... many music teachers acted in direct opposition to their stated beliefs concerning the functions and importance of music in the public schools when maintaining a top performing group. It may be concluded that there was an over-emphasis on skill with disregard for the functional, aesthetic, democratic, and social uses of music.  

This observation is further evidence of a split that exists in the music education profession between those emphasizing performance values and those promoting aesthetic values.

In a study that surveyed elementary music teachers exclusively, Roberts found that over half of the Missouri teachers surveyed considered the development of aesthetic responsiveness to be a more important curricular focus than the development of musical skills. This result, taken with the assertions of the last three studies, suggests that elementary teachers might be

---

43 William Leonard Kelly, "Beliefs and Practices of Administrators and Musicians from Selected Midwestern Cities Concerning the Importance and Functions of Music in the Public Schools" (doctoral diss, University of Kansas, 1963).

44 Ibid., 133.

more oriented toward "aesthetic" values while secondary ensemble conductors directors might more highly value "performance" objectives.

Chapter Summary

This review of attitude research was undertaken with the hope of illuminating the three research problems of this study. The first problem involves the nature of the clientele groups of the public schools in terms of their values toward music as a subject in the public schools. The results of these studies suggest that there are differences among these school-related groups in their attitudes toward musical norms and values.

Bryant, for example, reports that school board members represent a number of different groups in terms of attitudes toward objectives, and that board members and administrators' values are related to their level of previous musical experience. Sandlin asserts that music teachers and principals represent different groups in attitudes toward musical contests. LaRue finds that parents of "contest-emphasis" band programs favor more utilitarian values than do directors or parents of "non-contest-emphasis" programs.

In other studies which analyze clientele groups, the following conclusions are reported: school board presidents and superintendents are in very close agreement on objectives for music; administrators recognize aesthetic values for music along with functional music duties (pep rallies, etc.); principals consider a winning athletic team a better public relations
tool than a fine musical performing group; and principals, superintendents, and school board members favor modest performance objectives and utilitarian values for music.

The studies reviewed in this chapter present evidence that there are differences between groups within the clientele of the public schools regarding values for music in the schools. In addition to some contradictory findings, methodological problems are also noted in trying to ascertain attitudes on topics of such philosophical complexity as value statements.

The research discussed in this chapter also presents evidence concerning this study's second research problem, namely the attitudes of groups within the music education profession toward values for music in the schools and for the profession. Many statements reported in the studies suggest differences concerning values within these groups inside the music education profession itself. In fact, the single issue appearing most often in these studies is evidence of a conflict between music educators advocating aesthetic objectives and those favoring performance objectives. This dichotomy appears primarily in relation to the high-level performance of large ensembles, especially in suburban secondary school settings. Some form of this controversy is mentioned in five of the studies surveyed.

The next most common issue reported is that college music education professors seem to be, in terms of opinions about objectives, a group unto themselves. Furthermore, they dominate the professional literature by their frequent publication
of articles and their membership on the editorial boards of major journals. This dominance creates uneasiness among some public school teachers. At least four of the studies reviewed mention some form of the perceived separation between these groups of music educators. This reported conflict may be interpreted as evidence for the presence of competing symbolic universes of meaning between values held by the college professors and values held by the public school teachers.

The third research problem of this study, whether or not justifications based on "aesthetics" as a system of values are likely to be accepted by groups both inside and outside the music education profession, seems to be answered in the negative. Two studies assert that objectives relating to aesthetic education are not supported by music educators. In contrast, Kacanek reports general agreement with Reimer's philosophy among music educators, although a number of methodological problems may have affected his results.

Of the music educators who do concur with Reimer, there is higher agreement in theory than in practice. This duality of theory and practice is reiterated in at least two other studies. Among music educators who agree with the principles of aesthetic education, elementary school personnel are stronger in their agreement than secondary teachers in two studies. Roberts reports that, for grade school music curricula, more than half of the elementary teachers surveyed rate aesthetic objectives higher than performance objectives.
The "performance-emphasis" versus "aesthetics-emphasis" split mentioned above also may be seen as evidence that aesthetic values are not the ones held most firmly by all groups of music educators. Furthermore, at least five researchers encountered significant methodological problems in working with aesthetic terminology because of its complexity and unfamiliarity to non-aestheticians. Such difficulties in determining what people think are part of the problem of justifying music in the public schools.

Evidence reported in this chapter suggests that aesthetic arguments are not universally accepted by the clientele groups of the public schools or by all groups of music educators. At this point in time, there is a need for research into the justification process beyond the survey of opinion of a limited sample. For this purpose, a theoretical perspective is needed in order to analyze the issues involved: how norms and values are defined and controlled in social groups, and how these principles of group life operate in the world of music educators and the clientele groups of the public schools.

Social group theory provides such a perspective, and its pertinent concepts will be outlined in Chapter Six. Studies in music education which support the social group perspective of the investigation will be examined in Chapter Five. First, however, philosophical studies in music education will be examined (in Chapter Four) in order to present evidence for the line of argumentation of the study (contained in Chapter Seven).
CHAPTER IV

PHILOSOPHICAL JUSTIFICATIONS: SELECTED RESEARCH WHICH DEVELOPS PRINCIPLES FOR MUSIC EDUCATION

As background material for the present study, a plethora of research was found which falls into the broad category of "philosophy of music education." The general purpose of such studies is to analyze or formulate principles which supply ideologies, rationales, and justifications\(^1\) for music education. In this chapter a selection of these studies which raise issues pertinent to the justification of music education or of music in the schools will be examined.

The philosophical studies most pertinent to this research are those which develop or state "aesthetic" principles for music education. Some writers contend that their "principles" will fulfill all three functions of providing an aesthetic ideology, rationale, and justification for the music education profession or for music in the public schools. By the definitions of the three terms used in this research, however, most of the studies state aesthetic principles which are more appropriate for formulating ideologies, and less so for developing rationales and justifications.

\(^1\)See the definition of these terms in Chapter One.
Many authors of these philosophical studies use writings of a single philosopher, school of thought, or prominent figure in education or music education from which to deduce their principles. In doing so, they may provide ideological foundations for music educators who subscribe to the value systems represented by their arguments.\(^2\) Few of these studies qualify as rationales for music education, however, as the term is defined in this research. Principles deduced or borrowed from the thoughts of a philosopher or collection of thinkers are not guaranteed to be a fully ordered and logical system of thought which explains and describes the teaching and learning of music.\(^3\) As justifications, on the other hand, the principles are likely to be effective only for those groups who accept the aesthetic and philosophical values and language\(^4\) upon which they are based—in other words, for those groups who accept the principles as an ideology.

**Seminal Studies in Philosophical Issues of Justification**

The study which addresses issues most pertinent to the present research is Robert C. Smith's dissertation "Esthetic Theory and the Appraisal of Practices in Music Education."\(^5\)

\(^2\)See Chapters One and Seven, Line of Argumentation.

\(^3\)See the discussion of rationale in Chapter One.

\(^4\)See Chapters One and Seven, Line of Argumentation.

His research calls into question the role of aesthetic theory in rationales and justifications. He contends that the field of aesthetic theory is a complicated, specialized field of knowledge, not readily understood by the layman or the practicing music educator. This proposition is an important part of the main argument of this study.

Smith begins his study with the statement that "if music educators are to recommend changes in practice, they can do so only by arguing from principles." Far from assuming that problems exist in aesthetic rationale-making, he examines the philosophical realm of aesthetic theory with the stated hope that such theories will provide the basis for these principles.

As he discovers, however, aesthetic theory creates problems for music educators wanting to develop principles for music education. He points out that aesthetics as a subject for philosophical study is thought by some philosophers to be "the province of second-rate philosophers or of philosophers in their second-rate moments." Smith concurs with Beardsley, quoting from the latter's Aesthetics:

> It is plain to even a casual visitor that aesthetics is a retarded child, and though no doubt this is in no small part due to neglect, we must try to forget the past ... [and] we must be prepared to put out more care and effort than we do with a normal child, just to teach her her ABC's.

---


7Ibid., 72.

Smith also questions the link between aesthetics and music education. He points out that aestheticians and music educators arrive at their beliefs about aesthetic value in entirely different settings. There is a traditional conflict between those who practice art and those who try to describe, categorize, and teach it. Smith states that "philosophers do not know enough about art to say anything interesting and artists do not know enough about philosophy to say anything intelligible." Furthermore, he contends that teachers are caught between these two conflicting worlds of art and philosophy, being expected to be fluent in the language of both the artist and the critic—a difficult task at best.

Despite these observed differences, Smith feels that music educators might be able to articulate some aspects of the aesthetic experience which have not been addressed by aestheticians. He points out a few issues ignored by aestheticians which are in the music educator's experience—such as the distinction between "classical" and "popular" music, and the perception of music by very young children. These are proper aesthetic issues for music educators, issues which traditional aesthetics addresses only indirectly.

Smith further points out the conflict between normative and descriptive uses of philosophy:

Descriptive statements—statements which can in principle be verified or denied by observation of events—can be true or false; normative statements—statements to the

---

^Smith, 72.
effect that objects or events are good or bad--cannot be true or false; therefore disputes about value are in principle unresolvable.\textsuperscript{10}

Arguments about aesthetic value in music are normative arguments. As such, according to Smith, they are unresolvable by logical means.

Smith goes into great detail explaining the philosophical problems inherent in arguments over value. He discusses the naturalistic position (relativist), in which value is relative to each person, and rejects it as a philosophical argument on grounds of circularity:

A philosopher who asserts that all knowledge is provisional, subject to revision as other evidence comes in, asserts something that is not subject to revision as other evidence comes in--most philosophers would say. The assertion is a meta-proposition, a proposition about propositions. It cannot be treated as a proposition, any more than a proposition about events can be treated as one of those events.\textsuperscript{11}

He also claims that the non-naturalistic (absolutist) view, in which value is fixed for all people, is untenable. There is no way to derive an \textit{a priori} absolute version of value, since by definition \textit{a priori} value must be logically prior to argument.

In addition to difficulties with the term "value," Smith notes a philosophical dilemma in determining what is true about an aesthetic theory. In what sense may an aesthetic theory be said to be true? This question reduces to the same dichotomy between absolutist and relativist viewpoints discussed above.

\textsuperscript{10}Smith, "Esthetic Theory," 74.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., 65.
Smith does not take a stand on the absolutist-relativist debate, but his analysis of these issues shows him to be acutely aware of the complex nature of philosophical discussions of aesthetics. While he begins his study with the hope that aesthetic theories will provide a rationale and set of principles for music education, he concludes that the problems are too great to be overcome:

If there is one firm conclusion of the study reported here, it is that music educators can only confound one another if they try to make use of the concepts and terms of esthetic theory in attempting to offer reasoned appraisals of current practices.\(^\text{12}\)

In summary, Smith uses the following line of reasoning:

1. evaluation of practices in music education must be based on principles;
2. aesthetic theories are likely candidates to supply these principles, but there are many aesthetic theories which often contradict each other;
3. aesthetics as a field of philosophy is to some philosophers a questionable pursuit;
4. aestheticians and music educators view music and aesthetic experience from vastly different vantage points;
5. value statements are philosophically very difficult to handle;
6. the truth of value statements is thought by some philosophers to be impossible to verify; and
7. the complexity of dealing with value statements makes them poor candidates upon which to base principles which guide practices in music education.

After making all of these points, Smith proposes four possible choices for the music educator who is trying to use

aesthetic theory to find principles on which to base appraisal of practices in music education. The first alternative is to select one aesthetic theory and use it to derive these principles. He asserts that this is a fairly straightforward process and could successfully provide music educators with useful principles. He rejects this choice, however, because he cannot logically justify the selection of any one aesthetic theory over another. Each theory will fit some observations better and some observations more poorly than the other theories.

The second alternative is to develop principles for music education without resorting to aesthetic theories. He rejects this option on the basis of his belief that questions about aesthetic value will arise in any attempt to state the rationale and principles of music education.

As the third alternative, he suggests an eclectic approach. Whatever is applicable in each aesthetic theory may be used in developing a rationale and principles for music education. This choice is also rejected, however, because logical deductions from competing aesthetic theories may sometimes lead to diametrically opposed recommendations about practices. This situation then reduces to alternative number one, where music educators are asked to choose between competing theories.

Alternative four proposes that music educators should abandon the attempt to state the rationale and principles of music education. Smith accepts this alternative somewhat reluctantly based on his rejection of the other three. He
feels that "music educators can hardly expect to get to the theoretical problems which directly concern them if they begin by trying to settle persistent philosophical disputes first." He furthermore raises the question of the practicing music educator's ability to succeed in such a task:

The question which remains is: can music educators best get at reasoned appraisal of current practices by turning their attention first to the logically prior rationale and principles of music education? In order to answer that question, it is necessary to venture into deep philosophical waters, which requires some temerity when one has only the flimsy survival equipment of a practicing music educator. . . . The practicing music educator has quite enough to do without becoming a logician.

His solution, then, is first to look at current practices, and then to make statements of belief as to the value of those practices. As these statements about specific practices begin to conflict, the profession will be in a position to examine them for consistency and adequacy, and then general principles may be induced from these specific beliefs. He argues for an inductive approach based on observations of practices rather than for a deductive method which starts from principles which are, at best, only tangentially related to music education.

Trying to infer the rationale and principles of music education from esthetic theory is very much like asking esthetic theorists to furnish music educators their beliefs about the value of music.\

13 Smith, "Esthetic Theory," 80.\
14 Ibid., 53.\
15 Ibid., 81-82.
Smith addresses the problems inherent in a deductive a priori approach to rationale-making. To this writer, Smith's work is a pioneering effort in the field of the philosophy of music education because of its clarity of thought and sagacity of conclusions.

Other early research in the field of philosophy of music education was completed by Leedy\(^1\) in 1941, Marple\(^2\) in 1950, and Ross\(^3\) in 1963. Leedy and Marple undertook general studies of philosophical foundations for music education, while Ross developed a comprehensive rationale for music in elementary education.

Ross's work is inspired by Basic Concepts in Music Education,\(^4\) which had been published in 1958. He forms many of the ideas stated in Basic Concepts into a comprehensive, logical system which states the goals for music in American elementary schools. His objectives forecast what has happened in today's elementary general music classroom, by emphasizing singing, playing, and movement; insisting on quality music; including formal elements; and paying close attention to the

\(^1\) Clifford Leedy, "The Background Philosophy and Principles of Public School Music Education and Its Supervision" (doctoral diss., University of Washington, 1941).

\(^2\) Hugo D. Marple, "Contemporary Philosophies in Music Education" (doctoral diss., University of Rochester, 1950).


child's developmental level. As such, Ross's work represents a pioneering effort in the creation and clarification of a rationale for elementary music education.

Three other early studies were written by Arnstine, Fowler, and Miller. Arnstine completed his dissertation in 1960 at the University of Illinois under Harry Broudy. Cited by Reimer as having influenced his work, Arnstine considered questions of aesthetic value in several of the arts including music. Fowler, whose dissertation examines Reconstructionism as the basis for a philosophy of music education, is referred to by Schwadron as an important contributor to early research in the philosophy of music education. Miller, whose work tracing the influence of Progressivism on music education was completed at Boston University in 1964, is cited by Choate as also providing direction to early philosophical research in the field.

---

Schwadron and Reimer completed their dissertations in 1962 and 1963, respectively, and both later rewrote major portions into the two "classic" books currently available in music education philosophy. Reimer's study focuses on the similarities between religious and aesthetic experience, while Schwadron's work surveys major thinkers in many fields who have written about aesthetics, with implications for the music education profession.

By 1964 much of the seminal writing in the field of philosophy of music education had been completed; at about the same time, the aesthetic education movement was gaining momentum. Thinkers such as Reimer and Schwadron assumed leadership in the movement by publishing regularly in the professional journals. Aesthetic rationales and justifications were thus becoming predominant in the literature of the music education profession.

As the "aesthetic education" movement flourished in the professional literature of music education, a simultaneous

---


increase occurred in philosophical research studies in music education. As was mentioned above, many of these studies propose or deduce "principles for music education" based upon aesthetic writings and theories. These principles are presented as ideologies, rationales, or justifications by authors of the research. In the studies reviewed here, however, no mention was found of the objections raised by Smith concerning the difficulties in using one aesthetic theory or a combination of aesthetic theories to state principles for music education.

Of the studies found by this writer which propose principles for music education, only one takes Smith's alternative number four--trying to set up a conceptual framework for examining current practices in music education. As such, it meets the criteria of a true rationale for music education, as defined by this study. Most of the other studies reviewed fit this study's definition of aesthetic ideologies rather than of rationales. They deduce statements of belief from philosophical writings rather than inducing logically constructed systems of theory from observations or opinions about practices.

The remaining studies selected for review are organized according to Smith's categories: studies which analyze current

---

30 A perusal of the dates of dissertations in this category in the bibliography will verify this fact.


32 See the definition and discussion of rationale in Chapter One.
practices in order to induce principles; studies which use the writings of one author or school of thought to deduce principles; and studies which take an eclectic approach, using writings of a number of authors to deduce principles for music education.

A Study which Analyzes Current Practices

Mason seeks to develop a theory of music education based upon innovative and experimental practices in music education which evolved in the decade of the 1960's. These practices include instructional models recommended by the Yale Seminar, the Contemporary Music Project, the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project, the books *Music in General Education* and *Music in the Elementary School*, and computer-assisted instruction. For each curricular and instructional model, Mason assesses its view of the nature of the child, of how children learn, of the sequence of experience, of the selection of didactic materials, of the nature of interpersonal relationships, and of its final goals.

Though he does not mention Smith's study, Mason is engaged in an assessment of beliefs about practices as recommended by Smith.

The purpose of this study was (1) to identify trends and movements that have evolved from innovation and experimentation in music education from 1960 to 1970, (2) to provide order and unity to these data through the use of a conceptual model, (3) to ascertain the implications of certain common characteristics evolving from innovative instructional and curricular approaches in music education, (4) to specify an emerging theory in music.

Mason, "Conceptual Analysis."
education, and (5) to demonstrate the utilitarian functions of the theory in building and evaluating school music programs.\textsuperscript{34}

Mason proposes a rationale for music education, which he calls a theory of music education, based on beliefs about practices. He shows that rationale-building is not just a one-way process, either totally inductive or deductive, but should rather fit an "observe, hypothesize, observe, modify, etc." model—simply put, the scientific method.

Perhaps the greatest danger in the development of a theory is the over-commitment to its various premises, hypotheses, and postulates. This over-commitment, or I-have-arrived attitude, prevents a self-correctional feedback that comes from the search through additional studies. . . . Theories should always be open to review. Propositions should constantly be modified as the results of further experimental studies are related to the theory.\textsuperscript{35}

After giving this warning, Mason stresses the need for a theory of music education. Such a theory can provide guidance in the solving of many problems because: (1) it forces the theory builder to bring together in a concise form the knowledge that is currently available; (2) it forces a careful review of what is known and a separation of fact from the body of ambiguous findings; (3) it replaces a large number of detailed statements with a few generalizations that are inductive inferences from them; and (4) it can be a basis for research.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34}Mason, "Conceptual Analysis," 2.
\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., 200-201.
\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., 4.
Among the recommendations at the end of his study, Mason includes:

3. Postulates, whenever possible, need to be stated in operational terms with criterial guidelines to facilitate assessment.
4. Protocol statements need to be compiled from the results of experimental research, and should be used to modify the evolving theory.
5. If the modifications begin to overwhelm the theory, then a new theory should be proposed.  

These ideas put Mason in congruence with Thomas Kuhn, whose theory of the evolution of paradigms in science is described in Chapter One of this paper. Recommendation number five is a restatement of Kuhn's position that the paradigm is quickly abandoned for a new one when doubts accumulate past a certain point. Mason's theory, or rationale, is proposed as a first step in building a paradigm for music education. If it were to be accepted by a large enough majority of music educators and used by them in guiding practices and research, then his rationale could indeed become a paradigm for the profession.

Mason's work is important for the present research because he engages in rationale-building as the term is defined in this study. Mason's use of the word theory in the same inductive and dialectic sense as proposed here puts him in line with the underlying perspective of social relativism upon which this study is based.  

---

37 Mason, "Conceptual Analysis," 201.

38 See the discussion of rationale and theory in Chapter One.
Studies which Deduce Principles for Music Education from One Author or School of Thought

This section is organized according to the underlying perspective of the author or school of thought studied in each investigation. Theories are placed upon the relativist-absolutist continuum described in Chapter One. Those studies using relativistic theories are treated first, followed by studies based on absolutist principles.

Killam and Fowler both use Theodore Brameld's theory of Reconstructionism to deduce principles for music education. This theory is opposed to absolutism and its idea that truth is there to be discovered within objects of the world or senses:

Occasionally [the use of the term discovery] seems to suggest educational practice where pupils are "led" to "discover" some sort of pre-existing system of "truth." Such an approach would be totally antithetical to the present formulation.

In Reconstructionism, truth is determined culturally. Brameld's ideas are congruent to a large degree with the thought of Mead which underpins the present research. In fact, Brameld's following statement almost defines social relativism:

Whatever meaning the self possesses as reality is dependent upon the kind of environment, especially the group environment, within which it develops.


40 Fowler, "Reconstructionist Philosophy."


Killam analyzes Reconstructionist philosophy in order to deduce principles to guide the teaching of musical composition. Fowler uses Reconstructionist principles to "develop a music education program which is rooted in philosophy and consistent with cultural, educational, and musical aims and objectives." Showing Reconstructionism to be a valid philosophical perspective which is similar to that chosen for this study, both studies thus reinforce the validity of social relativism. Killam states:

From a reconstructionist viewpoint, the inevitable dilemma of all philosophies grounded in an assumed "absolute" truth arises from the difficulty of identifying men who possess elements of this "truth." Even among those of similar philosophies, divergent views arise; in absolutist terms one must necessarily be "wrong." Reconstructionists prefer to see "truth" as relative to time and circumstance, growing and changing like all other elements of the universe.

Killam contends, however, that Reconstructionism is an improvement over Dewey's Pragmatism in the former viewpoint's emphasis on modes of thinking other than the rational:

To the extent that men are rational and the universe comprehensible by man, pragmatism and progressivist educational philosophy have succeeded brilliantly. However, man is ultimately both less and more than rational—less in such aspects as prejudice and superstition, more in intuition and symbolizing ability. A philosophy which places such crucial dependence on rationality alone is thereby vulnerable.

---

44 Fowler, "Reconstructionist Philosophy," 11-12.
46 Ibid., 37.
For the present study, however, this minor squabble between Reconstructionism and Pragmatism is not important—both philosophies share the underlying perspective of social relativism.

John Dewey's writings contain much of the essential material of Pragmatism, especially as related to education. A number of researchers have analyzed the works of Dewey in order to derive implications for music education. Dennis and Floyd both derive principles from Dewey's thought which could be used to set up a framework for teaching music appreciation. Delpaz uses Dewey along with Collingwood to derive notions about aesthetic experience which would be the basis for a philosophy of music education. Delpaz' methodology and organization of chapters present a model for philosophical research similar to that used in the present investigation.

Gates' study uses Dewey's thought to deduce a general philosophy of music education. He traces the aesthetic education movement, finding it "the first major contender to appear


as a music education philosophy." As Dewey recommends, Gates emphasizes the experiential nature of aesthetic awareness. He defines the "musically mature" person as someone who is:

... characterized by increasing individual responsibility and dependability in making musical judgments and having aesthetic musical experiences independent of the direction of others. \(^{52}\)

He then provides a summary of the major instrumental values of musical maturity. He is forced to conclude, however, that Dewey's writings do not contain sufficient material to be the basis for a comprehensive theory of music education. He ends with a comment that is reminiscent of Smith's position:

Valid conclusions about present practices and the values they exemplify would have to be made, and these conclusions would have to be found continuous with Deweyan tenets about progressive education for the hypothesis to be supported. \(^{53}\)

Gates does not attempt this evaluation of present practices, however, because his research had a deductive purpose: to utilize the theories of Dewey in deriving a theory for music education. He does show, nonetheless, that he is aware of the dialectic nature of scientific inquiry, even though his research only attempts to state ideological principles.

Steinecker\(^{54}\) uses Dewey's concept of pluralism to debunk many of the common dualisms in music education, such as:

\(^{51}\) Gates, "Philosophy based on Dewey," 3.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 147.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 154.

(1) means versus ends; (2) aesthetic experience versus other kinds of musical activities; (3) process versus product; (4) specialized versus comprehensive musician-ship; (5) musical opportunities for the talented versus music for every child; (6) fine arts versus practical arts; (7) academic versus artistic studies; and (8) cognitive versus affective domain.

Steinecker advocates a broader perspective on musical values, including "utilitarian" as well as "aesthetic" values in music education, contending that: "Though not new to the educational scene, these dualities are still contentious and anachronistic in our increasingly pluralistically oriented society." If, along with Steinecker, one accepts Dewey's pluralistic conception of values for music education, then aesthetic and utilitarian arguments may be seen as complementary to each other.

This broader definition of musical value is in keeping with the philosophical basis of social relativism, in that value is to be defined by the groups involved in an activity. If a certain value is held in esteem by a specific social group, then that value is "real" in the epistemological sense—what we "know" is what we agree upon as reality. Steinecker adds:

As regards the placing of aesthetic response above performance skills, or the opposite, the author takes the position that it is advisable and possible to develop both within a balanced, comprehensive music program. A dualistic practice in this regard limits the nature of such a program.

56Ibid.
57Ibid., 215.
His study is a good example of how philosophical research can pose thoughtful questions, and by reasoned application of a theoretical perspective, can give the profession a good model to begin looking at current practices. It must be noted, however, that a person who disagrees with Dewey's pluralism will not likely be swayed by Steinecker's argument.

Schantz focuses on Dewey, but includes writings of Leonard Meyer and Nicholas Wolterstorff to state values for music education. He emphasizes the importance of a pluralistic approach, and redefines "music education" to include all musical activities within society where learning takes place: home, church, school, and community. He claims that "the theory of music education is separated from its practice, and both theory and practice are separated from ordinary musical experience."

As was mentioned earlier, such an approach is congruent with the tenets of social relativism. Schantz proposes that:

The goal of music education is to help students become agents of responsible aesthetic and artistic action in the world in which they live. Music interpenetrates life rather than existing on its fringes. . . . Music education becomes an active force within society rather than concentrating only on high culture and traditional aesthetic values.

It is no coincidence, however, that the ideas in these studies fit well into the framework of social relativism, as Dewey was

59 Ibid., i.
60 Ibid.
a close friend and colleague of George Herbert Mead, the founder of symbolic interaction. Mead emphasizes the importance of action as the focal point of human experience, and Dewey's aesthetic theories make the same claim.

In another study based upon ideas compatible with the philosophical base of the present research, Wry uses Merleau-Ponty's theory of the body-subject as the basis for a philosophy of music education. She asserts that philosophy is an important subject for music educators to master, and then extracts pertinent philosophical positions from Merleau-Ponty. Two of these principles support the tenets of the present research. First, Merleau-Ponty believes that the validity of ideas is the product of culture: "ideas which seem to be constantly accepted as valid, are valid for a period of time in the history of our culture or in our own personal lives." Second, he contends that social groups influence musical taste:

Social solidarity and a sense of communality are effected through music in any society. However, it must also be said that whereas a group may experience through music a sense of belonging, those outside the group often feel cut off from it. Music educators are familiar with this phenomenon. Some youngsters who sing rock and roll all day can feel ill at ease in a performance of a long opera. Likewise some music educators who are highly skilled in the classical repertoire may not understand the popular music of the day.

---

61 Ora Elizabeth Wry, "The Implications of Merleau-Ponty's Theory of the Body-Subject as the Basis for a Philosophy of Music Education" (doctoral diss., Temple University, 1976).
62 Ibid., 48.
63 Ibid., 191-192.
Furthermore, it is the participation (internalization, in Interactionist terminology) that helps create meaning for the individual as a member of the group:

It appears that if one participates in a particular style of music, one feels related to it. Participation is an important aspect of enjoyment as well as understanding in the arts. . . . Today there are musical spectators who often feel like outsiders. Their lack of participation and involvement in music limits their understanding. They cannot speak through the music of their society.  

Wry's study represents a philosophical perspective congruent with social relativism, and as such supports the choice of world view implicit herein.

In contrast to the ideas of social relativism, the aesthetic theory of Formalism is used by Soellner to derive a philosophy of music education. In the process of justifying his choice of Formalism, Soellner describes the absolutist/relativist duality, and places Formalism on the absolutist end of the spectrum. In his argument, he rejects Dewey's form of aesthetic meaning:

A major weakness of relativism is its emphasis on how a person responds. The interaction between an aesthetic agent and the observer becomes more important than what is producing the aesthetic condition. Dewey thus accepts a beautiful sunset as a legitimate aesthetic object. A formalist could not accept this as a truly aesthetic object since it is inconstant, it is never the same; it does not exist as an object or art to be contemplated and studied.

---

64 Wry, "Implications of Merleau-Ponty's," 192.

65 Glenn Earl Soellner, "Formalism as an Aesthetic Theory for Music Education" (doctoral diss., Boston University, 1971).

66 Ibid., 151-152.
This passage shows that the chosen frame of philosophical reference certainly affects opinions on matters of artistic value. What Soellner calls a weakness, Dewey would call a strength, and the ultimate "truth" must be decided by the belief system of the reader.

Using another absolutist philosophical stance, Wade\textsuperscript{67} considers the implications of Langer's musical aesthetics for music education. He stresses the importance of objectification of feeling in her theory, and that it is an object-centered theory (focused on the art work). After studying her theories and deriving implications for music education, he concludes:

Many people today are highly interested in the role of the percipient in any experience--what he brings to it and how he reacts to it. Langer has taken this into account. . . . Still, her attention is given largely to the work and its characteristics rather than the musician or listener.

This orientation of Langer's has resulted in fewer implications for music education practice than might have been available in a music aesthetic centered on the participant.\textsuperscript{68}

It is interesting that after assuming an absolutist position, Wade concludes that absolutism causes problems in deriving implications for music education. He reinforces the argument of the present study against taking a strictly absolutist position when dealing with values for music education.

\textsuperscript{67}Ralph Esrom Wade, "Susanne K. Langer's Musical Aesthetics with Implications for Music Education" (doctoral diss., Indiana University, 1965).

\textsuperscript{68}Ibid., 193.
Chronister analyzes and critiques Langer's views on the emotion-intellect dilemma, and then derives implications for music education. He begins by stating that Langer's theory embodies synthesis between intellect and emotion in the concept of "forms of feeling" which are symbolically articulated, presented, and perceived through nonverbal forms (e.g., a total musical composition) and nondiscursive thinking.

As Chronister's critique progresses, however, he also notes problems in applying Langer's theories to music education:

... her concept of artistic import is obscure because there appears to be no way to distinguish actual feeling from "conceptualized feeling." In her presentation, "expressiveness" of musical import takes on the aspect of a mystery, particularly when we are told that it cannot be pointed out or taught, that it is "self-evident," and that only "clear" and "intuitive" minds can grasp it.

Chronister brings out some important points in the debate over absolutist versus social relativist epistemology, as did Wade in the previous study. He contends that Langer's failure to recognize the importance of social influences on taste makes a difficult task for music education:

... her approach to music education appears to be negative--to have a student avoid corrupting influences by protecting him from them, rather than having him face up to them and learn how they have to be handled.

---


70 Ibid., 2.

71 Ibid., 142.

72 Ibid., 140.
Both of these studies which derive implications for music education from Langer's thought note problems with vagueness in her concepts. It should be pointed out, however, that Reimer\textsuperscript{73} also used Langer's theory as the basis for part of his dissertation and for his book, and he reported no such difficulties.

Studies which Derive Rationales from a Collection of Authors

In addition to the studies of Marple, Leedy, and Schwadron mentioned earlier, several other dissertations were found which derive implications for music education from a collection of writers or schools of thought. As such, these studies are not based on a single absolutist or relativist position, and cannot be classified in the same manner as the studies above. They have taken the alternative rejected by Smith of using an eclectic approach, including many theories to state aesthetic principles for music education.

Three of these studies purport to be advocates for the aesthetic education movement. Since this researcher is interested in the problems of using aesthetic theory to justify music education, these three studies are of particular interest here.

Spann\textsuperscript{74}, writing in 1969, attempts to formulate

\textsuperscript{73}Reimer, "Common Dimensions of Aesthetic and Religious."

\textsuperscript{74}Carry Edward Spann, "Implications from Contemporary Aesthetic Thought for Music Education" (doctoral diss., Florida State University, 1969).
a comprehensive aesthetic theory for contemporary music educators who lack confidence in aligning themselves with aesthetics even though they have dedicated their lives to furthering musical aesthetic experiences.\(^8\)

While acknowledging music educators' "lack of confidence" in their own aesthetic theorizing, he reviews a vast array of writings on aesthetics from artistic, musical, philosophical, and psychological sources. He opens the study, however, with a comment from skeptic Morris Weitz:

Aesthetic theory is a logically vain attempt to define what cannot be defined, to state the necessary and sufficient properties of that which has no necessary and sufficient properties, to conceive the concept of art as closed when its very use reveals and demands its openness.\(^9\)

This seemingly dichotomous realization is common to the studies reviewed which use an eclectic approach in stating aesthetic principles for music education. Each of these three authors point out that theorizing about aesthetics is fraught with problems, but then proceed to do it anyway. This criticism may be countered by calling the approach "pluralistic," and by arguing that aesthetic values are of many types, and require many theories to explain them. Instead of discussing the problem directly, however, all three authors ignore Smith's objection that a collection of aesthetic theories will yield contradictory recommendations about practices derived from them.

\(^8\)Spann, "Implications," vi.

Among the many aesthetic concepts Spann mentions is a definition of music which would fit social relativism: "One can define music in particular cases only according to tacitly implied rules found in a cultural milieu." While admitting the cultural forces which help to define music, however, he denies any social justifications for the music program in the schools: "Objectives other than musical are relegated to the periphery, not being central to a justification of music in education."

Sudano, writing in 1973, derives "foundational objectives" from the works of major authors of books in the music education profession. His three objectives are "to provide for effective living, to provide for aesthetic experiences, and to provide means for communication." Instead of interpreting these objectives broadly, however, he chooses to relate each of them only to those experiences gained through contact with art. His perspective is that of the absolutist connoisseur.

He expresses the same doubts as Spann, however, about the typical music educator's knowledge of aesthetic theory:

Music educators are aware of some sort of psychological response to music. Most have experienced it and may attribute their professional interest in music education to the fact that music "does" something to them. If this is

77 Spann, "Implications," 21.
78 Ibid., 255.
80 Ibid., 28.
the extent of the knowledge music educators have about the aesthetic experience, however, it is not really safe to base a portion of the curriculum on it or to use it in any sense as a justification for music or music education.\footnote{Sudano, "Aesthetic Theory," 95-96.}

He uses this dilemma as a justification for his study; more information about aesthetic theory, he implies, should be made available to practicing music educators. This writer, however, contends that dissertations in the philosophy of music education are not widely read by practicing music educators, precisely because of the dilemma that these authors have raised: music educators as a group do not share the gestures of or speak the language of philosophical and aesthetic treatises as do the writers of the dissertations reviewed here.

Chancellor,\footnote{George Robert Chancellor, "Aesthetic Value in Music: Implications for Music Education from the Classic Literature in the Field" (doctoral diss., Northwestern University, 1974).} writing in 1974, extends this dilemma from the music educator to the musician:

For most musicians, philosophical inquiry seems quite remote from the problems of music qua music. To some, the very term "aesthetics" has a rather quaint connotation about it. Its concerns appear to be somewhat anomalous among the issues of twentieth-century art. Identifying a person as an "aesthete" has even acquired a somewhat pejorative implication in contemporary usage. So the reader may well ask, "Why aesthetics?"\footnote{Ibid., 25.}

His study is an attempt to answer this question, but in the process of advocating a music education philosophy based upon aesthetic theory Chancellor adds more controversy to the
dilemma. Not only is aesthetic theory a difficult and arcane subject, but as Tompkins says:

Art has a way of undermining all aesthetic theories. This is especially apparent today, when artists seem less and less inclined to work within established traditions and more and more drawn to explore the uncertain nature of art itself, to raise more questions than they solve, and generally to becloud the fantasy . . . of art history. 84

Music educators, Chancellor feels, are expected to be both teachers and musicians (artists). In this dual role, if as teachers they are too busy to spend time studying aesthetics (as Smith claims), and if they as musicians deem philosophical inquiry to be rather remote from the problems of music (as Chancellor argues), then the task of those who would advocate the use of aesthetic theory by music educators to justify their school programs is doubly difficult.

Chancellor joins five other authors above who assert that the bulk of the profession either will not read their aesthetic rationales or will not understand them. This dilemma—that aesthetics are claimed to be important to music education, but that aesthetic theory is not understood by most music educators—reveals a serious problem for the justification of music in the public school by aesthetic arguments. Put another way, if aesthetics are going to be used to justify music education, then the people making the arguments (music educators) should be fully versed in aesthetic discourse.

Studies in the Clarification of Terminology

Two other studies were found which do not fit into the categories above, in that they do not specifically formulate principles for an ideology, rationale, or justification. They focus on the clarification of two terms which are often used inconsistently by music educators: understanding and creativity. These studies are important to the present research in that they contribute to a clearer and more logical approach to the philosophy of music education.

Turley\textsuperscript{85} looks at the meanings of the word understanding as the term pertains to musical understanding. He uses different statements from music appreciation texts to show that the word is used in a number of different ways.

There is not an agreement among musicians in general and music educators specifically, as to what is meant by understanding music. Therefore, the methods employed to arrive at any "understanding" are diverse and vary in accordance with whatever goal is contrived. This disparity affects the public school curriculum. In addition, it does not allow for the construction of an agreed-upon base leading to the music education of our youth.\textsuperscript{86}

According to Turley, the agreement on principles required for the formulation of a rationale for music education\textsuperscript{87} will not occur without agreement on terminology first. His study may thus be seen as a first step in rationale-building.

\textsuperscript{85}Marshall Raymond Turley, "A Study of the Concept of Understanding as it may be Applied to Understanding Music in Music Education" (doctoral diss., Ohio State University, 1976).

\textsuperscript{86}Ibid., 11.

\textsuperscript{87}See the discussion of rationale and paradigm in Chapter One.
In addition, Turley's perspective is compatible with a social relativist view. In a statement reminiscent of Mead, he quotes Charles Hughes, who states:

The final meeting of music and consciousness is conditioned by two factors, the nature of the individual and the nature of his society. The musical nature of the individual is very largely determined by the society in which he lives. That society is molded to some infinitesimal degree by what each individual is and desires to be. On the one hand there is the solitary and inviolable meeting of the individual sensitivity with music, on the other, the group pattern which impels towards likeness, conformity, a common experience.  

Another author who engages in the clarification of terminology for music education is Hounchell. His study of creativity and music reading as objectives in the *Music Educators Journal* formulates several conclusions about the uses of the terms. He asserts that, in the journal articles, (1) there is no clear definition of creativity; (2) very little has been written about the nature of creativity; (3) the term tends to be used in a casual, unnecessary, and sometimes gratuitous manner; and (4) the word is often used as a hortative term to encourage the acceptance of ideas regarding music education.

Hounchell's last conclusion is evidence of the use of "creativity" as the central focus of an ideology actually masquerading as a rationale. According to his study, many authors use the term to gain support for their ideas on the

---


basis of prejudice rather than upon clear definition and a
description of adequate means for attaining the goal of
"creative" behavior. In Interactionist terminology, these
authors could be said to be using the word "creativity" as an
insider term which holds certain preconceived connotations of
inherent "goodness" for those insiders who believe as the
authors do. To this writer, it seems that some authors of
aesthetic justifications use the term "aesthetics" in a similar
hortative manner, which appeals to preconceived connotations in
the minds of people who believe in the aesthetic values behind
those justifications.

**Chapter Summary**

Smith raises the question of the difficulty of logically
choosing between competing aesthetic theories, while no other
author addresses this point. He also stresses that value
statements are philosophically difficult to handle, an issue
likewise ignored by most other studies. Two writers besides
Smith raise the point that aesthetic theory is a field of
inquiry not entirely accepted by philosophers, much less by
laymen. All of these points have important ramifications for
the formulation of aesthetic justifications as well as
rationales.

One study in addition to Smith's argues that an important
difference exists between an ideology and a rationale. Only an
ideology has the power to compel action, this study asserts,
and only then for the members of the group who hold the ideology as absolute belief.

Finally, three studies emphasize the fact that rationale-making should be a dialectic process—a combination of induction and deduction whereby the theory is constantly challenged and refined. This perspective is similar to that of Thomas Kuhn, who provides one of the philosophical bases for this study. In addition, seven of the studies make statements congruent with the position of social relativism as a view of the field of music education, thereby helping to justify the choice of that perspective as the basis of the line of argumentation for this study.
SELECTED MUSIC EDUCATION RESEARCH
BASED ON SOCIAL GROUP THEORY

Also pertinent to the present investigation are studies in music education which use the principles of social relativism as their theoretical perspective. As a view of the field of music education, this perspective has been used by researchers to gain insights into a wide range of problems and issues.

In 1951, Kaplan\(^1\) wrote one of the foundational studies in this field. His research on the role of the musician in American society sets many of the ground rules for study of the sociology of music and music education:

\[
\text{The musician, however, cannot be understood until we establish the functions of music and the manner in which they are incorporated in patterns of social behavior. These three problems, accordingly, constitute the scope of a sociology of music: functions of music, its incorporation into social patterns, and the roles of creators [composers and performers].}^2
\]

Though he is addressing primarily the social roles of musicians in America, Kaplan's three areas of study certainly fit into the purview of music education.

\(^1\)Max Kaplan, "The Musician in America: A Study of His Social Roles" (doctoral diss., University of Illinois, 1951).

\(^2\)Ibid., 410.
He categorizes musical functions into two broad types, the aesthetic and the social. Similar categories—aesthetic and utilitarian—are familiar in philosophical discussions of objectives for music education today.

The first [aesthetic] relates its listeners to "materials, forms, sounds, or contents inherent within the artistic creation"; the second, [social] the "persons, ideas, cultural norms or patterns of behavior." Social conditions conducive to each were suggested, and five subtypes of social functions were given as collective, personal, symbolic, moral, and incidental. Kaplan puts the "aesthetic" in the realm of the listener's response, but feels that the response is to something inherent in the music. The "social" values he divides in a manner similar to that of a number of studies reviewed in previous chapters.

Kaplan also acknowledges the utilitarian purposes of music in the public schools. He discerns that, around 1950, the younger professional musicians whom he interviewed tended to have received their early training primarily in the public schools, while most of the older ones he interviewed had gotten their start almost exclusively through private teachers. In the 1940's, Kaplan asserts, the public school music programs in performance were just beginning to flourish, setting up the conflict—noted earlier in this research—between performance goals and aesthetic goals:

Our discussion of education patterns in relation to music began with the point that the American school has concentrated on character and social adjustment. Music
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3Kaplan, "Musician in America," 410-411.
was brought into the system on this moral basis [utilitarian values]. . . . [and] the role of the public school teacher is "to use music by indirection [for extra-musical purposes] while not neglecting respectable technical and artistic standards"; the role of the private teacher "centers upon the technical and artistic standards while not neglecting the indirect values".\(^4\)

At that time (1950), the dichotomy was between private teachers and public school directors, rather than between aesthetic educators and ensemble conductors, but the same type of split is apparent in even the most recent studies.

White,\(^5\) writing in 1964 (the same year as Robert C. Smith's pioneering study in the philosophy of music education), took Kaplan's research a step further into the music education field. His study, "The Professional Role and Status of the School Music Teacher in America," uses an Interactionist viewpoint to compare the social origins and status of music teachers to that of professional musicians, concert pianists, composers, and dance musicians.

The important ramifications of his study do not lie in White's demographic results, but in the theoretical perspective he develops in his introduction. He bemoans the unwillingness of scholars in music education to look at music from a sociological perspective, and blames this reticence on certain ideals and philosophies held over from the Romantic period in music:

\(^4\)Kaplan, "Musician in America," 412.

In their own minds the [Romantic era] practitioners of music placed themselves on a higher echelon of human existence than their uncreative brothers. Music was characterized as being a new religion; and its practitioners were gods, prophets, and prima donnas. A philosophy of "art for art's sake" prevailed, and music and musicians were thought to be unaffected by the routine of the culture in which they existed.  

It is interesting to note that Reimer's dissertation comparing religious and aesthetic experience was written a year prior to White's, although no certain connection between Reimer's thought and White's objection to "music as a religion" was found. It is probable, however, that White is referring to the same movement, which is based on the idea of connoisseurship, when he writes:

Although authors and lecturers with good intentions propagate the mystical, emotional, and ethereal values of music, the emerging trend of American society is to emphasize the social and psychological aspects which significantly structure a new frame of reference. This should help to remove the vestiges of the Romantic spirit found in the thinking of some contemporary musicians. Music can no longer be dissociated from the broader realms of knowledge; it cannot be completely understood if only its techniques and theories, dissociated from the cultural context in which they function, are to be studied.  

As it has turned out, White's prediction has gone relatively unheeded. The aesthetic education movement became the dominant force, at least in the professional literature of music education, with a sociological perspective used in relatively few studies.  

---

6White, "Professional Role," 7.

7Ibid., 8.
Rumbelow\textsuperscript{8} followed in 1969 with a study in the field of sociology which establishes the principles of a sociology of music based upon symbolic interaction. Even though it is not a dissertation in music education, he shows that symbolic interaction is a valid perspective from which to view musical phenomena, including music teaching and learning.

Modern sociological theory has accepted interaction as one of the most important frames of reference in which to view society. . . . The social psychology of music, then, deals with the individual and society in musical situations, and with the place of music in the socialization of the individual. . . . In the examination of the communicative aspects of music we look to social psychology for information and explanation.\textsuperscript{7}

Rumbelow's contribution to the sociology of music education is his demonstration that Mead's framework of theory and terminology gives pertinent insights to questions involving the making and teaching of music. After reviewing Mead's terminology and interpreting it in a musical context,\textsuperscript{10} Rumbelow extends Mead's concept of the gesture to include the musical gesture. He then analyzes aesthetic experience in terms of these musical gestures.

In contrast to most of the aesthetic theories advocated by writers reviewed in Chapter Three, Rumbelow's system of musical aesthetics depends upon the idea that "aesthetic experience is


\textsuperscript{9}Ibid., 1-2.

\textsuperscript{10}See the discussion of Interactionist theory in Chapter Six.
a psychological phenomenon involving the individual, music, and society. There can be no aesthetic experience if the music fails to communicate."11 Furthermore, communication depends upon gestures (in this case musical gestures) being interpreted as meaningful.12 This meaning is based upon a person's social experiences and relationships:

Communication through music will not take place unless the music heard has relevance to the musico-social experience of the individual. The musical experience of the individual depends upon the social groups with which he identifies.13

Rumbelow asserts that music is communication, but he feels that what it communicates is realized only in musical terms—or, more specifically, in terms of musical gestures:

The aesthetics of music should be an extension of social psychology, especially with regard to communication and social interaction. We have noted Langer's assertion that these attempts have failed because of the fundamental differences in musical symbolism and discursive symbolism. The underlying sociological basis escaped these writers because they did not push their examination of the symbolism of music to the point of realizing that music has its own universe of discourse, in George Herbert Mead's terms, which is independent of all other forms of symbolism, independent of all other forms of communication. These forms may have parallels which make them seem similar but they are still parallel, not identical, forms. They are not "translatable."14

Rumbelow goes on to define this universe of musical discourse by a three-way relationship between music, the individual, and the group:

12See the discussion of meaningful gesture in Chapter Six.
14Ibid., 113.
Each element in this diagram is influenced by the other two elements—the individual affects group taste, while the standards of the group influence the individual's preferences:

... the aesthetic values of the group form the frame of reference within which individual value judgments are made and beyond which the individual will not express a musical preference in the presence of his peers.\textsuperscript{13}

This principle of interrelationship among individual, music, and group, is of critical importance for the argument in the present study. Group norms and values affect musical behaviors and aesthetic experiences, just as these norms and values also influence the acceptance or rejection of justification arguments based upon particular musical or aesthetic values.\textsuperscript{16}

Five studies\textsuperscript{17} were found which investigated the role perceptions of teachers, student teachers, or undergraduate

\textsuperscript{13Rumbelow, "Music and Social Groups," 89.}

\textsuperscript{16See the discussion of reference group in Chapter Six.}

\textsuperscript{17Stephen H. Barnes, "The High School Instrumental Teacher Role: An Exploration of Interposition Consensus" (doctoral diss., Ohio State University, 1972); Lynn Elliot Moller, "The Relationship of Role Perceptions of the Secondary School Music Educator and the Resultant Effect on Job Satisfaction" (doctoral diss., University of Kansas, 1981); Robert Lowell Dick, "Teacher Role Perception of Music Student Teachers before and after Student Teaching at the University of Northern Colorado" (doctoral diss., University of Northern Colorado, 1977); Steven Grant Baxter, "The Relationship of Self Concept and Career Choice Among University Music Students" (doctoral
students in music education based on sociological theory and nomenclature. They are important to this study in supporting the choice of social relativism as a perspective from which to research issues in music education. Conclusions of these studies, however, are not particularly relevant for the present research, in that they do not address factors relating to justifications or choices about musical values.

One of these five studies, however, has particular methodological relevance to this research because it specifically uses symbolic interactionism and the theories of Mead as a research framework. L'Roy18 investigates the role perceptions of undergraduate music education majors, using a questionnaire and interview technique. Her data are analyzed according to an Interactionist perspective, showing that the theoretical framework of social relativism, sufficiently applied, can serve as a foil both for design and interpretation of research.

Perhaps the most important implication of L'Roy's study for the present research, however, is her call for more investigation, including philosophical inquiry, based on a symbolic interactionist perspective:

---

18 L'Roy, "Development of Occupational Identity."
When this study is viewed in sequence with the studies of Kaplan, Rumbelow, and White, it is recommended that Interactionist theory be applied to more phases of music education. Philosophical studies as well as descriptive explorations should be undertaken using a Symbolic Interactionist perspective. We believe that the application of this theory to a variety of concerns and topics can lead to a Social-Psychology of music education, rooted in the theoretical framework of Symbolic Interactionism. Such a theoretical framework would not only provide an underlying foundation for music education, but also supply the structure around which courses could be organized.

As defined in the discussion of rationale and paradigm in Chapter One, what L'Roy is calling for is a rationale for music education based upon the paradigm of Symbolic Interactionism. The success of any theory purporting to be the foundation for a rationale will depend upon that theory's ability to explain and simplify issues concerning music teaching and learning. In the light of Robert Smith's warning about not imposing outside theories on music education, Symbolic Interaction will have to stand up to the dialectic interchange of observation and hypothesizing by music educators working in empirical and theoretical inquiries based on its premises. L'Roy's study provides an example of the former type of inquiry, and the present research seeks to be an example of the latter.

Chapter Summary

The examination of research in music education which contains an overt social group theoretical underpinning has reinforced the validity of using such a philosophical perspective from which to view issues of music teaching and learning.

The early studies of Kaplan and White delineate the general approach to a sociology of music and music education, while Rumbelow adds a specifically Interactionist view of aesthetics and musical social situations. Interactionism is seen as an appropriate tool to analyze role perception, job satisfaction, and career choice.

In addition, a number of studies offer a sociological approach as an alternative to the Romantic and Realistic perspective of the aesthetic education movement. This opposition of theoretical constructs is interpreted by this writer as an episode in the aesthetic versus utilitarian and aesthetic value versus performance group value debates reported earlier.

Furthermore, L'Roy recommends that the philosophical perspective of social relativism, in particular the Symbolic Interactionist viewpoint, be used for more research in music education. This perspective is justified by its acceptance in contemporary sociological and educational thought and by its use or advocacy by a large number of studies reviewed here. L'Roy specifically calls for philosophical inquiry built on this framework. Given (1) the large number of problems identified in the last three chapters concerning issues of utilizing aesthetic theory for justifications in music education; (2) the lack of study into issues which govern the process of justification; and (3) wide support in the literature for the Interactionist perspective, this study is a response to that call.
CHAPTER VI

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Philosophical Background

Philosophical positions may be placed on a continuum from absolutism to relativism. Extreme relativism, or solipsism, is the belief that each person's perception of reality is completely independent of any other person's. It entails a totally subjective view of reality, in which there exists no shared basis for communication between people. Solipsism thus fails as a perspective from which to view education, which depends upon communication.

The basic tenet of absolutism is that there is a universal reality. The chief argument against absolutism is that of Thomas Kuhn, a noted historian of science. His paradigmatic concept of scientific inquiry rejects the notion that science is progressing toward an absolute version of the laws of nature. In Kuhn's view, scientists assume a fundamental set of propositions about the nature of the observable world:

Normal science, the activity in which most scientists inevitably spend almost all their time, is predicated on the assumption that the scientific community knows what
the world is like. Much of the success of the enterprise derives from the community's willingness to defend that assumption, if necessary at considerable cost.¹

Kuhn calls the assumption of such an underlying theory the acceptance of a paradigm. A paradigm is a theory, but one which is accepted by the entire community of scientists as being adequate to explain all of the existing problems being considered by the group. While other theories may exist, they do not have the power to guide actions commanded by the paradigm theory. The paradigm helps to ensure "the success of the enterprise" for the scientist because it provides a background of principles and attitudes upon which research can be built. Kuhn points out that:

When the individual scientist can take a paradigm for granted, he need no longer, in his major works, attempt to build his field anew, starting from first principles and justifying the use of each concept introduced.²

The paradigm also serves to allow the facts of the natural world to be viewed from a particular perspective. Without such guidance, all facts seem equally relevant. Kuhn states that the body of facts cannot be interpreted without "at least some body of intertwined theoretical and methodological belief that permits selection, evaluation, and criticism."³

Because it guides selection, evaluation, and criticism of facts, the paradigm becomes accepted in a particular

²Ibid., 19-20.
³Ibid., 17.
community as an adequate explanation of phenomena for the time being. It is normally not questioned, and its implications guide the everyday research of the scientists. In the course of that everyday research, however, anomalies are found. The paradigm is then adjusted to make them fit. When that adjustment becomes impossible, a crisis is produced, and a number of new theories compete to be accepted as the new paradigm. In Kuhn's words, the crisis commences with the awareness of anomaly, i.e., with the recognition that nature has somehow violated the paradigm-induced expectations that govern normal science. It then continues with a more or less extended exploration of the area of anomaly. And it closes only when the paradigm theory has been adjusted [or replaced] so that the anomalous has become the expected.\(^4\)

On the other hand, the new paradigm is not necessarily a more accurate representation of some absolute reality. It merely allows the new phenomena to be interpreted in some way which is seen as more meaningful than the old way. In fact, according to Kuhn, some of the phenomena explained by the old theory may not be explained by the new, so they are likely to be relegated to another science or thrown out as "unscientific" altogether.\(^5\)

One remarkable aspect of revolutions in paradigms, however, is the speed with which a change is made. When a critical stage of acceptance is passed, the community of scientists quickly abandons the old theory and assumes the

\(^4\)Kuhn, *Structure*, 52-53.

\(^5\)Ibid., 103.
stance of the new paradigm. Often new equipment is designed or purchased in order to investigate the questions posed by the new paradigm.

Kuhn says that the reason for this rapid change is that scientists are actually groups of people who share values, and once the new explanation of the anomaly is seen to fit within the existing value scheme, the group quickly adopts it:

A paradigm governs . . . not a subject matter but rather a group of practitioners. Any study of paradigm-directed or of paradigm-shattering research must begin by locating the responsible group or groups.6

According to Kuhn, the study of science is merely the study of what groups of people have thought at various points in time. The "scientific" knowledge in these groups is merely "what scientists think" even though to the layman the scientific knowledge may be seen as absolute truth. Kuhn states that the seeming "progress" of science, as seen by outsiders, is not a progression toward absolute truth:

I do not doubt, for example, that Newton's mechanics improves on Aristotle's and that Einstein's improves on Newton's as instruments for puzzle-solving. But I can see in their succession no coherent direction of ontological development. On the contrary, in some important respects, though by no means in all, Einstein's general theory of relativity is closer to Aristotle's than either of them is to Newton's. Though the temptation to describe that position as relativistic is understandable, the description seems to me wrong. Conversely, if the position be relativism, I cannot see that the relativist loses anything needed to account for the nature and development of the sciences.7

6Kuhn, Structure, 180.

7Ibid., 206-207.
Kuhn thus states an important case debunking notions that absolute truth exists in science. Instead, he asserts that what is called scientific knowledge is merely knowledge possessed by groups of people called scientists.

This knowledge possessed by scientists includes not just facts but a background of insider attitudes for interpreting those facts. Kuhn calls such insider knowledge "tacit knowledge . . . which is learned by doing science rather than by acquiring rules for doing it." Tacit knowledge guides both perception and interpretation, which in turn depend on previous schooling and conditioning. Kuhn states that:

interpretation begins where perception ends. The two processes are not the same, and what perception leaves for interpretation to complete depends drastically on the nature and amount of prior experience and training.

During their schooling, according to Kuhn, many science students are not exposed to primary source material, even in graduate school. Instead, they are given textbooks which contain the essence of the current paradigm both in terms of factual information and attitudes about interpreting it. The textbooks, he asserts, are rewritten to reflect the new disciplinary matrix each time there is a major paradigm change.

Disciplinary matrix is a term he coins to refer to the actual theory which is accepted as the paradigm, along with the attitudes, habits of working, methods, and other tacit knowledge accompanying it. By learning the elements of the

8Kuhn, Structure, 191.

9Ibid., 198.
disciplinary matrix from the textbooks and from apprenticeship with the research advisor, the new scientists are thus guaranteed to be brought into the group. They will accept the paradigm, learn the tacit knowledge, not question fundamental assumptions, and readily confine their activities to matters of interest to the group.

These and other matters of group socialization are for Kuhn the most pressing questions in the study of scientific knowledge, and of how all groups arrive at a useful body of knowledge:

How does one elect and how is one elected to membership in a particular community, scientific or not? What is the process and what are the stages of socialization to the group? What does the group collectively see as its goals; what deviations, individual or collective, will it tolerate; and how does it control the impermissible aberration? A fuller understanding of science will depend on answers to other sorts of questions as well, but there is no area in which more work is so badly needed. Scientific knowledge, like language, is intrinsically the common property of a group or else nothing at all. To understand it we shall need to know the special characteristics of the groups that create and use it.

Kuhn recommends studying the "special characteristics of groups that create and use" knowledge. The present study takes that recommendation in its choice of social relativism as a perspective from which to study how music educators and the clientele groups of the public schools gain knowledge of and develop attitudes toward values for justifications.

Symbolic interaction theory and the sociology of knowledge are applications of the perspective of social relativism to

---
communication within and among social groups. Since the process of justifying music education entails communication within and among social groups, any theoretical examination of this process should accurately describe that interaction.

Concepts of Interactionism and the Sociology of Knowledge

Symbolic Interactionism and the sociology of knowledge are complementary theories based on the philosophical perspective of social relativism. The sociology of knowledge, as developed by Berger and Luckmann, adapts and extends Symbolic Interactionism and other sociological theories into a comprehensive social epistemology. An understanding of selected concepts of Symbolic Interactionism and the sociology of knowledge is necessary to the analysis of aesthetic justifications to be made in the next chapter. These concepts will be presented here in the following order:

I. The Act
   A. Actor
   B. Gesture
      1. Stimulus-interpretation-response

11The ideas set forth in this section, unless otherwise noted, are taken from Mead's symbolic interaction theory, and from Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann's sociology of knowledge as set forth in The Social Construction of Reality (Garden City NY: Anchor Books, 1967). Berger and Luckmann's position is an elaboration of some of Mead's ideas and ideas from other thinkers into an epistemology of social groups. Their emphasis is thus on the function and development of knowledge in social groups; Mead's emphasis is on communication and interaction in social groups. The two positions represent, however, complementary versions of essentially the same position: that of social relativism.
2. Symbolic interaction
   C. Meaningful gesture—significant symbol

II. The Social Group
   A. Universe of discourse
   B. Body of knowledge
   C. Reference group
   D. Anchorage
   E. Norms and values

III. Primary Socialization
   A. Significant other
   B. Generalized other

IV. Secondary Socialization

V. Legitimation Theory
   A. A social theory of justification for music education
   B. Levels of legitimation
      1. Incipient
      2. Theoretical (rudimentary)
      3. Theoretical (explicit)
      4. Symbolic universes

The Act

Mead takes the act to be the prototypical case of human interaction. Each act consists of three elements:

--the stimulation, the response represented by the attitude, and the ultimate experience which follows upon the reaction, represented by the imagery arising out of past reactions.12

A person perceives a stimulus, whether it be words spoken, a facial expression, a physical movement, or other gesture, and responds to that stimulus. Mead says that the first response is inward—"represented by the attitude"—and is the person's interpretation of the intent and significance of the gesture in light of a previously developed "attitude" toward such gestures. The interpretation is followed by the reaction, which is driven by the "imagery arising out of past reactions." The reaction then becomes a gesture to the other person, and a conversation of gestures begins. The act is therefore the kernel of interaction, with its three parts: gesture, interpretation, and reaction.

Actor

An actor is simply a person involved in interaction. Social interaction involves actors engaging in a series of acts: a two-way conversation of gestures, interpretations, and reactions.

Gesture

According to Mead, "the gesture is that part of the social act which serves as stimulus to other forms involved in the


14Ibid., 46.
same social act."\(^{15}\) It is the gesture which is interpreted by the other in social interaction. Individuals create, by their interpretation of these gestures of others, their own version of the world of actions.

Response to a gesture is thus not a simple behavioristic response. The interpretation which is interjected between stimulus (gesture) and response (action) makes the gesture into a symbol. People react not to gestures but to their perception of the symbolic meaning of gestures, thus accounting for differences in reactions by different individuals encountering the same gesture. In turn, each response becomes a gesture to another person, who goes through the same process of symbolizing. The entire process gives its name to Mead's theory: symbolic interaction.

**Significant Symbol and Meaningful Gesture**

When the meaning symbolically interpreted from a gesture corresponds to the meaning intended by the gesturer, then the symbol is said to be a *significant symbol*, and the gesture a *meaningful gesture*. Communication takes place through meaningful gestures.\(^{16}\) If individuals are gesturing to each other but misinterpreting each other's intent, then those gestures are not meaningful, and there is a failure in communication. For example, a band director acquaintance of this writer was


\(^{16}\)Ibid., 173.
once called "coach" by a school superintendent who had started his career in athletics. The band director took great offense even though the superintendent had meant the remark most sincerely to be a compliment. The frames of reference of the two men prevented accurate communication in this case, because each person had a different group-defined idea of what a "coach" was. It is easy to see how similar conflicts could occur in the justification process for music education, in that the music educator is likely to have different attitudes toward gestures concerning music and musical values than the many diverse groups that research has shown to comprise the decision-makers in this process.17

These "attitudes" toward gestures are developed in a person over time through a combination of previous interactions. The set of attitudes thus collected become an internal reflection of the symbolic interactions experienced by that person. In a very important sense, the person is influenced by the group of actors with whom he or she has shared meaningful gestures.

17Aaria Butler Troiano, "A History of the Development and Determinants of Milwaukee Public School Arts Policy from 1870 to 1930" (doctoral diss., University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1984) (reviewed in Chapter Two) reported that school boards and superintendents were the primary decision makers in matters of arts policy. William David Bryant, "The Importance of Objectives from Secondary School Music Programs and the Opinions of Five School Related Groups," (doctoral diss., University of Illinois, 1986) (also reviewed in Chapter Two) found that school board members held widely diverse views of objectives for music education, because they represented a wide variety of groups who, for the most part, had only a layman's concept of the field.
The Social Group

Universe of Discourse

A group of actors using meaningful gestures with each other create a universe of discourse, which is a system of shared meanings agreed upon by the group. The group members participate in the universe of discourse by virtue of their common internalized attitudes toward gestures. In this sense the universe of discourse is similar to the paradigm of Kuhn—it provides a basis for group action.

When the group members begin to act according to their attitudes toward the universe of discourse, they also define part of themselves by these shared attitudes and become more strongly attached to the group. The members will adopt certain vocabulary, modes of dress, and mannerisms of behavior which will be seen by members and non-members as gestures of the group. Such a group which shares gestures is called a social group.

Body of Knowledge

Each social group commands a body of knowledge, which is the collection of gestures considered essential to group identity. It consists of facts, attitudes, habits, values, and so

---

18 Mead, Mind, 224.
19 Ibid., 200-201.
21 Ibid.
on, which are contributed by members of the group and assimilated by the group as a whole. A social group may be relatively open or closed, depending on the number of common gestures commanded by its body of knowledge. A group whose members share many gestures is a closed group; a group with only a few gestures in common is an open group. The group of aestheticians, for example, would be a relatively closed group, because a great deal of specific skill and knowledge is required for acceptance by insiders. School board members, on the other hand, would represent a fairly open group, perhaps sharing only the one gesture of serving on the board. Otherwise, they might be stockbrokers or steelworkers, homemakers or professors.

Reference Group

A reference group is a group with which a person identifies or feels empathy. The person may or may not be an actual member of the group—the interaction may be indirect. For example, a girl growing up in a small town may want to be an opera singer, and yet all she knows of opera singers comes from television, radio, books, and records. This social interaction

---

22Merrill, Society, 47.


is removed from the face-to-face situation, but by empathy the girl may still carry the symbolic world of the opera singer in her mind as a reference group.

Anchorage

An anchorage\(^{25}\) is a gesture or idea within the universe of discourse which serves to hold a group together. In Kuhn's terms, the theory accepted as a paradigm is the anchorage for the group of scientists who share in an entire disciplinary matrix. In Interactionist terms, the anchorage is the quintessential gesture which serves as a unifying force in the group. In open groups, the anchorage may be the only thing that brings the group together. In closed groups, there may be whole systems of anchorages. While in an open group, the anchorage may be very weak, in a closed group, it may resemble an ideology.

According to studies examined in Chapters Two through Five, the music education profession does not seem to have a single anchorage. There is evidence of groups who hold "aesthetics" as an anchorage, of those who hold "performance" as an anchorage, of those to whom scholarly writing and research is an anchorage, and a number of other groups. This diversity of anchorages indicates the presence of different reference groups within the field of music education.

Norms and Values

The existence of a reference group entails norms of behavior accepted by the group and values which are held as important for group membership. Members will hold the values in relative strength to the intensity of their desire to be an insider to the group, and they will take on the gestures practiced as the norm in the group with the same intensity. The young girl in the example above will try to act, dress, and talk like she thinks an opera singer would act, dress, and talk. Thus the autograph of her favorite singer and the recording from her favorite opera become objects which represent her dedication to the norms and values of her reference group. These objects hold great significance to her.

Interactionism states that the person or gesture of significance has the power to affect the actor because the significant other or significant gesture is related to the actor's self-definition. People and gestures attain significance through the process of socialization, which is divided into primary and secondary forms.

Primary Socialization

Significant Other

Primary socialization is the child's internalization of the world of its parents and immediate family. To the child, family members are significant others, that is, those persons

26 Clark, 12.
about whose opinions we vitally care. In terms of primary socialization the word significant must be interpreted strongly; family members are significant others if they have primary influence over the child's upbringing and if the intense emotional bonding (positive or negative) characteristic of maternal and paternal relationships takes place.

The significant others define reality for the child in everyday situations, showing the child the limits, scope, and nature of normal human behavior. The term normal here is telling. The child perceives the behavior of his or her significant others as normal, no matter how that behavior may be viewed by society in general. The child internalizes the reality of the home in such a powerful way that other realities are dim in comparison. The child, by this internalization of the socially constructed reality of the home, takes on the attitudes of the home and the roles of the significant others. If, however, the parents neglect the child and do not interact in a significant way, the child will not internalize the values of the parents. As Clark\textsuperscript{28} points out, internalization is dependent upon interaction.

It is by this process of interaction and taking on the roles of others that the child begins to form an identity:

In other words, the self is a reflected entity, reflecting the attitudes first taken by significant others toward it; the individual becomes what he is addressed as by his significant others. This is not a one-sided, mechanistic process. It entails a dialectic between

\textsuperscript{28} Clark, Reference Group Theory, 51.
identification by others and self-identification, between objectively assigned and subjectively appropriated identity. 29

Normally the child internalizes the roles of the significant others, language, certain cultural institutions, and at least the rudiments of a legitimating apparatus. 30 Thus the subjective appropriation of identity and of the social world are two parts of the same process of internalization which is in this case called primary socialization.

Generalized Other

Taking the role of the other is capsulized in the saying "we see ourselves as others see us." As the child comes into contact with a wider range of others, a generalized version of self-image becomes possible. The image is not simply a behavioristic response to the other's reaction--there is a three-part process of thought involved in the person's own mind, similar to the three parts of the social act:

A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification. The comparison with a looking-glass hardly suggests the second element, the imagined judgment, which is quite essential. The thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves, but an imputed sentiment, the imagined effect of this reflection upon another's mind. This is evident

29Berger, Social Construction, 121-122.

30"Legitimating apparatus" refers to the means by which institutions are defended, or made to seem legitimate, in society. A full discussion of legitimation theory closes this chapter.
from the fact that the character and weight of that other, in whose mind we see ourselves, makes all the difference with our feeling.\(^{31}\)

The child takes the different versions of himself that he interprets from reflections in these others and gradually generalizes them into one self-image. This entails the creation of the generalized other.\(^{32}\) With this crystallization of identity comes the end of primary socialization.

The formation within consciousness of the generalized other marks a decisive phase in socialization. It implies the internalization of society as such and of the objective reality established therein, and, at the same time, the subjective establishment of a coherent and continuous identity.\(^{33}\)

The purpose of primary socialization is ultimately to deliver the person from the world of the home to the doorstep of the world "out there."\(^{34}\) Its effects, however, can never be totally escaped. Primary socialization has a profound influence because the world first internalized seems to the person the world, or at least the most important one. It is the one from which other "worlds" are described and experienced.

In society at large, there are always more bodies of knowledge available than any one person can internalize. But it is due to this division of knowledge, the creation of roles, and

---


\(^{33}\) Berger, *Social Construction*, 123.

\(^{34}\) Ibid., 137.
the creation of role-specific secondary bodies of knowledge, that secondary socialization takes place.

Secondary Socialization

Secondary socialization is the internalization by the individual of these role-specific bodies of knowledge. The individual undergoes many secondary socializations, but only one primary one. The secondary socializations do not carry the affective weight of the primary socialization, and therefore their realities are not as strong:

While primary socialization cannot take place without an emotionally charged identification of the child with his significant others, most secondary socialization can dispense with this kind of identification and proceed effectively with only the amount of mutual identification that enters into any communication between human beings. Put crudely, it is necessary to love one's mother, but not one's teacher.\(^5\)

The fact that teachers need not be significant others is an example of the secondary nature of the reality internalized in secondary socialization. Significance in the classroom, in the absence of significant others must be achieved by attempts to "bring home" concepts to the students. The word "home" implies the world of primary socialization. The teacher must "speak the language of the students", or "start where the students are and bring them to where the teacher is." These sayings embody the difference in reality strength between the "home" of primary and the newly internalized sphere of reality of secondary socialization.

\(^{35}\)Berger, Social Construction, 130.
The same is true for the secondary nature of the situation of the groups involved in the justification process for music education. Unless the music educator represents a significant opinion in some sense, the groups being addressed by the argument are not likely to be swayed. In speaking of the manner in which groups are manipulated to accept values, Clark says:

Incoming information is ... evaluated in terms of the credibility of the informant’s expertness and trustworthiness ... [which] brings us back to reference groups, for they serve an important function of establishing guidelines for the credibility of an information source.\[^{36}\]

The reference groups adhered to by the school board members, superintendents, and others in a position of decision-making on curriculum\[^{37}\] will set the standards by which those groups evaluate the arguments put forth by the music educator. The groups’ existing norms and values, in terms of their reference groups, will affect their perceptions of the expertise and trustworthiness of the person making the case. This point was substantiated by Troiano in her finding that:

The complexity of analyzing public policy is largely due to the fact that the process of policy formation takes place over time and is the output of a large number of policy-makers, each of whom comes to the process with differing ideologies.\[^{38}\]

If the decision-makers’ reference groups include a high value for music, then the justification process will be a simple matter of reiterating values already held. But if the norms and

\[^{36}\text{Clark, Reference Group Theory, 50-51.}\]

\[^{37}\text{See footnote number 17 above.}\]

\[^{38}\text{Troiano, "History of Arts Policy," 128.}\]
values of their reference groups do not include a high valuation for music, the theory says that it will be difficult indeed to get decision-makers to take on the reference group of the music educator. In effect, the music educator is trying to change behavior (of the decision-makers) which is based on norms and values different from his or her own:

Because one's behavior (overt and covert) is assumed to be principally a function of the reference group he is using at the moment, control over his behavior is exercised by (a) affecting his choice of reference group and/or (b) changing the normative content of the reference groups with which he is now identified.39

A change in reference groups is not brought about coercively, without the decision-maker's identification with a significant other or group. The decision-maker must want to move into the new reference group, to adopt the new norms and values, and to be shown that there are potential benefits in doing so.

This change would be difficult enough to bring about using layman's language with gestures common to all the groups involved. Adding in the additional factor of a technical language such as that of aesthetics calls into question the very possibility of even achieving communication. The gestures of aesthetics are likely not to be meaningful because they originate in widely diverse bodies of knowledge from those common to the decision-makers.

39Clark, Reference Group Theory, 92.
When many diverse bodies of knowledge exist within the stock of knowledge of society at large, there arises the possibility of socially segregated subuniverses of meaning. These result from accentuations of role specialization to the point where role-specific knowledge becomes altogether esoteric as against the common stock of knowledge.\textsuperscript{40}

Because many of the gestures of the music educator fall into this category—especially knowledge of aesthetics and aesthetic values—a potential problem exists in using such esoteric knowledge as the basis for justifications to decision-makers on the school boards.

Legitimation Theory

\textbf{A Social Theory of Justification For Music Education}

Legitimation Theory\textsuperscript{41} describes the process by which socially segregated institutions justify their existence. Insofar as schools are institutions segregated from society at large, they have their own legitimating machinery designed to protect them and perpetuate them. This machinery includes formal rituals such as admission tests, complex application procedures, rules of conduct, and graduation. These rituals serve to remind the members that the institution is real and permanent.

In addition, music in the public schools may be seen as an institution in need of legitimation. Since the status of music

\textsuperscript{40}Berger, Social Construction, 79.

\textsuperscript{41}A full discussion of Legitimation Theory appears in Berger, Social Construction, 92-128.
as primarily an elective subject places it in a somewhat precarious position in the schools, music educators have had a preoccupation with justifying their subject and activity. This emphasis on justification invites a theoretical analysis using legitimation theory.

The function of the legitimating machinery is the preservation of the institution. The problems of legitimation in these increasingly autonomous and complex subuniverses of meaning must take into account the roles of insiders versus outsiders. Those who possess the meanings of the body of knowledge must feel that they are justified in feeling apart from those who do not share in the meanings, and that the outsiders are rightfully kept out.

Music educators who have developed strong reference groups concerning aesthetics and aesthetic theory have invested time and energy in those specialized norms and values. It is only natural that they should want to legitimate those values, even if the values are somewhat esoteric as compared to the values of society at large or of other subgroups within the music education profession.

Levels of Legitimation

Four levels in the legitimation process are identified by Berger and Luckmann:

---

42Hundreds of justification articles are cited by Jones, Hooper, Mark, and Miller, whose studies are reviewed in Chapter Two.

1. Incipient. Incipient legitimations are merely repetitions of the existence of the institution being legitimated. They are made in the same language used to describe the institution. They are often unintentional. Casual conversation about the weather maintains the everyday reality in the language of that everyday reality. But such legitimations may also be more explicitly intentional statements of facts as they are known to exist. In maintaining the institution of teaching music in the schools, an incipient legitimation is: "We should teach music in the schools because, in fact, music is already being taught there."

2. Theoretical (rudimentary). These legitimations are various explanatory schemes--proverbs, moral maxims, wise sayings, and so on. "We should teach music in the schools because music is the universal language."

3) Theoretical (explicit). Legitimation may take the form of explicit theories having their own specialized knowledge and institutional reality; in such cases, the legitimations are themselves institutions. The theories referred to are taken for granted because of the presumed acceptance of the institutional reality from which they are made. They are theories simply asserted in the spirit of "everybody knows that such and such . . ." or "Music should be taught in the schools because it allows adolescents the opportunity to belong to a group in a positive situation."

4) Symbolic universes. Legitimations may take the form of symbolic universes of meaning, which transcend the everyday
reality while remaining part of it. In fact, the ultimate legitimization is that of the symbolic universe, because the institution defines itself in its own absolute terms, placing it out of the reach of the objections of everyday life. Legitimations at this level, such as "Music should be taught in the schools because it gives the students aesthetic meaning," are actually ideologies, as the term has been used earlier in this study. There are, however, great difficulties in putting an ideology in place and enforcing it within a group.

Any new definition of reality with this level of importance not only threatens but annihilates the old reality. And since the old reality, in this case, was everyday reality, a highly intensified process of secondary socialization will be required to fill the gap left by the destruction of this primary, everyday reality. Stated another way, absolute acceptance of the ideology threatens the primary reality. The asocial or even antisocial tendencies of some artists, poets, and composers\(^4\) is evidence of this tendency.

The most historically important symbolic universes have been found within the pursuits of art, mythology, theology, science, and philosophy. From the perspective of the non-artist, the appearance of an artistic alternate symbolic universe is a threat because it is evidence that another reality is possible; the presently legitimated reality is not inevitable.

In music education competing aesthetic theories are alternate symbolic universes of meaning. This fact helps to explain the difficulty encountered by Smith in trying to choose one theory over another. The meanings of one theory (symbolic universe) are not interpretable in the symbolic universe of another theory.

As legitimation reaches the level of symbolic universes, the maintenance of the universe requires specialized personnel whose only job is legitimation:

The emergence of full-time personnel for universe-maintaining legitimation also brings with it occasions for social conflict. Some of this conflict is between experts and practitioners. The latter, for reasons that need not be belabored, may come to resent the experts' grandiose pretensions and the concrete social privileges that accompany them. What is likely to be particularly galling is the experts' claim to know the ultimate significance of the practitioners' activity better than the practitioners themselves. Such rebellions on the part of "laymen" may lead to the emergence of rival definitions of reality and, eventually, to the appearance of new experts in charge of the new definitions.  

Those who use aesthetics to justify music education are engaged in a process of legitimation on the level of symbolic universes of meaning. In so doing they are separating themselves as "experts" from the "practitioners" who do not share the meanings and values of the symbolic universe established.  


The separation of groups along "aesthetic" and "performance" objectives, and the isolation of college music education professors on matters of objectives as documented in the previous chapters is evidence of this split.
CHAPTER VII

AESTHETIC JUSTIFICATIONS AND SOCIAL GROUPS

Chapter Six examined specific concepts from theories based on social relativism. This chapter will use these concepts as the framework for a theoretical analysis of the research problems of the study. Evidence from the music education research presented in Chapters Two through Five will be utilized where appropriate to reinforce the line of argumentation.

A general overview of the line of argumentation is as follows:

I. Research problem one: issues of groups outside the music education profession, i.e., school board members, parents, principals, superintendents, and students

A. Problems arising from the diversity of these clientele groups of the public schools

B. Problems arising from the view of aesthetics as a symbolic universe of meaning

II. Research problem two: groups within the profession of music education.

A. Problems arising from the diversity of groups within music education

B. Problems arising from the view of aesthetics as a number of symbolic subuniverses of meaning

C. Problems arising from confusion of ideologies, justifications, and rationales

III. Research problem three: likelihood of aesthetic justifications being accepted by groups both outside and within the music education profession
Groups Outside Music Education

Diversity of Groups

Bryant reported that the school board members in his study exhibited such a wide range of opinions on objectives for music education that he questioned their familiarity with and knowledge of school music programs.¹ A wide range of occupations, education, and previous musical experience was reported. According to symbolic interaction theory these board members would represent several social groups with a diversity of norms and values.

A person's commitment to certain norms and values identifies that person as a member of a specific reference group.² In this case, the school board members represent a variety of reference groups with differing norms and values concerning music in the schools. In order for an aesthetic justification to be effective, the board members' values would have to be congruent with those of the person making the aesthetic justification. Reference group theory states that the board members would have to accept the norms and values of the reference


²See Chapter Six, 124. For purposes of clarity, the discussion will use the school board member as the prototypical case of a school arts policy maker, as substantiated by Troiano and Markowitz. The case of other groups, such as superintendents, principals, and parents, is made the same way because they also represent social groups primarily outside the norms and values of the aesthetic music educator.
group of the person making the argument, in this case, those of the "aesthetic music educator." Clark points out that adherence to norms and values of a reference group is determined by a person's desire to become a member of that reference group. In the present case, the school board members, if they do not already share the norms and values of the "aesthetic music educator," would have to want to move into that reference group in order to accept the justification as valid. According to Clark, people do not change reference groups easily against their will.

A person's desire to enter a certain reference group is based on the significance of the norms and values of the reference group in the mind of that person. Significance, as the term is used in this theory, implies a strong connection, built through direct or indirect interaction. A person's significant others have the power to attract him or her into a reference group, because of the intensity of the interaction which characterizes relationships of significance.

Theoretically, it would be possible to move school board members into the reference group of the music educator presenting a justification, but not without some significant connection with the music educator or the values upon which the

---

3See Chapter Six, 129.
5See Chapter Six, 124, 129.
6See Chapter Six, 125.
justification is based. It seems doubtful, however, that a music educator is likely to make that significant connection with the school board by using the complex and specialized language of aesthetic theory.

Aesthetics: A Symbolic Universe of Meaning

So far, the discussion has progressed as if the only problem were the differences in norms, values, and reference groups between members of the clientele groups and music educators. The argument presented would be the same for any justification used by music educators which is based on norms and values outside the reference groups of the clientele.

When the discussion is limited to aesthetic justifications, however, a whole new set of problems emerges. The research reviewed in the philosophy of music education and in attitudes toward music education claims, logically enough, that music educators need to understand aesthetics in order to make aesthetic arguments. The research cited, however, also reports that music educators are not trained in philosophy or aesthetics, nor do they have time to study these subjects, and, finally, the arguments based on aesthetics are too complex to be effective for justifications.

---


8 Harold Solomon Kacanek, "A Descriptive Analysis of Wisconsin Music Educators' Agreement with Bennett Reimer's A Philosophy of Music Education" (doctoral diss., University of Kansas, 1982); See also Sudano, Schwadron, and Smith, reviewed in Chapter Four.
In Interactionist terms, for a person to become an aesthetician, qualified to expound on aesthetic theories, he or she must learn the gestures of aesthetics. Among these gestures are philosophical terminology, manners of thinking and speaking, norms and values, cognitive information, classification systems, theoretical reasoning, and symbolic logic. If the gestures are not properly internalized to the satisfaction of the insiders, one will not really become an aesthetician. Any meanings will necessarily still be interpreted from the perspective of an outsider.

The body of knowledge of aesthetics is complex, and mastering it requires serious study. In Interactionist terms, the internalization of many of the gestures of aesthetics takes a great deal of time and energy. Since most music educators do not have the training, time, or incentive to enter the world of the philosopher and aesthetician, they will not internalize the gestures of this complex universe of discourse.

The music educator may, however, possess an aesthetic terminology based on personal experience as a musician and a music educator. Since a large part of the training of a music teacher involves musical performance and serious listening,

---

9 See Chapter Six, 120-122.
10 See Chapter Six, 124.
11 DiAnn L'Roy, "The Development of Occupational Identity in Undergraduate Music Education Majors" (doctoral diss., North Texas State University, 1983). Her discussion indicates that "performer" is for the undergraduate student often a stronger reference group than "teacher."
he or she should have a background of musical aesthetic experiences. He or she may also have had aesthetic experiences related to the music teaching process.

Personal descriptions of these aesthetic feelings experienced while teaching or performing music are going to be different for each individual, however, and thereby difficult to communicate clearly to outsiders who have not shared the experiences and are not members of the music educators' group. Without a basis of shared gestures, these personal and individual feelings of the music educator will not be significant symbols, and clear communication is impossible without significant symbols (meaningful gestures).\(^\text{12}\)

Should the music educator, then, not attempt to use individual subjective feelings in justifications? Hoffer, writing in the *Music Educators Journal*, argues:

Subjective feelings also should be included when making a case for music in the schools. Most people have good feelings when they hear young people perform music. They correctly sense that music is a constructive, worthwhile activity, and they want young people to be involved with it. They cannot say precisely why they have these feelings, but they still have them, and it is not necessary that they possess a rationale for their sentiments. Such feelings are hard to measure, but they are compelling and valid nonetheless.\(^\text{13}\)

His statement that "most people have good feelings when they hear young people perform music" is not couched in aesthetic terminology, but as an argument it is also not precise.

---

\(^{12}\)See Chapter Six, 120.

People might feel good from hearing the music, or they may be reacting to feelings about the young people performing it. Hoffer admits that these feelings cannot be described exactly, but still calls them "compelling and valid." While these feelings may be compelling and valid to those who have them (such as members of the group of musicians who share such gestures), such vague and difficult to articulate feelings are not the best choice for arguments made to people who are not members of groups who share these gestures.

The language of philosophical aesthetics is designed to add precision to descriptions of feelings such as those Hoffer refers to in his article. But, as has been noted, this language is difficult to learn, and learning it may not be the best answer for the music educator attempting to make justifications. Indeed, most members of school boards and the other clientele groups are also not members of the group of philosopher/aestheticians. The music educator who has gone to the trouble of learning the gestures of aesthetics will be speaking a language understood by few in his or her audience. Hoffer admits later in his article, that, for justifications the message must be easily understood by non-musicians. Complex philosophical discourses, full of polysyllabic terms and vague concepts, fail in this regard.14

Furthermore, this specialized language of "polysyllabic terms and vague concepts," also called by Bernstein15 inside

14Hoffer, "Informing Others," 32.

talk, can alienate those who do not share in its meanings. Bernstein contends that "outsiders dislike being outsiders. They envy or resent those who can speak and understand inside talk." 16

This alienation of outsiders from a given group is explained by legitimation theory. As discussed in the previous chapter, 17 legitimation is another word for justification. Social institutions such as the music education profession, the public schools, and subjects within schools, need to be legitimated in order to reinforce their norms and values. Legitimation helps the institution to survive and to separate insiders from outsiders.

Aesthetic justifications are legitimations on the level of symbolic universes. 18 A symbolic universe is a world of meanings which transcends the everyday reality while existing in the midst of it. It defines itself in absolute terms which are not subject to definition in the sphere of everyday discourse, thereby protecting itself. But it also isolates itself. The alienating effect of inside talk is one form of this isolation--it keeps the outsiders out and the insiders in.

Any realm of meanings which emphasizes the split between insiders and outsiders is not an effective choice for a persuasive argument. Such an argument will only serve to further

16 Bernstein, The Careful Writer, 237.
17 See Chapter Six, 131-135.
18 See Chapter Six, 133-135.
alienate the outsiders on the school board, when the desired
effect is a significant connection of the board members with
the music educator making the argument.

The meanings within this symbolic universe are also diffi-
cult to teach, since, by definition, they cannot be dealt with
in the straightforward language of everyday reality. This
observation helps to explain the many warnings about the com-
plexities of aesthetic discourse found in the literature.

Once the complexities of a symbolic universe are inter-
 nalized, however, the new reality experienced in the symbolic
universe tends to compete with everyday reality, as well as
with other symbolic universes. This competition produces even
more intense legitimation, and the evolution of "experts" whose
job it is to maintain the integrity of the institution. This
evolution of experts\(^\text{19}\) can bring conflict with the practi-
tioners in the field. The practitioners may resent the
experts' claim of knowing the ultimate significance of the
activity defined by the symbolic universe better than the
practitioners themselves know it.

This split between experts and practitioners, discussed by
Berger and Luckmann\(^\text{20}\) in their exposition of legitimation
theory, exists within the field of music education. In

\(^{19}\) See discussion of legitimating personnel on p. 135 of
Chapter Six.

\(^{20}\) Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction
of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden
comments on the expert/practitioner dilemma are quoted on p.
136 of this study.
Chapters Three and Four of this paper, evidence was reported in a number of studies of a split between music education "experts" (college professors) and "practitioners" (public school teachers) on matters of beliefs and ideologies. Berger and Luckmann warn that practitioners may begin to resent the "grandiose pretensions" and "concrete social privileges" which accrue to the experts. In applying this warning to music education, one cannot help being reminded of some of the comments that Kacanek received on his questionnaire on agreement with Reimer's philosophy, such as:

I don't have time nor patience to wade through a lot of highfalutin words when it comes to providing data for someone's dissertation. My students come first. Therefore, your questionnaire has been allotted 30 minutes (I had to monitor a study hall).  

And, appropriate to the discussion of other universes:

This form reflects a definite problem amongst many Music "Educators" - too "ethereal" - you need to get back in the real world, the classroom.

Postulating that the realm of aesthetic theory is a symbolic universe of meaning explains many of the difficulties in understanding and using aesthetic theory for justifications to groups outside music education. It is interesting to note, however, that the comments from "outsiders" quoted above were not from clientele group members outside of music, but from other music educators. This fact, along with other evidence

21 Unidentified music educator, quoted in Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," appendix L, 184.

22 Unidentified music educator, quoted in Kacanek, "Descriptive Analysis," appendix L, 176.
found in the review of research, makes it apparent that "music educators" do not represent one cohesive group with the common anchorage of aesthetic values.

Groups Within Music Education

For the purposes of the argument above, it was assumed that music educators shared a belief that aesthetic justifications could properly defend what they do. Music educators were treated as one reference group with shared values and a common anchorage. As has been pointed out, different reference groups exist within music education; utilitarian values have been cited by music educators along with the aesthetic ones. Historically, aesthetic arguments did not appear with any regularity until the late 1950's, becoming common in the 1960's and early 1970's. A recent (1987) publication of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), Beyond the Classroom: Informing Others, recommends a balance of aesthetic and utilitarian values as the basis for justifications.


Diversity of Groups

Other evidence that different reference groups exist within music education was reported by Kacanek and others, who discovered that there is an identifiable split between those who favor a performance emphasis and those who prefer an "aesthetics" emphasis. Bryant and others found that public school teachers felt alienated from college music education professors in that regard.

This multiplicity of groups is readily analyzed from the perspective of social group theory. Music educators learn gestures from many sources. In addition to the background that they bring to their training, they learn gestures of the performer, the theorist, the musicologist, the conductor, the psychologist, the teacher, the philosopher, and others. The degree to which they internalize these gestures varies with the individual. A music educator may be more of a conductor and less acceptable as a musicologist. He or she may be a true insider to the group of performers but an outsider to the group of philosophers. Each music educator thus learns the gestures, to varying degrees, of a number of groups defined by the different bodies of knowledge encountered in his or her training.

Furthermore, the specializations within music education have their own reference groups and anchorages. The labels

26 See reviews of Kacanek, LaRue, Barbour, and Bryant in Chapter Three.

27 See reviews of Bryant, Hooper, Barbour, and Kacanek in Chapter Three.
"choir director," "general music teacher," "orchestra director," and "band director" carry their own sets of gestures and values, and even within these groups there are subgroups, such as "Orff specialist," "show choir director," "jazz band director," or "Kodaly specialist."

Competing Symbolic Universes

The group of "aesthetic music educators" is a reference group within music education. Evidence has been presented throughout the study that there are other competing reference groups within the music education community. Because these reference groups are based on anchorages which are in the realm of symbolic subuniverses of meaning, competition between them is natural—the legitimation drive entails the fact that they threaten each other's reality.

This competition, as reported in the studies mentioned above, may be characterized as the performance-emphasis/aesthetics-emphasis problem. White\(^28\) claims that the aesthetic education movement derives from Romantic ideals and musical practice, which are based on ideas congruent to the philosophy of Realism. The performance-emphasis side seems to this writer to be based on Pragmatism, with its emphasis on action. One side says, "the aesthetic experience is the ultimate reason for playing music," the other side replies, "the values will come from the actual performance."

\(^{28}\) Howard G. White, "The Professional Role and Status of the School Music Teacher in American Society" (doctoral diss., University of Kansas, 1964), 7-8.
The identification of Pragmatism and Realism as underlying philosophies helps to make plain the reasons for conflict between these two different reference groups. They are both symbolic universes of meaning; they represent alternate realities; and neither can be interpreted from the point of view of the other. This point was made by Robert C. Smith, and it is easily explained in terms of legitimation theory. There is no logical way to choose between competing aesthetic theories, or philosophical perspectives, as long as the opposed theories represent competing symbolic universes of meaning.

Ideologies, Justifications, and Rationales

Another problem in dealing with justifications within the group of music educators is a confusion between ideologies, justifications, and rationales. An ideology is the set of norms and values which guide a person's actions—the values of his or her reference group. In this study, a justification is defined as an argument that works—it convinces the target group of the value of music in the curriculum. A rationale is defined as a logical construct of principles which explains the process of teaching and learning music.

An aesthetic ideology, more specifically, is a belief in the importance of aesthetics as a guiding force in one's teaching. An aesthetic justification to the groups within music education could be any argument which convinces music

educators that what they do must include "aesthetic" elements. An aesthetic rationale, however, would be a logical construct of principles which would explain how aesthetic experience is learned and taught. An ideology is the basis for personal action, a justification is the basis for an argument, and a rationale is the basis for a theory.

The differences in these definitions reflect three purposes of philosophy in music education: to motivate the teacher, to guarantee the survival of the music program in the public schools or the survival of the music education profession, and to guide practice. These three purposes are reiterated again and again in the extant literature as the fundamental purposes of philosophy in music education.\(^\text{30}\)

The conflicts which arise in the confusion of these three terms can be elucidated by answering the following questions about music education:

1. Why do I do it? (ideology or personal justification)
2. What do I tell other music educators about why we do it? (internal or professional justification)
3. What do I tell outsiders about why we should be allowed to do it? (external justification)
4. How do we go about doing it? (rationale)
5. Are our arguments and our method consistent with our beliefs about value? (Are our justifications, rationale, and ideology compatible?)

A typical answer to question number one, ideology or personal justification, might be: "because I love music and I love kids. I want to impart to my students the love of music and the joy of aesthetic experiences possible in music."

Question number two, the internal justification, could be answered in the same way, because other music educators share the gestures of loving music and loving their students. But, as was pointed out above, not all teachers agree that the aesthetic experience is the most important part of music education.

In any case, the answer to question number two above might or might not be the same as the answer to question number one for all music educators. Any effort to codify the "internal justification" for the entire group will alienate those members whose ideology is different. A person will not accept the values of a group which are not those of the person's own reference group. This fact is proof of Smith's view that music educators will only confound themselves by trying to agree upon the underlying values of music education as a first step toward unifying the profession.

Because of the differences in reference groups between music educators and the clientele groups, the answer to question number three, regarding external justifications, will often be different from the answer to question number one. The music educator may be forced to use arguments which do not correspond to his or her own personal beliefs, a situation creating a large potential for conflict within the teacher's
mind, in that the teacher must advocate the norms and values of a reference group which are in conflict with his or her own ideology (true reference group).

The answer to question number four may be the most vague of all. Since this investigation did not look primarily at rationales for music education, this writer cannot say by what rationales music educators pattern their methodologies. This writer's suspicion is that there are almost as many rationales as there are music educators. But that is the subject of another study.

Another conflict can arise in answering question number five, which concerns consistency among all the elements. If the daily method of teaching is not in harmony with the ideology, then a feeling of disconnectedness can arise between the teacher and the teaching process. On the other hand, the power of the connection between a strong ideology and a well-thought-out and compatible rationale is great. Reimer refers to this phenomenon when he advocates the study of philosophy in order for a teacher to be firmly grounded in the "why" of daily teaching.31

In an ideal situation, the personal (ideology), the internal, and the external justifications should be the same. Music educators would not face with as many conflicts and frustrations if these three arguments were identical. Furthermore,

31Reimer, Philosophy, 3.
the rationale upon which daily practice is based should be compatible with the justifications.

If the ideology, justifications, and rationale for the group of music educators were compatible, then music education would be, in Kuhn's term, a paradigmatic field. The entire disciplinary matrix would consist of a unifying ideology, a well-accepted rationale, and justifications both to insiders and outsiders which were built upon the values of the ideology and the principles of the rationale.

Unfortunately, differences in reference groups within music education show that the field is in a pre-paradigmatic stage. As yet, the profession has not developed to the point of being able to create and enforce a paradigm. As Kuhn states,

acquisition of a paradigm and of the more esoteric research it permits is a sign of maturity in the development of any given scientific field.\(^{32}\)

Since the mid-1960's, aesthetic theory and values have served as a paradigm for a movement within music education, commonly referred to as the "aesthetic education" movement. The group has published extensively in the professional literature, and conducted a great deal of research. The results of this study, however, indicate that the aesthetic paradigm has not been accepted as the paradigm for music education.

Acceptance of Aesthetic Justifications by Groups both Outside and Inside Music Education

True to the underlying philosophical perspective chosen for this study, the answer to the third research question is socially relative: it is likely that justifications based on aesthetics as a system of values will be accepted by groups both outside and inside the music education profession who already hold an aesthetic ideology. A theoretical analysis, however, has predicted differences in reference groups with respect to the complexity of aesthetic meanings and values. Legitimation theory also has predicted alienation between those groups holding values representative of competing symbolic universes of meaning, such as aesthetic and utilitarian values, or aesthetic and performance values.

An examination of music education research into attitudes of clientele groups, attitudes of music educator groups, justification trends for the profession and for music in the schools, and philosophical and aesthetic topics has revealed evidence which substantiates the theoretical predictions. The predictions and evidence show that groups exist both outside and inside the music education profession who do not hold aesthetic ideologies in music education as paradigmatic. As such, these groups are not likely to accept aesthetic justifications for music in the schools or for the profession itself.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, SPECULATIONS

Summary

A tracing of the justification arguments used for music in the public schools and for the music education profession discovered a trend from approximately 1960 to 1980 favoring the use of aesthetic values. Since 1980, aesthetic arguments have still been common, although utilitarian values appear more frequently than in the previous twenty years.

Justifications and the values which underly them have been studied only from the perspective of such trends, and not in order to evaluate the justifications' utility. A number of prominent writers in the music education field, while supporting aesthetic values as important for music education, have expressed doubts about the effectiveness of aesthetic justifications when used for convincing outsiders of the importance of music in the public school curriculum. These doubts, along with the preponderance of aesthetic justifications in the music education literature, led to the present study, which conducted a theoretical examination of the usefulness of aesthetic justifications for music education.

The study investigated three research problems, namely:

(1) the attitudes of the clientele groups of the public schools
in terms of their values toward music as a subject in the schools; (2) the attitudes of the groups within the music education profession in terms of their values for music in the public schools and for the profession itself; and 3) the likelihood that justifications based upon aesthetics as a system of values would be accepted by the groups both inside and outside the music education profession.

A philosophical-sociological perspective was chosen for the theoretical analysis because the problems of the study concern values, and in particular the manner in which values are accepted or rejected by groups of people. The particular sociological theory chosen combined the symbolic interaction theory of George Herbert Mead and the sociology of knowledge as described by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann.

Investigation of the research problems necessitated an analysis of studies on the attitudes of the clientele groups of the public schools toward objectives for the music program. School board members were reported to hold a wide variety of values for music in the schools, indicating a diversity of reference groups with regard to these values. Superintendents held values similar to those of the school boards. Because of the socio-political nature of the public school institution, board members and superintendents were seen to be of primary importance to justifications for music in the schools.

Studies investigating this socio-political institution revealed that, given some influence of federal and state
agencies, the local school board is still the primary decision-making body for the public schools. Teachers were reported to have little power in this process, and little time to pursue what options in curriculum decision-making they do have, because of the obligations of everyday planning and teaching.

Music educators also were found to represent a diversity of reference groups concerning aesthetic values, with college music education professors mentioned most often as a group separate from the rest of the profession. A conflict was noted between music educators who hold values centering on performance and those whose values emphasize aesthetics.

Research which derives principles for music education was also analyzed, and authors of these studies noted logistical problems with using the complex language of aesthetics for justifications to outsiders. The clientele groups of the public schools, as well as other music educators not trained in philosophy or aesthetics, were seen to be outsiders.

Evidence gleaned from the analysis of pertinent studies was interpreted in light of theories of symbolic interaction and the sociology of knowledge. The conclusions of this analysis are summarized in the following section.

Conclusions

Research problem one: a diversity of groups exists in the clientele of the public schools concerning values for music in the schools. These groups represent different reference groups in regard to aesthetic values.
The complexity of aesthetic language and the lack of training in aesthetics of most members of the clientele groups indicate that many of the clientele groups do not share in the gestures of aesthetic meaning. Aesthetics is thus seen as a symbolic universe of meaning outside everyday reality for these groups, and alienation from or hostility toward this unfamiliar world is a probable result.

Research problem two: a diversity of groups also exists within the music education profession with regard to aesthetic values for music in the schools, as well as to values for the profession. As with the clientele, a variety of reference groups exists.

Like members of clientele groups outside the profession, many music educators also are unfamiliar with the gestures of aesthetics, and see aesthetics as an alien symbolic universe of meaning. As with the clientele groups, alienation or hostility toward this symbolic universe of which they are not a part is a possible result. Even for those who share the values of aesthetics, there are conflicts between "experts" controlling the legitimation of this symbolic universe and the "practitioners" who carry out everyday activities. Furthermore, a confusion in philosophical terminology of ideologies, rationales, and justifications can act as a divisive force in attempts to unify the profession in terms of its values.

Research problem three: those groups not already holding aesthetic values as part of the norms and values of their reference group are unlikely to be swayed by aesthetic
justifications. Since accepting an argument means accepting the values of the reference group from which it comes, the unfamiliar language and potentially alienating symbolic universe of aesthetic meanings do not make aesthetics a good candidate for a persuasive justification.

In summary, there are problems in using aesthetic theory to justify music education because it:

A. is too complex.

B. is not well-understood by music educators or the clientele groups of the schools.

C. represents gestures of a reference group with norms and values not usually found in the clientele groups or music educator groups.

D. represents a potentially threatening symbolic universe of meaning.

Other conclusions of the study are as follows:

1. Social relativism is a useful perspective from which to analyze situations and theoretical constructs in music education. It provides a framework which accurately predicts phenomena, then organizes and simplifies observations of those phenomena. As a perspective which takes into account varying groups and their attitudes, beliefs, and practices (and music education is shown in this study to be a collection of groups with varying attitudes, beliefs, and practices), social relativism seems fruitful as a basis upon which a theory of music education could be developed.

2. The special definitions of ideology, justification, and rationale offered in this study can be very useful in
understanding confusing issues concerning the purposes of music education philosophy.

3. Legitimation theory adequately describes the process of using aesthetic justifications for music education.

Speculations

Stated simply, this study concludes that aesthetic arguments are likely to be effective only to those groups who already believe in the values of aesthetics. The issue of convincing other groups is dependent, theoretically speaking, upon the willingness of those other groups to accept the norms and values of the people making the argument. In other words, for those who already share the norms and values of aesthetics, such justifications are unnecessary, and for those who do not share aesthetic beliefs, such justifications are ineffective.

In speaking of the norms and values of aesthetics, however, it is important to note that there are a variety of aesthetic values expressed by different groups of music educators. Before the 1960's, so-called utilitarian arguments were prevalent, but these arguments also included aesthetic elements. The difference, according to White, is that in the 1960's aesthetic arguments began to take on an art for art's sake perspective, discounting the value to society of the aesthetically developed individual.

1Howard G. White, "The Professional Role and Status of the School Music Teacher in American Society" (doctoral diss., University of Kansas, 1964), 8.
Although public schools have the purpose of developing the individual, they also have the goal of perpetuating societal norms and values. Any justifications which are based strictly or primarily upon individual benefits are not likely to be as effective as those emphasizing societal values, given the social and societal emphasis of the public schools.

Furthermore, these conflicts of individual versus social benefits of aesthetic experiences show up within the music education profession itself. The split between performance-oriented teachers and aesthetics-oriented teachers can be interpreted as evidence of such conflicts in norms and values within the profession. Those who emphasize performance might say "it is through the high-quality performance of music in a group that students derive the best aesthetic experience" and those who emphasize aesthetics typically state that "my students achieve their ultimate aesthetic experiences while composing and improvising their own music in the classroom."

These two viewpoints are not mutually exclusive, logically speaking. It is possible to accept both points of view, as well as many other versions of the nature of aesthetic value. The fact is, however, as discovered in this research, that differing norms and values about aesthetics do exist within the music education profession, and these different views are often seen by members of the various groups as competing. The question naturally arises, "to what degree do these differences in norms and values affect the practice and progress of that field of inquiry known as music education?"
In 1977, Reimer wrote of an emerging "philosophical monism" for music education, which is another description of what Thomas Kuhn calls a paradigm. He noted its potential benefits:

... first, we have desperately needed the sense of unity as a profession that shared belief provides, and second, that there is still plenty of room for differences within the generality of agreement. Further, as beliefs become applied in action, as is occurring throughout the profession in these years, we are seeing a very healthy convergence in the general approach to the curriculum but still an equally healthy variety in methods, in activities used, in instructional organizations (individual, small group, large group), in amounts of freedom as balanced with structure, and so forth. I believe this shows that our philosophy is broad enough that it can be applied in diverse ways, yet focused enough that it does offer general guidelines for action.

The analysis of the literature and research which was undertaken as part of this investigation suggests that the aesthetic education movement has certainly been the strongest candidate for a paradigm for music education, with its writers and principles dominating the journals and the research for nearly three decades. This study, however, has also uncovered evidence of a number of competing reference groups in regard to these aesthetic values. In particular, the point mentioned most often in studies of the different groups within the music education profession is that values held by college music education professors are not representative of those held by public school teachers. Furthermore, public school teachers and others in the profession appear to resent these same

---

college professors’ domination of the publications and editorial boards of the journals.

This writer feels that there is no blame to be placed here on either side. College professors write and publish because writing for publication is one of the gestures of the symbolic universe of teaching in higher education. Public school teachers perform other activities which are equally time-consuming, and are gestures of their own symbolic universe. The very fact of discussing resentment, domination, and blame, however, is evidence that there do exist ideological conflicts, whether they be between public school and college teachers, or aesthetics and performance advocates. Such conflicts at present prevent any theory from becoming a paradigm for the entire music education profession.

If, as this study concludes, aesthetic values are unlikely to be accepted by all groups of music educators as justifications for music education, then where do we look for a paradigm for the profession? Further, is the profession ready to accept a paradigm? As Kuhn indicates, the acceptance of a paradigm marks a certain level of maturity for a field of study. Reimer has identified well the potential advantages of that maturity.

Robert Smith recommends abandoning attempts at an a priori agreement on values in trying to develop a "rationale for music education" (paradigm), and instead advocates a distillation of principles from observations about practice. He argues for an inductive, rather than a deductive, approach. One quickly arrives, however, at a "chicken-and-egg" problem: how can we
arrive at beliefs about practices before we decide what our beliefs are?

This writer agrees with Reimer that the ideal situation is a combination of inductive and deductive processes:

I can think of no more desirable state of affairs in the interplay of theory and practice than this--theory guiding practice, practice being diverse, and theory being itself clarified and altered according to practice. This seems to me to be a mature stage of development and I am often heartened by evidence that we are reaching such a stage.³

Evidence from this study, however, indicates that the music education profession is not reaching such a stage. If, as Smith asserts, a paradigm cannot be imposed from outside by applying a theory from aesthetics, and cannot be agreed upon from inside because of a diversity of ideologies present, then music education will be hard-pressed to enforce a paradigm at all under present conditions.

If, however, as Kuhn asserts, the study of a paradigm is the study of the people who hold the tacit knowledge (attitudes) and overt knowledge of the field of inquiry, then perhaps more study of the groups of people making up the profession will yield some progress at least toward understanding the myriad factors involved in developing a paradigm for music education. This future research would have to include all the groups involved in the music education profession, be they public school band, choir, or orchestra directors; general

music teachers, college teachers, church choir directors, or private studio instructors; and any other groups concerned with music instruction. Each group will naturally have its own body of knowledge, containing norms and values, ideologies, rationales, and justifications. The ultimate goal would be to find points of agreement, especially of rationales and ideologies, which might be candidates for a paradigm and disciplinary matrix for the entire profession.

The present investigation does not attempt to solve the problems involved in creating a paradigm for music education, but does uncover evidence indicating why one does not already exist. This writer hopes to help keep the debate open, by clarifying the sociological and political issues involved in just one aspect of the disciplinary matrix--the justification process.

Suggestions for Further Study

(1) Since, according to Kuhn, investigation into groups and group beliefs is essential to determine the nature of paradigms, more attitude research into music educator and clientele groups would be useful. This research should focus on underlying norms and values and should attempt to identify the various reference groups with regard to justifications, rationales, and ideologies. Furthermore, existing attitude surveys have used multiple-choice questionnaires, which tend to lead subjects into certain answers. A more open-ended normative method would be useful to examine the actual personal,
internal, and external justifications; rationales; and ideologies of groups within music education.

(2) Music education seems to spend a remarkable amount of time in its publications creating justifications. Are journals in other subjects thus preoccupied? If not, why not? If so, what are the common political factors between those subjects and music education? Are there differences in this area between so-called required subjects versus electives?

(3) It seems to this writer that many aesthetic music educators hold the ideology without possessing a clear rationale for implementation. As Hounchell found out in a study on creativity, terms of an undefined and esoteric nature tend to be used as hortative terms, implying an inherent value which is never clearly explained or rationally defended. Efforts such as the CEMREL publications and Reimer's Silver Burdett series are steps toward defining a true aesthetic rationale. These publications should be studied concerning general acceptance of their tenets, in order to further define the acceptance of an aesthetic rationale among music educators.

(4) Even if a subject can be demonstrated to be important for the individual or for society, it is not necessarily a candidate for inclusion in the public school curriculum (e.g. sex education or religion) More research into the socio-political process of decisions specifically relating to the

---

inclusion or exclusion of music from the curriculum would be beneficial. A follow-up of Markowitz's study could help to define a theoretical model from which to analyze case studies of specific schools where music programs have been cut or are in particular danger. It would be valuable for the music education profession to know the range of reasons given when music programs are eliminated or cut back. Justifications could then be designed to counteract such reasons.

(5) Aesthetic arguments can be boiled down to being a subset of utilitarian arguments, if any good is claimed at all for the individual or for society by aesthetic experience. It could be valuable for the music education profession to know why this particular issue (aesthetic/utilitarian) has become such a touchstone of controversy in the literature.

It seems to this writer that the aesthetic arguments are usually used to imply values that are inherently musical. If so, why are the arguments not based on musical values rather than on aesthetic ones? All the other arts (some would say all other disciplines, arts as well as sciences) can claim aesthetic values, and so an appeal to aesthetics does not single out music as uniquely valuable. Why are justifications not based on musical values? This issue could be investigated profitably by another philosophical study centered on what

---

groups of people mean by musical values, as opposed to aesthetic values.

(6) Kaplan, White, Rumbelow, L'Roy, Whitelegg, and now the present study have used a sociological perspective to analyze various issues within music education. As more research based on social relativism is completed, a socio-musical theory of music education should begin to develop. More philosophical-sociological research is needed to help frame the theory, and normative-empirical research with a sociological underpinning will be necessary to test the hypotheses created.

To this writer, a paradigm for music education—an inductive/deductive collection and intermarriage of theory and data—could be based upon a sociological perspective, since the experience of music can never be completely removed from the social context in which it is experienced. Even the composer who sits alone at the piano is dependent upon musical gestures which were learned from other musicians. The performer, even practicing alone, is using musical gestures learned in a social setting. And the listener, even listening alone to a recording, is interpreting the music in a way which is affected by a past history of reactions to musical gestures learned from people in other musical situations. The experience of music can be a singular human pleasure, but it is not experienced in its entirety by a single human without reference to or knowledge gained from others.
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