TOWARD A RATIONALE FOR MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

CONTEXT FRAMED WITH BOTH PROGRESSIVE AND ESSENTIALIST

CONSIDERATIONS: OPERATIONALIZING THE IDEAS OF

WILLIAM CHANDLER BAGLEY

Benjamin J. Price, BME, MMEd

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2016

APPROVED:

Warren Henry, Major Professor and
    Interim Dean of the College of Music
Donna Emmanuel, Committee Member
Todd Kettler, Committee Member
Debbie Rohwer, Chair of the Divison of
    Music Education
Benjamin Brand, Director of Graduate
    Studies of the College of Music
Costas Tsatsoulis, Dean of the
    Toulouse Graduate School

Price, Benjamin J. *Toward a Rationale for Music Education in the Public School Context Framed with both Progressive and Essentialist Considerations: Operationalizing the Ideas of William Chandler Bagley.* Doctor of Philosophy (Music Education), May 2016, 207 pp., references, 306 titles.

Given the recent core-status designation for music education, as a part of all fine arts, in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a framework from general education that supported music education could offer benefits for the domain. Two groups occupy most of the space there, and remain locked in a fundamental disagreement over the purpose of a formal education. The progressive educators, historically framed by Dewey and Thorndike, contend that education functions as societal improvement. In contrast, the essentialists contend that education functions as cultural transmission. Therefore, a more specific need for music education involves selecting a guiding framework from general education that resolves this conflict. The writings of William Chandler Bagley indicate that he balanced both considerations of a formal education while also advancing his notion of essentialism. Bagley differed from the progressive educators predominately associated with Dewey over definitions and ideas surrounding a democratic education. Emergent points of contrast with Thorndike include distinctions between social efficiency and Bagley's alternative idea of social progress. Bagley also diverged from other essentialists over definitions concerning liberal and cultural education. To make these differences explicit, I describe characteristics of a progressive education, and an essentialist education separately before introducing Bagley. Finally, I apply Bagley's ideas into the domain of music education, and contend that through common outcomes of creativity, competition, and literacy, the domain of music education can remain securely grounded in the values within the public schools.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Philosophy often generates and explores questions that can subsequently be used to formulate solid foundations for disciplines and domains. Applied to music education, Bowman and Frega (2012) suggested similar benefits, stating that a philosophical or theoretical foundation informs standards and content by guiding and informing choices made. Historically, two major philosophical frameworks have predominantly influenced the domain of music education, each of which have strong supporters that are often in conflict with one another. These frameworks are aesthetic education, chiefly championed by Bennett Reimer, and praxial music education, most closely associated with David Elliott. While each framer treats his philosophy as a complete explanation for music education (e.g. Wheeler, 2006), the continued debates revolving around the role of philosophy and implications for curriculum in music education among the aesthetic and praxial educators (e.g. Elliott, 1995, 2001; Reimer, 2003, 2009; Regelski, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2009c) have not led to a resolution of conflict between the two philosophies, or sole adoption of either. Both aesthetic and praxial philosophical frameworks are primarily music based, as well. Neither praxialism nor aesthetic education acknowledges primarily that music education in the public schools exists in the wider context of general education. Therefore, a framework is needed for music education that considers the general education context first. Given the messy context of general education, which will be detailed below, and point to a more specified conflict in that domain, this dissertation will explore the concept of providing a philosophical framework for public school music education through the lenses of essentialism and progressivism, focusing on the work of William Chandler Bagley. My primary argument

1

will place music education firmly in the general education core curriculum, as an equally contributing member, based on common outcomes of creativity, competition, and literacy.

Philosophy in Music Education

A philosophical foundation often underpins the basis of decisions, guides practice, and clarifies what encompasses that domain by defining its limits and boundaries. Bowman and Frega (2012) noted that other explanations or philosophies representing improvement over previous ones are "more useful … more refined …" (p. 9) and ultimately "improves practice, making it more intelligent, more effective, more useful and more responsible … by refining and improving habitual ways of thinking and acting" (Bowman & Frega, 2012, p. 7). By contrast, a lack of a solid philosophical grounding can potentially include consequences for many parties involved. In music education, Gates (1991) suggested that potential absence of a philosophical grounding could lead to lack of curricular alignment in schools, a disconnect between theory and practice, and little sense of community among all music educators. Regelski (2005) implied similar themes by asserting that music education does not typically concern itself with delivering results tailored to specific needs. Therefore, the impact music education can make in the lives of students is limited due to a curriculum driven by past historical practices which are not necessarily aligned with society's use of music. In a slightly different vein, yet acknowledging the need for guidance from a framework, Colwell (2009) posited that both research in music education and music teaching and learning in higher education have not established "clear and valid boundaries for itself" (p.141). Therefore, the inability of the domain to state clearly a research agenda and to specify its overarching role in these contexts ultimately hinders progress. Though in different contexts, both Colwell (2009) and Regelski (2005, 2009c) implied that a philosophical framework could function as an initial step in solving these perceived problems.

2

Much debate has taken place across the domain of music education regarding whether or not music education needs one unified philosophy, or whether many philosophies, or other frameworks can coexist (e.g. Bowman & Frega, 2012; Elliott, 1995, 2001; Paul, 1988; Regelski, 2003, 2004; Jorgensen, 1995, 2006; Schmidt, 2005; Stauffer, 2009, 2012; Wheeler, 2006). Bowman & Frega (2012) acknowledged that philosophy often does not provide one solution, and Jorgensen (2006) suggested that clarity "through the lenses of our various cultural heritages and languages" (p. 18) could advance the philosophical conversation while solidly undergirding the domain. Adding a slightly different perspective, yet nonetheless noting a need for a theoretical grounding, Mandolini (2012) proposed that a heuristic for problem-solving could offer greater explanatory power rather than a philosophical framework. Recent applications into music education have also focused on themes of liberation, empowerment, and social change through an education, which is consistent with critical theory (Koza, 2009; Schmidt, 2005). However, Jorgensen (1993) questioned this framework as a form of philosophy, and Colwell (2009) argued that critical theory is too restrictive in research contexts to use in effectively investigating pertinent questions. Nonetheless, it appears agreed upon that using any framework as a foundation could benefit music education, despite the persistent questions regarding the number of frameworks needed, and debate surrounding recent solutions proposed thus far (Bowman & Frega, 2012).

Each side has also challenged the other on the basis of comprehensiveness. Critics of aesthetic education have argued that this kind of education leaves supposedly critical elements of social or cultural contexts out (e.g. Elliott, 1995, 2001; Regelski, 2003, 2004, 2009), does not account for the scope and depth of what can be considered music, contributes to exclusion of students (e.g. Schmidt, 2005; Koza, 2009), and also does not directly connect music studied to

society's use of it (McCarthy & Goble, 2005). By contrast, critics of praxial music education (e.g. Walker, 2012; Woodford, 2005) have contended that non-critical allowance and acceptance of all musics with no hierarchy or value potentially creates a democratic society without the ability to criticize practices for the sake of understanding. Therefore, society would receive little guidance regarding "socially responsible choices in an uncertain world" (Woodford, 2005, p. 36).

One additional dimension of completeness encompasses the degree to which any given philosophical framework represents a goodness of fit with the context it is to serve. When past attention has focused this aspect with respect to the public schools, aspects of non-congruence emerge between both praxial and aesthetic philosophical frameworks and the public school context. Furthermore, few examinations have addressed this idea directly.

Elliott (2001) characterized his praxial philosophy as postmodern, relying on broader notions of multiple perspectives, meanings, contexts and acts of music making. His praxial philosophy also depends on music making in context, and "authentic music-practice" (Elliott, 2001, p. 39) situations, making music a multidimensional construct. However, Elliott (2001) also described the current context of education as modern. Thus, Elliott's product of a postmodern paraxial philosophy is not quite concordant with the modern educational context he described. Meanwhile, McCarthy and Goble (2005) contended that the wholesale implementation of aesthetic education and adherence to that philosophy without examination allowed praxial music educators room to address a major weakness that philosophy. That weakness is the connection of music to society.   Furthermore, Paul (1988) argued that neither public school music educators nor stakeholders within the schools typically understand aspects of aesthetics competently enough for such a philosophy to be a useful or understood argument.

Therefore, Paul concluded that problems with aesthetic justifications for music education exist despite relative popularity.

<div align="center">The Value of Context in Philosophy</div>

Jorgensen (2001) likened the role of a philosopher who considers context to that of an architect. Philosophers, like architects, benefit greatly from studying the landscape before drawing up any plans for a structure built on that landscape. However, architects generally do not inhabit the structures that they build (Jorgensen, 2001). In a similar vein, those who make the policies that impact music education and provide guiding theoretical frameworks do not usually enact them in music classrooms. However, those that find themselves in a position to provide theoretical grounding of any kind can benefit greatly from studying the broader landscape before any theoretical formulation is undertaken. Jorgensen (2001) stated:

> If the philosopher is to be practical, … differing realities need to be reflected in the purposes and plans forged. And those engaged in the work of music education in whatever place or time need to articulate their own perspectives rather than import them uncritically from other places and times. … the first sense of taking practical context into account as one formulates one's ideas is essential if those ideas are to have currency with music education policy makers. (p.22)

Questions surrounding the usefulness of a philosophical framework, rather than completeness, also achieve higher importance. Consistent with Paul's 1988 approach, this emphasis of usefulness also represents a small departure from past criticisms of traditional music education philosophical frameworks as discussed above.

Additionally, bringing context and usefulness into the forefront of any discussion over a philosophical framework could also allow for many philosophies to exist. That notion implies a

possible resolution to the question of the number of needed philosophies for music education. This idea also implies a degree of ecological validity, or the extent to which results of a research study can be generalized into "real world" (Welch, 2009, p.150) contexts. This generalization is possible because the conditions of the study have approximated authentic, everyday settings (Yoder & Symons, 2010). Many philosophies could flourish henceforth, so long as that philosophical framework is a good fit with the specific context; therefore, also ecologically valid upon examination. Through this perspective, questions of *where* teaching takes places become important, as do questions concerning *who* teachers teach, rather than *what* is taught and *how* it is taught (Stauffer, 2009, 2012).

Considering a literal interpretation of Stauffer's 2009 and 2012 prudent, place-based question of *where*, rather than *what* or *how*, I suggest that where I am located, for purposes of this dissertation, is in the context of public school education. Ergo, the wider context of education now represents a majority stake where both aesthetic and praxial frameworks for music education have concentrated on music first. Explicit consideration of a specific context, in this case the public schools, also demands attention given that music education has been a part of public school education since the 1830s, and the domain of music education continues to justify its place in this context (Mark & Gary, 2007; McCarthy & Goble, 2005). Furthermore, federal legislation pertaining to education now lists the arts, which includes music, as core subjects (http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf). This identification, which has happened in the broader context of education, not only necessitates a careful response from the field of music education with regard to any aesthetic or praxial stance, but perhaps has created a new awareness of the responsibility of music education to the trends and policies across education. In view of this information, it does not seem as prudent to remain steadfast to

philosophical frameworks stemming from music education that do not largely consider the broader context of public school education.

However, the constant reforms and trends in the domain of education have not immediately helped efforts in music education to settle philosophical disputes either. In the 1960s, when the curriculum across education was being unified under conceptual learning, justification of music centered on the things that are only and uniquely musical, which speaks of an aesthetic education (Mark & Gary, 2007). That implied isolation and compartmentalization, which was slightly contrary to the broad-based unification idea in general education at that time. Also, aesthetic education remained largely popular among music educators in the face of 1980s educational reform, again, representing a slight disconnect between those reformers who called for a return to the basic curriculum consisting of the core subjects (reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies), rendering other subjects secondary, including music (Mark & Gary, 2007).

Hence, I suggest that part of the current issue music education has faced with respect to its theoretical grounding could lie in the relative emphasis assigned to each word in the domain: *music* and *education*. Using the metaphor of weights that can be subsequently assigned to each word, perhaps the word *music* has been assigned too much weight, and could benefit from some de-emphasis for purposes of this dissertation. The staunch adherence to aesthetic education in view of the curriculum unification movement in the 1960s and isolation of music education in the 1980s away from other core subjects (e.g. Mark & Gary, 2007) perhaps has contributed to an overall imbalance of weight toward *music*. However, the recent status granted to music education could potentially unify all members of the curriculum under one designation from general education: the core. As a member of the core curriculum, the domain of music education

7

now exists in the larger sphere of general education, not as an isolated entity based on unique, special, or music-only characteristics. Therefore, I suggest that the domain of music education consider re-allocating these weights assigned to *music* and *education*. For purposes of this dissertation, I will assign more weight to *education* and less weight to *music*, to reflect the responsibility the domain now has been given to reinforce outcomes consistent with other members of the core curriculum, given its new core designation.

Identification of the Need

In view of the preceding information, the identified need thus far centers on providing a philosophical framework for music education that considers the broader context of education first. This need has been informed by the lack of one guiding framework that serves music education, neither existing major philosophical perspective in music education directly considering the context of public school education first, and a potentially significant status change for the arts in the public school. After considering the broader context of education, the logical next steps would include examination of aspects of music education, surveying questions of meaning for music education in the schools, and implementation of applications consistent with the context.

However, the picture appears quite blurry with respect to the broader context of education. Two opposing groups have traditionally occupied different stances over the purpose of a formal education. The progressive educators, historically dominant, and represented by John Dewey and Edward L. Thorndike, contend that the purpose of a formal education revolves around societal improvement (Setran, 2012; Popkewitz, 2011; Zimiles, 2008). Current sentiment, though, indicates a certain amount of dissatisfaction with many aspects of public school education that are associated with Thorndike. Gibboney (2006) spoke directly to this

8

feeling: "… [I]n the 20th century, Edward Thorndike won and John Dewey lost. Concerned educators need to make it clear that, in the 21st century, we need a rematch!" (p. 172). Shifting from one progressive framer to another would entail a massive undertaking, given the differences between the visions of Dewey and Thorndike.

The other complexity in present educational reform involves the relatively recent rise and influence of a group of essentialist educators. These educators have begun to exert influence on standards and policies that public schools often operationalize. Championing universal knowledge, or core knowledge (e.g. Hirsch, 1988) and a focus on the basic, foundational curriculum that all students should know in order to be thought of as educated, these essentialists operate under a different assumption than the progressives regarding the purpose of a formal education. That assumption is education-as-cultural-transmission.

Because aspects of both progressive and essentialist education have been found in education, and more extreme aspects of essentialism are currently gaining increased attention, such as Hirsch's slant toward core knowledge, the need also exists for a perspective that bridges the gap with respect to these frameworks. The addition of another perspective, one that falls between the progressives and extreme essentialists, would also allow for the frameworks of progressive and extreme essentialist education to co-exist in a beneficial manner that might be of positive impact, specifically music education.

A moderating perspective can be found in the writings of William Chandler Bagley. Bagley's writings indicate that he carefully balanced the two key considerations of a formal education that divide progressives and current conservative essentialists: societal improvement and cultural transmission. He shares the social context of the first half of the 20th Century with Thorndike and Dewey, but as Null (2003, 2007) detailed, many thoughts of Bagley have been

feeling: "… [I]n the 20th century, Edward Thorndike won and John Dewey lost. Concerned educators need to make it clear that, in the 21st century, we need a rematch!" (p. 172). Shifting from one progressive framer to another would entail a massive undertaking, given the differences between the visions of Dewey and Thorndike.

The other complexity in present educational reform involves the relatively recent rise and influence of a group of essentialist educators. These educators have begun to exert influence on standards and policies that public schools often operationalize. Championing universal knowledge, or core knowledge (e.g. Hirsch, 1988) and a focus on the basic, foundational curriculum that all students should know in order to be thought of as educated, these essentialists operate under a different assumption than the progressives regarding the purpose of a formal education. That assumption is education-as-cultural-transmission.

Because aspects of both progressive and essentialist education have been found in education, and more extreme aspects of essentialism are currently gaining increased attention, such as Hirsch's slant toward core knowledge, the need also exists for a perspective that bridges the gap with respect to these frameworks. The addition of another perspective, one that falls between the progressives and extreme essentialists, would also allow for the frameworks of progressive and extreme essentialist education to co-exist in a beneficial manner that might be of positive impact, specifically music education.

A moderating perspective can be found in the writings of William Chandler Bagley. Bagley's writings indicate that he carefully balanced the two key considerations of a formal education that divide progressives and current conservative essentialists: societal improvement and cultural transmission. He shares the social context of the first half of the 20th Century with Thorndike and Dewey, but as Null (2003, 2007) detailed, many thoughts of Bagley have been

largely lost through time, much less applied. Though one of Bagley's contributions entails the founding of essentialism, which is currently closely associated with Hirsch, parts of Bagley's ideas related to this framework have been taken to their extremes, thereby presenting an incomplete picture of Bagley's position (Null, 2003). Thus, closer examination of Bagley's writings offers a potential untapped source of information that can be used to bring divergent perspectives together, while also offering a new perspective through which to examine aspects, practices, and relevant questions pertaining to the domain of music education.

<div align="center">Purpose</div>

The purpose of this dissertation is to show how ideas from William Chandler Bagley can bring together the divergent perspectives of the progressives and extreme essentialists, and subsequently use Bagley's perspective to examine aspects of music education. I will attempt to move the discussion forward toward a resolution that would be of benefit to public school music education by considering the broader context of education first. This consideration represents a departure from the aesthetic and praxial philosophical frameworks that are music-based.

First, I will acknowledge limitations and assumptions, detail my method, define relevant terms, and outline the structure in this dissertation. Next, I will describe key characteristics of a Progressive Education. As mentioned previously, this perspective has been framed by John Dewey and Edward L. Thorndike. Then, I will describe components of a more extreme version of Essentialist Education, using E.D. Hirsch, Jr. as a point of departure. Through this content, I will show that each side is underpinned by a different assumption, thus necessitating a need for a moderating perspective that brings these two divergent perspectives together. When Bagley is introduced, I will highlight both progressive and essentialist thoughts in his writings. Since

Dewey, Thorndike, Hirsch, and Bagley exist outside the realm of music education, I will examine aspects found in music education through the moderating perspective of Bagley.

Limitations and Assumptions

Limitation in evidence. First, I will confine my analysis of Bagley's ideas to selected, limited primary pieces of evidence, though I recognize that other writings by Bagley exist. I will describe the character of Bagley's writings in more detail in Chapter 4. Likewise, I will limit my discussion of progressive education to Dewey and Thorndike as models of progressive education. However, others can also be recognized as following trends consistent with a progressive education. Generals (2000) argued that Booker T. Washington exemplified the archetype of a progressive educator by following Deweyian principles, yet historically received no recognition as such. Furthermore, Darling (1994) presented an argument that credited Rousseau with laying the foundation of child-centered education, a term more synonymous with Dewey than Thorndike.

Limitation of frameworks in education. Other frameworks from education could also have provided guidance beyond progressivism and essentialism. For example, Ornstein (1990) posited that both progressive and reconstructionist frameworks assume that education functions as societal improvement, with the progressives "[promoting] democratic, social living" (p. 105). However, the reconstructionist philosophy is explicitly concerned with solving societal problems, and empowering students to do so. Therefore, the teacher serves as an agent of change, rather than a guide for problem-solving and harmonious societal living and improvement (Ornstein, 1990). This philosophy has been historically associated with George Counts (1932, 1978). While perhaps aspects of education share a conspicuous overlap with Dewey's ideas,

movement farther in this direction only widens the chasm between progressive education and essentialist education.

As in the case of progressivism and reconstructionism, essentialism is not the only philosophy that accepts the education-as-cultural transmission assumption as true. Perennialism and essentialism share the belief in common importance of universal knowledge among members of a culture. Both frameworks also assume that knowledge exists as something that is passed down through successive generations. Therefore, the codification of such knowledge involves identifying critical elements of that culture as one part of its content. Both philosophies place the teacher at the center of instruction. However, a perennialist also believes that the past acts with a kind of permanence and "timeless knowledge" (Ornstein, 1990, p. 105). Historically, perennialism has been associated with Allan Bloom (e.g., *The Closing of the American Mind,* 1987) and Mortimer Adler (e.g., *The Paideia Proposal,* 1998).

Essentialism, however, provides a place for the teaching of foundational skills. The present and future must be considered as a context as well in an essentialist framework (Gutek, 1997). An essentialist stance implies also that education encompasses more than just static knowledge found in past works (cf. Bloom, 1987; Adler, 1998). Essentialists have also advocated for the basic curriculum consisting of grammar, literature, math, history, and science (Gutek, 1997). These subjects are synonymous with the basic core curriculum in American public schools. Essentialists also acknowledge, if only slightly, a liberal education rather than the strictly, classical education espoused by the perennialists (Gutek, 1997; Ornstein, 1990). Therefore, essentialism can serve as a more useful, initial framework with which to explore trends and applications more consistent with a liberal education, especially in light of the implications and a back to the basics argument contained in *A Nation at Risk*. When taken

12

together with the previous discussion regarding progressivism and reconstructionism, perennialism and reconstructionism both share a more restrictive, narrower stance and can be considered subsets or offshoots of their respective, broader class (Ornstein, 1990). Thus, my choice of educational philosophies (progressive, essentialist) rather than narrow subsets (reconstructionism, perennialism) of each is also an acknowledgment to the larger context in which I wish to situate this dissertation.

In light of this brief discussion that considered alternate education frameworks and the differing assumptions of the progressives and essentialists, I also do not envision the end result of this incompatibility between progressives and essentialists and their respective subsets as a battle with a clear winner and loser. This fundamental incompatibility will likely necessitate a different resolution, which is different than the way that Lagemann (1989) and Gibboney (2006) characterized the dialectic of progressive educators Dewey and Thorndike throughout the 20th Century. Adopting a polarizing solution, such as perennialism or reconstructionism would also not advance the unifying element needed. The unifying perspective that acknowledges both purposes of an education and completes the educational context by moderating perspectives will become evident in Bagley's position.

Progressive education has functioned in a position of relative dominance throughout the history of public schooling (Blanton, 2000; Mark & Gary, 2007; Weltman, 1999). Though Dewey and Thorndike have framed the philosophy of progressive education historically, each espoused radically differing ideas regarding the process by which to achieve their educational goals. Similar in structure to schools at the beginning of the 20th Century, American public schools generally continue to function as large, centralized organizations, to engage in testing, classifying, grouping, and sorting of students, and to employ differentiated instruction to reach

13

diverse learners. A progressive education paradigm also includes vocational education to prepare students for careers (Gibboney, 2006; Hearst, 1999). Specifically, Thorndike's influence has impacted these constructs across education. Even when progressive education was not as influential, as in the 1950s, Mark and Gary (2007) noted that "[p]rogressive education was not replaced by a new comprehensive philosophy, and every discipline found itself with a curriculum at least partially reflective of progressive education" (p. 415). Dewey's vision contrasted with Thorndike's ideas by conceptualizing schools as a collaborative learning community wherein social and emotional outcomes were placed on par with academic achievement outcomes (Chapter 2). Despite these differences, however, Dewey and Thorndike found common ground under the same assumption regarding the purpose of a formal education of societal improvement (Zilversmit, 1993; Zimiles, 2008). In Chapter 2, I will describe aspects of progressivism consistent with both Dewey and Thorndike, and highlight differences through that description.

Limitation of frameworks in philosophy. Other frameworks from philosophy could also have been used in achieving my purpose. However, those ideas might not have led to a clear statement of the problem. For example, Regelski (2003) asserted that idealism, realism, and neo-scholasticism have each been applied with respect to schooling, since each philosophy deals with knowledge acquisition and learning. Regelski linked each objective philosophy to music-education-as-aesthetic-education, creating combinations of idealist-aesthetic philosophers (Reimer), realist-aesthetic philosophers (Broudy), and a neo-scholastic-aesthetic movement (Discipline Based Music Education). Then, Regelski used these characterizations to criticize the aesthetic educators and their philosophies in favor of his praxial philosophy, which he claims is a blend of extentialism, and phenomenology. Regelski contended that praxialism was concerned with subjectivity, individuals and their experiences, with pragmatism providing support for our

14

experiences as knowledge is applied into action and made personally meaningful (Regelski, 2003).

Regelski also claimed a close relationship exists between rationalism, idealism, and realism. Assuming that realism indeed governs the empirical studies driving research, Thorndike can be tentatively assumed to fit, given Regelski's characterization, especially considering that Thorndike desired a science of educational psychology that would lead to the discovery of immutable laws governing learning. Hirsch, then, can be initially thought of as a neo-scholastic/perennialist given his desire for common learning to take place over common knowledge and bits of core knowledge (e.g. Hirsch, 1988). The neo-scholastic/prennialist assumption that all children are the same, and that knowledge is universal also lended credence to this link (Regelski, 2003). Regelski's discussion also implied connections between perennialists and neo-scholastics over questions of cultural import and transmission to successive among the exemplar models of works and ideas of Mortimer Adler (Regelski, 2003).

Bagley, tentatively also the idealist in this discussion, could easily fit the idealist profile given his desire for all students to have the same kind of liberal education (Null, 2006). However, Bagley's concern with balancing the same kind of liberal education with appropriate societal applications and also ensuring that purposeful kinds of cultural knowledge are passed down through successive generations make him something slightly different than an idealist. Typically, an idealist would not be concerned with transferability of knowledge into society or its transmission (Null, 2006; Regelski, 2003).

Problems with classifying Bagley as strictly an idealist aside, one way of looking at the present discussion is indeed in terms of neo-scholasticism, idealism, and realism. However, that does not provide an efficient way to bring together perspectives. The question regarding how an

idealist can bring together a neo-scholastic/perennialist and a realist is valid, but does not

specifically depend on formal education as a context, and does not allow clear access to see what

similarities and differences over the purpose of a formal education exist with respect to the

American public schools. Thus, idealism is not as useful in bringing perspectives together when

compared to a paradigm concerned with formal education in the American public schools,

though threads of idealism do exist in Bagley's writings.

   Limitation of interpretation. Another limitation is also present regarding my ever

increasing awareness of my peculiar role in the process of interpreting the words and documents

written by others. Though philosophical writing is not often regarded as qualitative research, I

notice that an overlap appears between processes used by qualitative researchers and

philosophical writers. Qualitative researchers often interpret words written and spoken by others

as their data in order to arrive at truth and meaning from their informants' perspective. Likewise,

I will be using an analogous process as I interpret words written by others as a kind of data while

exploring dimensions and boundaries of arguments and ideas contained in extant writings

(Creswell, 2012; Glesne, 2011). This exploration and interpretation will be directly related to

my purpose in order to arrive at and argue for a truth statement, which I believe is synonymous

with what is argued *to*, or my conclusion (Glesne, 2011; Rosenberg, 1996).[1] This discussion also

implies that the qualitative researcher is the research instrument (Creswell, 2012; Glesne, 2011).

Further, the data collected runs through, or is interpreted by, the researcher in order to arrive at a

conclusion revolving around meaning and truth from the informants' perspective. Therefore, my

---

[1] Though a philosopher might not fully embrace the role of a qualitative researcher (and vice-versa), the parallel to philosophical writing here is suggested in that a great amount of interpretation is needed on the part of the philosopher when examining the writings of others in order to analyze (break down) for core assumptions and engage for argument and in dialect. Rosenberg (1996), in *Six Ways to Read a Philosopher*, detailed ways which activity and interpretation on the part of the reader plays a critical part of engaging with the text when reading philosophical writings.

interpretations of the words I read and subsequent conclusions I draw from them are ultimately influenced, to a certain degree, by my own life experiences and meanings I have derived from those experiences. In that vein, I draw a parallel to Brown (2000) and her use of techniques from each paradigm (philosophical and qualitative) in a hybridized approach.

Assumption of need. Given the connection between the need for this investigation, ecological validity and creation of a scientific theory, Thorndike's vision of a valid science of education connects to this present discussion. One central need motivating this investigation for another perspective that informs music education is similar to the need that drove much of Thorndike's research and applications of scientific methods to the systematic study of education. Both needs revolve around having guiding principles that are parsimonious, have explanatory power, and possess utility. Both also assume the generative quality that Jorgensen (2001) spoke of in the context of philosophy and generative aspect of creativity as detailed by Gardner (2011).

Gardner (2011) noted that creativity with respect to theoretical principles often produces one of two outcomes. A "good," creative scientific theory can subsume all that came before it, while also explaining something additional that was previously unexplained. Also, a scientific theory can establish a clean break in any given domain and either create an entirely new domain, or give way to create a sub-domain. Gardner (2011) used the case of Einstein and his Theory of Relativity to argue that creativity and innovation in the "hard" sciences often involves adding something new to an existing theory. In contrast, creativity and innovation with respect to the social sciences often involve breaking away from conventions, norms, and traditional thinking to create new or sub-domains, as in his case example of Freud creating the discipline of modern psychology.

Though more consistent with the hard sciences and the act of subsuming, I will bring attention to an additional perspective, that of Bagley, that can bridge the gap between two divergent perspectives. This creation of a philosophical framework for public school music education using his ideas represents a more parsimonious perspective than either separate perspective of the progressives or essentialists, while also remaining firmly in the domain of education and music education. Therefore, I differ from Thorndike in that I will not offer a newly created science underpinning all aspects of music teaching and learning through this dissertation.

Given that Thorndike's ideas have been dominant across education for the better part of the 20th Century and that Dewey's ideas are perhaps less familiar, I will concentrate a portion of my discussion of a progressive education framed by Dewey around applications found in schools. These applications will be historical in nature, as selected places attempted to bring life to his ideas during the 1920s-1940s. I will also historically frame a large part of my discussion on Thorndike. Therefore, I will assume that the reader will have familiarity with present-day descriptions, applications, and examples of Thorndike's conception of progressive education, which include testing, measurement, evaluation, and schools as large centralized organizations that classify students. This examination will also allow for clearer understanding of Bagley's criticisms, given that Bagley, Dewey, and Thorndike were contemporaries.

Assumption of stability. Furthermore, I assume that music education's place in the public schools is stable, and not likely to change immediately. The place of music in the schools largely has not changed throughout our association with the public schools, as I will explain through this brief historical overview.

When the Boston School Committee adopted the petition to institute vocal music in its schools on a trial basis in August of 1837, it accepted, by extension, the utilitarian justification for music education (Birge, 1937; Mark & Gary, 2007). As such, music education was extolled initially as a benefit intellectually, morally and physically. Furthermore, it was also a fervent hope that public school music instruction would have application and utility in society. Among the various outcomes envisioned, early advocates for public school music education hoped that singing from the churchgoing congregation would improve (Birge, 1937; Jorgensen, 1995; Mark & Gary, 2007). Implied, then, is the notion that music could be accessible to all through content taught in the public school. The initial benefit of a musical education revolved around extramusical purposes (Mark & Gary, 2007). Also implied was the idea that this content was organized both systematically and scientifically. This desire to organize content taught in schools mirrored the larger societal transition into a society based in business. This utilitarian justification for music education lasted virtually unchallenged for nearly a century (Jorgensen, 1995; Mark & Gary, 2007).

As the connection between psychology, science, education, and music education grew through the progressive education movement during the first half of the 20th century, a divide occurred among educators. Dewey's brand of child-centered education was perceived as radical and contrarian in view of many established beliefs and assumptions regarding children and the purpose of an education (Levin, 1991; Mark & Gary, 2007). Though teachers across education and music education who embraced Dewey's principles of child-centered education achieved varying results, most of Dewey's ideas failed to take a firm hold across much of public education. However, learning through action and considering what is developmentally and naturally appropriate to the social and emotional education of the whole child continue to be

19

explicitly stated, current goals for teachers across both domains (Mark & Gary, 2007; McCarthy & Goble, 2005).[2] Though Dewey's ideas have not been as widespread across public education, independent schools experienced success with these methods, such as the Ohio State University Laboratory School (Mark & Gary, 2007). By contrast, Thorndike's scientific slant to progressive education through seemingly immutable laws that could govern behaviors, testing, measurement, and evaluation seemed to have more application and utility. Levin (1991) posited that characteristics such as bureaucratic schools, testing and sorting of students by performance which pervaded practice in the public schools was ultimately most consistent with Thorndike. By contrast, aspects found in education more consistent with Dewey's views, including customizing instruction to fit growth and development factors within children is more consistent in the scholarly community and in limited contextual situations (Levin, 1991; Zimiles, 2008). Thus, Levin (1991) declared Thorndike winner of the battle of implementation (Levin, 1991). Despite this dualism within progressive education between Dewey, Thorndike, and places of implementation consistent with each framer, a place for continued musical instruction was still provided nonetheless (Levin, 1991; Mark & Gary, 2007). However, the utilitarian rationale for music education was beginning to be supplanted by an aesthetic rationale (Mark & Gary, 2007).

In the 1950s, subjects were taught in isolation rather than with the mindset of holistic connection across subjects. Each subject, including music, developed separately (Mark & Gary, 2007). Given that, it follows that the justification of music education could rest squarely on musical grounds, rather than for extramusical purposes. Though support was garnered for the

---

[2] A problem of classification also occurs here, in that is nearly impossible to classify schools as strictly progressive, or strictly "traditional" (Chandler, 1999). Most schools studied shared characteristics of both progressive and traditional schools, as evidenced by the responses of administrators in Ohio to a semantic-differential questionnaire speaking to a progressive-"traditional" dichotomy (Chandler, 1999). The relatively few schools on either end of the progressive-traditional continuum, however, have provided insights into differences between a progressive and traditional school. These differences will be explained in Chapter 2.

inclusion of music in the core curriculum, for study as an academic subject, the overarching

thought revolved around the idea that music would continue to occupy a place in schools, given

that subjects were taught in isolation. Hence, music did not need membership in the core

curriculum or need study as an academic subject in order to retain its place (Mark, 1998; Mark &

Gary, 2007).

However, problems with this kind of non-unified, isolated curriculum became apparent.

By the late-1960s and early-1970s, emerging technological advances were beginning to change

society such that society itself required different sets of skills and knowledge.

[C]urriculum developers began to favor a conceptual approach to learning. The

traditional method of imparting a body of facts to children was no longer practical in an

era of change in which knowledge was expanding at an ever-increasing rate. It had

become virtually impossible to choose the body of facts that would be meaningful to

students in the future. Instead, the curriculum was organized by concepts, principles and

modes of inquiry, making it possible for students to know how to learn what would be

important for their individual needs. The ability to think inductively to resolve unfamiliar

problems became the goal of curriculum planners for students. (Mark & Gary, 2007, p.

416).

Seeds of modern-day educational reform also began to take hold in the 1960s with

Lyndon Baines Johnson's vision of a Great Society, the passage of the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act, as part of the War on Poverty. In the 1980s, *A Nation at Risk* alerted

educators, advocates for education, government, and the general public alike that American

schools needed extensive reform. However, during the turbulent times starting in the 1960s and

continuing through the 1980s, music education as aesthetic education remained popular among

music educators (Mark & Gary, 2007). As discussed previously, the field of music education appeared to adopt aesthetic education non-critically and pervasively, which was not intended (Mark & Gary, 2007; McCarthy & Goble, 2005). Combined with the relative lack of connection between in-school learning and out-of-school application, growing discontent with aesthetic education among a small group of music educators began to emerge (McCarthy & Goble, 2005). These praxial music educators, whose critiques of aesthetic education have been discussed previously, have been given recent space to thrive. Though the 2001 authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as No Child Left Behind, created upheaval across education, it did not lead to any clear resolution for this continued debate between aesthetic and praxial music educators (Mark & Gary, 2007).

Limitation of generalizability. Therefore, the concluding philosophical framework that includes Bagley's perspective also will not be generalizable outside the field of public school music education. Furthermore, language in the current version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) might change or be modified, despite being re-authorized, further limiting generalizability. However, Heilig, Cole, and Aguilar (2010) noted through their exploration of Texas House Bill 3 on perceived status of arts programs, many states do list the arts as members of the core curriculum and provide state-wide standards for study. Despite this provision, Heilig, Cole, and Aguilar concluded that the arts continued to be perceived as secondary in the curriculum, thus limiting the impact of the policy. Regardless of the outcome of federal legislation, which might be subject to change, I assume that music education will still remain in the wider context of general education. Thus, the responsibility of the domain to exist in concordance with general education is not negated if the arts do not ultimately achieve lasting core status in the ESEA.

I also assume that this dissertation will not hinder progress in advocacy efforts, teaching, or learning across the domain of music education. My goal in writing this dissertation is not to cast past philosophical rationales for music education in a negative light while accusing the entire domain of wrongdoing or disservice to students and teachers (e.g. Allsup, 2012; Regelski, 2002, 2009a). Regelski (2002, 2009a) explored the ethical dimensions of music teaching complete with examples, instances, and further opportunities for malpractice, which Regelski termed malpraxis, within our domain. Allsup (2012) took a more moderate approach, while suggesting that the further the domain of music education moves away from applying aspects of Dewey's ideas that center on care, morality, and virtue, the less able stakeholders within the domain of music education are to justify the subject as it currently exists. As my approach throughout this dissertation is to bring perspectives together by exploring the moderate perspective of Bagley, rather than polarize by choosing an extreme example, my intent is that this dissertation might positively impact efforts in advocacy, teaching, and learning.

Method

In Chapters 2 and 3, I will primarily use description, while employing analysis where needed. By devoting these chapters to a description of a progressive education and an essentialist education, respectively, I will show that different assumptions provide the foundation for the philosophy of each side. The material presented in Chapter 2 will show that one fundamental assumption in a progressive education revolves around education-as-societal-improvement. Essentialism, however, is underpinned by a different assumption. That assumption is education-as-cultural-transmission, which will be made explicit in Chapter 3.

After describing education-as-societal-improvement (progressive) and education-as-cultural-transmission (essentialist) and including applied examples, I will use primary sources written solely by Bagley (books, articles, editorials) that illustrate his thoughts regarding

23

bridging the gap between progressive and more conservative essentialist positions. Finally, I will apply Bagley's thoughts to the domain of music education. My approach in Chapters 4 and 5 will be descriptive and analytic as I examine, and synoptic as I build on ideas presented. Additionally, I will engage in deduction. As in a philosophical argument constructed in a logical paradigm, the validity or invalidity of an argument can be evaluated by what follows, as in an evaluation of the form, or as in what is true, as in an evaluation of content (Rosenberg, 1996).

Relevant Terms

Though one focus of this dissertation will entail the introduction of terms for the purpose of showing how groups operationalize terms differently, which impacts core assumptions and beliefs, some terms need definition before beginning.

Essentialism – framework associated with educational philosophers and theory-builders who argue that there are certain relevant kinds of cultural knowledge every citizen should possess. It is the job of the school to teach this kind of knowledge as a kind of cultural transmission. E.D. Hirsch, Jr. is an example of a current, extreme example of this kind of thought

Standards-Based Education – one application of essentialist framework revolving around high-stakes summative testing, teacher-centered instruction, and clear outlines of a specific body of facts and knowledge that details what each child should know and be able to do at specific points in their development

Curriculum – prescribed sequences of materials that often connect to standards.

Progressive Education – educational movement popular in the late 19th to early 20th century historically framed by Dewey and Thorndike. Education in this paradigm functions as societal improvement. This broad educational movement has two chief components: scientific education and child-centered education

Praxial Music Education – Postmodern philosophical framework for music education closely associated with David Elliott that emphasizes music-making as action and as a multidimensional construct

Scientific Education – Thorndike's brand of progressive education. Indicators of include using principles of science, such as laws that do not change, to arrive at truths regarding education of children. Applications include testing, classification of students, and conceptualization of schools as large, bureaucratic organizations.

Child-Centered Education – Dewey's brand of progressive education. Indicators include emphasis on social and emotional aspects of the child, and educating the complete child in accordance with democratic principles of liberation and equality. In this subset of progressive education, social and emotional considerations of the individual child are considered as important as academic considerations.

Aesthetic Education – rationale justifying the place of music in the public schools solely on musical grounds and content

Discipline – 1) as operationalized by Bagley; used for grounding in a set of

    principles or knowledge; see disciplined progressivism

    2) see discipline-based music education

Disciplined Progressivism – Null's term (2003) to describe Bagley; grounding education-as-societal improvement in a set of knowledge and skills that can be passed on to successive generations

Discipline-Based Music Education – offshoot of aesthetic education; focusing on a study of music grounded in a set of core knowledge needed to become literate in music through the use

of exemplar works of music as models for generalizable truths about the formal and referential aspects of music

Summary

Thus far, this chapter introduced the need and purpose of this dissertation, and explained how the need for considering context first as part of a guiding framework for music education represents a difference from past music-based frameworks that have not directly considered context first (Stauffer, 2009, 2012). Also, this chapter discussed the need for a perspective that brings two differing perspectives together. The method section explored connections between description, analytic, and synoptic approaches, and explained when each will be undertaken relative to each chapter. Through an undertaking of both kinds of approaches, both conditions of providing a framework for use will be satisfied (e.g. Jorgensen, 1993, 2001). Finally, this chapter explored limitations, assumptions, and relevant terms.

CHAPTER 2

FOUNDATIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF A PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the overarching goals of a progressive

education, using Dewey and Thorndike as initial points of departure. Historical context, by way

of pivotal events and policies, will also be established, particularly as a discussion of Thorndike

is undertaken. Establishment of this context will allow for a clearer understanding of Bagley's

criticisms of certain aspects of Thorndike's vision in Chapter 4. A discussion of vocational

education will also occur, concentrating on current applications of vocational education. This

discussion will also answer a possible limitation of progressive education framed by Dewey and

Thorndike as noted by Osgood (2010). Osgood argued that progressive educators ultimately

could not overcome the dissonance between the desire to manage schools as large organizations,

which implied a connection to Thorndike, and the need to tailor education to individual children,

implying a connection to Dewey. Perhaps the way in which vocational education has been

operationalized currently, which speaks to a blend between ideas from both Dewey and

Thorndike, can provide one answer in melding contrasting sets of ideas from two framers who

ultimately shared the same assumption. I will show throughout the remainder of this chapter

how each framer interprets education-as-societal-improvement differently, with vocational

education serving as an example of a synthesis of ideas. Both Dewey and Thorndike will be

united by a common foundation, societal improvement, though they differ widely in their

application of ideas consistent with progressive education.

Toward a Progressive Education

Education that functioned as societal improvement evolved as a metaphorical reaction to

the religious foundations established in the earlier part of the 19th Century (Setran, 2012). While

27

Setran qualified his assertion, positing that progressive education shares fundamental aspects with Protestant modernism and that religious foundations existed in progressive education, Dill (2007) argued that for Dewey, a progressive education grounded in pragmatic thought could "transcend the limits of dogmatic religion yet retain the moral and social goods that bind people together in a community" (p.226).

In the late 19th Century, the Puritan idea that education "… [prepared] children for the conversion experience that gave the individual moral behavior" (Popkewitz, 2011, p. 3-5) began to erode. Criticized was the connection between schooling and society, which was mostly ignored by the Puritans in curriculum design (Dill, 2007; Popkewitz, 2011; Setran, 2012). Thus, the progressives seized the opportunity to address this weakness, and answer questions related to "[the] Social Question … which gave focus to the planning that was to respond to the economic, social and moral disorder of the city" (Popkewitz, 2011, p.3) and explore the uncharted territory of "… the theories of the new sciences related to schooling, such as in the community sociology of the Chicago School and the psychologies of Edward L. Thorndike and John Dewey" (Popkewitz, 2011, p.3).

This shift into an educational movement that considered fundamentally different purposes of schooling fit well within a society that was in the process of change (Popkewitz, 2011; Reese, 2013). Urban living took the place of rural living, and cosmopolitanism began to flourish after previously held assumptions associated with the sustainability of an agrarian society faltered (Popkewitz, 2011; Zilversmit, 1993). The promise of a reinvented society was in its urbanization, industrialization, and immigration (Zilversmit, 1993). Education was not exempt from this change. Goals of liberation and freedom of the individual through schooling began to permeate education and loosely define the progressive movement. Dewey's response to these

societal changes and new goals entailed a kind of democratic education wherein individuals would learn principles consistent with responsible societal living as well as academic content. Democracy in a Deweyian education was also lived out through schools functioning as a community and places of problem-solving. By contrast, Thorndike's response to the increased urbanization and industrialization of society entailed a science of education that could be used efficiently to study learning and lead to emancipation through immutable laws and unchanging principles. Despite these differences, both Dewey and Thorndike were united by their overarching desire to reform schooling based on the new, emergent social question and connect the school to society (Beaty, 1998; Petrina, 2004; Popkewitz, 2011). Both Dewey and Thorndike also shared general distaste for classes in schools that focused on "vague qualities of mind" (Watras, 2009, p.119). Furthermore, Dewey and Thorndike were unified through their desire to reform education in response to meeting the needs of individual children and a mostly behaviorist orientation toward learning (Zilversmit, 1993; Watras, 2009). The behaviorist link in this context might seem tenuous when speaking about Dewey. However, Watras (2009) noted that Dewey explained learning as a kind of thinking that was a connection between an antecedent behavior and a subsequent consequence, whereas Thorndike explicitly applied behaviorist principles in his ideas concerning connectionism.

<center>Aspects of Dewey's Democratic Education</center>

Several recurrent themes have emerged when Dewey's democratic education is applied in practice. These themes have traditionally centered on community and child-centered education (Bensman, 1994; Domina, 2002; Sabia, 2012). Examples of applications consistent with these themes will be explored in this section. In *School and Society* (1962), Dewey outlined four characteristics central to his conception of schools in a changing world, which Domina

<center>29</center>

(2002) applied to a high school specializing in alternative education. Domina also extrapolated core belief statements on which to build foundations of teaching and learning: (1) the school itself would function as a community. Thus, student input is critical and integrated within the structure of the school; (2) students should be engaged authentically; (3) activities and learning opportunities for students should be applicable and useful, with creative emphases; (4) teachers should support and encourage their students with an interactive spirit that fosters mutual learning and collaboration between students and teachers (Domina, 2002). Bensman (1994) documented the case of Central Park East Elementary school, and noted that academic outcomes were intertwined with social-emotional outcomes, also consistent with Deweyian themes. While outcomes evidenced in the sample of students who attended this elementary school included higher rates of academic achievement, and higher graduation rates from high school, students also spoke to aspects of the environment itself that they perceived nurtured their social, emotional, and academic competence. Students perceived benefits as the teachers structured academic content such as math, history, music, literature, grammar (language arts), and visual art around student interests from both home and school. The meaningful relationships, centered on "caring, respect and mutual trust" (Bensman, 1994, p.5), were used by the students to foster positive relationships with others throughout their education. Parental involvement employed by the school as a whole also contributed to the sense of the school as an integral part of the community. This characterization is also closely related to a description of friendship, open-mindedness, and sympathy, given by Saito (2009), as she argued for these needed elements for a democratic education to flourish.

Sabia (2012) suggested other examples of Dewey's ideas in practice that integrate students into the school. The first two principles Sabia (2012) detailed will contrast quite readily

with Bagley's 1930 vision of an effective school. Some common ground can be found, however,

within the third principle as it concerns an "informed and intelligent citizenry" (p. 380) who can

also live in accordance with ideals established by society.

1. Students are part of the authority structure of the school. They must

play a meaningful, ideally equal, role in school governance and curricula/

pedagogical policies and practices. The extent to which students

can meaningfully and thoughtfully participate in school governance and

in their own education is to some degree age dependent, of course, but

that students should have a meaningful and ideally equal say in governance

and teaching, beginning with "the first day in the nursery," is a

central assumption and goal of the democratic school.

2. Because the democratic school is a public institution serving a residential

community, and because its broad aim is the cultivation of a democratic

citizenry, the democratic school must also be a community school.

School and community must be integrated into the "democratic learning

communities" that best characterize the ideal of the democratic school.

This means in particular that the school serves as a resource for the community,

the community serves as a resource for the school, and *all* the

residents of the community are students and members of the democratic

school.

3. The curriculum of the democratic school must be, in no small measure,

political. Because the democratic school strives to cultivate an informed

and intelligent citizenry committed to democratic ideals and aspirations,

the curriculum must include as a major goal the development in students

of an informed, critical, political and historical consciousness. (p. 379-380)

Major outcomes of a Deweyian education also included a symbiotic relationship between the student and their environment, as noted by Glassman (2001), and Prawat (1995) and similarly, a continuity between what is learned and how it is applied, which Dewey believed occurred at the nexus of experience and education (Bassey, 2010; Callan, 1982). As Rocheleau (2004) explained, continuity, "gives students practice testing theories and solving problems so that they can respond intelligently to future situations that are characterized by changing circumstances and new problems" (p. 5-6). Education is a lifelong undertaking and a process of continuous, neverending growth leading to societal improvement through liberation (Callan, 1982). For Manilow (2009), the Francis W. Parker School was synonymous with quality teaching, which implied that learning is continuous, lifelong, the responsibility of the learner, and driven by the interests of the student. Thus, "[finding] the individual potential of each student and maximizing it …" (p. 216) was also another goal of a progressive education framed with democracy in mind.

Moral Development as a Marker of Social and Emotional Development

The preceding description of Sabia (2012) intertwined cognitive and academic outcomes with social-emotional outcomes thus exposing the issue of teaching toward both in schools. Folsom (1998) noted that both morality and other forms of knowledge revolving around content are functions of intelligence and hence justifiable to teach in schools. Therefore, schools can function as places where all children can learn sets of skills and knowledge encompassing more than academic learning that will enable them to function adequately in society and make a contribution to it (Biesta, 2007; Folsom, 1998; Goodson, 1978; Sabia, 2012). Though Biesta

(2007) argued that Dewey's conception of producing members of society through his idea of a democratic education that melded social-emotional and academic outcomes exists as only one viewpoint, and is over and above what the school feasibly can do, she nevertheless positioned Dewey as an exemplar model of attempting to balance both kinds of outcomes in service of a democratic education.

Similarly, Bagley (e.g. 1944c) acknowledged Dewey's contribution to educational philosophy and contributing positively to ideas related to child development. Differences between Bagley and Dewey over definitions of a democratic education, however, contributed to dissonance between the two. Those differences will be explained in Chapter 4.

Given that one persistent criticism of a progressive education has traditionally revolved around inequality and separation of students with negative outcomes, balancing social-emotional outcomes with academic outcomes could perhaps temper this criticism (Maher, 1999). Self-cultivation of morality and the development of it in the context of a school community might also mediate the relationship found between power, knowledge, and skills, provided that the aspirations of individuals are in concordance with exemplar models within that community (Broudy, 1964). Therefore, academic outcomes and social-emotional outcomes are not only intertwined, but of equal in importance in a Deweyian framework. The following section will be devoted to a discussion of two underlying components related to social-emotional development in the context of a democratic education: moral reasoning and citizenship.

Moral reasoning. Social-emotional development in the context of a democratic, Deweyian education cannot be fully understood without incorporating a discussion of the moral development of the individual child. This viewpoint carries with it three assumptions: (1) it is possible to teach such reasoning within the school (e.g. Goodson, 1978; Krebs and Denton,

2005), (2) morality is governed by society, not religion (e.g. Dill, 2007, p. 227; Greene, 1978; Goodson, 1978; Sim, 2009), and (3) intelligence and morality are inseparable (e.g. Folsom, 1998). The school, as a kind of socializing agent, can and should teach skills and dispositions related to moral development within its limits and boundaries, and can also do so as a function of intellect (Dill, 2007; Folsom, 1998; Goodson, 1978; Krebs & Denton, 2005). Additionally, the school can teach these complex ideas and behaviors on the grounds of whole person development (Farrelly, 1993). In a Deweyian framework, there is no predefined set of virtues or actions that compose what is "right" in any given society. Rather, what is moral depends on the society itself (Sim, 2009).

The preceding statement of Sim (2009) on morality could also be used to argue for a progressive view to moral development, given the lack of absolute characteristics or qualities that define moral actions or thoughts in any given society in a Deweyian framework (Carr, 2002; Pietig, 1977, 1980). As Carr (2002) also noted, "the emphasis on moral development in a progressive framework is on the process of development, with no endpoint" (p.7). Therefore, the process of "becoming" (p. 8) a morally bound individual continuously evolves and emerges throughout life. Though the individual passes through stages, they are not necessarily inferior or superior to one another. The emphasis is placed on qualitative changes in moral thoughts and behaviors. Therefore, it is ultimately the goal of the school with respect to moral development of the child to provide meaningful experiences such that the school is also enabling children to pass through certain developmental stages during the time that they are in school (Carr, 2002).

Schools, however, also play a specific role in teaching the meaning behind acting as a moral individual by giving students learning opportunities and experiences rooted in modes of inquiry (Dill, 2007). Through inquiry and empirical testing through observation, the individual

34

child can determine the kinds of moral behaviors considered correct. In addition to testing the observable, which implies a behavior, the epistemological foundations of such behavior could also be examined, which Dewey considered a specific kind of intellectual skill that could be fostered. Also, implied is a cognitive component to moral development while also possibly reinforcing continuity, which is a key principle in a democratic, progressive education (Dill, 2007; Rocheleau, 2004). Further, anything under the umbrella of morality not empirically tested or observed could be debunked as a kind of unsupported myth. This reliance on the scientific method of inquiry to teach moral behavior through experiences and inquiry also stands in direct opposition to the very essence of certain religious beliefs often left unexamined and accomplishes promotion of freedom and liberation from religious dogma (Boller, 1977; Dill, 2007; Popkewitz, 2011; Setran, 2012).

Therefore, for Dewey, schools could not only give experiences to the child that would foster moral development, but also counteract powerful influences from religious institutions that did not engage inquiry. This critical experience of education, implying examination and thought, was central to the progressive argument as well. Furthermore, through participation in various social institutions, which include schools and authentic experiences within those institutions that are integrated as life experiences, the child also develops a sense of self-control and awareness of his or her place in the world (Sim, 2009). Through such awareness and control, the person, or in this case, the child, also develops a cultivated self who "identifies his own good with the well-being of others" (Sim, 2009, p. 86).

One specific way by which individuals make morally-driven decisions is through the process of dramatic rehearsal. Through a process of deliberation, which is a combination of reflection, problem-solving, incubation, and self-transformation, the individual brings all prior

35

experiences and knowledge to the decision-making process to arrive at a solution in which "the mind is made up, composed, unified … [as] the various factors now fit harmoniously together" (Caspary, 2009, p.378). As the individual develops morally, then, the primary goal becomes "the constant discovery, formation, and reformation of the self in the ends which an individual is called upon to sustain and develop in virtue of his membership in a social whole" (Dewey, 1908, MW5: 356, in Bergman, 2005, p.44). Such a transformed person has "found himself" (Dewey, 1908 MW5: 356, in Bergman, 2005, p.44). Hence, for Dewey, moral development was not an end-product, but a process of continuous growth and development (Caspary, 1991).

Citizenship. This discussion on moral development is also closely tied to citizenship. As stated previously, in Dewey's model of democratic education, children are educated for the purpose of empowerment and active participation in society (Dill, 2007; Sabia, 2012). Dill (2007) specifically noted that the essence of a Deweyian education revolved around the singular outcome of good citizenship, which implied a connection between application of knowledge and skills learned in school and a positive contribution made in society after schooling. The school has the obligation to teach components and aspects related to both of these complex ideas within its walls. Therefore, citizenship must be practiced authentically in all aspects throughout school life and is not limited to "social affairs and recreational activities" (Broudy, 1964, p. 28). Through authentic practice of participation as a citizen of the school, children learn the implicit and explicit values and norms, as well as "life outcomes of citizenship, vocational competence and self-cultivation," (Broudy, 1964, p. 28) which prepare children for life in their community.

Because the school explicitly serves the community, it follows that these values and norms learned in school would also be reflective of the values and norms that the community desires. While Bagley (e.g. 1918a) will not disagree that schools should teach values and norms

36

that are congruent with the values and norms of communities, he will suggest in Chapter 4 that the word *community* should be defined as broadly as possible, and not limited to the local level. Furthermore, Bagley (e.g. 1918a) will assert progressive educators often assume a localized meaning of community when attempting to articulate values and norms, thus contributing to a major point of division between Bagley and the progressives broadly associated with Dewey.

Academics

This section will explicitly focus on the academic curriculum, as it is of equal importance with other aspects of education taught within a Deweyian framework. Whether or not the social-emotional and academic outcomes evidenced from this type of progressive education are ultimately equal to each other, separate from each other, separate-but-equal, or integrated, the premium placed on construction of knowledge by students and the political nature of the academic curriculum, largely informs the application of the content taught (Bensman, 1994; Noddings, 1992; Sabia, 2012). Therefore, this section will discuss applications of the academic curriculum within models of progressive, Deweyian schools.

Though students acquired facts and information by devoting time to instruction delivered by teachers, they also spent time applying knowledge learned and connecting knowledge across classes. In English classes, for example, students could demonstrate that they could apply their knowledge by reading material which they found personally interesting (Zilversmit, 1993). It also follows logically that students would use that skill across other subjects, thus providing a tentative basis for the linking of all subjects such as social studies, mathematics, literature together. By way of comparison and contrast, Zilversmit noted that " … typical arithmetic instruction ignored the social aspects of the subject and its relevance to the world outside the classroom, emphasizing instead computational skills …" (Zilversmit, 1993, p. 29).

37

Furthermore, Zliversmit (1993) detailed certain subjects continued to be taught relatively discretely:

> In most cases, the social studies were not integrated (as progressives maintained they should be) but consisted of parallel courses in history and geography with little reference to the other social sciences. … the higher objectives of understandings, attitudes and skills are not adequately emphasized. (p.30)

While this statement offers a modicum of common ground between progressive education associated with Dewey and aspects consistent with Bagley over the need to emphasize higher order understandings, differences over the kind of experiences Bagley (e.g. 1923) contended the school should provide speaks more of a blended perspective. Bagley's specific, blended position in relation to the material presented here, and in Chapter 3 will be detailed in Chapter 4.

In the Winnetka schools of the 1930s, one type of education consistent with Deweyian though flourished. The "Winnetka Plan" detailed approaches for learning "common essentials – the skills and information which … any person growing up in modern society would need" (Zilversmit, 1993, p.41). Children advanced through a personally tailored curriculum from a series of self-paced books in "tool subjects" (p. 41) that centered on mastery of certain educational goals. Students spent roughly half of the school day in this self-paced instruction. This focus on common essentials, then, allowed students to spend the rest of their time in school on group, creative and applied activities. During this time, students engaged in "art, music, discussions of current events, student self-government and field trips" (Zilversmit, 1993, p. 42). Thus, each part of the curriculum depended on one another. Though it was not an explicit goal in Winnetka to teach common skills during the activities portion of the day, overlap often occurred (Zilversmit, 1993).

In Skokie, a village near Winnetka, junior high students applied their academic skills and knowledge to run a fully functional student government. These students wrote and revised their school constitution, which curiously allowed for formation of unions. As Zilversmit (1993) also noted, the language in their charter allowed student dishwashers to organize as a labor union, amid much controversy. Ventures run by the students included a Credit Union and an unsuccessful attempt to raise rabbits as part of a livestock corporation. While these undertakings by the students might seem frivolous, teachers linked these experiences to content previously taught, and also used these experiences as points of departure for new content. The miniature society built in Skokie Junior High, then, functioned as a microcosm of the larger community in Skokie (Zilversmit, 1993).

In Gary, Indiana, a third application of progressive education took hold. In this working-class city, effectively sustained by the United States Steel Corporation, schools adopted a work-study-play system, which was praised for its public service to the community given that this system provided for, and depended on, out-of-school learning and connection to the community through adult-education programs. In Gary, children learned by active, authentic engagement in laboratories and workshops, where they applied their "common skills" not so that it would make them a desirable steel worker, but so that it would contribute to the overall meaning as having been fully educated. In yet another feature of the schools in Gary, students also learned from each other; it was not uncommon to see older children and younger children learning cooperatively. Also worthy of note was the increased efficiency with which the school operated: every part of the building was used throughout the day. Groups of children did not necessarily spend mornings learning academic skills, or afternoons applying those skills. Thus, common themes of a progressive education emerged in Gary as well: a balance between teaching common

knowledge and applying that knowledge while addressing particular needs of the local community (Zilversmit, 1993).

In the Springfield, Missouri schools of the mid-1920s through early-1950s, superintendent Harry Study also implemented a model of education consistent with Deweyian principles. A project-based method of learning was used, which explicitly connected classroom content to other classes as well as to experiences outside of school (Nelson & Drake, 1998). The scope and sequence of the curriculum was connected by interdisciplinary threads throughout all facets of the school system. Teachers were encouraged to cede some elements concerning learning to the students through a coconstructed, collaborative, shared model of learning across all classes. Teachers weaved together content from seemingly disparate subjects as Biology, History and English with the common goal of discussing contemporary "social problems and issues" (Nelson & Drake, 1998). As noted:

> Films such as the "Howards of Virginia", "Tale of Two Cities" and "The Red Badge of Courage" were part of coordinated courses. They helped focus the students on social problems and issues … Even a topic such as driver education had an English component as well as science and social studies components. … [Of] primary importance in the curriculum guide was the emphasis upon discussion of values, race relationships, prejudice, bias, and analytical thinking. (p. 21)

Based on this description of these four schools that adopted a Deweyian stance to education, academics played an integral part in the functioning of the school. These academic subjects often consisted of traditional courses: reading, writing, and arithmetic in which students learned common skills and knowledge needed to contribute to, behave and think effectively. In a Deweyian framework, it mattered little whether that society exists in the school itself, as in the

second half of the school day in Winnetka, as a variable time period in a day, as in Gary, or in various societal institutions run by students as in Skokie. For Dewey and disciples of his generation who applied his principles of education in these schools, the point of departure did not rest on subject matter taught, but rather around the operationalization of that subject matter in school so that students could become responsible citizens who could thoughtfully and mindfully improve society. In more contemporary settings, Keislar (1980) and Donahue (1999) detailed similar themes, suggesting that highly similar attributes and applications of Dewey's ideas exist in more current contexts as well.

<center>Music Education in the Context of Progressive Education</center>

The domain of music education traditionally espoused several goals and outcomes that are consistent with the description throughout this section. Much of what has been linked is largely consistent with Deweyian notions of progressive education. Music educators frequently justify public school music education as valuable for lifelong learning and participation in the arts (e.g. Aspin, 2000; Myers, 2007). However, given that most of music-making within schools bears little connection to how music is used and consumed in society, problems arise between the content, breadth and scope of school music participation and out of school use of it (Allsup, 2012; Myers, 1995, 2007; Regelski, 2002, 2005, 2009a, b). This overarching concern for connection between music making inside and outside of school as complementary, however, speaks of a progressive bent towards continuity between the relevance of learning in school for future-utility purposes in society. The contrasting idea from this conception presented here that consumption can function as one outcome of education, yet not necessarily portend an educated student will be explained by Bagley in Chapter 4 and analyzed in Chapter 5.

In his theoretically-driven portrait of various methods in which people engage with music, related behaviors, and attained outcomes, Gates (1991) argued that involvement and subsequent perception of music can include work, serious leisure, and fun. The processes by which any given person chooses to make music a part of his or her life, then, depends on a kind of cost-benefit analysis that takes place within each individual. Music participation, broadened by this way of thinking and classifying, also shares some similarities to the praxial rationale for music education, particularly concerning links between participation and engagement as symbols for a kind of action, or doing (Elliott, 1995; Regelski, 2004, 2005). The connection here, however, also implies a fundamentally progressive bent in the societal connection to music participation, and differentiated ways in which an individual can engage with music. That contrasts with importance placed on culturally bound knowledge required for engagement with music. Thus Gates' point of departure with Elliott and Regelski is over the distinction between participation and perception of music's role in a social context, while moving toward a theoretical, explanatory model of music participation rather than what specific knowledge is needed as a kind of metaphorical toolkit.

Just because diverse definitions of music participation exist does not mean that all definitions are free from institutional challenges. Williams (2011) openly questioned the traditional model of public school music education, which has relied on a narrow definition of ensemble inclusion, mostly limited to bands, choirs, and orchestras that also perform very restricted kinds of music. More specifically, Krikun (2009) detailed challenges with regard to implementing a popular music ensemble and multicultural music courses in one community college. Krikun cited a "traditional music program" (p. 77) as his context, but expressed a desire to expand course offerings and explore ways in which active participation with music could lead

to additional engagement. Krikun also implied a progressive stance in his argument for inclusion

of popular music in his context, as the desire to connect music studied and experienced to

societal uses and applications of it informed his choice of course content.

This thinking supports music education because of its wide scope and depth. With a

wide definition of participation, engagement and with clear societal connections either in

materials chosen or the match between societal use and in-school music teaching and learning,

the domain of music education can potentially enjoy a secure place based on this broad scope of

participation, involvement and connection. However, what is not largely addressed by this

perspective is a direct connection to common knowledge and skills needed by all who choose to

participate with music throughout the lifespan (e.g. Myers, 2007) or regardless of level (e.g.

Gates, 1991). The participatory emphasis implied here also does not directly account for

acquisition of knowledge that can be passed down to successive generations. Though a

relationship exists between knowledge and participation, as implied by any cost-benefit analysis

(Gates, 1991), that relationship suggests an individual stance regarding the acquisition of

knowledge, which is another salient aspect of progressive education more consistent with

Dewey. The danger for the domain of public school music education, when adopting a

theoretical grounding more consistent with a participatory nature of music engagement involves

the distancing itself away from educational goals and objectives related to knowledge and skills

that make up the participatory act of music making itself. The danger is also consistent with

those who adopt a praxial stance toward music education such as Elliott, (1995) and Regelski

(2003, 2004, 2005) that also might overemphasize participation. Furthermore, this

categorization of participation does not directly address the level of importance, implying

hierarchy, within the public schools.

Furthermore, as will be explained in Chapter 4, Bagley will contend that major emphasis in schools should be placed on the kinds of creative work that can take place, leading to either fine art, or a profession.

By extension, Bagley (1914b) will imply that Gates' (1991) terms of serious leisure, and fun might describe more effectively another type of education known as cultural education (Bagley, 1914b). The conflation of participation and education in the public schools, then, speaks of another danger when adopting stances for music education that overemphasize participation. In Chapter 5, I will contend that it is the predominant association of music education as cultural education and subsequent conflation of participation and education that could potentially undermine equality of status for music education with respect to other members of the core curriculum.

<center>Aspects of Thorndike's Conception of Progressive Education</center>

Thorndike believed that societal improvement could be realized under a system of social efficiency that relied on "a more rational and systemic approach to a societal problem—in this case, the mass education of the citizenry" (Levin, 1991, p.73). Hence, Thorndike's common assumption placed him in agreement with Dewey. However, as implied by the statement above, Dewey and Thorndike diverged over the exact means by which to accomplish education of children. While Dewey argued for content taught in schools that fostered a sense of civic responsibility and connection to the local community for the improvement of society, Thorndike asserted that vocational training was the most efficient way to produce productive citizens (Watras, 2009). Further differences emerged between Dewey and Thorndike over the degree to which learning in one subject impacts learning in another. Thorndike occupied a narrow position on the issue, in that learning remained relatively discrete and separate between subjects

<center>44</center>

(Gibboney, 2006; Little, 2014). Thorndike also saw the need for so-called "abstract, conceptual or inferential thinking" (Thorndike, 1898, in Little, 2014, p. 105) as secondary, which differed slightly from Dewey's ideas that placed a greater degree of importance on such thinking. While Little (2014) noted that Thorndike believed students should learn by activity, the role of the teacher should be roughly analogous to that of an animal trainer or "to arrange everything in connection with the [desired response] so that the animal [student] will be compelled by the laws of his own nature to perform ..." (Thorndike, 1898, in Little, 2014, p. 112). Perhaps fueled by his preference for conducting experiments, as opposed to teaching, Thorndike's contributions to the progressive education movement also included development of tests measuring mental capacity, applying connectionism, and advocating for vocational classes in schools (Hearst, 1999). Using the constructs listed here to illustrate points of similarity and difference, Bagley (e.g. 1922) will argue for a different application of vocational education, in particular, in Chapter 4.

Encapsulating aspects of schooling consistent with Thorndike, Elliott (2001), paraphrasing Hargreaves (1994) stated:

> [M]ass education through public schooling is a cornerstone of modernity and the modern nation state. On one hand, schools and universities make cultural capital and economic success accessible and achievable for many. On the other hand, the public tends to assume that it is natural to educate all children in factory-like settings based on modernity's worship of scientific-industrial constructs. These constructs include curricular 'objectives', standardised curricula, standardised achievement tests, teacher-centred methods, restricted instructional time and age-segregated or ability-segregated classes. Even the design, look, feel, smell, and supervision of many institutions of mass

45

education mimic modernist bureaucratic institutions where standardisation, centralisation, mass production and mass consumption are the norm. (Elliott, 2001, p. 32)

Yet another underlying component to Thorndike's conception of progressive education revolved around his desire to establish educational psychology as a separate discipline (Tomlinson, 1997; Walberg & Haertel, 1992). Walberg and Haertel (1992) explained that Thorndike's commitment to scientific investigations and connecting research with educational practice closely related and connected to aspects and practices of learning and instruction. Walberg and Haertel also credited Thorndike as the founder of educational psychology and contended that his contributions to the discipline remain unmatched. Furthermore, Tomlinson (1997) stated that one of Thorndike's other motivations in undertaking this task might have been to create a science of education where "[b]y atomising and standardising every aspect of the educational process, a cadre of experts and administrators would replace traditional rule-of-thumb methods with scientifically proven practices dovetailed to the needs of a modern state" (p.1).

Elkind (1999) argued that a science of education does not exist given the lack of cross-disciplinary connections between the psychologically-centered educational outcomes of teaching, learning and testing, and sociological and developmental outcomes. Thus, what might be implied by scientific education and the development of a science of education in terms presented by Walberg and Haertel (1992) might be more aptly classified under educational psychology rather than toward a true science of education, as articulated by Elkind (1999).

Regardless of disagreement over the definition of educational psychology and a science of education, Walberg and Haertel (1992) explained that constructs such as testing, classifying, measuring and evaluating students represented congruence with the new, emerging environment

46

in education. The era of scientific education began in the late 1800s, during which time

intelligence testing and the "cataloguing of human abilities" (Walberg & Haertel, 1992, p.8)

flourished. The next section will be organized around key elements of Thorndike's science-

based, progressive education and its application in schools, connecting societal improvement to

the environment and application of scientific principles concerned with teaching and learning.

Testing, measurement, and evaluation. Thorndike's applications of science and

psychology into education stemmed from a combination of his previous experiences with animal

behavior and his professional goals concerning the creation of educational psychology as a

separate discipline (Hearst 1999; Watras, 2009; Walberg and Heartel, 1992). Tomlinson (1997)

echoed this statement and added that Thorndike's ideas stemmed from Thorndike's own

experiences with behavioral psychology, new statistical methods by which increasingly complex

data could be analyzed, and an overarching desire to legitimize psychology as a discipline within

academia. In addition to the perceived benefits that having a science of education, rooted in

psychology, could hold for teachers and students, Tomlinson (1997) explained that Thorndike

wanted to legitimize teacher education as well. Beatty (1998) also drew connections between the

overarching need to professionalize the training of teachers and the rise of educational

psychology, and credited Thorndike with contributions to each. Meanwhile, Gibboney (2006)

noted that modern-day applications of Thorndike's ideas can be seen in our federal policies, such

as No Child Left Behind and the mechanized way by which children are educated today.

Thorndike also believed that a science of educational psychology could explain

individual differences, which contrasted with the predominant belief of faculty psychology

associated with G. Stanley Hall (Beatty, 1998; Moyer, 1981; O'Connell, 1936). Petrina (2004)

explored the limits and boundaries of educational psychology during the time of Thorndike and

47

concluded that the close link between progressive educators and observed individual differences among students called needed attention to the measurement and investigation of precise ways in which students differed from one another. Therefore, learning could be customized to fit these differences. Applied specifically to Thorndike, Beatty (1998) also noted that Thorndike's interest rested on identification of ways in which children were different and documentation of the small changes that happen in children over time. McDermott (1976) offered a specific application in achievement of this goal, as he drew a connection between the creation of research departments in school systems during the 1920s and the need to evaluate, test, and study children systematically. Implied, then, is the idea that as children mature the changes documented are quantitative, rather than qualitative. It follows, also, that through training and ensuring that children make the correct small changes that are desired as they mature into adulthood, the child will ultimately respond correctly to stimuli based on these small changes made throughout time, thus tying together thoughts presented above by Little (2014). Beatty also noted that these thoughts regarding child development as a measure of quantity was in direct opposition to G. Stanley Hall, Dewey and other child-centered methodologists. Also implied by Beatty (1998) was the difference between Thorndike and Hall over genetic and biological foundations for differences in intelligence, reasoning and human behavior found in individuals: "for Hall, genetic psychology meant the history of development through the human race; for Thorndike, genetic psychology meant biologically inherited characteristics in individuals" (Beatty, 1998, p. 1147). Beatty (1998) also noted that World War I contributed to the commercialization of educational psychology, which was made manifest in testing and measurement.

On the subject of gender differences, another thread related to the broad idea of individual differences, Thorndike appeared more liberal in his thoughts regarding women,

careers, and the role of women in society than Hall (Seller, 1981). Despite this more liberal

stance, Thorndike envisioned different career pathways for many women, as compared to men.

Women were not perceived as inferior when compared to men, as Hall suggested. Rather, less

variation in innate ability existed on matters concerning intelligence, though women were

perceived as approximately equal on measures of other abilities (Seller, 1981). On average,

women and men were equal; therefore, grouping should take place according to ability, not

gender. Hence, women should be trained and educated for vocations "where the average level

[of intelligence] is essential" (Seller, 1981, p. 370) and not for professions where "a few gifted

individuals are what society requires" (Seller, 1981, p. 370).

Therefore, for Thorndike, in the name of efficiency, there existed a difference over the

education needed between women and men. Though this difference might imply division along

gender lines, Thorndike did not see these different career tracks for men and women in an

inferior-superior way, but rather in a separate-but-equal fashion in relation to societal needs.

Thus, any relationship between gender and needed skills, knowledge or training needed for a

successful career was intended to be purely coincidental (Seller, 1981).

Despite intent of coincidence, this spurious relationship between gender and career

nonetheless turned problematic for progressive educators adopting Thorndike's stance. As will

be detailed in Chapter 4, classifying students for social efficiency will undermine Bagley's vision

of societal improvement by social progress, which will also contain implications for occupations

and outcomes within education leading to chosen vocations.

Seller (1981) posited that despite Thorndike's perception of separate-but-equal, his

acceptance of separate education for men and women hampered the equality efforts of women

through the progressive education era and beyond. Powers (1992) agreed and noted that one

particularly insidious factor contributing to inferior status for women during the Progressive Era and beyond revolved around home-economics classes in schools. Instead of employing that kind of education for social improvement, it was used to segregate and stratify the genders. This conversation also extended to race and class, as Blanton (2000) noted in his examination of intelligence testing and the assessment of Mexican Americans and African Americans during the 1920s. Though the intent of such measurement, testing and evaluation might not necessarily have been to segregate along racial and classist lines, Blanton (2000) argued that has indeed become the outcome. Therefore, Blanton (2000) placed blame at the feet of the Progressive Educators, such as Thorndike, who originally started the movement in education toward testing, measurement and evaluation. However, Biklen (1978) explored the place of vocational education and women's roles during the Progressive Era, and Lakes (1995) noted that the contributions made in Cincinnati by Helen Woolley and Edith Campbell to advance the cause of industrial training for women during the Progressive Era served as one means for women to achieve independence. Areas women could train in included sewing, office work, and garmet making.

    Ability grouping. Ability grouping has its own history, which parallels many educational trends that vary widely in popularity from one time period to the next. Specific to this discussion on progressive education and Thorndike, however, this practice follows logically as an application of efficiency. As a term, ability grouping is closely linked to tracking; in practice, the two terms are often used interchangeably (e.g. Donlean, Neal & Jones, 1994; Futrell & Gomez, 2008; Gamoran, 2009; Kelly & Carbonaro, 2012; Mayer, 2008), though Thompson (1991) suggested that ability grouping is used in elementary schools, while tracking is the preferred term in secondary schools. Recently, the definition of ability grouping has been

broadened to include within-class grouping in elementary schools (e.g. Petrilli, 2011, Buttaro, Catsambis, Mulkey & Steelman, 2010; Chorzempa & Graham, 2006; Matthews, Ritchotte & McBee, 2013). This broadening definition could suggest that slightly different interpretations of this term could lead to different applications than the somewhat negative connotations and detrimental applications that has previously been associated with it (e.g. Donelan, Neal & Jones, 1994; LaPrade, 2011; Kelly & Carbonaro, 2012; Muskin, 1990). In the 1920s, ability grouping was perceived as a logical outgrowth of the intelligence testing movement. This idea also linked positively with the increased influence of the progressive educators, such as Thorndike, who envisioned systematic testing and measurement of children as one way to increase efficiency of education and provide fair and appropriate instruction. In light of the Space Race and other societal concerns of the 1950s, this link between testing and the desire for ability grouping with respect to the education of children strengthened. Ability grouping in this context took on a more divisive spin, as it was seen as a way to educate children whose abilities were unique, specialized, or above average. In the 1970s, ability grouping declined, as concerns over equality of education and school desegregation in the southern United States emerged as chief concerns (McDermott, 1976). More recently, Sparks (2013) noted that in the 1990s, ability grouping was perceived as discriminatory and not as widely practiced, though controversy emerged around the topic where it was practiced. In yet another swing of the pendulum, a 2013 study by the Brown Center on Educational Policy (Brookings Institute) signaled an uptick in the practice of ability grouping (Sparks, 2013).

Similar to McDermott (1976), Mayer (2008) discussed the practice of ability grouping in a historical context, initially alluding back to the time of Thorndike. Mayer (2008) noted that the practice of sorting students started in the early part of the 20th Century, and represented a shift

from the one-room schoolhouse model prevalent in the 19th Century. Mayer (2008) also noted a strong historical link between vocational preparation and ability grouping, as well as the more insidious outcomes of social control and justification of different educational opportunities for some students. While not focusing on outcomes of ability grouping explicitly, Merritt (2014) extended Mayer's 2008 link between ability grouping and career preparation, and noted that other tracks, also known as ability groups, included college preparation and general education. Bagley will also include his comments related here to different kinds of education in Chapter 4. These kinds of education include general, liberal, vocational, and cultural, and will represent differences between the two tracks identified here.

Merritt (2014) also detailed that students have not always been grouped according to intelligence. The ways students are grouped can extend to interests, learning preferences, and rate of learning. Lucas and Berends (2002) differentiated between two different forms of tracking: de-facto tracking, or the link between students and the subjects taken in school, and de-jure tracking, which is institutionally led. De-facto tracking occurs as students who are high achievers in one school subject tend to achieve highly in many subjects, and associate with like-minded students regardless of classroom. Conversely, de-jure tracking occurs when schools openly group students by ability or across other traits, such as those mentioned by Merritt (2014) (Lucas & Berends, 2002). Thus, even in heterogeneously grouped classes, some amount of grouping might nevertheless occur. Cast in this light, even a broader definition of what constitutes ability grouping and subsequent attempts to spin this idea positively might not be sufficient to control it from taking place, especially when taken with positive associations between de-facto grouping and diversity. As Lucas & Berends (2002) observed: more diversity

within a school tended to lead to more pronounced instances of de-facto grouping, even when student achievement was held constant.

Thus far, it appears that students can either be grouped by the school, or will group themselves in some way. This enduring feature of schooling throughout the 20th century, consistent with Thorndike and supportive of an efficient system, could imply connections to policy and law. If schools intend on taking responsibility for grouping students regardless of means chosen, then steps must be taken to ensure compliance with the law, as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expressely prohibits "within-school discrimination" (Thompson, 1991, p.2). Donelan, Neal, and Jones (1994) argued that tracking provides one means by which disproportionately unequal educational opportunities for African Americans continues long after *Brown v Board of Education.* Donlean cited *Brown v Board of Education*, the supposed elimination of de-jure segregation, and noted a positive relationship between perception of tracks as higher and lower, such as a college-preparatory/vocational education distinction, and quality of instruction. Donlean implied that tracking, on its face is not beneficial or legal. Similarly, Thompson (1991) voiced his concerns before the Congressional Committee on Labor and Human Resources that a lack of monitoring regarding Title VI compliance was leading to discriminatory practices in schools as data were presented that showed the majority of students from minority subgroups occupied lower-ability and special education classes. This testimony could explain Sparks' 2013 claim that ability grouping was perceived as discriminatory in the 1990s. Furthermore, Thompson (1991) stated that there existed no federally agreed-upon guidance for tracking and grouping of students. In order for enforcement of Title VI to take place, clear guidelines were critically needed to define the limits and bounds of ability grouping in schools. Thompson suggested that schools take steps toward re-establishing guidelines for

determining whether or not ability grouping, also known as tracking, was discriminatory or not.

For evidence, Thompson posited that test scores, other relevant, objective measures of evaluation and objective interpretation of such evaluations could be used as an initial litmus test. Also, Thompson noted that these guidelines were established in the Emergency School Aid Act in 1976 but removed in 1981. Explicitly assumed was the educational benefit and value of non-discriminatory ability grouping (Thompson, 1991).

It is worth noting that the assumption of non-discriminatory grouping was contradicted by Donelan, Neal, and Jones (1994). Futrell and Gomez (2008) also explored the delicate balance between non-discriminatory practices, disproportionate numbers of minority children placed in lower tracks, and the practice of tracking itself. Ultimately, they suggested that high academic standards for all children might be achievable under conditions that do not rely on tracking, but rather on systemic changes in school systems themselves, such as fostering greater parental and counselor involvement, equality of access to technology and resources for all children and ensuring that student-teacher ratios are maintained across classrooms. Furthermore, Futrell and Gomez (2008) argued for a highly qualified teacher in every classroom and stated that universal, free, preschool be available. Futrell and Gomez (2008) also asserted that a disproportionate number of minority and economically disadvantaged students have not had the opportunity to learn from the same curriculum that students who succeeded in school have had and from which standardized tests are based. The *Brown v Board of Education* decision that was supposed to guarantee such equality has not been brought to bear in reality (Futrell & Gomez, 2008). In addition to practices of sorting revealing itself through differences in group achievement, especially when students were tracked in high school, and racial and ethnic differences, Kalogrides and Loeb (2013) found that less experienced teachers tended to teach in

classrooms with lower achieving, lower-socioeconomic, minority students. When taken together with Futrell and Gomez (2008), these results suggest the need for systemic changes in education.

Gamoran (2009) argued that ability grouping according to achievement negatively affects productivity and inequality. Pointing to disaggregated data across a wide breadth of previous research, Gamoran used the data gathered to illustrate that high achievers offset performance of the low achievers when student-level data are nested within classes. What is considered an average performance in a classroom is not accurately captured by these data. Furthermore, in many cases where data are disaggregated by ability group, the gap observed between high achievers and low achievers with respect to achievement is most likely not due to chance. Thus, Gamoran's argument against ability grouping rested on the grounds that "tracking tends to exacerbate inequality with little or no contribution to overall productivity" (Gamoran, 2009, p. 4).

Investigating inequality from a different perspective, Brewer, Rees, and Argys (1996) and Brewer, Reese, and Argys (1995) found that curtailing tracking would most likely aid the low achievers at the expense of the high achievers. Therefore, Brewer, Reese, and Argys (1996) contended that the choice to group by ability or not depended on the desire to balance efficiency of instruction and management of education with equality of that education. The theme of efficiency noted by Brewer, Reese, and Argys (1996) links their discussion to Thorndike's original idea as well.

However, Bagley's conception of societal improvement as related to social progress (e.g. 1918b) relies less on efficiency, as characterized here, and more heavily emphasizes equality of status across subjects, occupations and kinds of education. Differences between efficiency, as

characterized here, and Bagley's notion (e.g. 1918b) of social progress will be explained in Chapter 4.

While ability grouping appears to foster some positive instructional benefits and increased student achievement depending on perspective taken, Mulkey, Catsambis, Steelman and Crain (2005) cautioned that students who display high achievement and are not tracked accordingly tend to suffer with respect to social, emotional and academic outcomes. Also highlighting somewhat mixed results, Vogl and Prekel (2014) reported that their sample of 5th and 6th grade gifted students who were grouped homogenously all the time experienced positive social-emotional outcomes (interest, relationships between teacher and student, acceptance), yet there appeared to be no detectible effect on assertiveness in this population. Matthews, Richotte and McBee (2013) highlighted gains in math, as no gains in reading were reported, for gifted children who were grouped separately according to ability, suggesting that ability grouping might not uniformly contribute to gains in student achievement.

When teachers practice within-class grouping, or the grouping of students by ability within a class of mixed-ability, similar mixed benefits have also been noted. Specifically, Chorzempa and Graham (2006) found their sample of reading teachers perceived freedom to differentiate instruction for students beneficial, despite potentially negative side-effects that included links between instructional time and group-level (lower groups tended to spend more time on non-instructional matters) and student-led choice and group-level (lower groups tended to have less choice over reading material). A potentially negative relationship between the use of questions and group level, as students placed in lower groups were less likely to be asked questions of a higher-level reading-comprehension nature (Chorzempa & Graham, 2006). In view of the controversy surrounding arguments for and against ability grouping, ultimately

supported under the socially efficient system desired by Thorndike, perhaps within-class

grouping has acted as a current solution geared toward compromise.

Historical roots of mental ability testing. As mentioned previously, the need to evaluate

American student performance grew out of the desire prevalent in the late 1890s and early 1900s

to document differences among individuals. Then, these individuals could be placed

appropriately in society (Chapman, 1980; von Mayrhauser, 1992). Thorndike's ideas were

readily applied in no small measure. However, other individuals also contributed to a larger

mental testing movement that was also applied in schools and functioned as a subset of ability

grouping and tracking. Though Thorndike has remained closely associated with this movement

in education, he was part of a larger group that worked to advance their cause beginning in the

1890s.

As early as the 1890s, Cattell sought to apply work by William Wundt on the subject

individual differences (McConnell, 1930; von Mayrhauser, 1992). Cattell theorized that

differences in "mental energy" (in von Mayrhauser, p.247) could explain the relationship

between performance on tests of mental ability and inherited mental ability. Applied to

education, Cattell also believed that such tests measuring this energy could aid college students

in selecting a vocation (von Mayrhauser, 1992).

As the growing body of research conducted in the early 1900s by Thorndike and others

such as Wissler and Woodworth demonstrated that performance in one discrete area does not

necessarily predict mental activity (coined *transfer*), divides among psychologists occurred

between those who wanted to support connections between theoretical uses of mental

measurement and those who wanted to apply it (von Mayrhauser, 1992). Thus, competing sets

of assumptions among these two groups existed: the theorists, also known as the formalists,

57

sought empirical support that connections between mental testing and inherited, general intelligence existed. Those who believed more applied uses of this testing "turned outward and ad-hoc, toward the needs of school boards and business employers, to advance the pursuit of happiness as middle-class managers defined it" (von Mayrhauser, 1992, p. 248) were known as pluralists. The cultural and intellectual import of pluralism during this time is not a small consideration, as Cravens (1985) noted. Speaking against the mental testing movement and advocating for the role that the environment played in nurturing intelligence, Cravens (1985) contended that the pluralists eventually diverged, at least in part, from traditional psychology and found resonance with the movement concerned with the well-being of children. Additionally, the rise of the pluralists also signified a reaction against the supposition that intelligence is inherited.

As the United States entered World War I, the need to evaluate performance, classify and manage personnel in the military emerged (Chapman, 1980). Yerkes, then president of the American Psychological Society (APA), solicited input regarding assistance psychologists could provide to the war effort that might also aid in legitimizing psychology as a science (Haney, 1984). The Committee on the Classification of Personnel in the Army was formed. Leading scholars on the forefront of this larger mental testing movement, a term first used by Cattell in the 1890s, including Yerkes, Terman, Scott and Thorndike formed the core of this committee charged with designing an evaluative system by which the military could classify its members efficiently and determine the best candidates suitable for each kind of position in the organization (von Mayrhauser, 1992). Interestingly, the members of this committee as listed here represent a synthesis of formalists (Yerkes) and pluralists (Thorndike and Scott), with Terman occupying the middle ground. As von Mayrhauser (1992) noted, these members of the

committee were forced to compromise on their beliefs for the sake of client satisfaction, who in this case, was the military. Using Thorndike's conception of reliability, which ultimately settled a dispute between Yerkes and Terman, Thorndike's solution "set the precedent for separating experimental reliability from a method of legitimation the required a criterion extrinsic to test construction" (von Mayrhauser, 1992, p. 252).

This solution of Thorndike's rested on the premise that the intrinsic properties in the test itself made it a reliable instrument that could be used for consistent results over time. The suitability of this solution thus convinced the client, the military, to authorize the committee to develop the "instrument that would become the profession's most influential contribution to society" (von Mayrharuser, 1992, p. 252). In fact, multiple instruments were developed and refined: the "Army Alpha" (for recruits who could read and write), "the Army Beta" (for those who could not) and the "Rating Scale for Selecting Captains" (Haney, 1984; von Maryhauser, 1992).

Such mental tests for sorting students also became popular throughout education, developing in parallel fashion and in a similar timeframe, between the late 1890s into the 1920s (Haney, 1984). Similar to the tests designed for the military, these tests found in education were designed to measure intelligence, mental capacity, and wide ranges of abilities. As Haney (1984) noted, Terman became a notable advocate for the use of testing for educational and vocational counseling, and ability grouping. These tests, then, also filled the gaping void for efficient, scientific means of classifying students (Chapman, 1980). Many of the tests used were direct applications from the Army's tests, tailored to suit the needs of schools, and developed by Terman, Thorndike, and Yerkes (Haney, 1984).

Similar to tracking, the history of classifying students based on performance on tests has sparked debates on the inequality that has arisen from such a practice (Haney, 1984). Speaking to this idea, Chapman (1980) and Haney (1984) also noted the biases in these early tests, and traced the notion of inequality through content on these early measures. However, Chapman (1980) asserted that the original intent of these progressive educators was not to engage in overtly discriminatory practices. Rather, the intent of these educators rested on efficient means and practices for education. This conclusion also highlights the disconnect between intent and results, which was also seen earlier in the discussion of individual differences and gender from a perspective more consistent with Thorndike.

The use of testing during this era for the purpose of classifying students in the name of educational efficiency was not without its share of controversy. The documentation set forth by Ryan (2011) detailing the state of the Chicago Public Schools between 1899 and 1928 provided a particularly rich case example. As debate waged in Chicago among the union of teachers, superintendent, and local board of education, over the use, application, and impacts of mass-intelligence testing, Ryan (2011) noted that one faction of progressive administrators saw this move toward mass testing as a means by which to serve children who were "less favored … and such education cannot be conducted on guess work …" (p. 344). A closer examination reveals that the phrase "less favored" extended to children with special [mental] needs, or as caustically put in the language of the late 1890s-early 20th Century "feeble-minded, subnormal … or backward [children] …" (Ryan, 2011, p.343-344). Ryan (2011) also noted that one place within the school that these children could be placed (in addition to separate classrooms) was on the vocational education track. Ultimately, as Ryan (2011) implied, a curious contradiction emerged among certain stakeholders in education in Chicago in light of a population boom, an influx of

60

an increasingly diverse student population with varying needs, and the strain on the public school education system to try to accommodate all children and educate them accordingly, as the progressive educators' espoused goal of societal improvement through education and the use of testing for social control was brought to the forefront.

However, this contradiction did not extend to certain mid-level administrators, as Ryan (2011) noted. Despite some stakeholders at the local and state level who used the platform created by intelligence testing as a window of opportunity to extend testing to reading, writing, and math, many administrators in Chicago were cautious, and extremely limited in their implementation of testing, mostly confining it to identifying those children who were "subnormal or feeble-minded" (p. 353) and providing services for those children. Furthermore, these same administrators who critically examined the use of testing thus were able to generate enough skepticism around this issue to fend off large-scale testing of students in Chicago until the mid-1920s (Ryan, 2011).

However valiant the efforts of the administrators in Chicago might have been to stave off mental testing, at least temporarily, this movement was nevertheless quite popular across education in the time period surrounding World War I. Antecedents that explain the Pre-World-War I popularity of testing also included increasingly sophisticated statistical analyses capable of providing answers to equally complex quantitative problems, such as factor analysis, translations of the Binet intelligence test into English with Yerkes contributing one translation, and promises of creation of other tests and measures that could possess the power to predict achievement in school which would lead to greater instructional efficiency (Haney, 1984).

From the 1930s to the early 1950s, testing expanded into achievement tests and standardized tests (Haney, 1984).   The impact of World War II on such testing was largely

minimal, as most tests simply needed a small degree refinement to be widely applicable across both the school and the military (Haney, 1984). Though controversy over the interpretation and use of tests still abounded, especially as the controversy related to unequal conditions and inequality of opportunity for minority ethnic and racial groups as compared to the majority, testing in the 1950s had not appreciably changed when viewed with the rapid development seen in the first quarter of the 20th century (Haney, 1984). Selection and tracking continued to function as major outcomes (Linn, 2000). The significant changes in testing would, however, be evident, beginning in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Haney, 1984).

Linn (2000) noted that testing from the 1950s through the 1990s continued to occupy a major place in American schools, despite many changes and reforms across education:

> At times, a new reform involves a major shift or pendulum swing as one ideological camp gains ascendance over another. Sometimes, a major shift may be supported by a legislative mandate or by policies adopted by state or local boards of education. (p. 4)

The major appeal of widespread testing in schools from the 1960s through the 1990s despite these shifts has revolved around ease of implementation, requirement, expense, and results. Linn (2000) asserted that it is relatively simple for policymakers to demand testing and also relatively easy to find tests for students to take. When the cost of hiring teachers and training teachers in new instructional approaches that might increase effectiveness is weighed with test-taking, the latter emerges as a less-expensive alternative. Furthermore, tests offer concrete results that can be distributed widely while also offering policymakers the opportunity to view any short-term gain made from one test to the next as political fodder for elections.

Despite the appeal of testing, the emphasis of tests has changed from tracking, which was prevalent in the 1950s to evaluating programs in the 1960s. During the 1970s and early 1980s, minimum competency testing pervaded education. This brief period was followed by a strict school accountability movement in the 1980s and standards-based accountability in the 1990s (Linn, 2000; Haertel & Herman, 2005). The accountability movement has continued into the present period, with No Child Left Behind dictating strict standards for school, district and student accountability with regard to standards and content tested. This shift to testing content and standards, however, has signaled yet another underlying purpose for testing students. As Haertel and Herman (2005) noted, that purpose has traditionally centered on mastery of common content and equality of access to that content in schools. Also, in the case of exams taken for graduation, tests speak to "the idea that high school exit exams will reflect the standards that students much reach for future success" (Haertel & Herman, 2005, p. 24).

However, more problems than resolutions have resulted with this current, increased focus on standards-based accountability (Linn, 2000; Haertel & Herman, 2005). Impacts have included narrow test-based teaching and a continued nonresolution to aspects of inequality found often in schools. Furthermore, underperforming schools tend to spend more instructional time on teaching to the standards so that their students can pass, and schools can earn acceptable ratings. Based on these impacts, Haertel & Herman (2005) asserted that teaching solely to the test does not instruct students in "essentials of the discipline or meaningful learning (p. 24) and might also lead to test score inflation. In that sense, Haertel and Herman (2005) argued that problems such as these that have lingered since the 1970s base-minimum competency movement have not ultimately been resolved.

Though Linn (2000) suggested that value-added accountability systems might provide an additional perspective into school and student improvement through testing, wide variations in models using value-added metrics have perhaps convoluted an otherwise viable solution. Debates over the use of exogenous factors such as socio-economic status, school attendance, gender, and ethnicity in any value-added model have persisted, with Webster and Mendro (1997) attempting to account for such factors in the model used by the Dallas Independent School District. By contrast, Sanders and Horn (1995), architects of the Tennessee Value Added Accountability System (TVAAS), argued that only student achievement scores be used in assessing achievement growth of students from one year to the next and assessing teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, questions regarding causal inferences, particularly with regard to the role of the teacher in impacting student achievement, have also added a high degree of controversy in using value-added modeling as a measure of school accountability despite any internal mathematical and statistical strength (McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz & Hamilton, 2003; Sanders & Horn, 1995; Sanders, Saxton & Horn, 1997; Wainer, 2011).

The search for any test, series of tests, or models to serve as a source of information, solve problems and offer positive impacts for schools speaks largely of the pursuit of quantitative data, interpretation of that data, and a bent toward applications of science. As seen, this particular aspect of progressive education is largely consistent with Thorndike's conception, despite consequences such as a narrow test-based curriculum, persistent inequality, and current questions surrounding mathematical, value-added modeling and subsequent interpretation of data generated from that model (Haertel & Herman, 2005; Linn, 2000; McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz & Hamilton, 2003; Sanders & Horn, 1995; Sanders, Saxton & Horn, 1997; Wainer, 2011). Given the current, increased role of federal involvement in schools, which impacts funding and

64

structure of those schools (e.g. Haertel & Herman, 2005; Linn, 2000), the turn toward

measurement, testing, and accountability and link of those constructs to generation of data,

through testing, which is then used for mathematical or scientific purposes seems to have grown

stronger during the time from the initial passing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

in 1965 to the present day.

Application of evaluation and testing in music education. Given that the majority of this

section has focused on the principle of social efficiency, associated with classification,

measurement, testing, and evaluation, this section will briefly discuss those applications in music

education. Specifically, this section will focus on assessments of students in relation to

achievement and mastery of learning objectives, and aptitude. It is these applications seen in

music education that are perhaps most consistent with Thorndike's system of efficiency. While

it is above and beyond the purpose of this section to detail a comprehensive history of

assessment in music education, the presence and relative debate surrounding the construct itself

not only appears to mirror trends seen across education, but also can largely be understood as a

logical outgrowth of progressive education, broadly associated with Thorndike. The need to

assess students across all classes within the public schools, then, is not necessarily limited

exclusively to the subjects traditionally considered members of the core curriculum.

Assessment in music education can encompass measurement of individual singing

achievement and aptitude among elementary school students (e.g. Hornbach & Taggart, 2006;

Levinowitz, Barnes, Guerrini, Clement, D'April & Morey, 1998; Persellin, 2006; Rutkowski,

1996, 2013; Rutkowski & Miller, 2003a,b; Svec, 2015). Other kinds of assessments have

focused on individual, and ensemble performances at contests and festivals (e.g. Hash, 2012) as

summative measures designed to measure achievement or mastery after instruction.

Assessments focusing on student achievement and mastery could also include summative, and formative assessments undertaken by music teachers in their own classrooms (e.g. Goolsby, 1999; Scott, 2012). Goolsby (1999) also noted that placement and diagnostic assessments are common to music classrooms, and can be used to classify students. Each of these varieties can also be classified under either summative or formative assessment, depending on use. Asmus (1999) detailed that authentic assessments and portfolio assessments also provide valuable data with regard to the process and product, in addition to relative mastery or achievement against predetermined standards. Taken as a whole, the subject of assessment in music education continues to be debated for its relative positives, negatives, and justifications based on the current high-stakes testing and school accountability context throughout education (Fisher, 2008; Hash, 2012). However, the additional link between perception of effectiveness and score achieved or award earned at festivals and contests adds a palpable amount of complexity to an issue already debated (Austin, 1990). Additionally, this link is often subsumed under the broad umbrella of assessment or accountability, yet can also be contrasted with any standardized, individual test or evaluation based on who is being measured and what criteria upon which they are being measured. Taken together, the close link established in music education between group ensemble performance at festivals, competition, and any perception of effectiveness might suggest a need for further clarity with regard to the broad construct of assessment, despite broad congruence with progressive education framed historically by Thorndike's ideas. In Chapter 4, I will show how Bagley's ideas regarding societal improvement through social progress contrast with the idea of efficiency. Then, I will use that material presented to explore a differing, Bagleyian view related to competition as a form of assessment. In Chapter 5, I will suggest how

the domain of music education might operationalize and conceptualize competition differently than the purely progressive notion presented above.

A Brief Interlude

Thus far, the discussion over progressive education has centered on key themes and outcomes of a progressive education framed by Dewey and Thorndike. In describing these key features, the two approaches appear drastically different; however, the tie that binds the two together is the central assumption of societal improvement. Dewey saw equal import to the social, emotional, and academic development of students. Therefore, schools functioned as life itself as primary means for societal improvement. Thorndike's desire to codify a science of education as a set of underlying, foundational principles that could be efficiently applied throughout education logically led him, and by extension, the domain of education, to seek out applications into it that were grounded in scientific methods of inquiry and study. Thus, aspects of education could be researched, measured, and evaluated for societal improvement. As has been shown through the preceding discussion, schools framed with Dewey's ideas in mind are characterized differently than progressive ideas stemming from Thorndike. As also mentioned, Bagley will agree with certain ideas discussed here, and depart from others, which will be discussed in Chapter 4.

As also detailed previously in this chapter, vocational education exists as a major outcome and defining feature of a progressive education framed by Thorndike. The domain of vocational education, however, has taken a slightly different journey through time and has evolved into a current blend and application of different progressive ideals. The next section will discuss vocational education framed with that consideration in mind and introduce associated policy as well as one contributing factor toward this different developmental track. In

Chapter 4, Bagley will introduce his vision for vocational education that will ultimately emerge as a criticism of both kinds of progressive education as well.

<div align="center">Vocational Education as a Blend of Each Framer's Ideas.</div>

The education that a student needs for productivity in society as an adult is not limited to what can be learned in a classroom. Given that one major assumption of progressive educators has involved the use of education for societal improvement, specific kinds of education might be needed for the kind of work that a continuously-improving and advancing society needs. This work, however, can change through time, given certain societal changes. As Spiggle (2001) noted:

> Economic growth during and after World War II enabled high school graduates across the country to find employment that supported a middle-class lifestyle. It became increasingly difficult for individuals without a college education to obtain such employment, however, as the United States began losing manufacturing jobs in the 1970s. At the same time, overseas competition placed downward wage pressure on U.S. jobs requiring only basic skills. More and more, people with only a high school diploma found themselves unable to find well-paying work that provided opportunities for advancement. This crisis triggered a wave of school reform initiatives intended to tailor U.S. educational curriculum to the requirements of a changing workplace. (p.1)

Needed, then, is an evolving workforce, with skill sets that ultimately reflect societal changes (Wraga, 1998). Since schools play a role in the kind of education it provides to its students, schools also have an implied responsibility to ensure that this kind of (progressive) education addresses needs found in society. By extension, schools also have the responsibility to present opportunities for and subsequently prepare students for the kind of work they could

reasonably undertake after schooling. Since the kinds of work adults undertake as occupations

can be highly variable, and can involve the need for postsecondary education or not, two tracks

have traditionally separated students along these very lines: the college-preparatory track and the

vocational track (Spiggle, 2001; Uriquiola, et al., 1997; Worthington & Juntunen, 1997).

Despite waxing and waning in relative popularity, and link between inequality, tracking

and outcomes, as discussed above, vocational education remains a central to a progressive

education (Wraga, 1998). This form of education continues to see a palpable amount of

resurgence in scope and influence, perhaps as a kind of response to the desire to keep the United

States economically competitive, given rapid changes in American society (Wraga, 1998). A

useful rationale becomes an economic one, then, as Lynch (2000) noted, and Bagley (e.g. 1914b,

1943) will agree with. As Maxwell and Rubin (2000) also stated, mismatches between skills

taught and skills needed would not keep the United States competitive, nor would the widening

economic gap between college-educated workers and non-college-educated workers. Extending

that rationale further, the argument that innovation and societal progression also necessitates a

different kind of worker gains a certain amount of relevance. Thus, this kind of argument can

prove useful in constructing a rationale while also fitting the surrounding environment. This

argument can be further strengthened with the idea that these workers, with new skills and who

will improve society, must be trained in some way in the context of a formal education. It is this

support that advocates for vocational education have used, and Bagley (e.g. 1943) will also use,

to strengthen their position with regard to utility and status and thus change perceptions of their

kind of education in the process.

Taking a descriptive perspective, Burke (2004) detailed the evolution of vocational

education to its present day incarnation of career education and also noted that a critical shift in

thought. In the case of vocational education, that thought paradigm involved a close association with non-college attendance, or jobs associated with the industrial domain. Career education, by contrast, does not carry with it such an association, and instead has connoted the idea that students will be taught rigorous academics and thinking skills as well, in conjunction with the specialized, technical training needed to succeed in a career. Meanwhile Miller (2002) acknowledged that career and technical education has been drastically and positively reformed, yet she qualifies that positive reform by noting that a lack of evidence regarding the long-term effects of such programs exists. Miller (2002) also posited that the positive benefits noted that are frequently linked to reforms (career academies, authentic learning contexts) could also be explained by many factors that are present without a direct focus on a specific career. These factors that Miller (2002) explored include high academic standards with emphasis on the core curriculum, rigorous requirements for high school graduation, completion of an algebra-based course by the end of 8th grade, meaningful learning centering on relevant classwork, small learning communities, well-informed, high quality teachers, and early career guidance. Taken together, Burke (2004) and Miller (2002) provided support for perception of vocational education as equal in status to a liberal education.

Reform at the legislative and policymaking level. In addition to the conspicuous blend of Dewey's ideas which include small learning communities, authentic assessment and Thorndike's ideas which include preparation for a vocation, tracked education or education along a specified pathway, career education has also received an amount of support and advocacy at the policymaker and legislative level. Fleischman and Heppen (2009) underscored the idea that policymakers and those stakeholders concerned with the link between legislation and education can play a vital, supportive role in the continued change in perception of career education. That

70

sentiment is shared by Lynch (2000) who also added, in concordance with Miller (2002) that authentic assessment and authentic learning contexts function as critical aspects of career education. These aspects that must be maintained in order for meaningful reform to take place (Lynch, 2000).

One specific turning point calling attention to the scope and subsequent reform of vocational education occurred when the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) passed at the Federal level in 1994. In addition to providing an impetus for shifting assumptions concerning career (vocational) education within public schools from psychological aspects to economic aspects, the STWOA specifically provided some needed resources, funding in the form of venture capital, and guidance to state and local entities (Krumboltz & Worthington, 1999; Worthington & Juntunen, 1997; Spiggle, 2001; Uirqula, et al., 1997). However, Hershey, Hudis, Haimson and Silverberg (1997) observed that many schools that had a vocational education track already constructed programs that met most of the desired aspects intended by the STWOA. This shift in assumptions from psychological to economic also might imply a different decision-making process where tracking is concerned. Whereas Thorndike desired a science of education grounded in psychological principles and to be able to explain individual differences so that each individual could be meaningfully educated and subsequently placed in society according to those differences, thus resulting in amount of goodness-of-fit between education received and career undertaken in society. Economic benefits, then, are simply a by-product. However, the language in the SWOTA assumed that goodness-of-fit between career and education is economic; thus, the by-product in this case are the individual differences. Vocational education, as conceptualized in the 1990s, in light of this policy, was conceived as a viable alternative for students who might not attend college, yet needed career development, or a skill or trade with

71

which a professional occupation was associated (Uriqula, et al., 1997; Worthington & Juntunen, 1997). To sidestep any separate-but-unequal arguments, and to avoid any perception of tracking as a hierarchical concept, where vocational education would be perceived as a lower track when compared to a college-preparatory track, Uriqula, et al. (1997) noted several strategies used for successful implementation, and to a certain degree, marketing. These strategies included integrating academic and specialized skill knowledge in applied settings which provides a context for work-based learning to thrive, and a rigorous foundational education for all students until the last two years of high school. It is only then that Uriqula, et al. (1997) suggested that students can be placed onto a college-preparatory or vocational-education track. Under this model, the gap is bridged between the final high school years and first years of coursework. In total, this model not only leads to a degree in a technical domain, but also "[creates] new curricular options that prepare high school students for both college and careers by organizing academic instruction around broad occupational themes; thus, satisfying prerequisites for admission to four-year college while at the same time including enough practical applications to give graduates a foothold in the skilled labor market" (Uriqula, et al., 1997, p. 16).

Bragg and Reger (2002) pointed to the reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act of 1998 (as well as earlier Perkins legislation preceding that reauthorization) as a factor for the continued reforms in vocational and technical education. In their longitudinal study, spanning four years, they recommended that future legislative policies include more specificity with regard to college transition from high school, more funding and diverse opportunities for all students, continued academic rigor, closer partnerships with institutions of higher education and a clearer distinction between programs that lead to immediate employment after high school graduation and those that do not.

Despite viability and the strides career education has taken to reform itself given changing expectations within education, Brand (2003) outlined very specific ideas for improving career and technical education, many of which echo the language contained in the STWOA. Her suggestions, similar to those envisioned by Uriqula, et al. (1997) included a rigorous academic curriculum in grades 9 and 10, while transitioning to specialized courses in 11th and 12th grade. These specialized courses centering on a specific career that Brand (2003) advocates for could take place within a comprehensive high school, at a separate career academy, or in an early college environment. To ensure high achievement and rigor with respect to academics and career preparation, Brand (2003) suggested that instructional goals and objectives be aligned with No Child Left Behind and assessed accordingly. Brand (2003) also criticized state funding and suggested that most funding for these career-centered programs be awarded on a competitive basis, rather than on an egalitarian one.

Career academies as applied examples of policy. Differing goals and strategies for effectively educating students who choose the vocational education track imply that this track might need different resources or structure within the same school that contains a college-preparatory track, or in an entirely separate school. To that end, career academies have evolved as one possible model of school that specializes in vocational, career education. Key features of such a school include small cohorts of students, teaching an optimal combination of career and college-preparatory content, and establishing partnerships with businesses and prospective employers (Burke, 2004; Castellano, Stringfield & Stone, 2002; Stern, 2001; Stern, Dayton & Raby, 2000).

Stern (2001) and Stern, Dayton & Raby (2000) also noted that this kind of model for a school appears to satisfy several conditions set forth by educational reformers. In addition to a

goodness-of-fit with the school-to-work movement, discussed in the context of policy earlier, Stern (2001) also asserted that career academies link well with the reforms desired by the Coalition of Essential Schools, and the small-schools movement. This assertion lends support to the viability of career academies as an application of one model of education that combines differing philosophical ideas under the same progressive framework. Despite the optimistic position taken by Stern (2001) and Stern, Dayton and Raby (2000), Miller (2002) implied that such factors, in addition to others she detailed, which have been discussed above, while often present in effective career academies, can also be present in other school environments. The career academy, then, can be a kind of spurious variable, unless carefully studied. Miller (2002) also warned that outcomes must be carefully documented that are solely attributed to the career academy itself.

Factors influencing outcomes. Pointing to a possible relationship between students and educational outcomes, Rubin and Ramaswami (2013) called attention to the importance of student selection in their study of career education, acknowledged the Perkins legislation of 1984, and subsequent reauthorizations of that Act as particular catalysts for the transformation of the substance of vocational and career education. Using their results that analyzed relationships between student success on standardized tests, gender, socioeconomic status (measured by qualification for free and reduced lunch), grade-point-average from middle school on a specific set of admission qualifications for entrance into one vocational and technical education program, Rubin and Ramaswami (2013) used their findings to imply that student selection into these programs is of critical importance when, given the significant positive relationships found between the set of qualifications needed for acceptance and predictor-set of variables. Therefore, Rubin and Ramaswami (2013) provided an argument that vocational and career education can

74

potentially serve students who might otherwise have not been considered for the vocational education track.

Fletcher and Cox (2012) noted that minority enrollment in vocational and career education has decreased recently, while enrollment among Caucasian and Asian students has increased. Fletcher and Cox (2012) detailed that represents a shift worth investigation, given that vocational and technical education program enrollment was historically dominated by African American and Hispanic students. Thus, Fletcher and Cox (2012) sought to document the lived experiences in their sample of African American students enrolled in one career and technical education high school. Citing potential challenges in the experiences of their sample, Fletcher and Cox (2012) noted that these students felt a sense of disconnection between academic subjects and technical subjects and decreased time for activities within the school. Though Fletcher and Cox (2012) documented positive aspects of their schooling experience, the students' perception of disconnection of academic rigor is particularly striking given that vocation and career education programs have achieved a certain amount of recent attention for collective attempts to strengthen academic rigor within these kinds of schools and programs.

Critical of more recent outcomes, Lewis (2008) posited that the latest round of reauthorization of career and technical legislation that was authorized in 2006 has not been supported in its effectiveness with regard to school-to-work transitions. Similarly, Rojeweski, Lee and Gemici (2010) also casted doubt on the effectiveness of career academies and postsecondary outcomes based on their results that failed to find a significant difference in career goals between those students who attended a career academy in 9th and 10th grade and those who did not. Though Rojeweski, Lee and Gemici conducted an additional analysis that revealed their

initial test might have understated the lack of statistical significance, they do not discount that there might be practical significance to their results.

Kemple and Snipes (2000) detailed that outcomes of their study involving career academies ranged from improved high school graduation rates to students' senses of greater ownership of their education, despite no significant achievement gains in math or reading. Meanwhile, Ahmad (2009) concluded that the career academy model appeared to be effective, given that he did not find a statistically significant difference in language arts test scores between students within the academy. Left unsaid, however, was whether or not the test scores analyzed in this school were significantly different from students who attended a traditional, comprehensive high school. Based on the longevity and sustainability of the career academy as a model of school reform, Stern, Dayton and Raby (2010) concluded that these kinds of schools appear to foster positive outcomes in achievement and post-graduate vocational success among students. When taken together, a tentative conclusion could be drawn that career academies, when implemented with other aspects of school reform, can foster positive outcomes and potentially mitigate some endemic issues in public schools.

However, Ryken (2006) did not entirely agree. Ryken explored decision-making processes related to career choice among urban students who participated in a career and technical education program. Based on the data analyzed, Ryken concluded that participation in a career academy empowered the participants in her study to envision a wide variety of careers for themselves, despite awareness of program shortcomings. However, Ryken noted that making a choice in one career eliminates other career possibilities, so careful balance between openness to alternate options along any given career pathway and progress down a chosen pathway is always critical to maintain.

Fletcher (2012) also found that despite increased, recent relevance and transformation within career and technical education programs, students who graduated from these programs continued to remain less likely to find employment, as compared to students graduating on the traditional, general high school track. Hence, a note of caution could be taken regarding the effectiveness of such programs and academies when it comes to outcomes over longer periods of time.

Career education in the context of school reform. Castellano, Stringfield and Stone (2002) found that comprehensive school reform can take one of several forms, of which career academies can play an integral part. Career academies, as one specific model of comprehensive school reform, functioned as one factor that potentially influenced at-risk students to complete school. Combined with reform efforts and supporting structures that include career pathways, partnerships that ensure a smooth school-to-work transition and a rigorous, highly applicable school curriculum, Castellano, Stringfield and Stone concluded that career education reform effort can be sustaining and offer many positive opportunities and entry points into the workforce. Underpinning this conclusion, then is the progressive tenet of education for societal improvement, with specific direction toward a particular vocation, which Thorndike extolled as a primary outcome of education.

Kuo (2010) detailed similar features of successful career academies consistent with Castellano, Stringfield, and Stone (2002), with additionally-implied ties to Dewey and Thorndike. However, Kuo (2010) did not limit his findings to students considered at-risk. Thus, career academies and their associated characteristics, might offer the benefits of increased academic achievement, increased high school graduation rates, and career success to students regardless of specialized population.

77

Adding to this body of research, Little, Erbstein, and Walker (1996) found that the goal of college and career readiness of the career academy are best achieved when combined with an interdisciplinary curriculum, authentic modes of assessment, and cross-curricular collaboration among faculty. The implication from Little, Erbstein, and Walker (1996) revolved around the critical need for schools to take an intentional role in its own reform, and customize these broad tenets of school-reform-effectiveness into applied examples. This sentiment is shared by Quint (2006), who advocated for support for practitioners, as it is these practitioners who often must search for ways to apply what has been mandated with little guidance. Danley and Waters (2002) also echoed the idea that career academies, and the ensuing school-to-work education received by students, must be customized to fit both student's needs and society's needs. Danley and Waters (2002) also suggested that a combination of technical skill and core knowledge be taught in the context of a school-to-work education. In this way, Danley and Waters offered a blend of essentialist education and progressive education. While a blended idea will be discussed in subsequent chapters and applied to music education within the public schools, it is worthwhile to consider that other domains also appear to recognize and call for the need to blend a set of technical skills with a set of knowledge needed in order to be thought of as educated. Though Danley and Waters (2002) referred to core knowledge under the guise of learning and skills common to all, they do not explicitly connect their definition of core knowledge, or common learning (p.3) to Hirsch's definition of common skills, or core knowledge, though similarities do exist.

Quint (2006) contended that reform efforts focused on transforming high schools into career academies, as part of larger reform efforts including programs such as First Things First and Talent Development, could solve persistent problems of school failure, among a disparate

number of minority students, as well as those from urban and rural backgrounds. Additionally, Quint (2006) posited that the high school dropout rate among students from these aforementioned populations could also be positively impacted. Also, Jordan, McPartland, Legters and Balfanz (2002) noted that the career academy could also hold the potential to solve such continuing problems in schools.

Fleischman and Heppen (2009) asserted that career academies can help mitigate problems commonly associated with low-performing schools. These problems include a high rate of dropouts and low student achievement. Career academies, as part of comprehensive high school reform efforts, can also help change the public school educational paradigm by preparing students for a career, which assumes societal improvement, while also maintaining high degrees of academic rigor. Fleischman and Heppen (2009) qualified their argument, however, by acknowledging that questions of effectiveness in such reform efforts remain, as does the lack of evidence-based reform that might influence educational evolution.

Applications to music education. Students can study music within the context of a trade, skill or career. These applications, mostly consistent with vocational education, function as a unique blend between progressive framers, as has been discussed. However, the application of music study in this context has remained relatively limited to the Community College context, with fewer systematic investigations conducted.

Powe (2010) used Alabama as her case example and posited that most music-as-industry courses tend to be restricted to community colleges and other two-year institutions designed with an economic and workforce rationale in mind. Course offerings designed with this context in mind included audio recording techniques, song writing and an introductory class in commercial music (Powe, 2010). Noting the lack of support for this kind of study of music, Powe (2010)

found that only one degree connected with the music industry was offered in Alabama. Judging from the lack of investigations on this topic, widespread implementation of music-as-industry courses has been quite limited. However, this economic and workforce rationale for certain subjects designed to equip students with a trade or skill (e.g. Cohen & Brawer, 2009), bears striking parallels to vocational education seen in high schools. Thus, this kind of rationale potentially underpinning music study in a community college context functions as an upward extension of vocational education seen in high schools while speaking of a progressive education orientation.

Laprade (2009) spoke to the varied nature of participation in music in a two-year college environment. These varied methods of participation range from first musical exposure through a foundational class, to a desire to transfer credits earned, or to acquire skills in need of remediation before transferring. Though Laprade (2009) did not directly mention careers associated with music as an industry, his connections tied him closer to Gates (1991) and revolved around the ways in which individuals can engage with music in this context.

Friedlander (1975) found that nearly three-quarters of community colleges offered music history or appreciation for the purpose of transfer. Though Friedlander (1975) confined the scope of his study to only these courses, his finding suggests very little change in the scope of music curricula in this context over time, when taken with Powe's 2010 finding that currently most music courses are offered are of that same variety as well.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

This chapter has focused on a description of a progressive education, which was historically framed by Dewey and Thorndike. Though these two framers worked under the same progressive assumption of education for societal improvement, the two took diverging pathways

in application of this assumption. For Dewey, social-emotional outcomes, academic outcomes, schools as places of community, mutual problem-solving and shared inquiry between teachers and students defined societal improvement. By contrast, Thorndike saw differentiated educational tracks, testing, measurement, and evaluation and application and discovery of immutable scientific laws that underpinned learning as his chosen pathway by which schools could work toward greater efficiency and organization.

This chapter also included a discussion of vocational education as a means to bridge the gap of progressive framers. Through this discussion, the transformation of this kind of education from its perception of a lesser, non-college preparatory track to one that is nearly equal with a traditional high school or college-preparatory education was highlighted. Through a blend of ideas, the possibility remains that many more domains across education can benefit and advocate for their disciplines based in this blend.

However, this side of progressive education and its ensuing blend represents only one side of the set of collective voices engaged in current educational reform. The other side, which also must be represented, are the essentialist educators, who operate under a set of fundamentally different assumptions than the progressives. Therefore, in Chapter 3, a discussion of essentialist education will be undertaken, concentrating on current more conservative applications. Through that description of an essentialist education, which will be taken together with the material presented in this chapter that also includes initial references to points of agreement and disagreement by Bagley, the crux of the debate between the progressives, conservative essentialists, and Bagley over the purpose of a formal education will come to the forefront.

CHAPTER 3

FEATURES OF A CONSERVATIVE ESSENTIALIST EDUCATION

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter will be to describe key features, outcomes, and applications of conservative essentialist education. A secondary purpose of this chapter will be to situate those outcomes in a more current context, as essentialist education has gained recent popularity across education. Currently, E.D. Hirsch, Jr. is perhaps strongly associated with this movement through works such as *Cultural Literacy* (1988), and his Core Knowledge Curriculum materials (e.g. http://www.coreknowledge.org/about-the-curriculum). However, Mortimer Adler also stood as a prominent figure who advocated for the cultural transmission of knowledge earlier in the 20th century (Casement, 1999; Weltman, 2002). Taking into account the relatively recent, 20th century rise of essentialism, factors potentially influencing this increase in popularity will be discussed as well. Additionally, given that the popularity of essentialists has been more current, and also relatively limited in influence when compared to the dominance of progressive education in public schools (e.g. Setran, 2012; Popkewitz, 2011; Zimiles, 2008), this chapter will be slightly limited in scope and depth of coverage when compared to Chapter 2.

Nonetheless, the overall viability of essentialism must be explored and assumed to have relevant applications for the domain of education. Holma (2007) suggested that the idea of essentialism is feasible in education provided that common features among all humans are identified, which are not "'essential features' of their reference group" (p. 46) as is commonly suggested, but "[a definition of] things essential for good human life in light of our experience" (p. 47). Using this definition of essentialism and applying it to gender equality and education, Holma posited ways in which such equality can be accommodated in this modern educational climate. As such, Holma also provided an argument for a complete and thorough understanding

of a complex idea, such as essentialism, before it is cast aside based on surface observations. In a similar vein, Horsthemke (2009) contended that in order to properly understand educational reform in a cultural context, the emphasis must be on examining impacts of education on aspects of human nature common to all, rather than adopting a relativistic stance.

These thoughts of Holma (2007) and Horsthemke (2009) will be explored directly in Chapter 4, in relation to Bagley's differing, moderating conception of essentialism. Horsthemke's idea of common elements will be applied in Chapter 5, where I will suggest common elements upon which the domain of music education can use to move toward a rationale for public school music education.

One defining feature of essentialist education rests on the prime importance of content. Content, in this strictly essentialist view, represents a body of facts as knowledge that individuals should know in order to be perceived as educated (e.g. Hirsch, 1988, 1993, 1999). That content, in the form of knowledge, then, can be transmitted as a kind of replication to successive generations. Therefore, one primary task of essentialist educators revolves around specifying the kinds of facts that will be transmitted. It is those facts that are considered core knowledge.[3]

Another hallmark of essentialist education often places emphasis on teacher-centered instruction.   After asserting that features of essentialism predominated education, Roberson (2014) detailed certain defining features of essentialist teaching and learning in classrooms, which included the teacher-centered model of instruction and high-stakes assessments. Roberson then contrasted those features with the assembly line model of education. Though Robertson's suggestions imply that education should move away from the essentialist model of education, his initial connection of essentialist features endemic in current education implied that progressive

---

[3] *core knowledge,* as used here, is intentionally left lower-case. *Core Knowledge*, as a proper noun, refers to Hirsch's sequence that has been adapted and applied in selected places across education.

education does not appear as the only educational framework used. Similarly, Bagley (1930) will assert that the central role of the teacher implies a larger responsibility to students. However, his characterization of teachers drifts away from the traditionally, negatively-connoted, teacher-centered idea. These comparisons and contrasts will be discussed in Chapter 4, and have also been alluded to in Chapter 2 in the characterization of Deweyian schools given by Sabia (2012).

<div align="center">Factors Contributing to the Essentialists' Rise in Popularity</div>

Possible explanation for persistent lack of academic achievement. Kilpatrick (2005) offered a broad viewpoint in that the increased popularity of an essentialist education as teaching of a body of facts every student should know could be attributed as a reaction against vague educational goals and objectives of child-centered (Deweyian) progressive education that have not led to success in school for all students. Woo (1997) observed that content is becoming of primary importance, and for that reason, Hirsch's Core Knowledge materials satisfy the overarching need across education to tie outcomes to specific content.

Meanwhile, Kamhi (2009) argued that students' lack of ability to read at the word-level could explain persistent and systemic reading failure. Pointing to overemphasis on context and interaction with the text, which implies threads of progressive thought, Kamhi (2009) posited that the ability to read can be reduced to teachable skills which can also be measured, evaluated and assessed. Teaching these skills that are related to word recognition (recognizing words, "letters, sounds, words, and processes like decoding," p. 175) might allow for clearer assessments and clearer guidelines. This line of reasoning also implies that reading at the word-level is a domain-general skill. Kahmi (2009) differentiated the ability to read at the word level with reading comprehension, which he contends occurs contextually and is "a complex, higher

level mental process that includes thinking, reasoning, imagining and interpreting …" (p. 175).

Thus, comprehension should be taught relative to individual areas of study and is domain-specific.

Palumbo and Kramer-Vida (2012) found further key differences between students. They contend that two of those differences have revolved around the school's obligation to meeting needs of its students and the relative impact that the school has on meeting both social-emotional and academic needs. Without the home as a place of reinforcement, which commonly occurs in economically disadvantaged populations, the school is then charged with bridging the gap between what is not being reinforced at home and what is being learned at school (Palumbo & Kramer-Vida, 2012). Since a relationship between command of academic language and knowledge appears to exist, students without command of academic language tend to score lower on tests purporting to measure knowledge (Chall & Jacobs, 2003; Stern, 2009, in Palumbo & Kramer-Vida, 2012). Palumbo & Kramer-Vida contended that students need the "… tools of learning. Words represent the ideas and concepts that subject knowledge uses to explain itself, so vocabulary knowledge needs to be taught; at time for its own sake, but often in the context of subject learning …" (p. 120).

Shifts in policy. Datnow (2002) noted that efforts toward school improvement tended to have more effectiveness when there is concordance between various policies, regardless of level. The collaboration and construction of policies that complement each other, then, become of paramount importance when the need arises for school reform. Similarly, Gaudelli (2002) also commented on the positive link between policies at federal, state and local levels, and curriculum frameworks.

Offering a connection between educational goals, objectives, continued gaps in student achievement, and policy, Rutherford and Boehm (2004) contended that changes in the overall educational environment have given Hirsch's ideas room to flourish. Specifically, Rutherford and Boehm noted that early-1990s education reformers wanted standards, and not necessarily accountability. Currently, both assessment and accountability appear to be advocated for among certain stakeholders in education. Thus, the integration of national standards and state curriculum has become important, as has the ability to document factors influencing implementation and to recommend suggestions to navigating barriers. In service of these three areas, Rutherford and Boehm suggested that "related skills [phrased as] 'able to do statements', assessment benchmarks and authentic assessment [connect] with a content driven scope and sequence, content standards, performance standards and assessment respectively" (p.233) as a way to satisfy the need for both standards and accountability.

Weltman (1999) drew links between the conservative and liberal dichotomy to illustrate the connection between changing political preferences in the United States and shift from progressive to essentialist thoughts in education. Weltman pointed to the Cold War as a specific catalyst that led to a shift from progressivism to essentialism, suggesting that essentialism remains relevant currently, given the educational climate. Weltman also blamed progressive educators for their continued dominance throughout education, despite largely failing in their efforts to reform education.

Weltman (2002) also asserted that the debates between the progressives and essentialists have given space for Mortimer Adler's ideas to thrive as well. Though Adler is generally associated more directly with perennialism, not essentialism, both perennialists and essentialists hold the education-as-cultural-transmission assumption as true. Weltman (2002) suggested that

perhaps one subtle difference between the two frameworks centers on the role of "classics" (p. 61) and the role of "academic disciplines"(p. 61), perhaps implying a sharper division between domain-specific and domain-general knowledge. Similarly, Casement (1999) argued that failure to acquire a broad knowledge base, as might be implied by general knowledge that can be transmitted, potentially leaves individuals with missing pieces of prior knowledge.

Casement (1999) cited both Hirsch's and Adler's works as possible solutions to close the void filled in general knowledge gaps among students. Taking a narrower view, Anderson (2013) argued that Adler's Great Books should be studied in the Community College environment, for their power to unify and transmit core knowledge and timeless values, and as "masterpieces of civilized tradition" (p. 42). This stance of Anderson, taken to its extreme, might also imply a relatively static view of exemplar models as cultural artifacts through which to transmit knowledge and values. Furthermore, potential overemphasis on study of these exemplar models themselves as artifacts from the past might also lead to a lack of clarity with regard to transmission of the specific timeless values intended for transmission. Hence, the value of the intrinsic properties of knowledge, or knowledge simply for the sake of knowledge, cannot be overemphasized if transmission of values takes place as well (Casement, 1999). Nevertheless, Weltman (2002), Anderson (2013), and Casement (1999) built support for a reconsideration of Adler's works, including the *Paideia Proposal* (e.g. Weltman, 2002) and the Great Books series (e.g. Anderson, 2013) as possible solutions that would ensure cultural transmission as an outcome of formal education. This similarity along education-as-cultural transmission lines places Adler in congruence with a broadly-defined essentialist framework.

Though Imig and Imig (2006) framed their conclusions around teacher education, they point to exogenous factors that control education, which favor the essentialists. As a case

example, Imig and Imig cite the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act as evidence of outside

policies that control teaching and learning in the classroom. Though Imig and Imig classify No

Child Left Behind as an essentialist policy, and draw further connections between policies and

evaluation standards that measure effectiveness as markers of essentialist control, their central

idea revolved around what such standards and policies portend that ultimately serves as a greater

marker of classification.

Speaking more directly to what policies and legislation at the federal level portend, and

how those policies have informed teaching and learning across education, Kessinger (2007)

contended that *A Nation at Risk, No Child Left Behind, Goals 2000,* and *The National*

Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) are fundamentally essentialist in their language that

largely calls for a return to the "study of the 'basics.'" (p.16). Explaining with yet more

specificity, Kessinger (2007) also noted that a group of neo-essentialists appeared in the 1980s,

in response to *A Nation at Risk*. These neo-essentialists were linked to the conservative

movement in politics, thus incidentally tied politics and education reform (Kessinger, 2007).

Finding a catalyst within educational policy that specifically started with *A Nation at*

Risk, Eberstadt (1999) contended that there has been a definite shift away from progressivism

that has been driven by the need to raise the achievement level of America's students so that it is

on par with the rest of the world. Eberstadt (1999) also cited E.D. Hirsch, Jr. as an example of a

current essentialist who is also driven by the same need to raise achievement levels among

students who attend schools in America. Eberstadt outlined her case of the progressives' "near

perfect monopoly on academic prestige," (p. 6) by noting that the Coalition of Essential Schools

boasts progressive principles such as "student exhibitions rather than tests, an emphasis of habits

of mind rather than accumulation of knowledge, a passion for relevance (such as studying

Othello for parallels to the OJ Simpson Trial) …"(p. 6). Eberstadt (1999) also implied that this progressive-essentialist debate will still lead to stratification of classes, in that the progressives will cater to the elite because that class will pick up the core knowledge in other ways. Those other ways speak to mostly informal contexts such as the home, traveling or whenever they find that they need it. By contrast, supposed disadvantaged students do not have those informal contexts to rely on; they must pick up whatever core knowledge is needed at school. Thus, the suggestion is made here that some place has to provide core knowledge for supposed disadvantaged students. That place is at school (Eberstadt, 1999).

A novel approach was taken by Ryan and Townsend (2010) as they explored the idea that the progressive-essentialist battle could pre-date the 1980s. Ryan and Townsend examined portrayals of teachers on television programs in the 1950s to support their idea that the characteristic teacher embodies characteristics from both progressive and essentialist paradigms and thus could illustrate a shift from progressivism to essentialism as early as the 1950s. Concerning academics, the often-observed teacher-centered nature of "pretender inquiry" (p. 48) where "…much of the teacher's inquiries were really pretender events with purposes to manage students' behavior and to test their knowledge …" (p. 46) is characteristically essentialist, as is the manner teachers on television take as they ask students to make sense of the information that they present and how they direct, not facilitate, their students to find information (Ryan & Townsend, 2010). That contrasts with the relative rare occurrence of progressive characteristics, such as using interests of students to inform instruction, or wondering (p. 48-50), and teaching in authentic learning contexts. The teacher-centered nature of essentialist transmission is highlighted here, as compared to the student-centered nature of progressive education.

Taking another perspective, yet remaining critical of federal policies, state legislation, and the child-centered philosophy of John Dewey, Shattuck (2003) criticized education in Vermont and argued that solutions for specific content did not exist in any of those places purporting to detail educational standards. Therefore, Hirsch's solution for listing specific content through core knowledge materials fills the need for determining what student should know and teachers should teach in schools. Shattuck (2003) also contended that it ultimately takes teachers to teach and apply what Hirsch articulates. Hence, the combination of application by teachers and content equals a powerful recipe for balancing considerations. Apple (2009) also acknowledged that policies often are created with a mish-mash of multiple contexts and realities, both liberal and conservative, in mind:

> Out of all these multiple spaces and identities and the conflicts, tensions and compromises that their interactions generate, policies evolve. These policies are almost never purely from only one of these element within this bloc. Rather they often embody a rich mix that somehow must accommodate as many themes as possible within the multiple forces of conservative modernization – without at the same time alienating those groups believed to be significant who are not yet integrated under the same hegemonic umbrella of the right who would like to bring under its leadership in the future (p. 241).

Apple (2009) also balanced criticism of Hirsch's brand of essentialism with a hopeful bent that critical inquiry can mitigate much of the potential negative impact of organizing education around a concrete body of facts for purposes of blind replication.

Standards as informing curriculum and content. Closely related to policy are standards that guide curriculum frameworks and development. One such set of standards used to guide English-Language Arts and Mathematics teaching are the Common Core Standards which have

90

been developed recently. These national standards have received sharp criticism, in view of their

intent that moves toward a singular, standardized curriculum based in common expectations,

"efficiency … [and increased] quality of assessments" (Porter, McMacken, Hwang & Yang,

2011, p. 103) which could offer advantages. Porter, McMacken, Hwang and Yang (2011) also

noted that wide variability of state-level alignment emerged when the Common Core Standards

were compared to state-level standards. Some state-level standards and curriculum did not

display high levels of congruence to the nationally-based standards, implying different content

taught, while others aligned to a higher degree, implying similar content. Not only does the

relatively low level of alignment pose a potential barrier to implementation, as Porter,

McMacken, Hwang and Yang observe, the differences between standards and content taught

supports the essentialists' claim that the focus of a formal education depends largely on

commonalities on a higher level of organization than might be present on the state-level. Bagley

(1918b) will agree that the codification of what is common should take place on the highest level

possible, which extends past the local, or state level.

Despite criticism and controversy, other disciplines have also modeled their standards

after these Common Core Standards. Examples across education include geography (Hume &

Boehm, 2011), history (Ellington & Rutledge, 2001), and the National Core Arts Standards

(National Association for Music Education, 2014). Further applications of content knowledge

exist in higher education, as Reedy (2006) offered a list of terms and people every college

graduate should know. In a cross-cultural application that highlighted differences between sets

of core knowledge, Bradford and Harris (2003) found that African-American children displayed

higher levels of core knowledge that was directly related to their culture. Lastly, Skinner (2003)

offered a specific curriculum pertaining to the training of pediatricians that was centered on

needed knowledge, skills and attributes. That many disciplines are modeling standards after the

Common Core standards might speak largely of broad support for the essentialist idea that there

are certain sets of knowledge, skills, and ideas that students need to know, relative to each

discipline, in order to be perceived as formally educated. While these standards and ensuing

curriculum for many school subjects ultimately centers primarily on mastery of broad-based

objectives and the information those objectives imply (e.g. Porter, McMacken, Hwang & Yang,

2011), a danger is present in adopting overly-rigid standards beyond an appropriate level, or

over-generalizing standards beyond an appropriate level of implementation. That danger

potentially involves a too-narrow, or restrictive set of core knowledge that is potentially not

representative of the vast ideas and knowledge available. That danger will be used as a point of

criticism later in this Chapter, in the context of music education as aesthetic education, but also

exists with respect to other disciplines and as a kind of subtle, ad homenim attack on E.D.

Hirsch, Jr., whose Core Knowledge materials and essentialist thoughts exist as current examples

of more conservative essentialism. These criticisms will also be tempered by Bagley's positions,

which will be explained in Chapter 4.

Criticism of standards, and of Hirsch. Hume and Boehm (2011) focused on standards

found in geography and criticized this application based on a lack of comparison to other

contexts and cultures. The criticism that Hirsch's materials and approach are mono-cultural and

are not adequate in a diverse, pluralistic society has also been articulated by Katter (1991), Hinde

and Perry (2007), Bahruth (2004), and Apple (2011). While not a direct criticism, but adding

strength to the argument that literacy is relative to cultural identity, Ferdman (2010) stated that

differences are expected between cultures over the meaning of literacy. These direct and indirect

criticisms, however, have been framed around content.

Offering further criticism on Hirsch, with a philosophical perspective, O'Neill (2011) contended that Hirsch falls short on interpretation of Dewey and his premise that child-centered education is soft and rooted in romanticism. Hirsch's conclusions and criticisms might be tempered slightly and used as an entry point into exploring the unacknowledged common ground between himself and Dewey (O'Neill, 2011). Offering a more specific descriptor of this modern-day brand of essentialism, Abusalih (2011) noted that the term neo-essentialism might be more accurate to describe the current bent of essentialist thought and application.

Framing an initial criticism over the operationalization of key terms Hirsch used, Cook (2009) contends that Hirsch has conflated some terms. Cook began by examining Hirsch's contention over common knowledge which is the content of learning and shifting contexts of that content ultimately do not complement each other. Cook (2009) also noted that Hirsch appears confused in how he talks about content, context and culture, which Cook classified as ironic because Hirsch appeared most unclear about the terms that he uses to build his argument. Therefore, Cook suggested that these terms could work better together with additional clarity to them, which was exactly what Hirsch does not do in *Cultural Literacy*. Thus, Cook concluded that *Cultural Literacy* is intended as a provocative piece of writing and easily critiqued.

Next, Cook (2009) focused on the form of *Cultural Literacy*. That is, the weight Hirsch placed on "the pedagogical emphasis on cultivating in students a rhetorical familiarity with a general body of knowledge, an attunement to the vitality of rhetorical fitness within the shifting constraints of various discursive and communicative milieus. In other words, "the ideological baggage that inhered in the content of the infamous list what was a burgeoning rhetorical sensibility, one that still holds a high degree of pedagogical utility…" (p. 409). To understand what Hirsch meant, focus cannot be on the list itself, but rather the meaning behind the list itself.

93

Cook suggested common ground over rhetorical terms – inherent in any literary analysis. The essence of Hirsch's rhetoric, then, centered on the premise that everyone needs both background knowledge and specialized knowledge: "a mastery of knowledge so familiar that flexibility with that knowledge cannot be far behind – a supple mastery of relevant concepts and ideas" (p. 496). Cook also recommended "[suspension of] judgment long enough to discover what [*Cultural Literacy*] can do, how it might resonate and what potentials it may have for pedagogical or rhetorical interaction" (p. 497).

<div align="center">Outcomes Associated With Use of Core Knowledge</div>

Student achievement. Pressley and Pressley (2001) cited increased achievement in language arts among elementary students who used Core Knowledge material. Similarly, McHugh and Stringfield (1999) found that third-grade students who were instructed with Core Knowledge materials tended to score significantly higher on the reading section of the Maryland state standardized tests. Greater gains were also experienced on a performance-based component of the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program. Similar results regarding increased student achievement and use of Core Knowledge in minority, lower-socioeconomic areas have been noted by Chenowith (2010) and Scherer (1996). Also suggested is the notion that early learning, of which Core Knowledge is a central part of, might positively impact achievement (WEL is Important, 2013).

In their comprehensive, national evaluation of Core Knowledge implementation, Stringfield, Datnow, Borman, and Rachuba (2000) noted large, meaningful effect sizes when standardized test scores were compared between Core Knowledge schools and non-Core Knowledge schools. Additionally, Stringfield, Datnow, Borman, and Rachuba detailed certain positive outcomes concerning teachers' perceptions as well. Those positive impacts included

greater instances of professional collaboration and collegiality, though much initial, system-wide change was often needed. These teachers also perceived that the curriculum was better integrated across the school and that Core Knowledge positively impacted the engagement levels of their students. Core Knowledge appears to foster certain positive outcomes among teachers and students regardless of level of implementation. That idea was also echoed in Stringfield, Datnow, Nunnery, and Ross (1998) as they explored applied uses of Core Knowledge in schools across various levels of implementation. The idea that Core Knowledge can also have some degree of effectiveness when implemented with other models of comprehensive school reform has also been explored by Stringfield, Datnow, and Ross (1998).

Mac Iver and Mac Iver (2009) found that gains at "other" schools using some model of systematic school reform, of which Core Knowledge was classified in this category, were not statistically significantly different from those with no model. However, those schools with lower starting points who used a model of school reform experienced gains such that their ending level of achievement was closer to those schools with no model. When Mac Iver and Mac Iver explored increasing math scores, they found that using a mathematically-based reform method tended to predict greater achievement, while using another non-math based model of reform aided somewhat, though not enough for statistical significance.

Increased student achievement specifically found in Core Knowledge schools has also been noted by Woo (1997). Using one specific low-income, minority school in the Bronx, Woo also explained that retention of material previously presented appeared higher, while suspension from school was lower in a different school with a similar student population. Woo framed her findings in terms of Hirsch as the "new guru of educational reform," (p. 14) and as related to a backlash against progressive education that argues process is more important than content.

Datnow, Borman, and Stringfield (2000) found that their experimental group of Core Knowledge schools tended to score similarly to or outperform matched schools in the control group on standardized tests. The positive relationship between degree of Core Knowledge implementation and academic achievement among students was also noted, in that those schools that extensively implemented the Core Knowledge materials tended to have students who scored higher on their standardized tests. Lastly, Datnow, Borman, and Stringfield found a significant difference between groups (favoring the Core Knowledge group) on tests of Core Knowledge. Those students from Core Knowledge schools tended to score higher than those students in the control group. When taken together, these results suggest that using the Core Knowledge sequence might not necessarily lead to consistent or statistically significant outperformance on tests not directly measuring Core Knowledge, but might not hinder performance either. The suggestion that Core Knowledge does not harm has also been implied by Mac Iver and Mac Iver (2009) and Baer (2003) and in other work by Stringfield, Datnow, and Ross (1998), and Stringfield, Datnow, and their various colleagues, which has been discussed previously in this section. When taken with the results of Stringfield, Datnow, Borman, and Rachuba (2000), a slightly more muted impact of that study could be suggested.

While not directly connected to student achievement on standardized assessments, Abusalih (2011) noted that the moderate relationship between achievement in advanced chemistry and prior-year's achievement in Algebra and English could hold implications for appropriate placement of advanced students in this current educational environment. Roberson and Woody (2012) used a narrative account of the teaching of the Civil War in an essentialist paradigm after categorizing features of learning as "understanding, thinking, problems, questions, and feedback" (p. 207) which speak largely of progressive educators' conception of

learning. Based on their description, Roberson and Woody contended that essentialist education does not adequately account for student learning, thus raising some question regarding application of features of essentialist education apart from any evidence suggesting positive impacts on standardized tests.

Changes in roles for school personnel. Hiebert (2012) found that the new Common Core Standards could provide an entry point into leadership for librarians by way of determining appropriate books as exemplar models for students to read, given their level of appropriateness in text and word complexity, which has been quantified. Students can choose reading material based on a wide variety of books and interest areas, all of which are suitable. Since librarians are not generally perceived as leaders, Hiebert noted that this initial opportunity could also provide another, more useful role for librarians in the school. Though readability formulas are not new, and the critical questions surrounding them are not new, these standards are the first set of standards to explicitly consider this component in formulating standards.

Potential impacts of belief systems of teachers. Schraw and Olafson (2003) and Olafson, Schraw, and Vander Veldt (2010) found that most teachers displayed relatively consistent beliefs over the issue of student-knowledge acquisition and a link between beliefs held and classroom practices. Those teachers who adopted a student-centered perspective tended to remain consistent throughout the duration of the study. The same held true for those teachers who indicated a teacher-centered perspective: little change in continuum shift was noted over time. However, those participants who were not as consistent in their beliefs tended to shift from teacher-centered to student-centered over time. Thus, Olafson, Schraw and Vander Veldt suggested that paradigm shifts can take place among teachers whose beliefs are not consistent with either teacher-centered or student-centered beliefs. Given the teacher-centered feature of

97

essentialist instruction, perhaps teachers who do not identify as student-centered can find a point

of resonance with the essentialist framework.

Schraw and Olafson (2008) also explored an inherent problem with the measurement of

epistemological beliefs, which make a salient point above explicit about the scale used. Noting

that traditional Likert scale measurements do not accurately capture the limitations and

boundaries of such beliefs, Schraw and Olafson asserted that a scale with two opposing ends, as

in a spectrum, might capture the dimensionality of the complex idea of teacher beliefs.

However, the implication of the investigations regarding teacher beliefs and educational

framework also involves the search for frameworks that fit beliefs of teachers. To the extent that

an essentialist framework can accommodate beliefs of teachers who are more teacher-centered in

their approach, then, this framework can be viable.

Roth and Weinstock (2013) observed a negative relationship between the epistemological

beliefs of teachers and their teaching practices that supported autonomous learning. Those

teachers who identified with more of an objective, stance toward knowledge acquisition tended

to identify less with autonomously-supportive behaviors and practices. These findings, then,

provide support to the present discussion regarding the link between teacher beliefs and

practices. Though essentialism might not be an epistemological framework, it is an assumption

of the essentialists that knowledge is transmitted, as opposed to constructed (Buras, 2012). The

connection between a teacher who tends to believe that student autonomy does not play a large

role in acquiring and constructing knowledge, and an essentialist can be connected through the

common assumption that knowledge acquired rests outside the learner. That connection, by

extension, implies a teacher-centered framework. However, Dunn and Rakes (2011) found that a

teacher education program that focuses on the process of teaching skills and providing training

around a student-centered curriculum influenced the beliefs of their sample of pre-service teachers to adopt a viewpoint more consistent with being student-centered. Bagley (1930) will detail his own application and outcomes associated with roles of teachers in Chapter 4.

Linking beliefs of teachers to a different area, Palak and Walls (2009) examined technology use among teachers and concluded that teachers often used technology for teacher-centered tasks of a logistical nature. Student-centered use of technology was rare, even in technologically rich school environments. Thus, Palak and Walls drew a connection between the ways in which teachers have been previously taught to use technology and the relative little change exhibited in technology use among teachers over time, despite continued emphasis in schools to shift toward student-centered technology use.

A similar parallel exists in the tendency of music teachers to teach as they have been taught, as noted by Austin and Reinhardt (1999). While Austin and Reinhardt suggested that there might be very little teacher-educators can do to change core beliefs among pre-service teachers that might not necessarily bear out in practice, Palak and Walls (2009) seem to suggest that professional development and increased education might aid in the teacher-centered-to-student-centered paradigm shift. Taken together with Dunn and Rakes (2011), who concluded that instruction of pre-service teachers does appear to make a difference with regard to their beliefs, the mixed nature of these preliminary results suggests that re-evaluation of the relative stability of pre-service teachers' epistemological beliefs might be needed before large-scale changes to teacher education programs are made that relate to either teacher-centered teaching, which is more closely associated with essentialism, or student-centered teaching, which is more closely associated with progressivism.

Application of Core Knowledge in Schools

The combination of application by teachers and content using Hirsch's Core Knowledge materials was explicitly investigated by Johnson, Janisch, and Morgan-Flemming (2001). Using the terms taught content to refer to how teachers instruct their classrooms and recommended curriculum to refer to what students should be learning, they argue that applications from Hirsch's materials can apply to classrooms, and can impact positively on low-income, minority schools. Using one classroom in Texas, they attempted to make their case. The teachers that participated in this study termed their work as the CLICK project (Connecting Literacy with Content Knowledge). As part of their work on this project, they filled in any gaps between the recommended curriculum and taught curriculum with instructional decisions on their own, with many choosing to employ Hirsch's units to replace less challenging content. After implementation, Johnson, Janisch and Morgan-Flemming noted that many teachers were surprised to find that their students rose to meet the challenges of the work and demonstrated increased achievement. Students appeared interested in what learning would take place next, and the students demonstrated awareness of their own increased literacy and knowledge comprehension. Also noteworthy was the perception echoed by the teachers who participated in this study that Hirsch's materials did not "stifle teacher planning and student inquiry. … They recognized the Hirsch topics and readings as curricular possibilities and viable resources. Rather than serve as a constraint on teacher thinking, the Hirsch content served as a springboard for lively and sustained teacher discussion and decisions about appropriate curriculum for students" (p. 271). Therefore, results from this study cast a slight measure of doubt on the perceived negative impact that the Core Knowledge materials might have.

Speaking to implied threads of creativity among teachers, and offering a portrait of the applied utility of Core Knowledge, Hirsch (1993) profiled the Mohegan School in the Bronx. Core Knowledge curriculum links well with studies on ancient civilizations, poetry, visual art with paintings by "Rembrandt, Monet and Michaelangelo [and music] by Beethoven and Mozart …" (p. 23), science topics and historical events. The outcomes of the sequence is specific as opposed to vague: "first graders will learn the meaning of "east", "west" "north" and "south" (p. 24) and locate on a map the equator, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the seven continents, the United States, Mexico , Canada and Central America"   It is suggested that Core Knowledge comprise "50 percent of the curriculum, leaving the other half to be tailored to a district, school, or classroom" (p. 24). At Mohegan, further positive impacts have included a lower incidence of discipline problems, and increases on standardized test achievement. Schoolwide attendance has also increased. Thus, broad general knowledge, such as emphasized in the Core Knowledge materials, can potentially lead to positive results despite criticisms related to assumption of commonalities among students. Adding support, Stevenson and Stigler pointed to diversity of academic preparation rather than cultural diversity as a greater kind of diversity, and contend that factor could potentially explain any knowledge and achievement gap more accurately. However, it is ironic that the profile of the school includes kinds of project-based activities, such as "modern Tom Sawyers whitewashing the bus ramp during Mark Twain days. (p. 30) and "integrated units" (p. 23-24) which Hirsch has spoken against. Bagley (1939a) will speak against the project method also, with exceptions primarily contained in elementary school. When taken all together, content does not appear expressly tailored or differentiated, but the methods by which the content is taught can be customized, which also is somewhat consistent with Bagley's views (e.g. 1916d). Throughout this discussion, it is important to remember that

both core knowledge and Core Knowledge represents only content; thus, teachers can be creative in implementation, as can districts and other localities. When summarized with the previous studies casting doubt on potential negative impact of Core Knowledge, questions begin to emerge regarding the assumed non-viability and non-effectiveness over implementation of standardization across education.

Casting further doubt on negative impacts of Core Knowledge, but on the subject of creativity, Baer (2003) found that stories written by seventh grade students who attended Core Knowledge schools displayed higher levels of creativity (as determined by a panel of experts using the consensual assessment technique) than those who did not. Interestingly, the comparisons of 7th grade poems and 8th grade stories from Core Knowledge Schools to Non-Core Knowledge Schools were not statistically significant. Instruction in Core Knowledge did not appear to act as a barrier to students' creative output, and might have acted as a factor influencing creative output. When taken together with the previous studies calling into question the perceived negative impacts of Core Knowledge, a tentative conclusion could be drawn that some perceived negative impacts are not initially supported. Similarly, Cooley (2003) suggested that the assumption of mutual exclusion between teaching technical and creative elements in writing is ultimately bothersome. As such, Cooley argued for a synthesis between technical mastery and creativity such that each element can reinforce and complement the other.

<div align="center">Music Education in the Context of Essentialist Education</div>

Music education contains essentialist connections as well. Just as Hirsch (1988, 1999) envisioned that all students are equipped with the same set of core knowledge in the service of commonality, universality, and cultural transmission, Kivy (1991) took a similar position. The essence of his position revolves around music's place based on a ritualistic, tribalistic,

humanistic unification. That stance implies a thread of essentialist thought with ensuing cultural connections. Consider these statements:

> Suppose I were to play an average audience of educated men and women recordings, respectively, of Hamlet's famous soliloquy that begins, "To be, or not to be …" and the opening measures of the *Eroica.* It is my hypothesis that almost everyone in such a group would know that the first excerpt I played was from a play by William Shakespeare called *Hamlet*, and almost no one would know that the second was the opening of Beethoven's Third Symphony … (Kivy, 1991, p. 79)

He continued:

> … and such [an average group of educated men and women] would not be singular in this respect but representative of the incontestable fact that educated people all over the English-speaking world can recognize at least the most well-known passages from their literature or such works as Michaelangelo's Sistine Chapel and the *Mona Lisa*, but not the familiar passages from the musical masterworks of equal stature and fame? … (p.80).

The salient parts of Kivy's stance linking him to an essentialist position are two-fold. First, Kivy's overall vision functions as a form of common knowledge within the music domain. All humans should recognize significant works of music in addition to recognizing significant paintings or quotes from literature. The other salient part of this stance is that these works are culturally bound and can be passed down through successive generations. Kivy's choices of the *Eroica Symphony,* the Sistine Ceiling and *Mona Lisa* are most likely not accidental choices, given his position, but purposefully chosen to represent artifacts from the arts that are exemplar models, and assumed to contain cultural import and relevance.

Kivy (1991) also recognized another commonality inherent in music that makes it unique, which is a common connection to a primitive, ritualistic, tribalistic notion that unites groups of people along one cultural element. Music, for Kivy, is that cultural element, and therefore is an essential component of education. Similar to this position on music, Hirsch (1988) envisions that all students learn culturally-rooted, common, core knowledge content. Ideally, then the possibility exists to question any student in any school in any part of the United States over that common knowledge.

Smith (1994) focused exclusively on synthesizing essentialist perspectives in dance, music, and visual art, while providing his perspective from a theoretical level. Smith's analysis and synopsis of perspectives pertaining to various facets of art education make sense in light of extending Hirsch's content from *Cultural Literacy* (1988) into the arts. However, Smith (1994) leaves out critical elements of the educational environment in his discussion. Thus, Smith's work is valuable in discerning an arts-based connection to a more extreme version of essentialist educational philosophy, however, remains less valuable with regard to a goodness-of-fit to the educational environment.

While Morton (2001) contended essentialism relies on unchanging, antiquated ideas and can lead to marginalization, Koza (1994) similarly criticized the acceptance and application of aesthetic education within music education. Morton and Koza have both tentatively linked essentialism to an aspect of music education that they contend has been widely accepted by the domain. As the centerpiece of her criticism, Koza contended that the set of knowledge focused on in an aesthetic education framework exists as a too-narrow, monocultural set of singular ideas that systematically oppress minority viewpoints. That criticism is similar to critiques of Core Knowledge, discussed above. Additionally, Koza also openly stated that essentialism is not

viable for consideration because the aspects of the culture that are passed down through generations are thought unchanging and assumed inherent. Therefore, little to no examination takes place with regard to these supposedly-inherent aspects within music education that can be exclusionary when applied in practice. Adding support, Gould (2004) contended that essentialism traditionally emphasizes unchanging, biologically-driven nature, thus, does not account for the extent of transformation or alternative views. These themes of exclusion and oppression can be reinforced.

Though this viewpoint of Morton (2001), Koza (1994) and Gould (2004) might describe certain outcomes and aspects related to the widespread implementation of aesthetic education, their viewpoints regarding essentialism is representative of the conservative, extreme side of essentialism.

As will be shown in Chapter 4, Bagley (1938a) will explain how his vision of an essentialist education allows for alternate viewpoints, and social progress implying change. Exclusion or oppression might be mitigated through a moderate viewpoint such as Bagley's (e.g. 1938a), yet still contain threads of cultural transmission, which forms the basis of essentialism.

The persistent criticism revolving around exclusion and oppression detailed thus far has also centered on music education as aesthetic education. The kind of music studied with respect to aesthetic notions also can speak of implicit or explicit musical, culturally-bound norms, values, and standards, which can be generalized to the domain of music education. As has been explained, this kind of aesthetically-grounded education has been contended to be exclusionary and oppressive toward other kinds of music and cultures who might not operate according to the same norms and values. O'Toole (2002), however, detailed a different viewpoint. O'Toole (2002) asserted that any attempt to defy any norms and values that are implied to be able to be

passed down can be known as a "transgression" (e.g. p.3), especially when met with a level of success. As a starting point, O'Toole (2002) offered a characterization of Charlotte Church as a transgressor, because her background, training, age, and relative fame stands in stark contrast to the prototypical notion of an accomplished, famous musician. As further support, O'Toole also noted that the relative fame Church received can serve as an indicator of her positive reception. This positive reception, however, is perceived as threating, because it runs contrary to traditional, implied notions and norms of musical formal training and fame associated with musicians. Therefore, the antidote to extreme essentialism, which can lead to exclusion, oppression, and monoculturalism, might appear in recognizing and receiving positively these transgressions, as noted by O'Toole (2002).

Similarly, Bagley could be viewed as a transgressor with respect to the essentialist line of thinking he helped develop because he also acknowledges openly that a formal education must encompass both progressive and essentialist purposes. Therefore, any criticisms of essentialist thought in music education, such as have been detailed above, must be tempered with the idea that those criticisms represent conservative interpretations of the essentialist framework itself. These conservative views do not necessarily reflect the entirety of Bagley's views, despite Bagley sharing the common label of essentialism with F. Alden Shaw, and Michael Demiashkevich (Null, 2003). Material presented in Chapter 4, using Bagley's own words through primary sources, will support this statement.

Ironically, it is these often-criticized points relating to essentialism, explained above, that emerged as a point of division between Bagley and Shaw (or Demiashkevich) in detailing the basic tenets of essentialism. Therefore, Bagley will not only emerge as a moderate essentialist, with repsect to his views on cultural transmission, but will also explain how his

views are reflective of progressive thinking that encompasses societal improvement through its progress as well. In encompassing both purposes of a formal education, then, Bagley can also answer these criticisms revolving around more extreme interpretations of essentialism, which the domain of music education has often gravitated toward in order to criticize it (e.g. Gould, 2004; Koza, 1994; Morton, 2001; Regelski, 2006, 2009a, b).

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

This chapter has focused on a description of essentialist education that is consistent with more current, conservative interpretations. Key features and possible explanations for the essentialist's current increased influence have been explored as well. When the content presented in this chapter is taken together with the content in the previous chapter, the competing assumptions revolving around the purpose of an education (progressives, societal improvement; essentialists, cultural transmission) appear quite pronounced.

Conspicuously missing from these descriptions in Chapters 2 and 3 is a moderating voice that could bring together both the progressives and more conservative essentialists, though previews into Bagley's views have been given. That moderating voice would agree with progressives over some key aspects of their kind of education, and agree with some elements of more conservative interpretations of essentialists and will be reflected in Bagley's ideas. In the process, both education as societal improvement and cultural transmission can be validated as assumptions of a formal education, thus negating the either-or-debate of the progressives and conservative essentialists. Therefore, in the next Chapter, I will introduce the perspective of William Chandler Bagley as that moderating voice that might allow for a synthesis of ideas between the progressive framework and more conservative interpretations of essentialism.

CHAPTER 4

WILLIAM CHANDLER BAGLEY: MODERATE ESSENTIALIST

Introduction

While an in-depth biographical and historical portrait of William Chandler Bagley is

above and beyond the purpose of this dissertation, and has already been undertaken by Null

(2003), a brief description of Bagley will allow for contextualization of his philosophy in a more

personal context. Additionally, analyzing his earlier writings will allow for insights into the

aspects of essentialism which remained constant and those that emerged. Though he shared the

social context with Dewey and Thorndike, he thought of himself as an educational philosopher,

and appeared acutely aware that he often did not share the popular or predominant progressive

viewpoint of the time (Campbell, 1975; Null, 2003, 2007). The essentialist philosophy he posited

departed with the thoughts of the more extreme progressive educators as well as others in the

founding cadre of essentialists (Null 2001, 2003, 2007). Bagley also began to codify formally

his philosophy of education relatively late in life, during the end of his career at Teachers

College and after his retirement from Teachers College in 1939. In that way, his philosophy

represented a culmination of ideas and thoughts that represented the sum-total of his experience

in education (Null, 2007).

Bagley's nearly 50-year career in education lasted from approximately 1900 to his death

in 1946 (Null, 2003). Bagley's experience also spanned diverse roles across the domain of

education. He served as a teacher-educator at three different universities, in school

administration as a principal, a teacher, and as an author of "numerous articles, editorials and

books, all of which related in one way or another to the education of teachers for public school

service" (Null, 2007, p.1017). Bagley's scholarly output also extended into philosophical and

theoretical foundations of education, which is the focus of this chapter. He wrote 532 articles in

the form of short editorials and longer papers, and also gave addresses that were also published to diverse audiences throughout the domain of education. Bagley co-authored seven articles, and wrote 12 books while co-authoring 21 books. For a complete list of Bagley's works, see Null, 2003, Appendix B, p. 303-327, and for more information about Bagley see J. Wesley Null's 2003 biography entitled *A Disciplined Progressive Educator: The Life and Career of William Chandler Bagley*. Serving on the editorial board of *School and Home Education* and for *School and Society* afforded Bagley many places to critique ideas he viewed problematic, allowing him to advocate for possible solutions in the context of these many editorials in addition to articles of longer length.

Bagley spent 21 years at Teachers College in New York City, which comprised the bulk of his career in education. He held the position of "Professor of Normal School Administration" (Null, 2007, p.1017), and "unofficial Dean of Teacher Education" (Null, 2007, p. 1013). By virtue of his position at Teachers College, Bagley focused primarily on curriculum through which the education of teachers took place (Null, 2007). However, this focus occurred during the national shift from Normal Schools to Teachers Colleges (Null, 2003). As Null (2003) explained:

> First, [teachers colleges] began to offer bachelor's degrees in specific academic
> disciplines. In doing so, [teachers colleges] began to compete with state universities in
> the preparation of high school teachers. Second, to offer bachelor's degrees, newly
> transformed teachers colleges were required to expand their general education offerings.
> To do so, they had to employ additional subject matter specialists rather than education
> faculty. As a result, the balance of faculty in these colleges began to shift toward

discipline-based scholarship and away from the education of teachers, specifically

elementary teachers. (Null, 2003, p. 172-173)

Despite facing this contextual transition, Bagley remained deeply concerned with the

growing gap between normal schools and teachers colleges concerning teacher education. This

unease deepened further given that teachers did not necessarily need to be certified any longer in

order to teach (Null, 2003). As a "normal school man" (Null, 2003, p.171), Bagley sought to

keep the professionalization of teacher education and teachers alive by offering courses for those

who envisioned teaching in more specialized environments such as normal schools and rural

schools (Null, 2003). This act of broadening the definition of teacher-educator and the focused

courses he taught relating to the educational environment most likely provided Bagley, and

others who taught with him, a method to remain relevant with respect to teacher education during

this time of organizational transition (Null, 2003).

Bagley's desire to remain relevant extended into the classroom. One former student's

portrayal of Bagley consisted of a "very pleasant gentleman" (Null, 2003, p. 177) and as "an

engaging speaker who respected people from all cultural, religious and racial backgrounds."

(Null, 2003, p. 177). Apart from his disposition as a teacher, he addressed content in his courses

that likely provided a principle means to remain relevant. During the 1920s, Bagley's *Technique

of Teaching* class attracted nearly 300 students (Null, 2003). One student, Arthur Marcus

Proctor, "saved syllabi, course notes and class handouts [from this class and other classes Bagley

taught] (Null, 2003, p. 176). This brief excerpt from Bagley's syllabus from *Techniques of

Teaching* and highlighted by Null (2003) illustrates not only a practical concern of many teachers

that Bagley brought to the forefront through course content, but also a persistent issue that he

thoughtfully attempted to balance throughout his career in his writings.

1) Education considered as a process of directing natural growth; emphasis upon the

needs of the individual.

2) Education considered as a process of conserving the human heritage through vicarious

experience; emphasis upon the needs of society. (p. 176-177)

The dichotomy seen in this artifact precedes the formalization of his essentialist

philosophy by nearly 10 years and perhaps reflects an attempt by Bagley to operationalize and

apply his emergent theoretical ideas in the context of his classes. Though the dichotomy Bagley

proposed appeared to distance himself mostly from Dewey and other child-centered educators,

Bagley found common ground with Dewey over aspects of a democratic education, which will

be explained below. Bagley also differed from other aspects of progressive education not clearly

evident in this artifact. Those differences will also be explained below.

As Bagley began to collaborate primarily with Michael Demiashkevich and F. Alden

Shaw over the preliminary organization of a new group of educators who opposed many facets

of radical progressive education in the 1930s, a new term emerged: essentialism. This term, as

explained by Null (2003) and Bagley (1938, 1939a) emphasized cultural transmission of values

and knowledge to successive generations as a major outcome a formal education.

Thus, Bagley drew an initial, sharp point of distinction over the role of cultural

transmission between the philosophy of the Essentialists and that of Progressives:

[The] contrast may be drawn by saying that the Essentialist emphasizes the basic

significance of the accumulated experience of the race, and affirms the chief concern of

education to be the transmission of the most important lessons that have come out of this

experience, while the prevailing American theory lays its emphasis upon personal or

individual experience and affirms the chief concern of education to be the direction of individual growth. (Bagley, 1939a, p. 326)

Despite this distinction and adoption of the essentialist label, Bagley only wished to distance himself from the radical progressive educators. He openly acknowledged Dewey's contributions revolving around increased knowledge of the child, and generally furthering educational philosophy in America (Bagley, 1944c). Bagley also acknowledged Dewey's own caution concerning other radical, child-centered progressives (Bagley, 1935a).

Bagley also sought to perpetuate the need for formal education. Though he (1905) acknowledged that informal education was superior to formal education "in efficiency to the educative forces of practical life" (p.24), Bagley ultimately critiqued informal education for its lack of a system, and lack of efficiency. His "uneconomical" (p. 25) critique centered on the inadequacy of informal education to transmit the "mass of experience that the race has acquired, and thus virtually leaves unutilized the capacity which man alone possesses to profit by the experience of others" (p. 25). Bagley's ideas centered on issues and possible solutions concerning public school education.

With these initial ideas in mind and the specific context of public schools, the remainder of this chapter will be devoted to specific ways in which Bagley's conception of Essentialism differed from that of progressives and of other essentialists. Two purposes of a formal education will be made explicit from Bagley's perspective: education-as-societal-improvement, and education-as-cultural-transmission. Therefore, Bagley can provide a link between the differences in perspectives seen thus far concerning the progressives and conservative essentialists.

Bagley as Different from the Radical Progressives: Definition of Democracy

Despite some initial differences between progressive educators such as Thorndike and

Dewey, Bagley and Thorndike, and Bagley and Dewey, Bagley appeared to agree with Dewey

over the need for a democratic education (Bagley 1915a, 1916a; Null, 2003, 2007). Specifically,

Bagley (1915a) acknowledged that Dewey's emphasis on "freedom, interest, and activity" (p.4)

functioned as components in any education that emphasized democratic ideals. However,

interest and activity should be featured prominently only in the primary stages of education.

Bagley (1933) supported this claim by asserting that the relationships between task enjoyment,

interest, work, and play can be initially assumed but ultimately not supported. The assumed idea

of a relationship between these components functioned as ideas found from radical progressives

and thus served as an initial point of departure (Bagley, 1933).[4]

More specifically, freedom was broadly conceptualized for Bagley as "a means of

education rather than the attainment of education" (Bagley, 1933, p. 408). Freedom also evolved

to connote a precious aspect of democracy to be actively acknowledged and cherished rather than

to be passively taken for granted (Bagley, 1935a). Therefore, Bagley contended that one

consequence of radical progressivism that focuses on a personally empowering, individually

meaningful democratic education revolved around the idea that over time, freedom in a

democracy might be taken for granted.

Bagley also critiqued the notion that Dewey only addressed half of what democratic

education ultimately required. Bagley (1915a) contended that Dewey's missing piece in his

vision for students did not "[insure] the community of knowledge among all members of a

---

[4] Here demonstrates a salient point of agreement with Thorndike and Bagley, and also illustrates how Bagley tended to interpret findings from research: "Mr. Thorndike, who, on the basis of experimental evidence has said 'The notion that the mind will not learn what is alien to its fundamental vital purposes is attractive and plausible but definitely false.'" (Bagley, 1938a, p.564).

democratic group …" (p.4). Bagley's criticism seen here, and discussed earlier (e.g. 1935a) therefore entailed a different definition of living in society, which rested on identifying predispositions common to all members in society. Bagley (1935b) suggested that possible common, qualities worthy to be passed down might include "willingness to cooperate in common enterprises and willingness to live comfortably with the social standards which are obviously essential to the welfare and survival of the group" (p. 167).

Bagley (1935b) suggested that, "… [these] may be called enduring values in a world of change" (p. 167). He suggested that additional enduring values might include "regimen of order and industry … and a capacity for sustained effort …" (p. 168). Schools, according to Bagley, have a responsibility to provide experiences for students to develop these values that might transcend subject matter itself (Bagley, 1910, 1913, 1916a, 1916c, 1935a, 1935b, 1939a).

Bagley (1916) also contended that a necessary question in considering a democratic education was as follows: "What does my education mean to the welfare of the State – to the welfare of society that so liberally provides these opportunities?" (p. 149) as opposed to the individualistic stance of "What is the use of this to me?" (p.149). Bagley then posited the second question spoke of consistency with progressive education, and it was exactly that guiding question of the progressives that also limited the extent to which any social group could advance. Bagley posed this set of initial questions early in his writings, indicating an emergent critique of overemphasizing individualized education as an aspect of progressive education. Perhaps this question also contributed to another late emerging thought of his, discussed above, that the freedom democracy guarantees might not be automatically granted, as a gift, but must be earned and protected as a more precious conquest (Bagley, 1935a, 1938a).

These consistently present concerns of Bagley spoke of a broad definition of the community as a large social group who ultimately had certain responsibilities to ensure its continued existence. A difference in this definition of community opposed that of Dewey and other progressive educators who took a more localized community stance. These differences along individualistic and group lines with respect to community and a democratic education emerged as a consistent point of reference for Bagley throughout the course of his writings (e.g. Bagley 1915a,b; 1916, 1916c, 1916d, 1933, 1938a, b; 1945a). These ideas would also imply differences for school structure and school curricula, which will be discussed later.

Bagley (1916a) also spoke specifically of two necessary duties of a patriotic dimension to his vision of a democratic education not directly addressed by Dewey or his followers. Bagley noted that the "duty of courage" (p. 149) was often spoken of in terms of the only quality needed for a democratic education. By contrast, he contended that "the duty of intelligence" (p.149) functioned as a critical yet overlooked dimension of a democratic education. For Bagley, patriotism and democracy linked closely together through both intelligence and courage. Bagley's point of criticism here related to an overemphasis on courage at the expense of intelligence. His characterization of a kind of collective intelligence, as evidenced by the guiding question regarding the needs of society rather than the needs of the individual, also implied awareness by any individual of the collective set of values and beliefs of the society that an educated individual would enter. Intelligence, for Bagley, not only encompassed the degree to which common understandings, ideas, and standards could be accepted and subsequently transmitted from one generation to the next, but also included the extent to which members of a society were literate to a high degree (Bagley, 1916c, 1916d, 1939b). A high degree of literacy,

then, implied that the social group would not only be maintained, but progress, grow, and change as well. A literate society encompassed:

> more than the ability to translate printed letters into spoken words[.] It means the development and expansion of ideas; it means the basis for intelligent understanding and for the collective thought and judgment which are the essence of democratic institutions. (Bagley, 1939b, p. 79)

A highly differentiated curriculum governed largely by student interests, achievement, or progress through courses of study might be problematic because this broad definition of democracy, as well as the associated prominent role of a high degree of literacy would depend on collective needs, moving toward a "community of culture" (Bagley, 1916b, p. 362), rather than the often emphasized individual needs endemic to a progressive education. While Bagley (1916d) acknowledged differentiation around courses, not outcomes, the conception of a highly differentiated democratic education strongly associated with more extreme child-centered, Deweyian progressive thought is perhaps equally problematic because there might be little to no guarantee that "each generation [will] be placed in possession of a common core of ideas, meanings, understandings and ideals representing the most precious elements of the human heritage" (Bagley, 1939b, p. 79-80).

Furthermore, without common agreement on the needs of society, Bagley conspicuously noted that:

> the tendency in the past in our high schools toward uniformity is unfortunate because the uniformity that has prevailed has been more or less accidental, --at least, it was not always nor often determined by a clear vision of social needs. (Bagley, 1914a, p. 11)

116

Therefore, for Bagley, an educational theory that might support common aspects among all to the high degree that he claims must also be highly informed by society itself. Ideas for common aspects that could inform a rationale for public school music education will be suggested in Chapter 5.

Given this emerging difference in definition of a democratic education, and the premium placed on the necessity of commonness that can be found in the aforementioned "core of ideas, meanings, understandings and ideals …" (Bagley, 1939b, p. 79-80), the philosophically-oriented question of *worth* of any subject to be taught in school, or any idea within that subject, deserves consideration and logically extends from the previous discussion. To that notion, Bagley (1916b) suggested that focusing on *worth* in relation to subjects taught in the curriculum transcends individual subjects. *Worth*, where individual subjects are concerned, would depend more on larger outcomes. These outcomes might range from disciplinary, to informational, to appreciative, and would not be necessarily discrete categories in relation to any given subject. In any subject, primary emphasis of one or two outcomes might exist, with secondary emphases in the others. As another initial starting point in exploring this idea, Bagley (1916b) offered that *worth* with respect to any subject could lie in the "older view of mental discipline [that] assumed a direct relationship between the difficulty of a subject and its disciplinary value" (p. 364). Therefore, subjects that were perceived as highly difficult due to a high degree of conceptual thought could in fact possess more worth. In these subjects, then, "general training depends primarily upon the possibility of lifting a procedure to the conceptual level, and endowing it with a consciousness of worth …" (p. 364-365). Implications for this idea related to music education will be discussed at the end of this section.

Closely tied to this conception of *worth* as an older idea with emerging relevance for

Bagley's theory are the ideas of mastery and thoroughness. Bagley (1917) contended that

mastery in this sense implied that students' independent thinking depended on their

understanding, and he contrasted that with the radical progressive idea of "liberation of the pupil

entirely from [that] which does not appeal to him as productive of beneficial results" (p. 719).

Thoroughness, then, referred to the depth of knowledge possessed by students, and spoke of

"that meticulousness in details and facility in looking after small and routine matters" (p. 719).

That the progressives, according to Bagley, assumed a negative relationship between

thoroughness, and discovery and innovation turned problematic for them, as Bagley noted:

> I may cite the recent finding of Mr. Thorndike regarding the specific question as to
>
> whether thoroness [sic], meticulousness, and capacity for routine work are really
>
> inconsistent with initiative and originality. Mr. Thorndike says, 'Far from there being
>
> any antagonism between originality and industry at routine tasks, or between originality
>
> and system … there is a positive correlation, and one as close as that between industry
>
> and enthusiasm or that between thoroness [sic] and system.'[5] (Bagley, 1917, p. 720)

This idea will be discussed in detail at the end of this chapter, and exposes a potential

problem with a particular aspect of music education. That specific aspect will be discussed in

Chapter 5.

Applications for subjects taught in schools. While specific implications for music

education will be discussed in Chapter 5 and at the end of Chapter 4, Bagley offered applications

---

[5] The above quotation also illustrates how Bagley envisioned scientific findings, such as those discovered by Thorndike and other proponents of a science of education. As seen here, Bagley appeared to perceive the role of scientific findings as valuable in testing aspects of theories. Thus, Bagley did not see the scientific bent toward education as undermining his theory in its entirety. As will be explained later, with more direct criticisms to Thorndike, Bagley will critique the emerging science of education on the grounds that its findings are being overgeneralized.

for other subjects based on both domain-specific and domain-general understandings. Applied to science, evidence in Bagley's earliest writings emphasized the process of scientific inquiry. Bagley (1911b) advocated for the teaching of science on the basis of "securing control of the material world" (p. 12). However, an emphasis on the process of inquiry led in a slightly different direction that emphasized a kind of trial and error approach, rather than a primary focus on only knowing a priori laws as facts (Bagley, 1911b). Specifically, Bagley stated, "The value of close and unprejudiced observation, of controlled experiment, of careful and painstaking induction and generalization has been recognized only after a long series of efforts and struggles and costly errors." (p.12-13)

In the following characterization of the process of inquiry and discovery applied to the scientific method, Bagley further implied that mere transmission of the scientific method as a set of facts with no future utility would not suffice:

When the neophyte in science recognizes that the laws which he is attempting to master were not brought down full fledged from some remote storehouse of abstract wisdom, but were toilsomely wrought out of crude human experience to meet vital human needs, his attitude toward his task will be positive rather than negative. (Bagley, 1911b, p. 13)

For Bagley (1911b), content such as the scientific method also implied teaching universal aspects of human defeat and success rather than domain-specific steps as solely factual knowledge. In this scenario, the universal aspects related to the process of inquiry and discovery ultimately represent what might be passed down from generation to generation. In addition, the specific knowledge gained from such a process might serve in the generation of new knowledge. Society might perceive this new knowledge as valuable, as it fills a need. This implication

regarding society links directly with Bagley's view of societal improvement as social progress, which will be discussed below, in relation to Thorndike's view of social efficiency.

In history, Bagley (1911a, b, c, d, e; 1912a, b, c, d) posited several applications upon which the teaching of history could be defensible in schools, and methods by which that might be accomplished. In addition to outcomes revolving around moral conduct and being able to live in concordance with society, Bagley (1911c, d) also noted that teaching of ideals and attitudes must take place. One specific problem, according to Bagley, resided in only addressing moral conduct and passive forms of societal living.

Bagley (1912a) defended the importance of the study of history by linking it to common experiences, and the degree to which

> [t]he pupil may conceive and execute, and his plans may stretch across the centuries; he may toil and triumph; he may struggle, suffer, and go down in defeat. And because the experiences that he has relived have been the significant and important experiences of the race (else they were not "history"), the resultant attitudes, the perspectives, the presuppositions, the prejudices, the interpretive background – or whatever you wish to call them – reflect something infinitely more comprehensive and valuable than any single life-span could encompass; something that solidifies individual experience and gives it permanence and value; something that liberates minds from the insidious fallacy of the immediate. (Bagley, 1912a, p.196-197)

Bagley (1912c) suggested that current events would be allowable in history if they represented the answer to a problem not solved for a long time, or gave credence to an older ideal. What might seem to be a point in favor of application of the project or activity method was greatly qualified. Politics, in the context of current elections, could also be defensible to

120

teach, when trends were discussed, and when social issues manifest themselves. The

"interpretation … and to encourage pupils to reflect upon the significance of every-day

happenings …" (p. 331) might yield not only students who would be better newspaper readers

for content, which was Bagley's context in which he placed learning about current events, but

might also produce students who could discern significant, common societal ideals from this

content. Additionally, these students might reflect responsibly on those ideals. As an added

benefit, connections to a democratic education based on common information taught early could

strengthen the emerging collective conscience of a society:

> An idea or a fact or a bit of information about a historical event has its value greatly
>
> enhanced if it is a matter of common knowledge; it becomes thereby a possible point of
>
> reference in collective thinking – a common denominator in the exchange of experience.
>
> In light of this contention, the facts, ideas, and items of information that have been and
>
> are the common property of the great majority of the people assume a large significance
>
> to the student of educational values. (Bagley, 1915b, p. 142)

Though the content Bagley discussed thus far provided examples with respect to teaching

history and science in the elementary schools, Bagley (1914a) also expounded on this idea of

common elements and their impact in literature. Bagley contended that the value in studying

characters, situations, and events related to a timeless resonance found in universal aspects and

themes rather than merely the immediate story itself. Bagley (1929) suggested that teaching

geography revolve around mastering its facts and principles, and also cultivating a sense of,

"appreciation of what this knowledge has cost and what it has meant to human progress" (p. 92).

Furthermore, outcomes in geography could be greatly enhanced "if in teaching the facts and

121

principals, we give some attention to the way in which they have been discovered and established … and what [that knowledge] has actually accomplished" (p. 92).

The larger subject of Bagley's ideas with respect to education revolved around domain-general commonalities and their impacts in society. Bagley's characterization of the connection between the role of commonalities in the curriculum in service of establishing a broad community with democratic links presented here stands in direct contrast to what has been discussed with respect to the differences in the more localized definition of community, often in "eighteenth-century … neighborhood terms" (Bagley, 1918a, p. 243). This older, narrower definition of community was more commonly associated with other progressives, including Dewey. Therefore, when adopting a broader view of community and democracy, "Common elements in the curriculums of the public schools are not only justified, they are demanded, by social needs, and particularly by needs of a democracy…" (Bagley, 1914a, p.12).

To add support to that position, Bagley (1914a) also noted that, "If democracy depends on one factor, it depends on social solidarity – it depends upon a certain community of ideas, standards, ideals and aspirations among all members of the democratic society and it is this necessity that lies at the basis of uniformity in the programs of a democratic school system" (p. 12). Therefore, the individualistic stance of progressivism and its meaning for a democratic education is a noticeable point of division when contrasted with a democratic, Bagleyian, collective perspective.

Implications for student experiences in schools. The differing definitions of community and democracy according to Bagley and Dewey over collective versus individual concerns have special implications for the kinds of experiences schools might have the responsibility to furnish. Whereas Dewey and others associated with this type of progressive education focused on

122

experiences that closely or exactly approximated those children were likely to have in society as authentic experiences, Bagley (1923) spoke of a vicarious kind of experience that only the school could provide.

> What the school attempts to do, - what, indeed, it is doing with increasing success as the art of teaching is refined is to control the conditions of experience that the important lessons will be learned in the most economical and effective way. The identification of education with experience, however, while clearly justified, is likely to obscure a very important service that education can be made to render – a service, too, that "raw" if experienced, no matter how extended or varied, cannot guarantee. The outstanding advantage of education as contrasted with raw experience lies in the fact that it enables the learner to transcend the limits of space and time within which the influence of raw experience is restricted. (p. 35)

Applications of this idea for music education will be discussed in Chapter 5 in relation to the role of rehearsals, performances, and teaching.

Using a case of a hypothetical, male, recent high school graduate who Bagley refers to as having been educated by effective teachers, Bagley (1923) continued, with particularly vivid examples drawn from a wide breadth of content areas. First, in history, he stated that given that this graduate "had the teaching we have assumed, he *sat* in the Constitutional convention then assembled. He participated in its discussions." (p. 36)

Bagley continued with more examples, emphasizing that a critical point in this student's education revolved around significance and meaning of the content:

> [This graduate] not only watched the tide of emigrants sweep down the Ohio; he knew what this meant – and he saw the same movement from half-dozen other points of

vantage: from the summits of the Appalachian passes, from the Erie Canal and the Great

lakes, later from the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the transcontinental rails. The most

significant events of the industrial revolution he lived through – and saw their meaning.

He was with Fulton on the Claremont; he helped Whitney invent the cotton gin, and

Morse the telegraph, and McCormick the reaper. The black cloud of slavery he saw

gathering long before in darkened in the sky. (p. 36)

Bagley continued, in science:

He can see and the following apple what Newton was the first to see. He sees the plant

world through the eyes of Linnaeus, and the animal world through the eyes of Cuvier,

Lamarck, and Agassiz, and the whole world Vries. (Bagley, 1923, p. 36-37)

Lastly, in literature:

If it is true that he has lived with the great figures of history, it is also true that he has

lived with the great figures of literature, and because he knows Hamlet and Macbeth and

Shylock he can see in human nature something that Shakespeare was the first clearly to

see. (Bagley, 1923, p. 36-37)

Implications for school vision. When contrasted with the Deweyian characterization of

integrating students into the structure and life of the school, Bagley's own model of a good

school spoke of a clearer separation between students and the school itself. At the same time,

Bagley (1930) did not discount meaningful relationships between students and teachers and the

reciprocal relationships formed between the two parties. Bagley (1930) also maintained that

"health and bodily well-being … eager and aggressive industry on the part of both pupils and

teachers … helpfulness and a constant regard for the rights of others … happiness [and] … hard

work …" (p. 266) all played a prominent role in a "good school" (p. 266).

Other characteristics that Bagley (1930) noted perhaps spoke more directly to larger ideals that he emphasized. These characteristics also represent other notions that will be discussed below and in Chapter 5, where implications for music education will be discussed. Therefore, these characteristics have been included in their entirety, with original numbers, as denoted by Bagley (1930). Characteristics 1, 2, 4, and 5 have been summarized above. Bagley (1930) stated:

3) A good school is characterized by whole-hearted cooperation between teacher and pupils and among pupils. In such a school the teacher is a leader and a guide rather than a taskmaster.

6) A good school sets high store by what might be called the ideal of fine workmanship. To do as well as one can the task that the hand (or the head) finds to do, irrespective of the reward that it brings, irrespective of whether it is intrinsically interesting or boring; this to my mind is the ideal that American youth needs most of all at the present time.

7) In a good school, every pupil learns each successive day a little bit more to stand alone, to "carry on" without oversight and direction, to control his own interests and desires, and to direct his own conduct toward worthy ends. The most important test of the teacher's efficiency is the degree in which he or she makes himself or herself not *indispensable*, but dispensable. *Self*-guidance, *self*-discipline, *self*-control—these are among the primary objectives of a good school. (p.266)

Based on the differences seen here which also stem from various interpretations of democracy, distinctions between Bagley and Deweyian forms of progressive education have emerged along individual and collective lines. These differences then have clear implications for structure and experiences for students in schools along dimensions of authentic and vicarious

involvement. Implications of this that influence and impact the specific manner by which common elements in music education have been operationalized will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Bagley as Different from Thorndike: Social Efficiency Versus Social Progress

Bagley also differed with respect to several aspects of progressive education consistent with Thorndike. In particular, Bagley staunchly opposed the mental testing movement as well as vocational education (Null, 2003). Speaking directly to a consequence of perceiving vocational education as an inferior pathway, Bagley (1912d, 1912f) contended that negative impacts might include social stratification. For Bagley, the issue of the role of vocational-education in formal education spoke of a moral issue to solve lest more students experience negative influences.

However, Bagley (1911f, 1912e) appeared to accept the scientific slant toward education as enduring and credited Thorndike directly for moving science education out of "blind empiricism" (Bagley, 1912e, p.415). In a response to Professor Shorey, an outspoken critic of scientific education, Bagley mused that efforts leading to complete eradication of scientific education might "accomplish just what the old woman accomplished when she attempted to sweep back the sea" (Bagley, 1911f, p.137).

Bagley (1916b, 1935b) also acknowledged the complex nature of psychological foundations "to lay bare the facts" (Bagley, 1916b, p. 363), despite often conflicting results and limitations. Bagley (1935b) also began to define differences between levels of learning, which further differentiated potential contributions of scientific findings in education and perhaps their resulting impacts. While Bagley (1935b) acknowledged that "[Laws related to] primitive levels of learning could possibly be clarified" (p. 168), he emphasized that

It is the higher emergent learnings, however, that are most important in education, and

these present-day psychology has in some cases entirely ignored and in other cases

126

attempted to explain in the same way that it explains primitive or lower-level learnings. (p.168-169)

As a consequence of acceptance, however, Bagley (1911f) acknowledged a metaphorical exchange between philosophy and science:

Educational science has abandoned its search for the philosopher's stone; it has given up its attempt to square the circle, or trisect an angle, or construct a cube that will be precisely double the contents of a given cube; It [sic] has settled down to the prosaic business of solving little problems, of ferreting out little facts, and of constructing tentative working hypotheses upon the basis of these facts. (Bagley, 1911f, p. 136)

As further means to differentiate the psychological and scientific connections from philosophical and theoretical links, Bagley contrasted the tendency toward quantification with respect to measuring abilities in education with the notion that "[g]eneral educational theory must answer the question 'is it worthwhile to make the attempt' [to measure ability]" (Bagley, 1916b, p. 362). Likewise, Bagley (1916b) posited that differences in fundamental meaning of democracy and its implications are considerations for "general educational theory rather than by educational psychology" (p.363).

Hence, the notion of investigating the nature of teaching and learning, for Bagley, rested on a careful balance between asking appropriate scientifically oriented questions, and reflecting on the results in relation to the philosophically oriented question of worth, which has been discussed in detail in the above section. Bagley (1916b) contended that a psychology of education based on scientific findings could answer such specific questions as, "In how far can weak native ability be profitably trained?" (p. 363), then subsequently analyzing whether or not

127

any gains made as a function of training are worthwhile. Using a case example of math made this salient point of Bagley's especially vivid:

> There are some high-school pupils for example, who seem to profit in no way by the study of algebra and geometry. Assuming that these subjects furnish the best available means for giving one a conception of what abstract and symbolic thinking means, and some valuable exercise in this type of thinking (an assumption which can be theoretically defended), is this value to be realized in any appreciable measure among those pupils who find these subjects extremely distasteful? It is at least conceivable that the trouble which many pupils experience in connection with these subjects is greatly intensified by the fact that they are continually measuring their weakness against the strength of others. Under such conditions, of course, discouragement and its consequent depression form what might be called an extraneous or factitious handicap. The administrative expedient that at once suggests itself in this case is differentiation of classes on the basis of standards of accomplishment and rate of progress. But the fundamental question is whether any progress that is possible under these conditions is really worth while. (p. 363)

While Bagley (1916b) noted that this line of reasoning could be extended across the curriculum, the preceding example would seem to imply a stance consistent with the problems of a progressive slant to a highly differentiated curriculum governed by student interests that Bagley previously criticized. However, the next portion of his position, applied to history and ending with a leading, rhetorical question, perhaps implied that it did not make sense to assume a link between worth, need for that subject to exist in schools, and subject matter that might not be interesting to students. That link also would not make sense when considering the collective,

communal definition of democracy that ultimately formed the foundation of Bagley's position of

a democratic education. Further, Bagley's 1930 characterization of a "good school" (p. 266), did

not necessarily depend on this link between worth, need, and interest. Bagley (1916b)

> We note with apprehension, for example, that history does not appear in some of the
>
> curriculums proposed for junior high schools. Does this mean that pupils are to be trained
>
> for "citizenship" with only the simple, biographical history that is taught in the lower
>
> grades, and largely because some boys and girls do not "take" to this subject? (Bagley,
>
> 1916b, p. 363)

This question might also suggest that in order for history to be considered worthwhile in

the curriculum, there should be clear understandings of a higher order that would speak beyond

the subject matter itself. By implication, then, grouping and differentiation might become less

efficient ways, or perhaps strategies that would not make sense to use, given the broad-based

nature of common knowledge and understanding. Implications for music education regarding

potential higher-order understandings will be discussed later in this Chapter and in Chapter 5.

Differences in social efficiency.   Two specific points of difference emerged between

Bagley's vision of societal improvement and Thorndike's. While one difference involved

contrasting Bagley's vision of social progress with social efficiency of Thorndike, another

difference revolved around the role of common understandings Bagley desired and the role of

individual differences emphasized by Thorndike. Bagley contended that the link to social

efficiency was also dependent on commonalities, rather than the individual differences

emphasized by Thorndike:

> The efficiency of a democracy is directly dependent on the number of ideas that are
>
> common to all of the members of the democratic group. The level upon which a

democratic society does its collective thinking is dependent upon the level to which

formal education has raised the great majority of its members, or to put it another way, a

high level of common ideas is essential to collective thinking on a high plane. (Bagley,

1914a, p. 12-13)

Bagley's conclusion remained largely unchanged regarding the establishment of a

community based on common elements both in relation to a democratic education, associated

with Dewey, and now social efficiency. Additionally, consequences might include the

following, especially given a uniform "leveling up or leveling down" (Bagley, 1918b, p. 43)

regarding abilities, achievement, thought or action, as could be the tendency if the connection

between science and education is relied upon to a strong degree.

Lacking this community of culture, the social group must of necessity remain but an

aggregation of individuals, bound together perhaps for the time by a community of

interests and desires, but incapable of realizing their common aims and subject to

disintegration into conflicting groups once the engrossing but only temporary compelling

need of cooperation has passed. (Bagley, 1918b, p. 43)

Therefore, schools had a responsibility to define what common elements are a part of the

curriculum in each subject, what role teachers play in transmitting those elements to their

students, and what function school life plays in the scope of the broader community (Bagley,

1918b).

While transmission and role definition of teachers and of the schools could imply

replication and an amount of stability in a changing society, Bagley stated that schools have a

responsibility to ensure that society evolved. His thoughts on the connection between creative

ability and the societal impact of it were particularly direct:

130

But with the conditions of social stability there must also be provided the conditions of social progress. Merely to perpetuate what the past has achieved, even if only the worthiest elements are selected, will be not sufficient. To stimulate new growth and open new lines of development is the second basic function of the public school. It is clear that social progress depends on creative ability rather than upon merely imitative or reproductive ability. (Bagley, 1918b, p. 43)

Bagley continued, carefully noting limitations of the school in relation to this idea he mentioned:

The school cannot manufacture creative ability, but it can and must be keen to detect it, ready and willing to recognize and encourage it, and competent to direct its development. Further than this, even though the school cannot develop creative ability in all, it can do much to prepare all whom influences to evaluate leadership intelligently – and social progress depends on the creative leadership that is not only available but also, in a democracy, acceptable to the social group. (Bagley, 1918b, p. 43)

While many interpretations of creativity continue to surround the development of creative ability in the context of the public school environment, the potential links between creative ability, leadership, and national social progress, as Bagley assumed, ultimately supports the responsibility schools have to develop this construct as a part of a formal education. Given this link established by Bagley, schools also would have a responsibility to educate students such that they can discriminate wisely and would also be prepared for a changing society with new responsibilities:

It is true that our little local school systems do constitute in the aggregate a national system of public education, but this fact, which process now to be so fortunate, has come

131

about through accident rather than design. What is needed is a much more explicit effort to insure through the schools that national community of ideas, ideals, standards, and aspirations upon which the realization of our new national aims and the successful meeting of our new national responsibilities must inevitably depend. (Bagley, 1918b, p. 43)

However, the counter-argument to what has been presented thus far involves conceding that schools would also have a responsibility to identify and potentially select individuals who would fill certain roles in society more effectively than others. In that sense, social efficiency and its improvement would be made manifest in ways that are largely consistent with Thorndike, and more broadly, a position of determinism (Bagley, 1922). For Bagley, a position consistent with broad and widely applied determinism and associated aspects of education consistent with that position became a particular point of division between the progressive educators consistent with Thorndike and himself. A move toward social stratification, as reinforced either implicitly or explicitly by the schools, ultimately undermined Bagley's vision of a community based on collective ideas and common knowledge (Bagley, 1912a, 1912c, 1912d, 1912e; 1922). However, a collective societal vision based on commonness would not necessarily imply equality except with respect to understandings. Bagley (1914a) stated:

> Education cannot make all members of the social group equal in ability or capacity. The world would be extremely flat and uninteresting if this were the case. Differences in capacity are inevitable; but education can give to all, or to practically all, the same ideas and the same ideals if it wishes to do so. (Bagley, 1914a, p. 10)

Though Bagley (1914a) also acknowledged the impact of individual differences, he also noted that "it should not be forgotten that, for social welfare, resemblances in ideals and

132

standards are vastly more important than resemblances or differences in native capacity"
(Bagley, 1914a, p. 10).

Thus, specific constructs such as mental testing and the second-tier status of vocational
education, as have been described in Chapter 2, existed as points of criticism for Bagley. Bagley
(1922) contended that the fault in mental testing rested not in the "facts that measurements
themselves reveal, but upon the hypotheses and assumptions that development of the measures
has involved …" (p. 373). In addition, Bagley also warned vehemently against
overgeneralization of conclusions and applications from results.

More deleterious, perhaps, than overgeneralization would be the lack of a clear
foundation from which results have tended to be based upon. Applied to a case related to the
effect of experience on learning:

> [The determinist] argues back to a hypothetical factor which, far from having isolated, he
> has never clearly defined. The closest that he has come to a satisfactory definition is to
> call this factor "ability to learn." He then, by an act of pure imagination, reads out of the
> product everything that experience, education and training have contributed. Until
> recently, he has had no notion how much they have contributed or where their
> contribution stops. (Bagley, 1922, p. 376)

For Bagley (1922), however, the most serious charge to the then-current wave of mental
testing involved clear implications for a society based in democracy. After positing that
democracy carries with it another definition in a determinist framework, Bagley implied that
social efficiency and placement would not necessarily portend its improvement and
advancement. Bagley noted:

Equity of opportunity, then, is the only real democracy, according to the determinist.

Give every child opportunity, he says, opportunity to develop precisely as his original

nature indicates, this one into an artisan, that one into an artist; this one into a machine

operative, that one into a "captain of industry"; this one into a clerk; that one into a

"merchant prince"; this one into a teacher, that one into an "educator." … Every man, he

nonchalantly assumes, can be taught to know his own place, appreciate his own

limitations and mind his own business. (p. 379)

Next, Bagley (1922) explicitly contrasted his collective, democratic position with a

deterministic one by first stating that, "The development of democracy has been unquestionably

toward the elevation of the common man to a position of supreme collective control" (p. 380).

He continued:

What has the determinist to propose in place of this program? He would apply his

intelligence tests to discover the future leaders. Having thus selected them in advance, he

would give them every advantage and stimulus to turn their native abilities to the benefit

of society[.] (Bagley, 1922, p. 380)

As another concrete example of the dangers of determinism, Bagley (1922) contended

that aspects of testing to identify those with intelligence advantages that were successful in the

army would not work in schools because of differences in context:

The personnel of the Army does not choose its own leaders; the personnel of the nation

does. The personnel of the Army does not pass final judgment on plans and policies that

the Army seeks to realize; the personnel of the nation does. (p. 381)

Furthermore, Bagley (1922) garnered support for his argument against determinism by taking a specific stance against the idea that training some individuals to be leaders, as the Army did, would undermine a democratic education:

> Yet because some difficulties stand in the way of preparing the great masses of the people to interpret these problems intelligently, the determinist proposes to chuck overboard the democratic ideal of education; to substitute a deceptive "equality of opportunity" for a while-hearted effort to bring the masses of our children up to a reasonable intellectual standard, and to devote educational efforts to the training of leaders, a great majority of whom, under an ignorant electorate, would fall to a quick defeat at the hands of the demagogue and the political machine. (p. 381-382)

Therefore, Bagley (1922) concluded that schools would have another specific task, which complements his vision of a democratic education, rather than in the training of a few, which undermines it:

> It is doubtless true that the school cannot increase the sum total of mentality, but it can and does increase the sum total of trained and informed intelligence" (p. 383).

Further supporting his dissent with the determinists, Bagley (1945a) commented on further dangers of overgeneralization of inherent intelligence:

> That the IQ may be fairly constant in a great many cases is not to be questioned. Similarly, that the "transfer of training" is negligible in a great many cases is not to be questioned. But the conclusion that the IQ can be infallibly trusted as a guide has proved itself to be a costly delusion. And similarly to conclude, as many reputable students of education still do, that the "transfer" experiments have made the concept of mental

discipline as dead as the dodo is, in the light of the recorded evidence, a delusion that in the long run may be just as costly. (Bagley, 1945a, p. 419-420)

Taken together, these passages from Bagley illustrate clearly his consistent position as an anti-determinist across time. As an anti-determinist, Bagley logically concluded that such ideas that are endemic to a progressive education closely associated with Thorndike and the broader idea of determinism undermined his own vision of a democratic education based on collective, common ideas.

Implications for underlying organization of materials. Bagley asserted that content with respect to each subject should be organized according to its conceptual relationships. While that statement implied a distinct difference in thought from those educators consistent with a radical, more Deweyian stance, the method of instruction Bagley (1939a) spoke of also implied that relationships between concepts could be discovered and might lead from lower-order understandings to higher-order understandings. Given the contention of Bagley that scientific evidence could help discern laws relating to lower-level learnings, which has been discussed earlier, perhaps such an organization of materials might indicates a salient point of agreement with a facet of progressive education associated with Thorndike:

There is for example, a general denial—sometimes implicit, often explicit—of any virtue in the systematic and sequential mastery of subject-matter as such. In other words, the organization of learning materials on the basis of what may be called their internal relationships—logical, chronological, spatial, and causal—has been questioned, in some cases to the point of discredit (p. 336).

136

Implications for this statement within music education will be discussed later in this Chapter. Bagley (1939a) continued, positing that the radical, child-centered progressive educators contended that:

> All learnings should come as instruments in the solution of immediate problems or the realization of immediate purposes. In effect, this excludes the recognition of any educational values except those now called "functional" or "instrumental" but which were long referred to in educational discussions as "utilitarian." A very clear tendency in recent years has been still further to extend this limitation, and to view with suspicion any learnings that are not initiated by the learner itself. (p. 336)

As seen here, as Bagley outlined his understanding of progressive education, utilitarianism would be allowable. Given his position on common understandings, meanings, and ideas across society, however, perhaps the word as it is operationalized by the progressives might take on a slightly different connotation than it had in an essentialist framework. At the very least, in this discussion, that term is used here to describe a component of progressive education.

Perhaps, though, the domain of music education has too narrowly viewed utilitarianism, or attached negative connotations to it, which has connoted that music education exists in relation to help, aid, or to enhance performance in another area. If utilitarianism, though, also depended on common elements, as it did in a Bagleyian framework, then the extent to which subjects have *worth* in the public school might also be to the degree that they serve the same sets of common understandings. All subjects then might tentatively be labeled utilitarian; however, with a different connotation for music education than has been thought of in the past. This discussion will connect directly to the common elements presented in Chapter 5.

However, Bagley (1939a) qualified his assertions with certain considerations concerning child development and explicitly labeled these qualifications as Essentialist:

The essentialist certainly would indorse [sic] the functional approach to the problems of teaching and learning; the effort always to build the lessons of race-experience upon the individual, first-hand experience of the learner; the condemnation of stupid, parrot-like learning; the importance in the earlier school years especially of the procedures that are reflected in such concepts as the project method and the activity program; and the efforts to make school like a happy as well as a profitable series of learning experiences. (p. 339)

In addition, Bagley (1935b) tentatively answered criticisms that an essentialist slant toward education might lead to an overreliance on information with no application or utility. While this idea will be discussed directly in the next section, the link between organization of content taught and the understanding that it leads to is directly addressed here:

But to sequential learnings, properly taught, the term "mere" information does not apply. It is a "mere" fact that James Watt, after long struggle and failure, finally learned how to make the power of steam turn a wheel; or that Arkwright and Hargreaves, after overcoming similar difficulties, invented machinery which made possible the manufacture of textiles on a quantity basis; or that Eli Whitney finally succeeded in making the large-scale production of cotton possible? Considered each in and for itself these inventions might have been interesting but not fundamentally significant; but when they are put together they are seen to have initiated a movement which started social evolution on a new course and led to a new configuration of social forces. Not to have this knowledge as part of one's present mental background is simply not to have the basis for interpreting some of the most significant present-day social and economic

phenomena. To read out the picture systematic and sequential learnings based upon the logical, chronological, and causal relationships of the materials of learning is not only to obscure the importance of dynamic and dependable mental backgrounds; it is to encourage an ineffectiveness which has been clearly apparent whenever [progressive education] has been applied consistently on a scale large enough to show how it works (p. 180).

Vocational Education as Equal in Status

Given that the developmental track of vocational education emerged as a blend of progressive ideas, which has been discussed in Chapter 2, this notion of Bagley's conception of vocational education and its role might also speak of a blend of criticisms of progressive ideas. While his early writings centered on a lack of systematic instruction with respect to vocational education (e.g. Bagley, 1912d, 1912e) and specialized nature of vocational education when compared with a liberal education (e.g. 1914b), later ideas emerged that directly spoke to points of criticism with both equality as opportunity, prominently associated with Dewey, and social efficiency, associated with Thorndike.

Therefore, the specific points of Bagley's (1943) application of democracy into the domain of vocational education also emerged as a blend between progressive ideas as well, which coincidentally paralleled the track of vocational education, which has currently emerged as a blend of progressive ideas.

Take for example, the constant reiteration of the sateen that the aim of public education in our democracy is to ensure an equality of opportunity for "all the children of all the people." This is a highly worthy ideal—provided that one clearly answers the question "equality of opportunity for what?" The word "opportunity" has come to have a rather

139

narrowly restricted meaning in American life. In the development of our national mores, material success or success in our competitive economic order has come to loom much larger than success in other forms of endeavor. (p. 216)

This link between economic prosperity and success as an underlying value of society has consequences, however. Bagley (1943) continued:

All this has tended to limit the concept of "opportunity" in the minds of probably a large majority of the people, to opportunity for achieving success in these fields. And under our "enterprise system" (a euphemism for the individual-profits system) "equality of opportunity" means an equal chance to "get ahead", which in turn means to get ahead of others in the race, not alone or primarily for wealth, but more frequently and fundamentally, for the honor and distinction that the achievement (not the mere possession) of wealth confers upon this who win the race (p. 216-217).

This emerging line of argumentation provided by Bagley (1943) also necessitated a shift in thinking with regard to the perceptions that traditionally low-status professions might be viewed. Equal status for previously low-status professions could be garnered based on the needs of society and the degree to which workers in those professions demonstrated mastery of skills and knowledge relevant to that profession, or carried out the duties of their profession (Bagley, 1943, 1944). Thus, for Bagley (1943) differences in process implied different outcomes:

In the process of training and discipline that moulded the apprentice into a journeyman and the journeyman into a master craftsman, one ideal stood out sharp and clear above all the others—the ideal of good workmanship, of doing superlatively well the work that the guild represented. In reality, one's trade became in all essential respects a fine art. (p. 217)

140

For a wide range of disciplines, his position applied in parallel fashion. Particularly noteworthy is his mention of the fine arts:

Similarly, with the great artists—the painters, the sculptors, actors, musicians and those who do creative work in literature. And something of the kind is true of workers in the so-called professions—in medicine, and in engineering, in preaching and in teaching. (p. 217)

Therefore, for Bagley (1943), conceptualizing "every socially-essential occupation [as] a fine art, or an applied science, or a profession, or a combination of these" (p. 217) is one initial consideration in formulating an argument for equal status among all work done. Additionally, Bagley placed responsibility on "the public to recognize the worth and the dignity of the worker and of the work that he does" (p.217-218). Because this might also imply a value held by society, it is incumbent upon formal education to instill that sense of "worth and dignity" (p. 217) in relation to chosen occupations, regardless of category.

Following logically from this groundwork established, Bagley (1944a) suggested recommendations for the domain of vocational education based on equality of status, not opportunity. These recommendations included "effective processes and procedures involved in any given occupation explained … in terms of principles established by scientific investigation, … systematic training, … enlightened practice for the mastery of skills to the point of proficient and satisfying artistry, [and] … an enduring loyalty to the highest ideals of the profession, art, or craft that this work represents. … "(p. 52-53)

Finally, Bagley (1944b) noted that implications for a more enriching life and existence could also be realized through his ideal broadly described here, that he termed occupational democracy (Bagley, 1943, 1944a, 1944b).

Granted that, of [any person's] 112 waking hours, the 72 in which he does not work need

illumination and enrichment and a "sense of purpose," does it not follow that, for his 40

working hours, the skills with which the "training programs and industry" may equip him

will provide all the illumination and enrichment and sense of purpose in respect of his

occupation that he needs if he is to live a truly "integrated life? Is the worker as a

worker, merely an automaton, merely a "hand, and must seek all his joys, satisfactions,

and opportunities for creative effort outside his working ours? Vocational education of

the right sort, administered in co-operation with business and industry but under truly

educational ideals, can fill the gap in the scheme of "integration." (Bagley, 1944b, p. 340)

The characterization of vocational education in this way also stands in criticism to the

idea of social efficiency through purposeful placement in certain occupations. This

characterization of vocational education as equal in status also contradicts the notion of that

domain as second-tier, or inferior, to a liberal education often found in the comprehensive

secondary schools. This notion of equality also speaks to the Bagleyian notion of commonalities

among all, and social efficiency through its collective progress.

Bagley as Different from Other Essentialists: Liberal and Cultural Education

One potential weakness of any philosophy that places emphasis on cultural transmission

is the extent to which that philosophy becomes representative of one culture or one set of ideas

exclusively. The idea of monoculturalism might be indicative of a more conservative position on

the Essentialist spectrum and will be addressed in this section, as will implications for a liberal

education which could also be an indicator of an essentialist perspective of education (e.g. Imig

& Imig, 2008; Kivy,1991).

Speaking to the broad role education can play in creating social awareness of other

cultures based in insights derived from understanding pivotal events and people relative to that

culture, Bagley (1945b) implied that essentialism can also accommodate differing cultural

perspectives, which are dependent on relative truths endemic to that culture. In an increasingly

diverse society, an understanding of such perspectives would be needed:

Public education, especially, now has a clear mandate to direct its potentially powerful

influence toward the development of a pervasive international consciousness and

conscience on the part of American citizens. Common sense would seem to dictate two

primary educational objectives: (1) an enlightened understanding of the ideals and

aspirations of other peoples and particularly of the facts of both remote and recent history

from which these have emerged and from which they now derive their power as "social

binders"; and (2) a predisposition toward patience and tolerance in the dealings that the

American people must have with other peoples in the years that lie ahead. A relatively

minor but not unimportant question of present interest to American education is what

influence, if any, this emergent situation will have on the public attitude toward

compulsory military training." (p. 69)

With this caveat, Bagley (1938a) did not over-generalize that line of thinking to non-

critical acceptance of other ideas, and did not perceive that understanding other cultures through

their perspectives would necessarily compromise ideals from democracy, so long as balanced

coverage was applied:

Nor in respect to other social orders and their ideals should I wish American citizens to

be uninformed; I should even be willing that their claims be presented in as appealing

form as possible – only reserving the right to present the cause of democracy in an equally appealing way. (p. 564-565)

Essentialism and a liberal education. The strong connection between an essentialist education and facets of a liberal education perhaps lend an amount of credence to the seemingly contrarian contention of Imig and Imig (2008) who posited that essentialist thought had been dominant throughout education over the past 80 years. The facet of liberal education that "will deal rather with explanatory principles which will give [a student] the possibility of a rational control over new situations which we cannot foresee but which we are morally certain will arise in his life" (Bagley, 1914b, p. 167) lays the groundwork for potential impacts that Bagley (1914b) detailed:

> [A liberal education] will aim to give him the power to detect new situations and devise methods, implements and devices for their solution. It will furnish him with standards of value, thru which he can view his problems in their proper proportions. (p.167)

Bagley (1914b) continued, initially suggesting specific impacts in history and science.

> [A liberal education] will rid his mind of the fallacy of the immediate; thru the study of history, it will give him a time-perspective upon his own life and upon the issues of his own generation which he must help to meet. Thru science, it will rid his mind of superstition and fraud and error. (p. 167-168)

Bagley (1914b) continued concerning the influence a liberal education might have on literature and art. His classification of literature with art here speaks to a salient idea of distinction between the technical properties of literature and the expressive, affective properties. The implications for literacy and creativity in relation to that idea will be discussed as related to music education in Chapter 5.

Thru [sic] literature and art, it will reveal the finer and more subtle forces which dominate

human motives and so often determine human conduct – forces so subtle that only the

masters can detect them and interpret them – but which, once caught and crystallized, are

available to all who can appreciate and understand. (p. 168)

The material presented here led Bagley (1914b) to the conclusion that emphasizing this

kind of liberal education involving outcomes beyond rote memorization of bits of knowledge

also contributed to an education that has a lasting impression on people's lives. Though Bagley

also qualified his description of his vision of a liberal education, he nonetheless remained

steadfast about its importance and its link to societal improvement through social progress.

I protest, too, against the theory that this type of education is merely for adornment or for

enjoyment. It lies at the very basis of progress. It furnishes very frequently the

compelling motive of toil and sacrifice and effortful achievement. (p. 168)

An additional caveat to this type of education, noted by Bagley (1911b) and briefly

mentioned above, revolved around knowing facts and not applying them. Yet another centered

on the assumption that knowledge of facts would lead to their application. A further

complicating factor with potential impacts for the effectiveness of a liberal education also

included students who generally did not come into school with the "appropriate attitude to

receive instruction and act upon it" (Bagley, 1911d, p.106). The teacher's responsibility, then,

must also encompass ensuring that students gain this amount of attitude (perhaps as a synonym

for motivation) needed. All of these caveats represented additional challenges in the classroom

(Bagley, 1911d).

Bagley (1911e) noted that certain foundational understandings would be needed before

application of a liberal education could take place, even suggesting a "standard list" (p. 143) that

might be useful for teachers to use in determining prerequisite, "certain automatic bases that must be laid" (p.144). Content experts could construct these "habit standards" (p.144). On the basis of assigning a high number to each bit of information, these habit standards could be available to teachers in each subject (Bagley, 1911e, 1912a). In history, Bagley suggested, one might include dates of significant events. Bagley (1912a) also concluded that the business of selecting the initial content should be left to the experts, such as a historian rather than a layman. Though the layman might offer utility and application, Bagley contended, only the historian would possess knowledge to select relevant subject-specific facts and then could connect those facts, or knowledge in the subject, to the underlying values those facts represented. However, Bagley also stated that these bases simply existed as means to an end, which implied utility or transfer. In Chapter 5, I will outline the relevance for music education along layman-expert lines and connect that with the kinds of distinctions Bagley was elucidating here regarding types of education, with respect to advocacy.

As Bagley (1914b) continued here into his vision for a third kind of education, which he termed cultural education that "trains the consumer" (p. 169), the point of departure with when compared to the ending point of a liberal education is especially blurry and ambiguous with respect to the role of arts and resulting implications for public schools. Implications of this statement will be discussed immediately following this section.

> A third subtype of general education I should call *cultural* and while the distinction
> between the liberal education and the cultural education should not be sharply drawn, I
> should think of [cultural education] as essentially the education that prepares for leisure.
> Literature and art and music and healthful sport all have a function here, altho each may
> also have a function under one or another of the heads already discussed. (p. 169)

146

While conceding that the future is unpredictable and uncertain, Bagley (1933) did not acquiesce that there are not "permanent, or at least relatively permanent, elements of culture" (p. 565), which placed distance between his views and those of progressives with a relativistic stance on culture.

> From the point of social welfare and progress, too, there are some virtues that have not
> lost their value. Frugality and thrift may not be so significant as they once were, but
> respect for life, respect for law, consideration for the rights and certain feelings of others,
> and plain every-day honesty are important. (p. 566)

Bagley (1933) also commented on other ideals, and noted that while religious institutions have traditionally instilled these values, they did not have to be necessarily taught by sacred institutions:

> Ideals of duty, loyalty, and devotion are usually conditioned by one's early training, and
> so in the past usually reflected in religious dogmas, but they are capable of being aroused
> by and enlisted in, causes that have nothing to do with dogmatic religion." (p. 566).

Bagley's wide-ranging generalizations into what the school should provide encompassed more than knowledge and skills. Despite evidence presented thus far that might suggest drawing a sharp distinction between home and school, Bagley (1938b) qualified that assertion, which perhaps also moderated his perspective. Suggesting that moving into an industrial society from an agrarian one necessitated that schools fill in certain gaps that the home once provided, Bagley (1938b) stated:

> For four decades or more we have been told that the school must provide opportunities
> for types of education that the normal bringing-up of children one provided on the farm
> and in the home. Manual training and the household arts were among the first responses

to this demand. The parallel development of physical training with its later ramifications into various forms of health education are traceable in part to the same causes. Playgrounds, gymnasiums, and swimming pools are material expressions of the effort to meet these recognized needs. School and college athletics are lusty by-products representing in a very real sense the importance of finding a substitute for the vigorous physical work that once devolved of the necessity upon the great majority of young people. With the profound changes in the conditions of life already in progress, and with their clearly predictable extension and intensification in the immediate future, analogous substitutes must be sought for other educative experiences which the simpler conditions of life naturally and normally provided. (p. 255-256)

Some of these "analogous substitutes" (p. 256) Bagley spoke of here will be explored in Chapter 5, relative to music education.

<p style="text-align: center">Implications of Bagley's Essentialism for Music Education</p>

Possibly the most striking implication of Bagley's ideas for the domain of music education is the degree to which it separated Gates' 1991 conception of levels of engagement and our relative, implicit acceptance of these levels. As Bagley (e.g. 1914b, 1943) characterized liberal education as different from cultural education, the theoretical lines between music as a serious pursuit, a leisure pursuit, and a fun pursuit becomes more sharply drawn. Serious pursuit of music might more clearly belong to the liberal education categorization of Bagley, while leisure and fun pursuits might be more closely associated with what Bagley characterizes as cultural education. In light of this characterization, perhaps one particular, additional issue with respect to past philosophical efforts justifying the place of music in the public school has been a slight over-emphasis of music-as-cultural-education, encompassing leisure and fun, or to "train

the consumer" (Bagley, 1914b, p.169). Perhaps there has been a potential under-emphasis of

music as a critical component of a liberal education, which could, by extension, encompass

serious pursuits of musical engagement and include music study as a fine art and music as a

profession.   Furthermore, the idea in music that speaks overly of leisure, interest, and fun and

might form the basis for lifelong participation and engagement with it (e.g. Gates, 1991; Myers,

2007) is slightly problematic in the context of the public school. Overreliance on interest and

activity and link to the work that might be required for success in music is also not largely

supported in Bagley's conception as it relates to a liberal education. As a choice among many

subjects for study in the public schools, but not necessarily required, perhaps support for the link

between leisure, interest, activity, and lifelong participation and engagement as a consumer

makes sense under that conception of public school music education. Markers such as lifelong

participation and engagement that then might act as indicators of a musical education would also

be logical, given the cost-benefit analysis Gates (1991) contended occurs within individuals

when they decide how to engage with music. However, if music education is going to justify its

place in the core curriculum over and above a name-only designation as a result of legislation

contained in the re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, further

overreliance on components from Bagley's conception of cultural education might not be

entirely sufficient. Thus, there can be allowable instances of discipline-specific kinds of work

that do not necessarily have to hold enjoyment or interest. However, this discipline-specific

work could relate to both domain-specific knowledge and domain-general understandings. This

line of thinking might also extend to the conceptualization of music as a fine art or profession

that has been discussed above and will be discussed in Chapter 5. This characterization of music

as cultural education and music as a part of the liberal education also has further implications for literacy and advocacy that will also be discussed in Chapter 5.

While music's place in the liberal education has been articulated by Kivy (1991) and applications of core knowledge across the arts have been undertaken by Smith (1994), Bagley's characterization also spoke of a key difference between those who also operate in a more conservative essentialist paradigm, discussed in Chapter 3. Music, studied with common, transcending, enduring understandings in mind, also might go beyond which models of music are exemplary and worthy of study and that should then passed down, or determining which kinds of core knowledge will be transmitted.

Given that it is possible for music to exist primarily as a spatial art form, which connects to aesthetically-based understandings, and consistent with one of Bagley's 1939 identifications by which curricular materials can be organized, the emphasis placed on performance initially makes a high degree of sense. Components associated with performance can include sound, harmony, rhythm, melody, articulation, characteristic tone, and other musically based elements would need mastery in order to indicate understanding. As a domain, given time spent on performance standards, it might also be plausible that we teach effectively for that set of understandings. Perhaps in teaching behavioral or cognitive component skills associated with performance and listening, however, would also imply a logical or chronological order, or an optimal combination between the two. Again, it is plausible to conclude that the domain of music education does an effective job here too. The organization of its domain-specific materials, whether it be foundational skills for singing, playing an instrument, or listening, makes sense while one skill taught also follows logically from the previous one. This line of thinking also extends from the premium placed on performance in that we have organized relevant

materials endemic to studying music well enough to maximize chances of a high degree of performance among those who choose to participate in music education.

Additionally, it is also possible that the highly differentiated offerings from large ensembles, to non-traditional ensembles, to listening-based, non-performance classes have unintentionally moved the domain farther apart with respect to some domain-general common understandings that could be agreed upon. Aesthetically based dimensions of music could perhaps serve as an initial starting point for building domain-specific common understandings, but our domain-general, non-aesthetic, utilitarian contributions have been a source of more disagreement. That disagreement potentially illustrates further complex issues symbolizing dissatisfaction with the utilitarian idea that teaching for domain-general understandings implies. The tentativeness and relative disagreement between embracing non-aesthetically based understandings as a point of philosophical grounding could be explained given our enduring, negative experiences with utilitarianism as linked to the perception that "music makes you smarter." This idea remains quite controversial, given the lack of empirical support, and non-replicability of the initial Raucher, Shaw and Ky (1993) study; negative reaction of the domain of music education; and perhaps overgeneralization of those findings beyond what were intended. Furthermore, this current line of thinking largely present outside music education potentially undermines the domain because it implies that music education exists in a supportive role. In a supportive role, music principally exists to enhance performance in other areas or subjects within the public school. That also speaks of music education as predominantly a function of cultural education (e.g. Bagley, 1914b) rather than as an equal partner in a liberal education (e.g. Bagley 1914b).

Still more consistent with Bagley's ideas is the thought that subjects can be deemed worthwhile for study within the walls of the public school if they teach for enduring understandings that do not depend on the subject matter itself while also contributing to collective and common understandings and meanings.

For music education, then, the implication is especially poignant in that the enduring understandings one teaches for must go beyond what is music-specific, which includes aesthetics. To the extent that music education might possess an enhanced degree of worth with respect to the public school as inclusion for a required subject for study most likely depends on the extent to which music can contribute to non-aesthetic enduring understandings that also speak to the values of education illuminated by the core. Contributing to those enduring understandings, then, would perhaps mitigate the difficulty noted by Paul (1988) that music educators often face in justifying the place of music within the public schools with respect to aesthetic education. In a sense, all subjects that are included in the core curriculum would be justified similarly: along common enduring understandings and meanings that contribute to a literate, intelligent citizenry.

That line of reasoning is also most consistent with Bagley's 1914b characterization of a liberal education. This set of enduring understandings for all subjects, then, might also solve a problem that post-modern music philosophy, such as praxialism, might have in the public school context, since perhaps the public school is somewhat limited in scope by its own set of understandings.

One future task for stakeholders within music education is to envision how aspects of music education might be consistent with specific, non-aesthetic, enduring understandings that would speak of music as a serious pursuit. This serious pursuit might also move beyond

152

Bagley's conception of cultural education. This movement also implies a change in status, with respect to the potential elevation of the discipline of music education from focusing on aspects of Bagley's 1914b characterization of cultural education to focusing on Bagley's conception of a liberal education. The final chapter of this dissertation will focus on aspects of music education that could be most consistent with these kinds of understandings. Therefore, the argument that could move toward a rationale justifying music's place in the public school will not lie in the equality of opportunity for music education as it relates to being a member of the core, as might be designated by legislation (e.g. Heilig, Aguilar & Cole, 2010). Instead, the theoretical grounding that is needed in order to move the domain toward a rationale will be based in equality of status for music education with respect not only to the other subjects within the core, but with respect to specific aspects of music education found within the domain.

Summary

This chapter presented ideas from William Chandler Bagley. Bagley's positions on a democratic education as a function of collective thought, ideas, and social progress for all as societal improvement encapsulate points of differentiation from popular progressive educators such as Dewey and Thorndike. Bagley's stance on cultural transmission as a function of a liberal education and understanding different perspectives in an increasingly diverse society also differentiate him from essentialists with a narrow, possibly mono-cultural interpretation of education-as-cultural-transmission. Bagley's moderating perspective ultimately speaks to each side of a formal education, and also explains aspects of both progressivism and conservative essentialism, offering a tentative resolution to the conflict present between progressives and essentialists. With this resolution in mind, the final chapter of this dissertation will examine outcomes for music education using Bagley's moderating perspective. These outcomes could

move the domain toward a rationale based upon common elements that ultimately also resolve this conflict.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED OUTCOMES IN MUSIC EDUCATION FROM A BAGLEYIAN

PERSPECTIVE: TOWARD A RATIONALE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL MUSIC EDUCATION

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation was to show how ideas from William Chandler Bagley could resolve the tension created by the progressives and essentialists over the purpose of a formal education and to examine those ideas for relevance and support of music education. Through differing definitions and applications of democracy, community, and core knowledge, Bagley did not appear to take a stance toward either education-as-societal-improvement or education-as-cultural-transmission, as illuminated in Chapters 2 and 3 by discussions of progressive and essentialist stances. Instead, Bagley's position encompassed both purposes, which was detailed in Chapter 4 through primary sources. Both cultural transmission and societal improvement have been made manifest through a focus on common meanings, understandings, and ideas that can be both transmitted and add value to society through social progress. Additionally, both purposes of a formal education can be applied through equality of status across occupations. Bagley also made both his positions of agreement and disagreement with progressives and essentialists explicit throughout his writings. In so doing, Bagley also detailed how he envisioned certain applications of his philosophical framework, primarily in the subject of history, though literature, science, and math were also included.

While other fine arts subjects were also mentioned by Bagley (1914b), he suggested that music initially could be placed under the heading of "cultural education" (p. 169). That designation implied a stance more consistent with the essentialists than the progressives. In

addition, Bagley (1914b) displayed other thoughts consistent with the essentialists over different kinds of education, each with their own set of outcomes.

Though Bagley (1914b) conceded that there exists a fluid line between cultural and liberal education, the preceding chapter also alluded to Bagley's connotation of "cultural education" (p. 169) as potentially inferior to a "liberal education" (p. 169). Potential consequences were detailed for outcomes within music education with regard to persistent overemphasis of "cultural education" (p. 169). Therefore, embracing a Bagleyian perspective also supports elevation for the domain of music education as an equal component of a child's "liberal education" (p. 169) which is fundamentally linked to the core curriculum. Ultimately, membership in the core curriculum, or as a part of "liberal education" (p. 169), implies that music education can function on the same level of importance and contribute to a set of outcomes that transcend subject-matter. Thus, for the recent core designation pertaining to the fine arts contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to have maximum impact for music education, the domain could consider what outcomes are consistent with Bagley regarding his conception of a liberal education.

Given the close link between Bagley's ideas and the degree to which his writings speak of "enduring values in a world of change" (Bagley, 1935b, p. 167), this chapter will be framed around examining both explicit and implicit outcomes of music education as proxies for those values. Therefore, these outcomes of music education will be domain-general in orientation and might also suggest larger ideas.

In the discussion of creativity (see below), I suggest that a salient point of agreement would be illustrated by Bagley and others such as Elliott (e.g. 1995) and Sawyer (e.g. 2012) who might advocate for different theoretical and philosophical positions, yet largely agree on

applications of their respective theoretical grounding with regard to that construct. This agreement could indicate support for creativity as one outcome for music education that might move the domain toward a rationale for public school music education based on at least one agreed-upon, common outcome (e.g. Paul, 1988). The outcome itself could serve as a starting point for its cultural transmission, perhaps guided by the initial question of, "What student outcomes should public schools have, other than aesthetically-based, musical knowledge?" Other questions to consider, especially with respect to competition and literacy could be phrased as such: "What skills and knowledge do students currently have when completing public school music programs?" Are we generally satisfied with the outcomes, skills, and knowledge?" While the outcome itself might be static and suggest cultural transmission, implied is the idea that there can be variability in the "answers," to the questions above. That variability might suggest through analysis and repeated examination, "satisfaction" might also vary over time. In that repeated analysis and examination over time, further clarity and refinement of outcomes, skills, and knowledge could also result (e.g. Bowman & Frega, 2012) and denote a degree of societal improvement through social progress as envisioned by Bagley (e.g. 1918b) by allowing that outcome to evolve and change over time.

As also mentioned, the emphasis placed on the role of aesthetics in music education has served primarily as domain-specific knowledge. Given time spent on performance-based standards in comparison to the other standards such as improvising and composition (e.g. Byo, 1999; Orman, 2002), perhaps the relative emphasis on domain-specific knowledge ultimately serves effectively and efficiently as a marker of an aesthetically-based music education. With respect to certain domain-general understandings that all subjects in school can contribute to equally, however, it is those understandings that might need increased clarification with respect

157

to music education. Without further clarity, the danger revolves around the idea that music will

continue to be perceived as a helper, aid, or exclusively linked with the Bagleyian

characterization of "cultural education" (Bagley, 1914b, p. 169). Therefore, ideas presented here

could also help the domain of music education to formulate expressions of domain-general

understandings in language that might be understood by stakeholders from the broader context of

education. Additionally, examining aspects of music education in light of Bagley's writings

could also resolve the present conflict between progressives and more conservative essentialists,

as shown in Chapters 1, 2, and 3.

Many components of a child-centered education exist as points of agreement between

Bagley and the progressives, with respect to the elementary school and other restricted,

appropriate contexts (Bagley, 1912a, 1915a, 1939a, 1939b). Therefore, the outcomes analyzed

in this section will be examined with a focus on secondary music education, as the role of

secondary education represents a more distinct point of difference between Bagley and Dewey in

particular. Future research undertaken in this area could analyze the degree to which outcomes

envisioned by Bagley, found in elementary music classrooms are similar to those envisioned by

Dewey. Future ethnographic research might also further confirm an amount of common ground

between Bagley and Dewey with respect to values instilled and culture transmitted and methods

by which music teachers engage their students in learning. Thus, with regard to any future

common ground found between Bagley and Dewey as a result of any future investigations, credit

given to Dewey by the domain of music education could also be shared with Bagley.

<center>Creativity</center>

If a musician can be associated with "creative work" (Bagley, 1943, p. 217) in a

Bagleyian context, then the domain of music education could consider possibilities regarding

<center>158</center>

specifically how the broad construct of creativity could be operationalized differently within the domain. While Sawyer (2012) argued that jazz is perhaps an exemplar model of creativity in music, Tengowski and Tweed (1994), Ran (2012), and Collins and Dunn (2011) implied perhaps composing is an indicator of creative behavior and problem-solving. Given that the social progress described by Bagley (1918b) has depended on creative ability, and that Bagley (1918b) linked creative leadership to possible applications in the teaching of social studies, the emphasis detailed here on creative outcomes in music education would highlight one way in which Bagley's ideas could apply to this domain.

Perhaps one additional issue with regard to relative lack of implementation of composition in music education (e.g. Byo, 1999; Orman, 2002; Strand, 2006, 2009) also involves placement. Under a Bagleyian framework, perhaps specific courses that explicitly target composing, not only as creative work, but as a function of music-as- profession, could fit more readily in a vocationally-oriented school, such as the career academy. With the pressure likely relieved to offer those classes in the context of a comprehensive high school, more traditionally focused on a liberal education, the domain of music education could turn a level of concentration toward ensuring that equal status could be garnered for applications speaking of music as profession rather than music as fine art. These music-as-profession courses could encompass composing, arranging, songwriting, music production, recording, and other industry-related occupations. As a potential added benefit, students who chose to engage with music in these ways could also be maximally assured that the value of a formal education, as noted by Bagley (1905), is also retained.

This discussion might also have implications for the relative weight on fluency, flexibility, and originality, which are component skills theorized as related to the creative person,

159

process, and product (Sawyer, 2012). Evaluated from Bagley's perspective (e.g., 1918b), teaching these skills could be related to the overall responsibility of the school to develop and support creative and innovative thinkers, which is a critical tenet of his vision of social progress. Focusing on these component skills could aid schools by giving observable qualities of a less-observable outcome to "detect … recognize and encourage, and [be] competent to direct …" (Bagley, 1918b, p. 43). Perhaps in the context of improvising in a performing ensemble, a high degree of fluency with regard to technical performance of scales and conceptual familiarity with chord changes are both needed to create an original-sounding, creative improvisation. Different sounding improvisations over the same harmonic progression could even be created which could imply also a high degree of flexibility needed. In this case, the fluency needed with the technical aspects mentioned here could function as knowledge, leading to the flexibility of use and application in performance. Originality is then assumed, functioning as a by-product of fluency and flexibility in this example. Hence, in music classrooms where improvisation is a critical aspect of ensemble performance, music educators could emphasize the application of improvisation as most strongly related to flexibility, after a period of instruction concentrating mastery on technical skills as knowledge and fluency.

That might contrast slightly with the idea that in a composition class aimed at exploring and performing music for non-traditional ensembles, high degrees of originality and flexibility could be requisite skills needed to envision possibilities not-yet-codified for that specific medium. Relatively low amounts of fluency would be needed in this scenario, given the lack of conventions for certain non-traditional ensembles. In these classes, music educators could concentrate their time differently, perhaps spending more time in acquainting students with

processes relating to novel musical combinations rather than familiarization with techniques or conventions leading to fluency in their application that might still be emerging.

Similarly, a class or larger program of study aimed at teaching the skills and knowledge needed for successful popular music singing and songwriting might also require a high degree of fluency and flexibility with knowledge of language, grammar, and musical forms. At the same time, students might not need high degrees of originality with respect to actual singing performance or genre of music they choose to compose in. The primary focus in this example is not explicitly creating new genres of music or combinations of old genres, as it might be for emerging forms of music in the previous application. Here, a primary focus would be similar to the improvisation discussion above, wherein the creative musical output might be contained in the fluency and flexibility with which the musical conventions and techniques are applied.

These suggestions, however, depend on mastery of "certain automatic bases which must be laid" (Bagley, 1911e, p. 144), implying a high degree of instruction by the teacher and subsequent application by students in a Bagleyian framework. Mastery here also depends on "eager and aggressive industry upon the part of both pupils and teachers [such that] hard work is taken for granted" (Bagley, 1930, p. 266). Therefore, the teachers have the right to insist the students work hard, and the students have an obligation, in service of mutual cooperation based in a "spirit of helpfulness and a constant regard for the rights and welfare of others" (Bagley, 1930, p. 266), to fulfill that obligation.

While this broad characterization of mastery and conditions under which it could be maximally fostered might be largely agreed upon (e.g. Bagley, 1939a; Elliott, 1995; Regelski, 2004), differences quickly emerge on the emphasis of lower order and higher order understandings. In the context of the public schools, perhaps it is of prime importance for much

161

more weight assigned to mastery earlier in a child's education so that as the child progresses further in school, higher-order understandings can be developed (Bagley, 1939a). That speaks strongly to a systematic progression of learning, as outlined by Bagley (1912d, e; 1935b, 1939a). Whereas Elliott and Regelski have never explicitly discounted the role of lower-order understandings, knowledge and skills as a component of either procedural knowledge (e.g. Elliott, 1995), or *techne* (e.g. Regelski, 1998) leading to performance-based behavior in music, the relative importance of the systematic sequence of learning has been traditionally underemphasized by them. Instead, Elliott and Regelski have placed greater stress and value on various social, activity, and participatory based outcomes. Though the weight placed on activity and participation is logical in a context where participation is optional, or a choice, it is less logical in a context where participation is required or is assumed. Given the change in status of the fine arts to required, as provided by the latest re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a change in relative emphasis of outcomes might also be supported.

The difference seen here over the role of knowledge and skill acquisition is in the degree to which a Bagleyian framework emphasizes both lower-order mastery of critical knowledge and skills and higher order applications over outcomes of participation and activity as primary outcomes of a formal education. Thus, in a Bagleyian framework, higher-order demonstrations of creativity by students in the public school must be accompanied by foundational knowledge and skills as "automatic bases" (Bagley, 1911e, p. 144) as a necessary condition.

This discussion also implies elements of contrast between Bagley and the more radical progressives where the teacher is predominantly a facilitator in response to student interests throughout most stages of learning (e.g. Bagley, 1930, 1939a; Regelski, 2008). The predominant role of the teacher in a Bagleyian framework also illustrates a point of growing difference in

162

characterization of a "good" music classroom as part of a "good" school (e.g. Bagley, 1930) that

also moves toward embodying Bagleyian principles. If "the most important test of a teacher's

efficiency is the degree to which he or she makes himself or herself not *indispensable* but

dispensable" (p. 266) such that the teacher is both a facilitator and authority figure in the

classroom, yet not a "task master" (p.266), then that teacher also has the obligation to give and

take control as needed relative to what students are able to do and what they need help with. In a

radical progressive framework, perhaps there is a higher danger that the teacher is dispensable, as

in not needed, or only there to subserviently cater to students, lest they become uninterested or

wish to decide to do something else because the work or learning objectives are too hard. Here

again, the latter statement might be understood and quite logical in a context where music

education is an elective, or choice among many but not necessarily required. However, if music

education is to be thought of as equal in status with the other components of the core curriculum,

or is implied as equal by the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act,

that implies an additional level of responsibility for music teaching. Music teachers cannot yield

to student interests exclusively, however implicitly or innocently, then letting that yield serve as

a proxy for an education in music.

As an additional benefit, it could be possible that placement of music as professional

courses specifically in a career academy setting, such as has been outlined in Chapter 2 (e.g.

Stern, Dayton & Raby, 2000), might also lead to increased access to funding, increased

availability of resources, or other aspects of vocational or career education not necessarily

covered at the comprehensive high school. Evidence for opportunity concerning music-as-

profession offerings such as recording techniques, singing/songwriting, and composing and

arranging for popular genres, that take place in the context of the public schools, independent of

physical location, is also noticeably lacking, perhaps due in part to this placement issue. Future investigations could also inquire as to the relative widespread, or limited instances of these music-as-profession courses as part of larger programs in the public schools. Though evidence from Powe (2010) suggested that evidence for programs and classes of this nature has been traditionally confined to the community college setting, with relatively restricted implementation in that context, perhaps this alternate theoretical perspective given by Bagley (e.g. 1943, 1944a, 1944b) from which to view these courses and the occupations that they lead to can also lead to more widespread implementation within the public schools in addition to instances that might already be present. Perhaps, too, more widespread instances of music-as-profession kinds of classes would also serve as a meaningful way to reach a portion of the population of students who want to engage with music, participate meaningfully within the domain by contributing to it through means not traditionally thought of, all while still ensuring a meaningful education in music by contributing to music's continued role in society. To the extent that social progress and cultural transmission is evident here too, as relating to clarifying and contributing to music's role in society, so too are these thoughts consistent with Bagley.

Studying music that is more congruent with music as a fine art, therefore, might take place more effectively within the walls of a comprehensive high school. It is there that perhaps a stronger association to a liberal education resides. But even in that environment, the enduring understandings taught for cannot be only aesthetic, or domain-specific, given the Bagleyian characterization (1916b) of *worth* of each subject in the school curriculum that encompasses domain-general, non-aesthetic enduring understandings. The study of music as a fine art might be qualitatively different than music as a profession, discussed briefly above, but perhaps that also implies another message. For each kind of study to be valued equally, each instance of

164

music in the public schools has to exist in the right physical place. Then, that instance of music might serve common outcomes more effectively. Therefore, the utilitarian distinction here over different conceptions of music (as profession and as fine art) serving one common understanding, creativity, leading to an education in music also implies a measure of equality within the domain of music education, in addition to equality with other subjects in the core.

<div align="center">Competition</div>

In public schools, competition as it relates to performance at contests and festivals is frequently associated with traditional, small, and large performing ensembles. The pressure placed on festival score earned, then, could be nothing more than a logical application of the need to measure, evaluate, and assess aspects of performance taught in music classrooms that are also most consistent with Thorndike's progressive views. As the scientific slant in education was accepted by Bagley (1911f), so too might competition need acceptance as an aspect of music education such that trying to eliminate any instance of it might likewise "accomplish just what the old woman accomplished when she tried to sweep back the sea" (Bagley, 1911f, p. 137). Saliently, however, competition might be an example of an aspect of music education that has also endured as a more implicit point of emphasis, yet sometimes heavily emphasized nonetheless in some music programs. Given that the current high-stakes accountability movement demands evaluation and measurement, perhaps this part of music education will endure in the future such that music educators will find it necessary to operationalize competition effectively. By extension, this application might also contribute to the worth of music education, in Bagleyian terms (e.g. 1916b, 1935b).

I suggest that the worth of competition resides in the degree to which it teaches hard work and attention to detail such that a high level of performance can be maximally ensured. Mastery

and thoroughness (e.g. Bagley, 1917) can then be related ideas. Temporarily, however, these domain-general outcomes of hard work and attention to detail and associated ideas of mastery and thoroughness are separated from any aesthetically-based understandings, which are domain-specific. Thus, problems can arise in highly competitive music programs when the two sets of domain- specific and domain-general understandings are conflated such that hard work and attention to detail leads to the unfounded, assumed link between score earned, award achieved and any musical, aesthetically-based outcome.

Therefore, the two sets of understandings can be related only to the extent that high performance quality and ensuing results of score earned or award received are functions of artistry, musicianship, expression and notions of beauty, which are ideas related to aesthetically-based understandings. Mastery of domain-specific goals and objectives is also implied here, which speaks of the "habit standards" (Bagley, 1911e, p.144) and "certain automatic bases that must be laid" (p. 144) that are also of critical importance in a Bagleyian framework. Future music-related assessments in performance settings could also focus on dimensions of performance, rather than a single, summative number or single descriptor implying an evaluation. Any score earned or award received as a product of competition also must capture domain-specific mastery of goals and objectives, musicianship, artistry, and expression, as well as reinforce the domain-general ideas of hard work, attention to detail, and musicianship and artistry through the performance itself, competition might possess worth with respect to its place within music education and in light of a Bagleyian framework.

Herein lies one problem, however, with a mostly implicit outcome such as competition that is not often explicitly stated, or largely advocated for openly. Given the close associations between music performance, the public schools, assessment, accountability and competition at

contests and festivals, an overemphasis on any result garnered in the service of hard work and

attention to detail could potentially undermine the domain-specific musical knowledge taught by

music teachers or gained by students. Hence, great amounts of caution and continued analysis

are likely needed with respect to competition and the possible "enduring values in a world of

change" (Bagley, 1935b, p. 167) that it might reinforce.

If competition is to remain closely linked to music education, especially as a form of

assessment, then the domain of music education could also clarify specific methods by which the

competitive aspect of music education might continue to be nurtured, and allow for effective and

efficient assessment. Competition might be assumed and necessary at auditions and events such

as solo and small ensemble performances, individual region and state-level auditions for selected

ability-based performing groups, marching band, and contemporary acapella choir (e.g. Burlin,

2015). However, overgeneralization of competition, as assessment, into musical contexts where

competition has not traditionally been present or is necessary might ultimately undermine the

"enduring values in a world of change" (Bagley, 1935b, p. 167) of hard work and attention to

detail competition is meant to foster in music education.

This growing characterization of competition as an outgrowth and enduring feature of

assessment in performance-based music classes while also reinforcing certain understandings

within students, could also contain implications for the kinds of assessments used for both

teacher and student evaluations. Traditional, large ensembles might be best suited to kinds of

assessments taking place in performance venues, as summative measures of the teaching of skills

and knowledge acquired. By contrast, other kinds of small, medium, or non-traditional

ensembles might be better assessed through alternate means. These alternate means could

include portfolio assessments judged by a panel of experts or adjudicators and encompass lesson

plans, video-clips and assessment evidence pertaining to teaching and learning. Thus, the mode

of assessment could potentially vary widely dependent on the specific kind of ensemble needing

assessment, yet serve as both an assessment for teachers and students. In cases where a

particular type of ensemble relies on methods of teaching and learning that is also authentic to a

particular culture or context, any assessment needing to take place would consider the idea of

authenticity (e.g. Bagley, 1945b) into account when designing standards by which those

ensembles are assessed. This implication can also be particularly relevant when applied to any

future instance of music-as-profession courses in the context of a career academy that might need

to assess their students individually, yet in accordance with their requisite knowledge and skills

acquired. Fisher (2008) noted that a standardized test is required for all members of the core

curriculum in public schools. Therefore, the suggestions presented can serve also preliminary

ideas for future kinds of tests that would support skill development and knowledge acquisition.

These tests could be highly variable in design, given ensemble or method by which music can be

studied, but would also be valid and reliable without oversimplifying goals or objectives.

Assessments could also evaluate teacher performance and student performance with only minor

modifications needed concerning adjudication rubrics, scales, and data collected.

Literacy

In music classes, the ability to translate notation into sound can serve as one indicator of

literacy, as roughly analogous to the ability to interpret what is read. Given the time spent on

performance-based goals and objectives, perhaps serving this understanding most readily, music

education is also likely quite effective here. Students generally are able to demonstrate a basic

idea of literacy as it relates to reading and interpreting symbols to produce the desired outcome

such as a right note played, accurate performance of rhythms, and basic expressions and musical

styles. These same indicators are also generally assumed to stand as markers of inward literacy as well. However, observable behavior does not always predict inward, conceptual understanding. Therefore, the outward perception of literacy might exist, yet internally it does not. Bagley's definition of literacy goes beyond reading and writing, and also extends to "intelligent understanding and for the collective thought and judgment which are the essence of democratic institutions" (Bagley, 1939b, p. 79). Under Bagley's definition, assumed literacy by behavioral indicators alone are not sufficient to indicate the kind of literacy described here. That implies with many component parts to literacy also exists many opportunities for students to be categorically illiterate, or not develop literacy in music to the fullest extent possible.

The confounding possibility that a student can behave as though they were literate in both domain-specific aspects and domain-general understandings related to music education and yet not actually be literate in some component related to literacy, then, is particularly a problem for the specific context of public school music education to solve. Herein illustrates one difference between in-school musical outcomes and out-of-school musical outcomes. Literacy across all dimensions covered under Bagley's 1939b definition in music now functions as a major outcome, whereas out-of-school musical outcomes do not necessarily depend on literacy as a major outcome of music participation. This distinction also implies a sharper division between music education as a function of cultural education and as a function of a liberal education (Bagley, 1914b). Under cultural education, as consumer-training, it might not be a high priority or a needed condition to be highly literate if consumption of music, as reflected in listening to it, as is commonly done in society. Preferences or student interests, then, might also not depend on a high degree of literacy, thus illustrating another hidden problem of overreliance on student interests in a progressive framework. However, in the public schools, where mastery of literacy

169

is a major outcome given that it is at the core of not only democratic institutions but a democratic education (e.g. Bagley, 1939b), the ability to demonstrate more than behaviors as indicators of literacy, might need increased attention. This attention is particularly important with regard to the high-stakes testing and accountability movement seen across education. Herein possibly also lies another entry point into the core curriculum with respect to music education as an equal player among other core subjects.

This discussion also implies elevation in status, which is also separate from the notion of updating a supposedly-outdated and outmoded curriculum (e.g. Williams, 2011). While updating the supposedly-antiquated school music curriculum has traditionally connoted varying degrees of integrating technology, non-traditional ensembles, and fostering authentic experiences closely mirroring societal applications of music governed by student interests (e.g. Salauvo, 2008), a Bagleyian definition of those aspects and applications is perhaps also closer to cultural education than liberal education. Social progress is also contained in this elevation of status, as music education would receive an additional amount of worth, perhaps implying a higher degree of future value placed by society on music other than just consumption of it, or using technology as purely a communicative and informational tool in music (e.g. Gouzouasis, 2006). Given suggestions that lifelong participation with performance decreases among the general population after secondary school (e.g. Boswell, 1992; Cavitt, 2005), perhaps an initial elevation in status will lead to increased future opportunities for proliferation of community-based music which is over and above consumption.

Great amounts of caution are also needed here too to ensure the same high degree of literacy within these current aspects of music education previously not envisioned in an 18th century conservatory model of music education. Just as deleterious as the notion of faked

170

literacy, then, is also the idea that certain ideas consistent with "updating" music education into the 21st Century might also be undermining students' abilities to be highly literate in music. Perhaps future analysis could examine which "updates" of music education, previously unimaginable, given earlier societal and technological limitations also reinforce high degrees of literacy most effectively. By extension, these "updates" would also support the elevation of music education in relation to the Bagleyian characterization of worth, which speaks of a disciplinary value (e.g. Bagley, 1914b, 1916b) and of primarily a liberal education rather than a cultural education.

Also problematic for the idea of "faked literacy" is the premium the domain places on performance, as often the sole indicator of mastery of domain-specific knowledge. If the possibility exists, however remote or unlikely, to demonstrate the behavior of performing without satisfying all components of Bagley's 1939b definition of literacy, the behavior of performing cannot always be relied exclusively to demonstrate literacy. While comprehensive musicianship, and standards across music education have traditionally emphasized music's role in relation to society culture as a valid frame of reference, perhaps a more explicit focus on academic language and application of that language in context would enhance not only performance, but literacy as well. When students use domain-specific vocabulary words, demonstrate their command of those words, and also demonstrate performance behaviors in context, together, those indicators could be taken as one indicator of being musically literate. An additional focus on academic language would also allow access to both domain-specific and domain-general understandings. Students could see how common ideas, meanings, and understandings came to exist in music while also giving students the means by which to express themselves in a manner consistent with how other members of music education communicate

171

both in performance and with language. Furthermore, students could move toward understanding what those in the domain of music understand, which extends beyond aesthetically based knowledge, and also extends beyond consumption of music as well. The different components of literacy, as indicated by Bagley, perhaps speak of the greatest difference in outcomes with regard to in school music and out of school music. These different facets of literacy also speak to music's part in reinforcing the same sets of understandings as other members of the core.

A Characterization of a Model Advocate in Bagleyian Terms

Bagley's 1912a characterization of a layman as someone who could adequately speak to relevance, use, and application of certain bits of knowledge could tentatively refer to those stakeholders throughout education who might have experienced music by some means, but who ultimately reside outside the specific domain of music education. Since these laymen often make decisions impacting music education that can center on funding, staffing, and the nature of musical experiences available in public schools, the domain of music education might be best served by advocates who are fully literate.

However, these laymen might not be completely literate, given that a Bagleyian definition of literacy encompasses "more than the ability to translate printed letters into spoken words" (Bagley, 1939b, p. 79). For music education, that might encompass more than the ability to perform. As discussed previously, experiences with music in schools also can center on the use of it, as explained under Bagley's definition of cultural education. That is equally problematic, as a "cultural education" (e.g. Bagley, 1914b, p. 169) might not ensure complete literacy either, instead functioning primarily "to train the consumer" (Bagley, 1914b, p. 169).

172

Given the potential perception of music education as a current component of cultural education, students who find themselves in a positon to advocate for music education later in their lives might logically continue to advocate for music's continued place in the public schools on grounds more consistent with the form of education they received. That education might be more consistent with "cultural education", not "liberal education" (e.g. Bagley, 1914b, p 169). That advocacy stance, however, could potentially undermine efforts present to ensure equal status for music education as a member of the core curriculum. Compounding the problem here, under this current line of reasoning, is the blurry line between cultural and liberal education (Bagley, 1914b). One solution to the resolution of this problem, then, is to ensure outcomes for music education taught in the public school also move beyond "training the consumer" (Bagley, 1914b, p. 169). This solution might reduce possibility that consumption of music as a primary or nearly-exclusive experience with music also leads to the perception of being musically educated. In this case, neither consumption nor performance alone would indicate a complete Bagleyian characterization of literacy.

Therefore, future advocacy efforts that supported equality of status for music education would need to be led by people who possessed a complete Bagleyian definition of literacy (e.g. Bagley, 1939b), and who do not have direct association with the domain of music education as their profession. Advocates for music education who are literate, in the Bagleyian sense, then, regardless of degree of affiliation with the domain, might also ensure that the domain of music education, as a part of the fine arts, can be perceived as an equally-contributing member of the core curriculum.

With this picture of a model advocate in mind, awareness is needed regarding who specifically makes critical decisions that impact music education, especially when these

stakeholders reside outside of music education. If these kinds model advocates, detailed above, are found as relatively scarce entities or absent entirely, then it is incumbent upon advocates from the domain of music education to shape and refine advocacy statements using unique, domain-specific knowledge such that the advocacy message sent is also correctly received (e.g. Paul, 1988). Correctly sent and received might mean that language used in efforts to illuminate understanding of music's place in the wider context of general education does not imply anything unintended, as in the conflation of the utilitarian rationale that can imply music-as-helper. Correctly sent and received might also mean that specific outcomes are emphasized that go beyond cultural education. Stakeholders outside music education who also advocate for its continued existence in public schools might regard music education neutrally or positively. These people can perhaps even offer advocacy-oriented statements that make sense. However, it is ultimately incumbent upon them, as the leaders of future advocacy efforts, to be fully informed and thus fully literate. Therefore, the domain of music education has the ultimate responsibility for fostering complete, Bagleyian (1939b) literacy while the next generation of future advocates attends public schools.

Summary

In this chapter, I have suggested that the outcomes of creativity, competition, and literacy could form the basis of moving the domain of music education toward a rationale justifying its place in the public schools. This rationale reflects outcomes found within the domain that could be worthy for passing down to successive generations (cultural transmission). Since that is only half of what is required by a Bagleyian application, the material presented in this chapter might lead to social progress through evolution over time based on ever-changing needs found in

society (e.g. Bagley, 1918b). Both purposes of a formal education, cultural transmission and societal improvement, can be satisfied.

As also discussed, these outcomes might contain further benefits for advocacy. Given the problems noted by Paul (1988) regarding aesthetically-oriented justifications of music within the public schools, and Bagley's idea that experts within a domain, not a layman, should be in charge of constructing domain-specific lists for their subjects (e.g. Bagley, 1911e), these outcomes could also form the basis of non-aesthetic understandings that might be better understood by the general public. Therefore, the domain of music education would possess a starting point upon which to move toward further agreement on a more comprehensive list of non-aesthetic, domain-general understandings that do not imply music exists in the schools to aid achievement or performance in other subjects. In addition to moving toward satisfying both purposes of a formal education, as is supported by Bagley, perhaps this list might also illuminate initial values, qualities or characteristics desired in future model advocates as well.

Regarding any disagreement found among creativity, competition, and literacy given different philosophical or theoretical viewpoints, points of departure can exist between what has been suggested in this chapter, or by Bagley in Chapter 4, without impacting agreement upon the outcomes themselves. Thus, details such as the teacher's role in the instructional process (e.g. Regelski, 2004), the degree to which out-of-school experiences should influence what is taught in school (e.g. Elliott, 1995; Regelski, 1998, 2004, 2005, 2006), or the role of vicarious experiences in schools (e.g. Bagley, 1923) might not have to be widely agreed upon so long as there is agreement on creativity, competition, and literacy, with respect to their importance and impact on students within the context of public school music education.

Conclusion

      Throughout the course of this dissertation, material has been presented that can justify the place of music education in the public schools by applying ideas from William Chandler Bagley. Specifically, Bagley's thoughts on a democratic education, social progress, and the distinction between a liberal and a cultural education were explored herein as a possible bridge across the gap created by the progressives and essentialists. These two groups, however, are associated with the context of general education, not music education. Given that music education ultimately exists in the wider context of general education, and that problems with both music-based philosophical frameworks (aesthetic education, praxial music education) have been noted by Paul (1988), Walker (2012), and Woodford (2005), operationalizing Bagley's ideas from the domain of general education could also speak to the salient role context plays in any philosophical grounding. As explained to by Stauffer (2009, 2012), questions of *where* are of higher importance than *what* or *how*. By examining and describing the *where,* or wider context of general education first in Chapters 2 and 3, the need was illuminated for a perspective from general education, such as Bagley's, that extends across progressive and essentialist viewpoints. Because Bagley is relatively unknown in both general education and music education, specific ideas from Bagley were highlighted using primary sources in Chapter 4, and applied into the domain of music education through creativity, competition, and literacy in Chapter 5. It is these specific outcomes that could form the basis of a rationale justifying public school music education.

      Ultimately, Bagley's ideas were explored not only for their relevance and application into the domain of music education, but also to the extent to which his particular positions bridge the gap created in the domain of general education between progressives and essentialists. Despite

176

these differing philosophical frameworks originating from general education and the extent to which Bagley's viewpoints can resolve these differences, common ground appears among various competing groups across other domains, including music education, regarding the overarching need for a philosophical basis underpinning it. As Bowman and Frega (2012) explained, a philosophical basis can impact critical decisions, intelligently inform practice, define boundaries, and be of benefit "by refining and improving habitual ways of thinking and acting" (p. 7). For music education, Bagley's philosophical framework and applications here might also support the domain as an equally-contributing member to the wider context of general education, as opposed to an aid, helper, or assistant. That support could represent not only a refinement and improvement in thought but also could ensure that music education remains securely justified within the public schools.

REFERENCES

Abeles, H., Buting, R., Colwell, R., Cutietta, R, Elliott, D., Ernst, R., Gates, J. T. … &

Swanwick, K. (1993). Philosophical issues in music education. Retrieved from

http://www.maydaygroup.org/colloquium/philosophical-issues-in-music-education.

Anderson, J. M. (2013). Why Community College Students Need Great Books. *New*

Directions for Community Colleges, *2013*(163), 41-50.

Austin, J. R. (1990). Competition is Music Education the Loser?. *Music Educators*

Journal, *76*(6), 21-25.

Austin, J. R., & Reinhardt, D. (1999). Philosophy and advocacy: An examination

of preservice music teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 18-30.

Abusalih, L. (2011). *A research synthesis of student achievement in high school*

chemistry: Effect of Algebra 1, English 1, gender and teacher perceptions. (Doctoral

dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3453974)

Adler, M. (1998). *The paideia proposal.* New York: Touchstone.

Ahmad, A. (2009). *The impact of career academy programs on student achievement in a*

New Jersey urban high school (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.

(AAT3399876)

Allsup, R. (2012). The moral ends of band. *Theory into Practice, 51,* 179-187.

Apple, M. (2009). Can critical education interrupt the right? *Discourse: Studies in the*

Cultural Politics of Education, *30*, 239-251.

Apple, M. (2011). Global crises, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher*

Education, 62, 222-234.

Asmus, E. P. (1999). Music assessment concepts. *Music Educators Journal*, *86*(2), 19-24.

Aspin, D. (2000). Lifelong learning: the mission of arts education in the learning

      community of the 21st century. *Music Education Research*, *2*, 75-85.

Baer, J. (2003). The impact of the core knowledge curriculum on creativity. *Creativity*

      Research Journal, 15, 297-300.

Bagley, W. (1905). *The educative process.* New York: Macmillian.

Bagley , W. (1911a). Recent criticisms of scientific education. *School and Home*

      Education, 31, 135-136.

Bagley, W. (1911b). Biographical material in science teaching. *School and Home*

      Education, 31, 12-13.

Bagley, W. (1911c). Outcomes of teaching I. *School and Home Education, 31,* 52-57.

Bagley, W. (1911d). Outcomes of teaching II. *School and Home Education, 31,* 101-110.

Bagley, W. (1911e). Outcomes of teaching III. *School and Home Education, 31,* 140-144.

Bagley, W. (1911f). Recent criticisms of scientific education. *School and Home*

      Education, 31, 135-137.

Bagley, W. (1912a). Outcomes of teaching IV. *School and Home Education, 31,* 193-

      197.

Bagley, W. (1912b). Outcomes of teaching VI. *School and Home Education, 31,* 327-

      331.

Bagley, W. (1912c). Outcomes of teaching VII. *School and Home Education, 31,* 419-

      424.

Bagley, W. (1912d). Industrial education and our national ideals. *School and Home*

      Education, 31, 182.

Bagley, W. (1912e). Thorndike's contribution to the science of education. *School and*

Home Education, 31, 415-416.

Bagley, W. (1912f). Are precedents disregarded and ideals endangered? *School and Home Education, 32*, 81.

Bagley, W. (1914a). Principles justifying common elements in the school program. *Proceedings of the High School Conference*, *13,* 10-21.

Bagley, W. (1914b). Fundamental distinctions between liberal and vocational education. *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses*, *1914,* 150-170.

Bagley, W. (1915a). Dewey's individualism. *School and Home Education, 35,* 4-5.

Bagley, W. (1915b). Determination of minimum essentials in elementary geography and history. *National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, 4,* 131-146.

Bagley, W. (1916a). Educational basis of democracy. *School and Home Education, 36,* 147-149.

Bagley, W. (1916b). Problem in educational values and its bearing upon curriculum readjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 7,* 361-365.

Bagley, W. (1916c). Some handicaps to an education in democracy. *School and Society, 3,* 807-816.

Bagley, W. (1916d). Minimum essentials vs. the differentiated course of study in the seventh and eighth grades. *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses, 1916,* 958-965.

Bagley, W. (1917). Are the older school virtues obsolescent. *National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses, 1917,* 717-721.

Bagley, W. (1918a). Education and our democracy. *School and Society, 8,* 241-245.

Bagley, W. (1918b). Function of the public school. *Religious Education, 13,* 43-45.

Bagley, W. (1922). Educational determinism. *School and Society, 15,* 373-384.

Bagley, W. (1923). Education as a unique type of experience. *Religious Education, 18,* 35-37.

Bagley, W. (1929). Element of adventure in teaching and learning geography. *Journal of Geography, 28,* 89-99.

Bagley, W. (1930). What is a good school? *Pennsylvania School Journal, 78,* 265-266.

Bagley W. (1933). Task of education and a period of rapid social change. *Educational Administration and Supervision, 19,* 561-570.

Bagley, W. (1935a). Is subject matter obsolete. *Educational Administration and Supervision, 21,* 401-412.

Bagley, W. (1935b). How shall we view elementary education as regards discipline, the psychology of learning, subject matter. *Mathematics Teacher, 28,* 167-181.

Bagley, W. (1938a). Some relations of education to the status quo. *School and Society, 47,* 562-565.

Bagley, W. (1938b). An essentialist's platform for the advancement of American Education. *Educational Administration & Supervision, 24,* 241-256.

Bagley, W. (1939a). The significance of the essentialist movement in educational theory. *The Classical Journal, 34,* 326-344.

Bagley, W. (1939b). Progressive education is too soft. *Education, 60,* 75-81.

Bagley, W. (1943). Education and the two new freedoms. *Education, 64,* 211-218.

Bagley, W. (1944a).Vocational education as the key to occupational democracy. *School and Society, 60,* 52-53.

Bagley, W. (1944b). Attitude of present Hutchens Ward vocational education. *School and*

Society, 60, 339-340 .

Bagley, W. (1944c). John Dewey, vigorous at age 85, defends progressive education. *School and Society, 60,* 292.

Bagley, W. (1945a). Danger of sweeping generalizations and the science and education. *School and Society, 62,* 419-420.

Bagley, W. (1945b). Two events of the week ending July 28 and their educational applications. *School and Society, 62,* 69.

Bahruth, R. (2004). Those who dare teach. In J. O'Donnell, M. Pruyn & R. Chavez (Eds.), *Social justice in these times (pp. 33-53).* Charlotte: Information Age.

Bassey, M. O. (2010). Educating for the real world: An illustration of John Dewey's principles of continuity and interaction. *Educational Studies, 36*, 13-20.

Beatty, B. (1998). From laws of learning to a science of values: Efficiency and morality in Thorndike's educational psychology. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1145-1152. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.53.10.1145

Bensman, D. (1994). *Direct assessment of a progressive public elementary school: Graduates of central park east.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED374182)

Bergman, R. (2005). John Dewey on educating the moral self. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 24*, 39-62.

Bietsa, G. (2007). Education and the democratic person: Towards a political conception of democractic eduation. *Teachers College Record, 109,* 740-769.

Biklen, S. K. (1978). The progressive education movement and the question of women. *Teachers College Record, 80,* 316-335.

Birge, E. (1937). *History of public school music in the United States.* Boston: Oliver

Ditson Co.

Blanton, C. K. (2000). They cannot master abstractions, but they can often be made efficient workers: Race and class in the intelligence testing of Mexican Americans and African Americans in Texas during the 1920s. *Social Science Quarterly, 81*, 1014-1026.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Boller, P. F., Jr. (1977). Freedom in John Dewey's philosophy of education. *Teachers College Record, 79,* 98-118.

Boswell, J. (1992). Human potential and lifelong learning. *Music Educators Journal*, *79*(4), 38–40.

Broudy, H. (1964). *Democracy and excellence in American secondary schools; a study in curriculum theory.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Burlin, T. (2015). *High school contemporary a capella: A descriptive phenomenology* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Texas, Denton, TX.

Bowman, W. & Frega, A. L. (2012). Introduction. In W. Bowman and A. L. Frega (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy in Music Education* (pp. 3-17). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bradford, A. C., & Harris, J. L. (2003). Cultural knowledge in African American children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *34*, 56-68.

Bragg, D. & Reger, W. (2002). *New lessons about tech prep implementation: Changes in eight selected consortia since reauthorization of the Federal Tech Prep legislation in 1998.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED467245)

Brand, B. (2003). *Rigor and relevance: A new vision for career and technical education. A white paper.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED478344)

Brewer, D. J., Rees, D. I., & Argys, L. M. (1995). Detracking America's schools: The

    reform without cost?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *77*, 210.

Brewer, D. J., Rees, D. I., & Argys, L. M. (1996). The reform without cost? A reply to

    our critics. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *77*, 442-444.

Brown, C. (2000). *A humane approach to private piano instruction: An analysis and*

    application of the ideas of Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, and Jerome Bruner (Doctoral

    dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3045990)

Burke, B. (2004). School to career: Reworking the model. *Technology & Learning, 24,*

    26-33.

Buttaro, A., Catsambis, S., Mulkey, L., & Steelman, L. C. (2010). An organizational perspective

    on the origins of instructional segregation: School composition and use of within-class

    ability grouping in American kindergartens. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 1300-1337.

Buras, K. (2012). Tracing the Core Knowledge movement: History lessons from above

    and below. In M. Apple and K. Buras (Eds.), *The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power,*

    and educational struggles (pp. 43-75). New York: Taylor and Francis.

Byo, S. (1999). Classroom teachers' and music specialists' perceived ability to implement the

    National Standards for Music Education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47,* 111-

    123.

Callan, E. (1982). Dewey's conception of education as growth. *Educational Theory, 32*, 19-27.

Campbell, J. K. (1975). The Unconventional Wisdom of William Chandler

    Bagley. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *11*, 43-45.

Carr, D. (2002). Moral education and the perils of developmentalism. *Journal of Moral*

    Education, 31, 5-19.

Casement, W. (1999). Liberal Learning Needs a New Public Relations

Campaign. *Midwest Quarterly*, *41*, 88.

Caspary, W. R. (1991). Ethical deliberation as dramatic rehearsal: John Dewey's theory.

Educational Theory, 41, 375-388.

Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone, J. (2002). *Career and technical education*

reforms and comprehensive school reforms in high schools: Their impact on education

outcomes for at-risk youth. The highlight zone: Research at work. Retrieved from ERIC

(ED467594).

Cavitt, M. E. (2005). Factors influencing participation in community bands. *Journal of Band*

Research, *41*, 42-57.

Chandler, L. (1999). *Traditional schools, progressive schools: Do parents have a choice?*

A case study of Ohio. Retrieved from ERIC. (ED436855)

Chapman, P. D. (1980). *A mental test for every child: The use of intelligence tests in progressive*

school reform. Retrieved from ERIC. (ED196957)

Chenowith, K. (2010). Turning obstacles into triumphs. *U.S. News and World Report,*

147, 58-61.

Chorzempa, B. F., & Graham, S. (2006). Primary-grade teachers' use of within-class ability

grouping in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 529-541.

Cohen, A. & Brawer, F. (2009). *The American community college.* San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Collins, D., & Dunn, M. (2011). Problem-solving strategies and processes in musical

composition: Observations in real time. *Journal of Music, Technology & Education, 4*, 47-

76. doi: 10.1386/jmte.4.1.47_1

Colwell, R. (2009). An expanded research agenda for music education. In T.A. Regelski

    & J.T. Gates (Eds.) *Music education for changing times* (pp. 139-149). New York:

    Springer.

Cook, P. (2009). The rhetoricity of Cultural Literacy. *Pedagogy, 9,* 487-500.

Cooley, N. (2003). Literary legacies and critical transformations: Teaching creative

    writing in the public urban university. *Pedagogy*, *3*, 99-103.

Counts, G. (1932, 1978). *Dare the school build a new social order?* London: Arcturus

    Books

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods approaches.*

    Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Danley, N., & Waters, C. (2002). *Career education by design: Making it fit your school,*

    your curriculum and your teachers. Retrieved from ERIC (ED471829).

Darling, J. (1994). *Child centered education: And its critics.* : Sage.

Datnow, A. (2002). Can we transplant education and does it last? *Journal of Educational*

    Change,3, 215-239.

Datnow, A., Borman, G., & Stringfield, S. (2000). School reform through a highly

    specified curriculum: Implementation and effects of the core knowledge sequence. *The*

    Elementary School Journal, *101,* 167-191.

Dill, J. S. (2007). Durkheim and Dewey and the challenge of contemporary moral education.

    Journal of Moral Education, 36, 221-237.

Domina, M. (2002). *Application of John Dewey's ideas to an inner city alternative high school.*

    Retrieved from ERIC. (ED465789)

Donahue, L. M. (1999). *What is an experiential learner?* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED438141)

Donelan, R. W., Neal, G. A., & Jones, D. L. (1994). The promise of brown and the reality of

academic grouping: The tracks of my tears. *Journal of Negro Education, 63*, 376-387.

doi:10.2307/2967188

Dunn, K. E., & Rakes, G. C. (2011). Teaching teachers: An investigation of beliefs in

teacher education students. *Learning Environments Research*, *14*, 39-58.

Eberstadt, M. (1999). The schools they deserve. *Policy Review, 97,* 3-18.

Elkind, D. (1999). Educational research and the science of education. *Educational Psychology

Review, 11*, 271-287.

Ellington, L., & Rutledge, V. C. (2001). Core Knowledge: A content foundation for civic

virtue? *International Journal of Social Education*, *16*, 34-44.

Elliott, D. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education.* New York:

Oxford University Press.

Elliott, D. J. (2001). Modernity, postmodernity and music education philosophy.

Research Studies in Music Education, *17*, 32-41.

Farrelly, T. M. (1993). A new approach to moral education: The integrated character education

model. *Journal of Correctional Education, 44*, 76-82.

Fisher, R. (2008). Debating assessment in music education. *Research and Issues in Music

Education*, *6*.

Fleischman, S. & Heppen, J. (2009). Improving low-performing high schools: Searching

for evidence of promise. *Future of Children, 19,* 105-133.

Fletcher, E. (2012). Demographics, tracking, and expectations in adolescence as

determinants of employment status in adulthood: A study of school-to-work transitions.

Career and Technical Education Research, 37, 103-119.

Fletcher, E., & Cox, E. (2012). Exploring the meaning African American students ascribe

   to their participation in high school career academies and the challenges they experience.

   High School Journal, 96, 4-19.

Folsom, C. (1998). From a distance: Joining the mind and moral character. *Roeper*

   Review, 20, 265.

Friedlander, J. (1975). Music history and appreciation in the two-year college curriculum.

   Journal of Research in Music Education, 27, 29-34.

Futrell, M. H., & Gomez, J. (2008). How tracking creates a poverty of learning. *Educational*

   Leadership, 65, 74-78.

Gardner, H. (2011). *Creating minds: An anatomy of creativity seen through the lives of*

   Freud, Einstein, Picasso, Stravinsky, Eliot, Graham, and Ghandi. New York: Basic Books.

Gamoran, A. (2009). *Tracking and inequality: New directions for research and practice. WCER*

   working paper no. 2009-6. Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Gates, J.T. (1991). Music participation: Theory, research and policy. *Bulletin of the*

   Council for Research in Music Education, 109, 1-35.

Gaudelli, W. (2002). U.S. kids don't know U.S. history: The NAEP study, perspectives,

   and presuppositions. *Social Studies, 93,* 197-202.

Generals, D., Jr. (2000). *The architect of progressive education: John Dewey or Booker T.*

   Washington. Retrieved from ERIC. (ED454142)

Gibboney, R. A. (2006). Intelligence by design: Thorndike versus Dewey. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*,

   170-172.

Glassman, M. (2001). Dewey and Vygotsky: Society, experience, and inquiry in educational

   practice. *Educational Researcher*, *30*, 3-14.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers.* Boston: Pearson.

Goodson, M. R. (1978). *Human foresight and moral re-education. The work of the school.*
Retrieved from ERIC. (ED160530)

Goolsby, T. W. (1999). Assessment in Instrumental Music. *Music Educators Journal*, *86*(2), 31-35,50.

Gould, E. (2004). Feminist theory in music education research: grrl-illa 1 games as nomadic practice (or how music education fell from grace). *Music Education Research*, *6*, 67-79.

Gouzouasis, P. (2006). Technology as arts-based education: Does the desktop reflect the arts? *Arts Education Policy Review*, *107*, 3-9.

Greene, M. (1976). John Dewey and moral education. *Contemporary Education, 48,* 17-22.

Gutek, G. (1997). *Philosophical and ideological perspectives on education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Haertel, E., & Herman, J. (2005). *A historical perspective on validity arguments for accountability testing.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED488709)

Haney, W. (1984). Testing and reasoning about testing. *Review of Educational Research, 54,* 597-654.

Hash, P. M. (2012). An analysis of the ratings and interrater reliability of high school band contests. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *60*, 81-100.

Hearst, E. (1999). After the puzzle boxes: Thorndike in the 20th century. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 72*, 441.

Hershey, A. M., Hudis, P., Haimson, J., & Silverberg, M. (1997). *Partners in progress: early steps in creating school-to-work systems.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED410437)

Heilig, J. V., Cole, H., & Aguilar, A. (2010). From Dewey to No Child Left Behind: The

evolution and devolution of public arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *111*, 136-145.

Hiebert, E. (2012). The common core state standards and text complexity. *Teacher Librarian, 39,* 13-19.

Hinde, E. R., & Perry, N. (2007). Elementary teachers' application of Jean Piaget's theories of cognitive development during social studies curriculum debates in Arizona. *The Elementary School Journal*, *108*, 63-79.

Hirsch, E.D. (1988). *Cultural literacy.* New York: Random House.

Hirsch, E. D. (1999). *The schools we need and why we don't have them.* New York: Anchor Books.

Hirsch, E. D. (1993). The core knowledge curriculum: What's behind its success? *Educational Leadership, 50,* 23-25, 27-30.

Holma, K. (2007). Essentialism regarding human nature in the defense of gender equality in education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *41*, 45-57.

Hornbach, C. M., & Taggart, C. C. (2005). The relationship between developmental tonal aptitude and singing achievement among kindergarten, first-, second-, and third-grade students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *53*, 322-331.

Horsthemke, K. (2009). The South African higher education transformation debate: culture, identity and 'African ways of knowing'. *London Review of Education*, *7*, 3-15.

Hume, S. E., & Boehm, R. G. (2001). A rationale and model for a scope and sequence in geographic education, grades K-12. *The Social Studies*, *92*, 16-21.

Imig, D. G., & Imig, S. R. (2006). The teacher effectiveness movement: How 80 years of

essentialist control have shaped the teacher education profession. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*, 167-180.

Johnson, M. J., Janisch, C., & Morgan-Fleming, B. (2001). Cultural literacy in classroom settings: Teachers and students adapt the core knowledge curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *16*, 259-272.

Jordan, W., McPartland, J., Legters, N., & Balfanz, R.(2000). Creating a comprehensive school reform model: The talent development high school with career academies. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At-Risk, 5,* 159-181.

Jorgensen, E. (1995). Justifying music instruction in American public schools: A historical perspective. *Arts Education Policy Review,* 96, 17-32.

Jorgensen, E. (2001). What are the roles of philosophy in music education? *Research Studies in Music Education, 17,* 19-31.

Jorgensen, E. (2006). Reflections on futures for music education philosophy. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 14,* 15-22.

Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2013). Different teachers, different peers: The magnitude of student sorting within schools. *Educational Researcher, 42*, 304-316. doi:10.3102/0013189X13495087

Kamhi, A. (2009). The case for the narrow view of reading. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools, 40,* 174-177.

Katter, E. (1991). Meeting the challenge of cultural diversity. *Visual Arts Research*, 28-32.

Keislar, E. R. (1980). The inquiry-oriented laboratory school. *UCLA Educator, 21*, 26-31.

Kelly, S., & Carbonaro, W., (2012). Curriculum tracking and teacher expectations: Evidence from discrepant course taking models. *Social Psychology of Education, 15*, 271-294.

Kemple, J. & Snipes, J. (2000). *Career academies: Impacts on students' engagement and performance in high school.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED441075)

Kessinger, T. A. (2007). Efforts toward national educational reform: An essentialist political agenda. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, *20*, 16-19.

Kilpatrick, W. (2005). Is there an America in Italy's future? *Journal of Education, 2,* 71-86.

Kivy, P. (1991). Music in the liberal education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 25,* 79-93.

Koza, J. (2009). Listening for whiteness: Hearing racial politics in undergraduate school music. In T.A. Regelski & J.T. Gates (Eds.) *Music education for changing times* (pp. 85-96). New York: Springer.

Krebs, D. L., & Denton, K. (2005). Toward a more pragmatic approach to morality: a critical evaluation of Kohlberg's model. *Psychological Review*, *112*, 629.

Krikun, A. (2009). Mixing Memphis soul into the community college curriculum stew. *Journal of Popular Music Studies, 21,* 76-89.

Krumboltz, J. D., & Worthington, R. L. (1999). The school-to-work transition from a learning theory perspective. *Career Development Quarterly, 47*, 312-325.

Kuo, V. (2010). Transforming American high schools: Possibilities for the next phase of high school reform. *Peabody Journal of Education, 85,* 389-401.

Lagemann, E. (1989). The plural worlds of educational research. *History of Education Quarterly, 29,* 183-214.

Lakes, R. D. (1995). Social welfare and vocational education--in progressive era Cincinnati. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 11*, 12-21.

Laprade, P. (2009). Two year colleges: Program growth and opportunities for the two-year college choral program. *Choral Journal, 49,* 58-59.

LaPrade, K. (2011). Removing instructional barriers: One track at a time. *Education, 131*, 740-752.

Linn, R. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher, 29,* 4-16.

Little, J. (2014). From Chick to Child: The Role of Analogy in the Making of Thorndike's Educational Science. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, *44*, 101-114.

Little, J., Erbstein, N., & Walker, L. (1996). *High school restructuring and vocational reform: The question of "fit" in two schools.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED401454)

Levin, R. (1991). The debate over schooling: Influences of Dewey and Thorndike. *Childhood Education, 68,* 71-75.

Levinowitz, L. M., Barnes, P., Guerrini, S., Clement, M., D'April, P., & Morey, M. J. (1998). Measuring singing voice development in the elementary general music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *46*, 35-47.

Lewis, M. (2008). Effectiveness of previous initiatives similar to programs of study: Tech prep, career pathways and youth apprenticeships. *Career and Technical Education Research, 24,* 165-188.

Lucas, S. R., & Berends, M. (2002). Sociodemographic diversity, correlated achievement, and de facto tracking. *Sociology of Education*, *75,* 328-348.

Lynch, R. (2000). *New directions for high school career and technical education in the 21st century. Information series no. 384.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED444037)

Mac Iver, M. & Mac Iver, D. (2009). Urban middle grade student mathematics achievement: Growth under comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Educational Research, 102,* 223-236.

Maher, F. A. (1999). Progressive education and feminist pedagogies: Issues in gender, power, and authority. *Teachers College Record, 101*, 35-59.

Mandolini, R. (2012). Musical heuristics: Contributions to the understanding of musical creative processes. In W. Bowman and A. L. Frega (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy in Music Education* (p. 346-367). New York: Oxford University Press.

Manilow, A. (2009). An exploration of education: Examined through the philosophies of plato and progressive education. *Schools: Studies in Education, 6*, 215-221.

Mark, M. (1998). *Contemporary music education.* New York: Schirmer.

Mark, M. & Gary, C. (2007). *A history of music education.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Matthews, M. S., Ritchotte, J. A. & McBee, M. T. (2013). Effects of schoolwide cluster grouping and within-class ability grouping on elementary school students' academic achievement growth. *High Ability Studies, 24*, 81-97.

Maxwell, N. L., & Rubin, V. (2000). *High school career academies: A pathway to educational reform in urban school districts?* Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Mayer, A. (2008). Understanding how U.S. secondary schools sort students for instructional purposes: Are all students being served equally? *American Secondary Education, 36*, 7-25.

McCaffrey, D., Lockwood, J., Koretz, D., & Hamilton, L. (2003). *Evaluating value-added models for teacher accountability.* Santa Monica: RAND.

194

McCarthy, C. (1999). Dewey's ethics: Philosophy or science? *Educational Theory, 49*, 339-58.

McCarthy, M. & Goble, J. S. (2005). The paraxial philosophy in historical perspective. In D.

    Elliott (Ed.), *Praxial Music Education: Reflections and Dialogues* (pp. 19-51). New

    York: Oxford.

McDermott, J. W., Jr. (1976). *The controversy over ability grouping in American education,*

    1916-1970. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (48106).

McHugh, B. & Stringfield, S. (1999). Three-year analysis of implementation and effects

    in five schools. Core Knowledge curriculum. Report No. 40. Retrieved from ERIC.

    (ED435766)

Merritt, R. D. (2014). Ability grouping. *Ability Grouping -- Research Starters Education*, 1-9.

Miller, V. (2002). *The role of career and technical education in high school.* Retrieved

    from ERIC (ED466941).

Morton, C. (2001). Boom diddy boom boom: Critical multiculturalism and music education.

    Philosophy of Music Education Review, *9,* 32-41.

Moyer, A. E. (1981). Physics teaching and the learning theories of G. Stanley Hall and Edward

    L. Thorndike. *Physics Teacher, 19*, 221-28.

Mulkey, L., Catsambis, S., Steelman, L., & Crain, R. (2005). The long-term effects of ability-

    grouping in mathematics: A national investigation. *Social Psychology of Education, 8,* 137-

    177.

Muskin, C. (1990). *Equity and opportunity to learn in high school United States history classes:*

    Comparisons between schools and ability groups. Retrieved from ERIC. (ED322039)

Myers, D. (2007). Freeing music education from schooling: Toward a lifespan

    perspective on music learning and teaching. *International Journal of Community*

Music, *1*, 49-61.

Myers, D. (1995). Lifelong learning: An emerging research agenda for music

    education. *Research studies in music education*, *4*, 21-27.

National Association for Music Education (2014). *National core arts standards.* Reston:

    NAfME.

Nelson, L. R., & Drake, F. D. (1998). *The eclipse of progressive, democratic education in the*

    United States: A case study of Springfield, Missouri schools, 1924-1952. Retrieved from

    ERIC. (ED461587)

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools.* New York: Teachers College

    Press.

Null, J. W. (2001). Schwab, Bagley, and Dewey: Concerns for the theoretic and the

    practical. *The Educational Forum*, *65*, 42-51.

Null, J. W. (2003). *A disciplined progressive educator: The life and career of William*

    Chandler Bagley. New York: Peter Lang.

Null, J. W. (2006). Social reconstruction with a purpose: The forgotten tradition of

    William Bagley. In K. Riley (Ed.) *Social reconstruction: People, politics,*

    perspetives (pp. 27-44). Charlotte: Information Age.

Null, J. W. (2007). William C. Bagley and the founding of essentialism: An untold story

    in American educational history. *The Teachers College Record*, *109*, 1013-1055.

O'Connell, G. (1936). Thorndike as an exponent of naturalism in education. In G. O'Connell

    (Ed.) *Naturalism in American education (pp. 181-211).* New York: Benziger Brothers.

O'Neill, L. (2011). Hermeneutic haunting: ED Hirsch, Jr. and the ghost O'Nof

    interpretive validity. *Educational Studies*, *47*, 451-468.

O'Toole, P. (2002). Threatening behaviors: Transgressive acts in music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *10*, 3–17.

Olafson, L., Schraw, G., & Vander Veldt, M. (2010). Consistency and development of teachers' epistemological and ontological world views. *Learning Environments Research*, *13*, 243-266.

Osgood, R. L. (2010). Laggards, morons, human clinkers, and other peculiar kids: Progressivism and student difference in shaping public education in the United States. *Philosophical Studies in Education, 41*, 1-10.

Orman, E. (2002). Comparison of the national standards for music education and elementary music specialists' use of class time. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50,* 155-164.

Ornstein, A. (1990). Philosophy as a basis for curriculum decisions. *High School Journal, 74,* 102-109.

Palak, D., & Walls, R. T. (2009). Teachers' beliefs and technology practices: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *41*, 417-441.

Palumbo, A., & Kramer-Vida, L. (2012). An academic curriculum will close the academic achievement gap. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *85*, 117-121.

Paul, S. (1988). *Aesthetic justifications for music education: A theoretical examination of their usefulness* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (808932)

Persellin, D. C. (2006). The effects of vocal modeling, musical aptitude, and home environment on pitch accuracy of young children. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 39-50.

Petrilli, M. J. (2011). All together now? Educating high and low achievers in the same classroom. *Education Next, 11*, 48-55.

Petrina, S. (2004). Luella Cole, Sidney Pressey, and ducational psychoanalysis, 1921-1931. *History of Education Quarterly, 44*, 524-553.

Pietig, J. (1977). John Dewey and character education. *Journal of Moral Education, 6,* 170-180.

Pietig, J. (1980). Lawrence Kohlberg, John Dewey, and moral education. *Social Education, 44*, 238-42.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2011). Curriculum history, schooling and the history of the present. *History of Education, 40*, 1-19.

Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011). Common core standards the new U.S. intended curriculum. *Educational Researcher*, *40*, 103-116.

Powe, H. (2010). *An assessment of music programs in the Alabama Community College System* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3422975)

Powers, J. B. (1992). *The "girl question" in education: Vocational education for young women in the progressive era. Studies in Curriculum History.* Bristol: Falmer.

Prawat, R. (1995). Misreading Dewey: reform, projects and the language game. *Educational Researcher, 24,* 13-22.

Pressley, M. & Pressley, M. (2001). *Effective beginning reading instruction: A paper commissioned by the National Reading Conference.* Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Quint, J. (2006). *Meeting five critical challenges of high school reform. Lessons from research on three reform models.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED491634)

Ran, S. (2012). On teaching composition. *Contemporary Music Review, 31*, 305-312. doi:
    10.1080/07494467.2012.725813

Reed, J. (1987). Robert M. Yerkes and the mental testing movement. In M. M. Sokal (Ed.),
    Psychological testing and American society (pp. 75-94). Piscataway, NJ, US: Rutgers
    University Press.

Reedy, J. (2006). Cultural literacy for college students. *Academic Questions*, *20*, 32-37.

Reese, W. J. (2013). In search of American progressives and teachers. *History of Education, 42*,
    320-334.

Regelski, T. (1998). The Aristotlean bases of praxis for music and music education as praxis.
    Philosophy of Music Education Review, 6, 22-59.

Regelski, T. (2002). On "methodolatry" and music teaching as critical and reflective praxis.
    Philosophy of Music Education Review, 10, 102-123.

Regelski, T. (2003). Implications of aesthetic versus paraxial philosophies of music for
    curriculum theory in music education. Retrieved from
    http://www.maydaygroup.org/2003/04/ implications of aesthetic versus paraxial
    philosophies of music for curriculum theory in music education.

Regelski, T. (2004). Social theory, and music and music education as praxis. *Action, Criticism,*
    and Theory for Music Education, 3(3), 1-42.

Regelski, T. (2005). Music and music education: Theory and praxis for making a difference.
    Educational Philosophy and Theory, 27, 7-28.

Regelski, T. (2006). Reconnecting music education with society. *Action, Criticism, and Theory*
    for Music Education, *5*, 1-20.

Regelski, T. (2009a). The ethics of music teaching as profession and praxis. *Visions of Reserach in Music Education, 13,*1-34.

Regelski, T. (2009b). Ethical dimensions of school-based music education. In T.A. Regelski & J.T. Gates (Eds.) *Music education for changing times* (pp. 284-307)*.* New York: Springer.

Regelski, T. (2009c). Preface. In T.A. Regelski & J.T. Gates (Eds.) *Music education for changing times* (pp. v-xiv)*.* New York: Springer.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music: Advancing the vision.* Boston: Pearson.

Reimer, B. (2009). *Seeking the significance of music education.* Lanham: MENC

Roberson, S. (2014). Improving Teaching and Learning: Three Models to Reshape Educational Practice. *Education*, *134*, 340-358.

Roberson, S., & Woody, C. (2012). Declaring civil war on essentialist teaching. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *85*, 207-212.

Rocheleau, J. (2004). Theoretical roots of service learning: progressive education and development of citizenship. In B. Speck and S. Hoppe (Eds.) *Service Learning: history, theory and issues (pp. 3-21).* Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Rosenberg, J. (1996). *The practice of philosophy.* Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Rojeweski, J., Lee, I., & Gemici, S. (2010). Using propensity score matching to determine the efficacy of secondary career academies in raising educational aspirations. *Career and Technical Education Research, 35,* 3-27.

Roth, G., & Weinstock, M. (2013). Teachers' epistemological beliefs as an antecedent of autonomy-supportive teaching. *Motivation and Emotion*, *37*, 402-412.

Rubin, S. & Ramaswami, S. (2013). In what ways is the New Jersey county vocational

school admissions criteria a predictor of student success on state mandated tests?. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 10,* 46-60.

Rutherford, D. & Boehm, R. (2004). Round two: Standards writing and implementation in the social studies. *Social Studies, 95,* 231-238.

Rutkowski, J. (1996). The effectiveness of individual/small-group singing activities on kindergartners' use of singing voice and developmental music aptitude. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *44*, 353-368.

Rutkowski, J. (2013). The nature of children's singing voices: Characteristics and assessment. *The Phenomenon of Singing*, *1*, 201-209.

Rutkowski, J., & Miller, M. S. (2003a). The effect of teacher feedback and modeling on first graders' use of singing voice and developmental music aptitude. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 1-10.

Rutkowski, J., & Miller, M. S. (2003b). The effectiveness of frequency of instruction and individual/small-group singing activities on first graders' use of singing voice and developmental music aptitude. *Contributions to Music Education*, 23-38.

Ryan, A. M. (2011). From child study to efficiency: District administrators and the use of testing in the Chicago public schools, 1899 to 1928. *Paedagogica Historica, 47*, 341-354. doi:10.1080/00309230.2010.530284

Ryan, P. & Townsend, J. (2010). Representations of teachers' and students' inquiry in 1950s television and film. *Educational Studies*, *46*, 44-66.

Ryken, A. (2012). Goin' somewhere: How career technical education programs support and constrain urban youths' career decision-making. *Career and Technical Education Research, 31,* 49-71.

Sabia, D. (2012). Democratic/Utopian education. *Utopian Studies, 23*, 374-405.

Salauvo, M. (2008). Social media as an opportunity for pedagogical change in music education. *Journal of Music, Technology, and Education, 1,* 121-136.

Saito, N. (2009). Reconstruction in Dewey's pragmatism: Home, neighborhood, and otherness. *Education and Culture, 25,* 101-114.

Sanders, W. & Horn, S. (1995). The Tennessee value-added assessment system (TVAAS): Mixed-model methodology in educational assessment. In A. Shinkfield & D. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice (pp.*337-349). Boston: Kluwer.

Sanders, W., Saxton, A., & Horn, S. (1997). The Tennessee value-added assessment system: A quantitative, outcomes-based approach to educational assessment. In J. Millman (Ed.), *Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure?* (pp. 137-162). Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Sawyer, R. K. (2012). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation.* New York: Oxford Press.

Scherer, M. (1996). On Better Alternatives for Urban Students: A Conversation with Sylvia L. Peters. *Educational Leadership*, *54*, 47-52.

Schmidt, P. (2005). Music education as transformative practice: Creating new frameworks for learning music through at Freirian perspective. *Visions of Research in Music Education, 6,* 2-14.

Schraw, G., & Olafson, L. (2003). Teachers' epistemological world views and educational practices. *Journal of cognitive education and psychology*, *3*, 178-235.

Schraw, G. J., & Olafson, L. J. (2008). Assessing teachers' epistemological and

ontological worldviews. In M. Khine (Ed.), *Knowing, knowledge and beliefs* (pp. 25-44). Netherlands: Springer.

Scott, S. (2012). Rethinking the Roles of Assessment in Music Education. *Music Educators Journal*, *98*(3), 31-35.

Seller, M. (1981). G. Stanley Hall and Edward Thorndike on the education of women theory and policy in the progressive era. *Educational Studies, 11*, 365-74.

Setran, D. P. (2012). "More religion in education and more education in religion": Liberal progressivism and the educational "common faith,". *Teachers College Record, 114,* 1917-1940.

Shattuck, R. (2003). Going Back to School: The Curriculum, John Dewey, and Don Quixote. *Journal of Education*, *184*, 7-21.

Sim, M. (2009). Dewey and Confucius: On moral education. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy, 36*, 85-105. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6253.2008.01506.x

Skinner, A. (2003). The application of a core curriculum and options to an undergraduate paediatric course: A personal view. *Medical Teacher, 25,* 199-201.

Smith, R. (1994). *General knowledge and arts education: An interpretation of E.D. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Sparks, S. D. (2013). More teachers group students by ability. *Education Week, 32*(26), 8.

Spiggle, T. (2001). School-to-work: A movement in crisis. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy, 8*, 429.

Stauffer, S. (2009). Placing curriculum in music. In T.A. Regelski & J.T. Gates (Eds.) *Music education for changing times* (pp. 175-186). New York: Springer.

Stauffer, S. (2012). Place, music education, and the practice and pedagogy of philosophy.

In W. Bowman and A. L. Frega (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy in Music Education* (pp. 434-452). New York: Oxford University Press.

Stern, D. (2001). *Career academies and high-school reform before, during, and after the school-to-work movement. Spotlight on student success.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED474217)

Stern, D., Dayton, C., & Raby, M. (2000). *Career academies: Building blocks for reconstructing American high schools.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED455445).

Stern, D., Dayton, C., & Raby, M. (2010). *Career academies: A proven strategy to prepare high school students for college and careers.* Retrieved from ERIC. (ED524061)

Strand, K. (2006). Survey of Indiana music teachers on using composition in the classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*, 154-167.

Strand, K. (2009). A narrative analysis of action research on teaching composition. *Music Education Research, 11*, 349-363.

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., & Ross, S. M. (1998). Scaling Up School Restructuring in Multicultural, Multilingual Contexts: Early Observations from Sunland County. Research Report No. 2. Retrieved from ERIC. (ED423701)

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Borman, G., & Rachuba, L. (2000). National Evaluation of Core Knowledge Sequence Implementation. Final Report. Retrieved from ERIC (ED451282).

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Nunnery, J. & Ross, S. (1998). *First year evaluation of the implementation of the Core Knowledge sequence.* Retrieved from http://www.teachingcontentisteachingreading.org/mimik/mimik_uploads/documents/37/JHU_FirstYear_1996.pdf.

Svec, C. (2015). *The effect of instruction on the singing ability of children ages 5-11: A meta-analysis.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Texas, Denton, TX.

Tengowski, R., & Tweed, J. (1994). Your band can compose, too. *Teaching Music, 2*(3), 32.

Thompson, L. H. (1991). *Within-school discrimination: Inadequate title VI enforcement by education's office for civil rights. Statement of Lawrence H. Thompson, assistant Comptroller General, Human Resources Division, before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate.* Retrieved from ERIC (ED336441).

Tomlinson, S. (1997). Edward Lee Thorndike and John Dewey on the science of education. *Oxford Review of Education, 23*, 365-384.

Vogl, K., & Preckel, F. (2014). Full-time ability grouping of gifted students: Impacts on social self-concept and school-related attitudes. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 58*, 51-68. doi:10.1177/0016986213513795

von Mayrhauser, R. T. (1992). The mental testing community and validity: A prehistory. *American Psychologist, 47*, 244-53.

Wainer, H. (2011). Value-added models to evaluate teachers: A cry for help. *Chance*, *24*, 11-13.

Walberg, H. J., & Haertel, G. D. (1992). Educational psychology's first century. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 6-19.

Walker, R. (2012). Avoiding the dangers of postmodern nihilist curricula in music education. In W. Bowman and A. L. Frega (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy in Music Education* (pp. 386-408). New York: Oxford University Press.

Watras, J. (2009). Academic studies, science, and democracy: Conceptions of subject matter from Harris to Thorndike. *Philosophical Studies in Education, 40,* 113-124.

Webster, W. & Mendro, R. (1997). The Dallas value-added accountability system. In J.

    Millman (Ed.), *Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid*

    evaluation measure? (pp. 81-100). Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

WEL is Important (2013). *College and career readiness: The importance of early*

    learning. Retrieved from ERIC (ED542020).

Welch, G. (2009). Ecological validity and impact: Key challenges for music education

    research. In T.A. Regelski & J.T. Gates (Eds.), *Music education for changing times* (pp.

    149-159). New York: Springer.

Weltman, B. (1999). *Reconsidering Arthur Bestor: A postmortem for the Cold War in*

    education?. Retrieved from ERIC. (ED433276)

Wheeler, T. R. (2006). *Toward a framework for a new philosophy of music education:*

    Logstrup as synergy between the Platonic and Aristotelian perspectives in the music

    education philosophies of Bennett Reimer and David Elliott (Doctoral dissertation).

    Retrieved from ProQuest. (3254233)

Williams, D. (2011). The elephant in the room. *Music Educators Journal, 98*(1), 51-57.

Woo, E. (1997). Educator Hirsch winning cultural literacy debate. *Human Events, 53*,

    14-16.

Woodford, P. (2005). *Democracy in music education.* Bloomington: Indiana University

    Press.

Worthington, R. L., & Juntunen, C. L. (1997). The vocational development of non-college-bound

    youth: Counseling psychology and the school-to-work transition movement. *The Counseling*

    Psychologist, 25, 323-363.

Wraga, W. G. (1998). The school-to-work movement in the United States: Policies, problems
and possibilities. *Curriculum Journal, 9*, 177.

Yoder, P. & Symons, F. (2010). *Observational measurement of behavior.* New York:
Springer.

Zimiles, H. (2008). A bittersweet appraisal of progressive education. *Society, 45*, 164-169.
doi:10.1007/s12115-008-9068-6

Zilversmit, A. (1993). *Changing schools: progressive education theory and practice, 1930-1960.*
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.