facphotodup

074358

Patron Name : Robinson, Mitchell
Street or Campus Department : 208 Music Practice Building
City, State, Zip or Room and Bldg: 48824
Campus Phone : 355.7555
Home Phone : 517.349.1293
E-mail : mrob@msu.edu
Barcode : 900702073
MSU Account Number : 113613
FAX number : 517.349.1293
Use E-Doc? : yes

Music Ref

MT
1
N48
2002

Author : Colwell and Richradson

Entry Title : Chapter 8, Contemporary Curriculum Practices and Their Theoretical Bases

Book Title : The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning

Volume : X Issue : X Pages : X Date of Publication : 2002

Cited :

113-143

(30)

Initial : MR

Free Text : MT1
N48
2002
(Music reference book)
this book is in the Fine Arts Library

Need RESPONSE by: _____

Need ITEM by: _____

Responses (Please check):

NC _____ BDY _____

NOS _____ CITE _____

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICES

1 – 10 pages	$3.00	☐
11 – 20 pages	$4.00	☐
21 + pages	$5.00	☑

Copied by _____ on _1/12_

♦ Please direct inquiries to Heather Karen   ♦ Telephone: 353-4590   ♦ E-mail: karenh@msu.edu

Contemporary Curriculum Practices and Their Theoretical Bases

BETTY HANLEY

JANET MONTGOMERY

> The particular domain of curriculum research is not in its method(s) but rather in its questions, questions that appreciate the continually shifting coalescence of all its parts.
>
> L. B. Wing, "Curriculum and Its Study"

Although the practical issues that surround the teaching of music have always been important, the field of curriculum study has not historically received a high priority in North American music education. For example, Wing's (1992) review of curriculum conversations in the *Journal of Research in Music Education* and the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* from 1953 to 1988 revealed only 88 articles related to curriculum, 61% of which were dissertations. Applying Wing's criteria to the same sources between 1989 and 2000, we found 44 articles, 77% of which were dissertations. It seems that music educators are demonstrating some sign of increased interest in curriculum studies. This chapter provides an account of this interest.

Context of Curriculum Issues

After establishing a context for the discussion of curriculum issues, we begin the chapter with an overview of curriculum theory from Tyler (1949) to the present. We then examine the research related to contemporary music education curriculum from two perspectives: (1) curriculum research in the positivistic mode and (2) reconceptualized curriculum work. We conclude by revisiting some of the questions raised throughout the chapter and looking to the future.

What Is Curriculum?

There are many possible definitions of curriculum, with some focusing on content and others on form. We have selected a few to demonstrate the scope of the discussion. Fowler (1984, p. 33), for example, identified curriculum as the content of a subject or discipline. Eisner (1994) described curriculum as "the program of activities and opportunities provided to the young" (p. 61). Doyle (1992) relied on what he described as the way curriculum is "usually understood": "Curriculum refers to the substance or content of schooling, the course of study (literally, a racecourse)" (p. 486). Runfola and Rutkowski (1992) adopted an operational definition by Pratt (1980): Curriculum "refers to an organized set of formal educational and/or training intentions" (p. 697). Foshay (2000) conceived of curriculum as "a plan for action by students and teachers" that required clarity of goals, content, and practice (p. xv). Wing (1992) avoided a single definition of curriculum but suggested that curriculum involves conversations that surround "educational aims, objectives, materials, scope and sequence, articulation, teaching strategies, learner activities, and outcomes" (p. 196). Jackson (1992) traced historical changes in curriculum definitions, identifying different focuses and the importance of interpretation in definition making: Is curriculum what teachers plan? What students experience? The course of studies? The unplanned/hidden/undelivered curriculum?

There is a difference in the scope of these approaches to defining curriculum. The first six direct us to classroom practice. The last one asks us to think about the meaning of definitions and to examine the underlying assumptions. Definitions are "pieces of arguments" (Jackson, 1992,

p. 12) that present a point of view. Given the value-laden nature of definitions, Jackson emphasized the need to consider a number of questions when considering curriculum definitions and issues: What is the purpose of the proposed idea? Where does it come from and why? Why should anyone urge us to believe that it is so? Whose interests would be served? What impact would the ideas have on our beliefs? What actions might ensue? (p. 11). Jackson's questions themselves represent a particular way of seeing the world.

Jackson (1992) divided the many possible definitions of curriculum into two categories: (1) those "narrowly focused" concerns that deal with the development and implementation of specific subjects or topics within a school or set of schools and (2) those "more broadly focused" concerns that deal with theoretical issues such as "the construction of general theories and principles of curriculum development or broad perspectives on the curriculum as a whole or on the status of curriculum as a field of study" (p. 3). We will use this twofold conceptualization as our framework for discussing curriculum and direct the reader to Jackson (1992) for a detailed account of the historical evolution of curriculum.

What is important at this point is to acknowledge the complexity and many meanings of curriculum. As Pinar (1995) stated, definitions can be both beginnings and endings "dependent upon the discourse and its functions" (p. 28).

Curriculum Practice and Research

How have curriculum practice and research interacted in music education? Music educators have typically approached curriculum from the perspective of specialists who are interested in the subject matter (cf. Gary, 1967; Thomas, 1970) and in specialized topics such as the teaching of singing (Phillips, 1992) or the acquisition of music-reading skills (Hodges, 1992) rather than in what Jackson (1992) called "curriculum in general or curriculum improvement across the board" (p. 37). Discussing the factors that influenced curriculum decisions before there were curriculum specialists, Jackson identified custom and tradition, usefulness, authority, and textbooks (p. 22). These factors remain influential in contemporary music education. Curriculum in music education has been developed more on the basis of tradition and rigorous evaluation than on systematic research (Colwell, 1990a, 1990b).

There has been, moreover, concern that research has not significantly impacted on classroom practice. In *What Works: Instructional Strategies for Music Education*, a compilation of research-based strategies, Merrion (1989) wrote: "Although it may appear obvious that researched strategies would prove useful to teachers, there do not

seem to be many practitioners who use or highly value such information" (p. i). In the minds of practitioners, research has often been equated with theory, with both considered largely irrelevant.

Where Does Theory Fit?

If practitioners have been reluctant to use research, they have not been any more eager to engage in theory building. Reminiscing on his early years in the profession, LeBlanc (1996), who later in his career developed and tested a theory of music performance anxiety and a theory of music preference acquisition, described his reluctance to develop theories on which to base his research. This reluctance is shared by many music educators who consider theory to be esoteric. Whatever the reason, the quality of much research has suffered from a lack of solid theory building. Referring to research methodology in music education, Costanza and Russell (1992) concluded:

> There has been a good deal of research regarding the techniques, methods, and curricula used in the field of music education; however, because of the absence of a philosophical basis and a foundation of research for many of these techniques, methods, and curricula, there have not been many exemplary studies dealing with music education methodologies. (p. 505)

Beall (1991), however, questioned the value of unified theories "to guide all of our efforts in music teaching and learning" (p. 96), while Plummeridge (1985, 1999) discussed the limitations of theory. Are theory and practice unrelated? Does theory influence practice, or does practice generate theory? Or is practice theoretical (Pinar, Reynolds, Slatter, & Taubman, 1995, p. 586)? These questions will be examined in this chapter in the context of curriculum research in music education.

What Constitutes Curriculum Research?

In her seminal article, "Curriculum and Its Study," Wing (1992) drew together the literature and research from a number of disciplines to help clarify the field of curriculum study in music education. After providing a summary of the history of curriculum, she examined the relationship between curriculum conversation and teaching practice, the conceptions of curriculum implied in program evaluation models, and the challenges to curriculum. Wing noted a reluctance to conduct thorough curriculum studies, the emphasis on and inadequacy of the "scientific" study of curriculum, and the importance of the interrelationship of context, teachers, and learners in the curriculum. She emphasized the importance of asking the right questions, not

"just 'doing' curriculum" (p. 211), and the need to determine what knowledge is of most value. She concluded that

> the bulk of it [curriculum knowledge in music education] relates to having good ideas (comprehensive musicianship, sequential organization of concepts to be learned, quality literature, and so on), being able to create curricula based on these ideas, getting teachers to use these programs in varying degrees for a period of time, and seeing some evidence that students learned what was intended from these programs. The profession knows itself largely from the standpoints of stated values and scientifically conducted, quantitative inquiry into some of its curriculum efforts. (p. 211)

Much depends on the definition of curriculum employed. Discussing curriculum ideologies or belief systems and their impact on curriculum, Eisner (1992) recognized three areas of possible research: studies of the social and intellectual sources of the ideology, historical studies of the consequences of ideology on the content and form of schooling, and assessments of the effect of a particular ideology on "the processes and outcomes of schooling" (p. 319).

Identifying a number of issues that had not been addressed in research, D. F. Walker (1992) defined curriculum research as "any research that illuminates a curriculum problem or advances our ability to deal with it" (p. 109). He suggested the following research questions:

- How do we study curriculum practices in relation to their contexts rather than as isolated independent factors?
- How do we do justice in research to the differing values, interests, and perspectives of all those involved in curriculum practice?
- How do we reconcile research that meets the practical need for detailed studies of specific curriculum practices with traditional methodological standards and the institutional structures and procedures of the research community?
- How do we identify purposes when studying curriculum practice? (p. 112)

Curriculum research includes historical, analytical, descriptive, experimental, action-research, ethnographic, phenomenological, critical theory, and narrative models, each with its own criteria for excellence and assumptions about the nature of reality. The answer you get depends on the questions you ask.

The following critical observations have been made about curriculum research in music education:

1. There has been a lack of rigor in determining the effectiveness of innovation through evaluation (Costanza & Russell, 1992; Leonhard & Colwell 1976; Shuler, 1991a) and in music curriculum research in general (Wing, 1992).
2. There has been an absence of philosophical bases and research foundations for music education methodologies (Costanza & Russell, 1992, p. 505).
3. There has been a tendency to base curriculum on activities and techniques rather than carefully developed models (Runfola & Rutkowski, 1992, p. 700; Shuler, 1991a) and to neglect the study of the merits of teaching strategies/methods (Colwell, 1990a, p. 47).
4. There are few replications of research studies undertaken (Wing, 1992, p. 210).
5. There is a need for longitudinal and large-scale studies (Costanza & Russell, 1992; Reimer, 1985).
6. There is a lack of knowledge about what students are actually doing in classrooms (Wing, 1992, p. 212). Furthermore, researchers have noted a discrepancy between policy and practice (Shepherd & Vulliamy, 1994, p. 37), between the ideas behind curriculum and their actual implementation (Reimer, 1989, p. 161; Stake & Easley, 1978), between beliefs and practice (Hanley, 1989; Robinson, 1996; Stake, Bresler, & Mabry, 1991), between what teachers report they do and what they are observed doing (Swanwick, 1992, p. 5), and between what researchers and teachers consider to be ideal and what is presented in textbooks (Prawat, 1993).

Overview of the Chapter

In this chapter we will focus on developments in music curriculum in U.S. and Canadian and to some extent English and Australian K–12 schools since the publication of the first *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (Colwell, 1992). Mirroring Jackson's (1992) categories, our overall intention is twofold: (1) to examine practice and theory in music curriculum research from a "broad focus" in order to interpret the theoretical perspectives evident in curriculum research in music education and situate this research in the context of the general curriculum field and (2) to examine the more "narrowly focused" theoretical basis of music education practice and curriculum research.

In undertaking this chapter we realized that, given the magnitude of our purpose and the relative brevity of this chapter, we would have to be very selective in the research cited and focus more on the research literature than the practical realization of the ideas. We begin with the broad focus.

Curriculum Theory

Music education does not exist in a vacuum. While music educators are sometimes happy to be left alone, we are also

eager to jump on the latest educational bandwagon so that music education is perceived to be an integral part of the whole educational enterprise. Indeed, as we endeavor to maintain a place for music in the school timetable, it is becoming increasingly important to consider how music education fits into the broader framework of curriculum theory. In this section, we begin with the Tylerian Rationale, which underpins a generation of curriculum work described as prototypical of current school-based curriculum (Pinar et al., 1995). We next consider a decade of change and conclude the section with a look at the reconceptualized curriculum field.

Tylerian Rationale

The Tylerian Rationale has remained influential in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation in the schools since the publication of Ralph Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* in 1949. Tyler proposed putting curriculum on a scientific footing by asking four questions to guide curriculum work:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? [setting objectives]
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? [designing learning experiences]
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? [determining scope and sequence]
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? [evaluating student learning] (p. 1)

The Tylerian model developed and implemented by practitioners over 50 years is linear and hierarchical, with the teacher's role that of implementing the given curriculum. The model may sound quite familiar; its principles continue to form the basis for curriculum practice in North American schools. In this traditional conception of curriculum, the focus is on schooling. Researchers in this curriculum model adopt the positivist assumption "that human experience can only be understood via research methods modeled after those employed in the natural sciences" (Pinar, 1995, p. 52). Thus such curriculum researchers value validity, reliability, and generalizability and rely on the statistical analysis of data in what is called quantitative research.

The Tylerian Rationale has been heavily criticized. Doyle (1992) saw it as a production-system conception of education, a way of controlling teachers through the imposition of curriculum: "The knowledge of most worth—that is, practical knowledge—tended to be that which administrators could use to control how schooling was conducted" (pp. 491–492). An interest in curriculum implementation rather than in classroom experience was one outcome of this model (p. 492). Phrases such as *curriculum*

policy, planning, and *supervision* feature prominently in the applications of this model. The Rationale supported a "technical rationality" that focused on teacher effectiveness and grounded research in behavioral psychology. Pinar et al. (1995) argued that the Rationale was atheoretical and ahistorical because it was "procedural, and this bureaucratic interest has little need to consult history" (p. 42).

A Decade of Change

In the early 1970s the curriculum field was at a crossroads. Jackson (1992) considered the problem to be a matter of direction and saw two emerging trends. The first trend was a rapprochement of curriculum specialists to the *practice* of education by becoming consultants rather than distant experts. This view was supported, for example, by Schwab (1969, 1970, 1973, 1983), who thought the weaknesses of the curriculum field would be addressed by considering the practical over unsubstantiated theory. The second trend was a move "toward the academy," with the curriculum specialist serving as a "critic of educational affairs in general" (Jackson, 1992, p. 34) removed from the daily life of schooling. This latter trend may have contributed to the "ivory tower" label attached to academics in faculties of education. Pinar et al. (1995), however, saw this period as the beginning of a "paradigm change" (chap. 4 in Pinar) that was to shake the foundations of curriculum studies and also lead to a "balkanization" of the field.

Meanwhile, positivist research was increasingly being criticized because it tended to rely on the following assumptions:

1. In the same circumstances many people will have the same experience.
2. The majority dictates reality.
3. The individual is omitted in understanding a situation.
4. There is a tendency to treat subjects as means to ends.
5. Quantitative research pretends that objectivity, including political neutrality, is possible by eradicating subjectivity and ideology. (Pinar, 1995, p. 53)

The purpose of positivist researchers is to seek the Truth (the right answer), predict, and control through the application of criteria more appropriate to the natural sciences than to human subjects. The Tylerian approach to curriculum and curriculum research was very influential, but change was imminent.

A Reconceptualized Curriculum Field

In *Understanding Curriculum,* a landmark synoptic text, Pinar et al. (1995) described a reconceptualized view of the curriculum field they thought had successfully emerged in the 1980s. In the reconceptualized view, a quest for un-

derstanding and meaning making replaced a desire for improvement, collaboration replaced hierarchy, and inquiry replaced an emphasis on action and results: "The field had been reconceived from one with an essentially institutionalized aim to maintain practice (by improving it incrementally) to one with a critical hermeneutical goal of understanding practice and experience" (Pinar, 1995, p. xvi). According to Pinar, this view of the curriculum field prevails at the writing of this chapter, with the addition of the "relatively sudden and influential appearance of 'cultural studies' in curriculum, emphasizing popular culture" (personal communication, October 7, 2000). In the reconceptualized field, "why" became more important than "how." Proponents of this view were united mainly by their opposition to the Tylerian tradition (p. xvii), their belief in use of "eclectic traditions" such as phenomenology, and their "left-wing political bias" (Pinar, 1995, p. 39).

The contemporary curriculum field focuses on discourse as text and as words and ideas. *Discourse* refers to "a particular discursive practice, or a form of articulation that follows certain rules and which constructs the very objects it studies" (Pinar, 1995, p. 7). In the reconceptualized curriculum field, curriculum specialists are interested in understanding curriculum as political, racial, gender, autobiographical/biographical, phenomenological, postmodern, theological, institutionalized (in practice), and international texts. The interest in school-based curriculum research continues, but as only one of a number of discourses and with an important change in perspective: The difference between traditional (Tylerian) curriculum research and curriculum as institutionalized text is the search for understanding evident in the latter.

Addressing the theory/practice issue, Pinar concluded that "contemporary scholars are simultaneously closer to both 'practice' and closer to 'theory' " (p. 40). In the reconceptualized curriculum field, the distinction between theory and practice is one of appearance; the lines have blurred: "In the contemporary field practice *is* theoretical" (Pinar et al., 1995, p. 586). What has changed, in the authors' view, is the relationship between researcher and practitioner from one between expert and subject to one of collaboration. Nevertheless, to date, contemporary curriculum specialists have focused on what most would call theoretical issues, such as who is disenfranchised in curriculum decision making or whose values are being imposed (issues of hegemony). These issues are not always directly applicable to the classroom (cf. Jackson, 1992, p. 35, for research by curriculum generalists). The role of theory is to promote inquiry (Pinar, 1995, pp. 8–9). Referring to the early 1990s, Pinar stated that the majority of the ideas generated have not yet permeated elementary and secondary schools (p. 39). We note, however, that some inroads have been made in classroom practice in the past few years (e.g., in racism, ecology, and gender discourses).

Pinar proposed a more relevant definition of curriculum, one in which the point of view is made explicit: "Curriculum understood as a symbolic representation [rather than school materials] refers to those institutional and discursive practices, structures, images, and experiences that can be identified and analyzed in various ways" (p. 16). Curriculum is seen to be a "conversation" (Pinar et al., 1995, p. 848).

Not surprisingly, given this definition, the research methodology has broadened to encompass qualitative methods (for example, case studies, ethnographic research, action research, and critical and theoretical research). The map of the curriculum field includes classroom practice as one of the interests, but the focus in classroom research has changed to one of understanding—"understanding curriculum as it functions bureaucratically" (Pinar et al., 1995, p. 661). The role of the researchers, too, has changed: "The traditional role of the 'expert' which implied a relationship of 'theory' *into* 'practice' has been altered to a smaller, more modest role of consultant" (p. 662).

Commenting on the nature of contemporary curriculum research, Oberg suggested that in the conservative tradition research consisted of psychological effectiveness studies—an input/process/output model to determine the impact of a treatment on learning. In the ethnographic approach, the interest is in what actually happens in the classroom. In Oberg's view, curriculum research can be more expansive than has been previously acknowledged. Newer research focuses on the learner's experience as seen from the learner's perspective, and theory seeks the political implications of decisions, programs, and teacher actions (personal communication, Victoria, February 17, 2000).

One consequence of the reconceptualized curriculum has been a move away from subject specialization to an interest in issues that go across or beyond the curriculum. Another has been a new way of thinking about research that has led to the use of qualitative methods. In a postmodern world, there is no longer one Truth, one external point of judgment, one narrative. Reality is socially constructed and, therefore, multiple (Natoli, 1997). Curriculum is "a process—not of transmitting what is (absolutely) known but of exploring what is unknown" (Doll, 1993, p. 155).

Where does music education fit in this bigger picture? We address this question in the remainder of the chapter.

Music Education Practice and Theory in the Broader Theoretical Curriculum Context

Music education is facing a profound disparity between theory and practice forced on us by the emergence of a postmodern society.

R. Rideout, On Leadership in American Music Education

The first purpose of this chapter was to examine practice and theory in music curriculum research from a "broad focus" in order to interpret the theoretical perspectives evident in curriculum research in music education and situate this research in the context of the general curriculum field. We are now prepared to address this purpose.

Music education research followed the path traced earlier with a small time lag. It was only in 1953, when the American *Journal of Research in Music Education (JRME)* first appeared, that music education research had "gained sufficient stature to be considered a serious aspect of the profession" (Mark, 1986, p. 287). By 1972, most of the articles in *JRME* were descriptive or experimental, with some historical research. The second major American research publication, the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, first appeared in 1963. It was established to report on funded research and critique research studies, not all of which were quantitative. Nevertheless, these journals reflected an interest in experimental research that continues to the present in some streams of music education research (Schmidt, 1996, p. 80). In 1985 Reimer acknowledged this predominance: "If we were to eliminate from the research literature in music education all the studies using statistical tests of significance . . . what do you think we'd be left with?" (p. 15) and commented on the isolated, unrelated, and disconnected nature of the experiments. Until recently music education curriculum research typically adopted mainstream quantitative models. What about curriculum in the classroom?

Although many music educators resisted what they considered a mechanistic model inappropriate to music, music curriculum documents were designed with a focus on development, implementation, and the use of increasingly specific behavioral objectives. The focus of this "conventional" curriculum (Elliott, 1995) was on program delivery rather than on teaching and learning. A number of authors supported the assumptions of the Tylerian Rationale in their curriculum writing (e.g., Boyle, 1974; Greer, 1980; Labuta, 1974; Madsen, Greer, & Madsen, 1975; Madsen & Madsen, 1970).

Elliott (1995) explained that "a softer variation on Tyler's scheme" developed in the 1960s. This variation was based on the work of Bruner and others who supported a structure-of-disciplines approach "based on the assumption that every subject has a foundational pattern of verbal concepts that, when understood by teachers and students, enables all other aspects of that subject to fall into place" (Elliott, 1995, p. 244). For Elliott, the result of this approach in music education was the use of verbal concepts about music to organize curriculum rather than the "procedural essence of musicianship" (p. 246). Although Bruner did not emphasize language as the main focus of conceptual understanding (1960, p. 31; 1993, p. 138), music

education curricula used verbal concepts as labels to identify the concepts of nonverbal musical sounds. These verbal concepts were then used to organize the music curriculum. According to Elliott, both behavioral objectives and the concept approach had a profound impact on music education: "Separately, and in combination, the Tylerian concept and the structure-of-disciplines approach resulted in a steady stream of 'teacher-proof' curricula that continues to flow to the present day" (p. 244).

This traditional curriculum thinking continued to be the basis for "real" research until the late 1980s when the "paradigm change" started to infiltrate music education curriculum research. Eisner, Reimer, and Plummeridge, among others, saw the need for new ways of doing research. Eisner (1985) explored the idea of research as "educational criticism," and Reimer (1985) invoked the richness of qualitative research in addressing human experience. Plummeridge (1985) stressed the need to replace the emphasis on methodology and resources with "increased 'understanding' of curricula and a clearer sense of direction in music teaching" (p. 49).

One sign of change was the initiation of a number of new English music education research journals that allowed for greater diversity and representation: the *British Journal of Music Education* (1984), the *Canadian Journal of Research in Music Education* (1987), the *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* (1990), *Research Studies in Music Education* (1993), and *Music Education Research* (1999). Another significant step was the acceptance of qualitative research methodology by the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* (see particularly issues no. 123 in 1994/95 and no. 130 in 1996). Further signs of changing research practice were evident in the chapter on qualitative methodology by Bresler and Stake (1992) in the first *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (Colwell, 1992) and journal articles by Bresler (1992, 1994, 1996a). The establishment of the *Philosophy of Music Education Review* in 1993 was yet another indication of a growing interest in "why" questions. As a synopsis of research in music education, the chapters related to curriculum in the 1992 Handbook are revealing. Most authors reported on past research (largely experimental); the tone and assumptions were traditional. Wing's chapter, however, represented a transitional stage in which the identification of curriculum conversation and the importance of questions hinted at the future yet did not identify completely with the reconceptualized contemporary curriculum field.

Since the 1990s, music education curriculum research related to the schools (curriculum as institutional text) has been undergoing a transformation. The increased frequency of qualitative research models, the search for understanding in both quantitative and qualitative work, and the tendency to look at the experience rather than the de-

livery are all signs that at least part of the music education research community is adopting a reconceptualized view of curriculum. As Pinar (1995) wrote: "The point of contemporary curriculum research is to stimulate self-reflection, self-understanding, and social change. Simply put, practical or theoretical research is intended as much to provoke questions as it is to answer questions" (p. 56).

Commenting on the gap between researchers and teachers, Colwell (1985) pointed out that "one reason thinking and research have had little impact on music education is the high importance teachers attach to the information that comes through daily, first-hand experience" (p. 32). One benefit of the newer type of curriculum research is that it may resonate better with practitioners, some of whom are engaging in this type of research as initiators or partners. Perhaps contemporary research practice will put an end to the researcher/practitioner dichotomy that has so troubled the research community and alienated teachers.

Meanwhile, experimental researchers have moved away from the seemingly esoteric and atomistic kinds of research that have characterized the field to more subtle and connected studies (Gouzouasis, 1992; McDonald, 1991; Shuler, 1991b). As might be suspected of a postmodern age where multiple viewpoints are expected, experimental research still has its place:

> Experimental research, when directly related to a growing set of coherent understandings, can be undertaken with the kind of precision that it requires but also with the kind of meaningfulness that can only exist when an experiment is guided by a larger need. (Reimer, 1985, p. 16)

In spite of the changing times, traditional thinking still lingers in high places. In MENC's *Thinking Ahead: A Research Agenda for Music Education* (Lindeman, Flowers, Jellison, Kaplan, & Price, 1998), the wording in the section about curriculum clearly reflects a traditional viewpoint:

> The National Standards for Music Education identify what students should know and be able to do as they progress from kindergarten through grade 12. . . . Now the challenge is to find ways to implement and study the outcomes of the standards and examine emerging curricular issues in a time of education reform. (p. 7)

This wording is consistent with the nature of the standards themselves, which, in spite of the consensus-building process used in their development, are traditional in that one size fits all. Two of the suggestions for research in *Thinking Ahead* provide further evidence of this view:

- How can content listed in the national standards be communicated to and implemented by persons responsible for local curriculum development? To what extent are the standards being implemented, by whom, and with what result?
- Is there a core of songs that can and should be learned by all American school children? (p. 7)

The thinking behind these statements is hierarchical, implying that there is a right answer, and positivist—numbers will tell the tale. These underlying assumptions may be partially responsible for the reluctance of some music educators to "embrace" the standards. Schmidt (1996) commented: "The very act of establishing national standards presupposes that there is a body of knowledge and/or skills that is identifiable by some authority as true and valuable and that the acquisition of such may be measured" (p. 77). She considers the standards to be more of an advocacy tool than a vehicle for change. Her conclusion may prove to be ironically inaccurate if states opt to develop standardized tests in music that in turn drive the curriculum.

Have government curriculum policies and documents for the schools changed? The short answer is a qualified no. The emphasis on national standards (USA) and national curricula (England and Australia) suggests that, at the political level, the model is still Tylerian. Rideout (1998) proposed that the leadership in American music education is operating from a modernist worldview (emphasizing universal goals, hierarchical achievement, and peer comparisons) in a postmodern society (with multiple realities, socially constructed meaning, and collaboration) (p. 7). At the same time, there have also been attempts to develop research-based, learner-centered curricula with greater decision making given to teachers (Saskatchewan Education, 1995). Has curriculum in classrooms changed? The short answer is a qualified yes. Teachers have had to adapt to rapidly changing cultural and social expectations and technological advances. In some locations (e.g., the province of Ontario), teachers are expected to be curriculum developers, with single textbooks no longer accepted as the source of all knowledge. What will become of music textbook series in such a climate, you might ask? To paraphrase Mark Twain, the news of their demise is premature. Not so long ago, Gordon's use of coded cards with activities that teachers could coordinate with his learning sequence in *Jump Right In* (Gordon & Woods, 1985) was one of the reasons the series was not well received (Shuler, 1991a, p. 53); the new series (Bolton et al., 2000) has textbooks. In addition, in 1996 McLellan found that only 11 of 112 K–6 music teacher respondents indicated they did not use textbooks.

So far in looking at change we have addressed curriculum as institutionalized text. Is there also evidence of increased interest in theoretical issues in music education? The MayDay Group (Gates, 1999), an international think tank formed in 1993, provides an example of a discourse based on critical theory. There are also examples of femi-

nist scholars (Green, 1993; Koza, 1994a, 1994b; Lamb, 1993) and cultural studies scholars (Shepherd & Wicke, 1997). These researchers work more in the area of theory, although their ideas could have significant impact on music education in the future, as will become evident in the discussion of a reconceptualized view of curriculum.

Having provided a quick overview of educational trends and situated music education within the broader enterprise, we will now progress to our second purpose: to examine the more "narrowly focused" theoretical basis of music education practice and curriculum research. We begin with school-based music curriculum research and theory development based on the Tylerian view of music curriculum practice. We then examine how a reconceptualized field of curriculum is emerging in music education.

Music Curriculum Theory and Research in the Tylerian Tradition

Most of us formed opinions on the worth of CMP, Manhattanville, programed learning, CEMREL, and the Rolland string materials on what we would like to believe, not on the basis of student readiness or any evaluation of the effectiveness of the materials.

> R. J. Colwell, "Program Evaluation in Music Teacher Education"

In most cases the innovators who developed the methods were almost entirely concerned with helping children to learn music and worked from the basis of the music rather than from psychological theory.

> M. L. Mark, Contemporary Music Education

The methods/approaches used to teach music in the classrooms have been many. Mark (1986) identified nine: the Dalcroze Method, the Orff Approach, the Kodály method, Orff and Kodály combined, the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program (MMCP), teaching music through learning theory (Gordon), the Carabo-Cone Method, Suzuki Talent Education, and Comprehensive Musicianship. Costanza and Russell (1992) would add music textbooks to the list. We would include Discipline-Based Music Education (DBME), Education Through Music (ETM), and the Generative Approach (Boardman, 1988a, 1988b, 1989). In addition, music education exists in different instructional settings, such as general, instrumental, choral, keyboard, elementary, secondary, middle school, and early childhood (Colwell, 1992), and is sometimes required and sometimes an elective. Sometimes music is supposed to be taught by classroom teachers (elementary grades) and sometimes by specialist teachers (elementary and secondary grades). The 1992 Handbook reviewed research about many of these approaches and settings. The

research cited was predominantly quantitative or descriptive, operating within a positivistic framework.

Rather than address each of the approaches/methods/instructional settings in turn, we will examine (1) the theoretical sources of classroom practice at a time when the Tyler Rationale prevailed and (2) the research generated within the positivistic perspective under six categories identified by Wing (1992) in her review of curriculum literature:

1. position statements and curriculum guidelines,
2. status studies (surveys/analyses),
3. development of curriculum/curricular materials,
4. curriculum development and trial,
5. evaluation of existing curricula, and
6. curriculum development and comparative study (p. 210)

Theoretical Bases of Music Teaching in the Schools—Positivist Views

There have been strong trends in education which have always resulted from some viewpoint or standpoint originating within an influential personality or group, and spreading first to the leaders then to the grassroots of the profession. These trends seemingly constitute the philosophy of the profession.

> R. J. Colwell, "Music Education and Experimental Research"

Historically, music education curriculum has been somewhat lacking in the area of philosophical discussion, favoring the identification of what works based on common sense and experience: the WHAT and HOW rather than the WHY. Although Costanza and Russell (1992) considered the Kodály, Orff, Dalcroze, and Suzuki approaches to be methodologies, meaning "a body of techniques, methods, and curricula . . . based on a philosophical system and a foundation of research" (p. 498), other writers are less convinced about the philosophical and research foundations of these approaches (Atterbury, 1991; Dolloff, 1993; Gouzouasis, 1991; Reimer, 1989, pp. 159–160; Shuler, 1991a, p. 39). Even though the approaches listed previously along with choral music, instrumental music, and so on, could claim to have underlying learning principles and philosophical assumptions, questioning and clarifying these underlying principles have not been a priority. Historically, improving practice and, in some cases, proving the worth of an approach have been the major concerns. Is music education still guided by "influential personalities" or do we have a more reasoned approach to curriculum? We will examine two examples of well-developed theoretical foundations for music education. The first is based on psychological learning principles, the second on philosophical method. Both have impacted on classroom practice.

Psychology. Psychology has dominated educational thinking in music education (Rideout, 1997a). The most developed model of music education with a psychological base is Gordon's music-learning theory. For over 40 years, Gordon has remained committed to developing and refining a theory of music learning and teaching and a method that he characterizes as sequential and comprehensive (Gordon, 1993, p. 46).

Music-learning theory "refers to the specific sequential taxonomies for skills and for tonal and rhythm content that Gordon formulated, as well as to his general theories of musical development" (Shuler, 1991a, p. 40). Learning theory is "an explanation of how we learn when we learn music" (Gordon, 1993, p. 33) and implies how students should be taught:

> Proper methodology in music is based on an understanding of music learning theory. Music learning theory provides a teacher with the basis for establishing sequential objectives in a music curriculum, in accord with his/her own teaching styles and beliefs, that are sensitive to individual musical differences among students. (p. iv)

Gordon addresses students' readiness in terms of melodic and rhythmic aptitude. Individual differences are identified through the use of psychometric music aptitude tests developed by Gordon (the *Musical Aptitude Profile*, 1965, for stabilized aptitude; the *Primary Measures of Music Audiation*, 1979; and *Intermediate Measures of Music Audiation*, 1982, for developmental aptitude).

Gordon presented his theory most recently in *A Music Learning Theory for Newborn and Young Children* (1990) and *Learning Sequences in Music* (1993), in which he also explained the importance of the development of audiation (the process of assimilating and comprehending music in our minds) to both music aptitude and music achievement. For Gordon, audiation is the key to musical understanding, and understanding is the goal of music education (1993, pp. 33–35). Gordon's music-learning theory is operationalized in *Jump Right In: The Music Curriculum* (Gordon & Woods, 1985), *Jump Right In: The Instrumental Series* (Grunow & Gordon, 1989), and *Jump Right In: General Music Series* (Bolton et al., 2000).

Gordon's work can be described as positivistic because his approach is atomistic and skills-based; his method is prepackaged; meaning is externally imposed rather than constructed by the learner (Woodford, 1996, p. 88); he neglects the context of music; much of his research involves the development and use of psychometric tests; and he operates within a quantitative understanding of what research can be (Gordon, 1992, pp. 62–63). In 1991, while acknowledging Gordon's important contributions to music education in theory development and in his development of aptitude measurement, Colwell and Abrahams (1991) claimed "there is no research which is sufficiently definitive to indicate the degree of truthfulness or error in the research of Gordon and his writings" (p. 19). Shuler (1991a) reinforced the need for research that supported Gordon's theories, and Stokes (1996) wrote that Gordon's learning theory had more internal than external validity. Gordon's major contribution to curriculum has been in the application of his music-learning theory to classroom practice.

We now move to Reimer, a philosopher who may, at first glance, seem to fit poorly under the heading of positivism. After all, Reimer aligned himself with cognitive psychology, not behaviorism; he criticized isolated experimental research and did not engage in it himself. Why is his work included in this section? There is some justification, if not a sterling match.

Philosophy. Stokes (1996) summarized seven aspects of curriculum identified by Reimer "for responsible curriculum enterprise":

> Curriculum theorists must base educational choices on a sound philosophy, relevant psychological research and educational practice and research, effective short- and long-term sequencing of learning, professional teacher interpretation of materials, experienced teacher/student operations in the classroom, what students undergo and bring to the learning situation, and what educators and society expect from the educational process. (p. 96)

Reimer (1989) argued that "practice must be grounded in a secure philosophy" (p. 10). He was not impressed with the rationales for music education presented in the past: "On the philosophy side, music education has offered rationales so puny, so unessential, so political, so tied to values not unique to music, as to convince many that music is little more than a pleasant, recreational hobby" (1989, p. 149). Reimer also did not think that psychological theory alone provides a sufficient foundation for curriculum development, because it does not address questions of value (pp. 149–150); psychology comes into play to bring philosophy to life. Reimer developed a philosophy of music education based on "the nature and value of the art of music" (1989, p. 1). At the core of the philosophy was the importance of sensitivity to the expressive qualities of music. Called absolute expressionism and, in practice, aesthetic music education, Reimer's philosophy was made available to practitioners in the elementary music series *Silver Burdett Music* (Crook, Walker, & Reimer, 1974, 1978, 1981, 1985; Reimer, Hoffman, & McNeil, 1974, 1978, 1981, 1985). In the introduction (Crook et al., 1981, Grade 5), the authors claimed consistency with developmental learning theory because the series "provides opportunities for gradual, progressive, consistent growth" and high levels of success and challenge (p. vi) and a spiral

mode of organization. So Reimer coherently addressed both philosophical and psychological concerns in his curriculum development work.

Reimer's work is important because aesthetic music education arguably became the "bedrock upon which our self-concept, as a profession, rests" (Reimer, 1989, p. xi). Reimer was accurate in describing the considerable influence of aesthetic music education on the field for nearly 30 years (Mark & Gary, 1999, p. xviii), even if its ideas were imperfectly understood and implemented (Elliott, 1995, p. 29; Hanley, 1989; Reimer, 1989, p. xi).

It is on the basis of the *Silver Burdett Music* series that the case for a positivist designation can be made. Reimer's work can certainly not be classified as Tylerian, but it is an example of the "soft variation" noted by Elliott (1995, p. 244). There are two reasons for this conclusion. First, *Silver Burdett Music* portrayed a structure-of-disciplines organizational approach with the content organized around verbally mediated concepts related to music (what Elliott called verbal concepts, 1995) as determined by experts (even though these concepts were in service of the student's perception of and response to music). Second, the series is a commercial curriculum and therefore an attempt to develop a "teacher-proof" package. Although *Silver Burdett Music* has been used for control groups in comparative studies (Byrd, 1989), we have located no published research about its efficacy in terms of student learning, in spite of the competency tests developed for the series (Colwell, 1979).

Trends. In addition to the two preceding examples, there are other indications of a greater interest in the theoretical underpinnings (both philosophical and psychological) of music education methods. One example is Dolloff's (1993) study of Orff's *Schulwerk* to identify the cognitive, musical, and artistic foundations that the approach provides for the development of children. A second is represented by Montgomery's (1997; in press) decision to use the unifying principle of sound before symbol in her work, focusing on a process with a strong basis in research rather than on more experientially based methods. Her view is that research efforts that attempted to test/justify a whole method have been futile and have merely reinforced unproductive competition among Dalcroze, Orff, and Kodály proponents. The focus on sound before symbol that is common to the three methods (as well as to Gordon's approach) provides a more fruitful foundation for music education (personal communication, June 13, 2000). So, the answer to the question "Is music education still guided by 'influential personalities' or do we have a more reasoned approach to curriculum?" is (arguably) that, as a profession, we are showing a greater understanding of the need for theoretical bases and becoming better at applying what we are learning.

Research about Curriculum Practice

We will now examine the research related to classroom practice using Wing's six categories as organizers. Our purpose is to examine the research mindful of both current practice and theoretical bases while focusing mainly on the past decade.

1. Position statements and curriculum guidelines. We have selected two sources of guidelines: The first is a collaboration among arts organizations, a university, foundations, and the schools; the second looks at national initiatives. When it exists, research in this category comes from an examination of guidelines and their implementation.

Discipline-Based Music Education.

There is a recent curriculum initiative based on a structure-of-disciplines approach that is quite different from the concept-driven model of the 1970s and 1980s. Rather than using music concepts as curriculum organizers, in DBME music instruction is based on works of music (Patchen & Harris, 1996). DBME is modeled on the Getty Institute for the Arts' development of Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) under way since the 1980s and was evaluated by Wilson (1997) in his model study, *The Quiet Evolution: Changing the Face of Arts Education.* DBAE grew out of the reform efforts of the 1960s (Wilson, 1997) and the work of Bruner (1960). From Bruner's emphasis on disciplines arose the four-discipline perspective—production, history, aesthetics, and criticism. DBME was an extension of DBAE undertaken by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, where local funding established the Southeast Institute for Education in Music (SIEME) to engage in research, development, and implementation.

Patchen (1996), an early director of the center, noted that the discipline-based approach is "reflected in the new *National Standards for Arts Education*" (p. 17) and that because it is "a conceptual framework and not a curriculum or methodology, it is compatible with the major methodologies in music education such as Orff, Kodály, and Dalcroze" (p. 18). SIEME undertook an extensive evaluation of DBME from 1989 to 1994 conducted by Asmus. The positive findings of the annual reports and site observations are summarized in *A Discipline-Based Music Education Handbook* (Patchen & Harris, 1996, "Conceptual Framework," p. 12). The practice of DBME was enhanced by an emphasis on team building, in-service delivery, and, as of 1993, a required course on the discipline-based approach for elementary music majors at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. This teacher education program implements discipline-based instruction in all four arts over a nine-state area (Kim Wheetley, personal correspondence, June 1, 2000). Others have also shown an interest in DBME (e.g., developing a theoretical framework

[Sibbald, 1989]; determining the frequency of component use [Townsend, 1998]).

National Curricula.   We proceed to examine four cases of national curriculum development: one in a small country where government control is more manageable and the curriculum is imposed and inspected; one in a large country where standards have been developed through "consensus-building" (see Schmidt, 1996, for a critique of this process) and adoption by states is voluntary; one in a large country where the provincial jurisdiction of education is enshrined and interprovincial partnerships have been slow to build; and the last in a large country where state and territories administer education and teachers have maintained professional independence.

First, to England. Following the 1988 Education Reform Act, *Music in the National Curriculum* (Department of Education, 1992, 1995) was adopted in England. The National Curriculum represents "national priorities for learning and assessment," a "framework for school inspection," and a "basis of the National Standards for Initial Teacher Training" (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education, 1999, p. 72). The music curriculum documents identified two Attainment Targets: (1) performing and composing and (2) listening and appraising. The National Curriculum replaced a system in which music teachers were autonomous and had no obligation to respond to calls for a common direction (Plummeridge, 1996, p. 29) and had a politically conservative agenda (Cox, 1993; Shepherd & Vulliamy, 1994). In the new system, "what 'counts' as music is now firmly determined by the government through the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority. . . . There is now an 'official' view of music education" (Plummeridge, 1996, pp. 30–31). Kushner (1999) commented on the limiting nature of the National Curriculum:

> It imposes a logic of "simple to complex," it insists on a theory of iteration, it assumes that the only worthwhile learning is that which follows teaching, it demands universal treatment of pupils, it subjugates individual professional knowledge to the theories of professional "tribal elders." (p. 213)

Some (Gane, 1996; Preston, 1994; Stowasser, 1993) saw opportunities in the National Curriculum because of the potential for expanded encounters with music. Major (1996), however, critiqued the concept basis of the secondary curriculum, calling for more attention to neglected skill development.

The implementation of the music curriculum is checked by HM Inspectors of Schools (HMI). Official reports of the quality of music teaching use public criteria for assessment (OFSTED, 1993a), and early studies indicated that implementation was more successful in the primary years (ages 5 to 10) than in the secondary years (ages 11 to 14) (Mills, 1994, 1997; OFSTED, 1993b). Mills (Clay, Hertrich, Jones, Mills, & Rose, 1998) noted that, in spite of overall positive results, "continuity and progression," exploiting pupils' musical creativity and developing their musical imagination," and "participation in music at school" in Key Stage 4 remained areas of concern (pp. 60–61).

Non-government-affiliated researchers were, however, more critical of the early implementation of the curriculum. Lawson, Plummeridge, and Swanwick (1994) found that the teaching of listening and appraising was weak and the teaching of literacy and sound exploration was neglected. Writing about the National Curriculum, Paynter (1993) concluded that while national guidelines may be useful, "it is impossible to legislate for universally good education" (p. 176); it is innovative and inventive teaching that makes the difference.

Second, the American National Standards for Arts Education (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994) include standards for music, which "have quickly become accepted as the basis for most state and local music standards and frameworks" (Music Educators National Conference, 1996, p. 1). The standards were a response to those who believed that the quality of student learning had degenerated to the point that the nation was at risk. The music standards were developed by a coalition led by the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) that wanted to ensure that the arts were included in the Goals 2000 Project and were thus part of the national education agenda. The standards provide a common foundation for curriculum development by presenting nine content and achievement standards for students in K–4, 5–8, and 9–12. To date, 44 states have adopted some form of the standards, with development and implementation at different stages of completion (American Music Conference News, 1996). Given the voluntary nature of the standards and the regulation of education by individual states, not the federal government, this level of collaboration is an indication of considerable success (possibly related to funding).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) recently completed its 1997 report card in music and the other arts for Grade 8 students (Persky, Sandene, & Askew, 1998). The content of the assessment "was designed in conjunction with the newly developed voluntary" standards (p. 11), taking advantage of the opportunity to coordinate curriculum and evaluation at a national level. Although the NAEP results show a high level of achievement by some young people, they also show that "too many young people lack the skills and knowledge that are necessary to experience the satisfaction, fulfillment, and enrichment that music can bring to the life of every citizen"

(Lehman, 1999, p. 37). The gap between standards and student achievement seems considerable.

Third, in Canada there has been an attempt to develop a Pan-Canadian protocol for arts education similar to the Pan-Canadian Science Project developed by the Council of Ministers of Education (CMEC) in 1997 (Sandner, 1999). Favaro (1999) explained the process and lack of success for the arts project at a political level, and Hanley (1998a) addressed grassroots discomfort with the idea of a national curriculum framework or standards in the arts. Provincial governments, for their part, are watchful of their jurisdictional prerogatives. There has been some headway toward consolidation in that, since 1993, the western provinces and territories have agreed to collaborate on the development of common curriculum frameworks in mathematics, language arts, and social studies (mathematics was completed in 1995), but the arts are not on the agenda. Meanwhile, the four Atlantic (eastern) provinces have produced *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada Arts Education Curriculum* (Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation, 2000), a framework for elementary arts education. There appears to be a different interest in the arts on each coast. In an attempt to address the dilution of elementary music programs, the Coalition for Music Education in Canada and the Canadian Music Educators Association (CMEA) have collaborated to produce *Achieving Musical Understanding: Concepts & Skills Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 8* (2001) independent of any government affiliation. The impact of this resource, if any, is yet to be determined. There has been no recent attempt to assess student learning in music either nationally or provincially.

Fourth, in the late 1980s in Australia there was an attempt to develop a national framework for curriculum development that identified eight core areas of learning, one of which was the arts. The result was *The Arts—A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools* (Curriculum Corporation, 1994). Education in Australia is administered by state and territory systems. Although the curriculum framework is in place, "more than a decade of continuing efforts to standardize pedagogical practices around Australia" has not resulted in homogeneous practice across the country: "Australians have always resisted a top-down approach by governments and education systems which prescribes a central curriculum" (McPherson & Dunbar-Hall, 2001). McPherson and Dunbar-Hall present a view of music education that they described as postmodern in the questioning of tradition, in adopting the view that "the student is the source of knowledge rather than the teacher," in the increased use of technology, and in adopting an ethnological foundation for music education with curriculum more inclusive of aboriginal music systems.

Four stories, four political contexts. Many questions arise. Why is there a trend to national curriculum initiatives at this time? What agenda do standards and frame-

works mask? What evidence supports the validity of national curricula? Who decides what will be included? How is the assessment of student learning integrated into the planning? Clearly there are issues of development and control when national curriculum initiatives appear (Plummeridge, 1996, p. 27).

2. *Status studies (surveys/analyses).* These studies include surveys and curriculum analyses that are intended to inform decision making. They differ in scale from more local to national projects.

On a smaller scale, Finter (1995) examined the elementary music curricula in Nevada to see whether they conformed to authoritative sources. On the basis of percentage of agreement, the author concluded that the best match was in "psychomotor/manipulative" objectives and the least congruency existed in the area of "cognitive/elemental" objectives. Finter evidently assumed that the authorities he cited knew what is required to construct a valid music curriculum.

National studies provide large databases, and the comparison across districts can be instructive. Brown (1993) examined the status of elementary music education in Canada through a comparison of provincial curriculum guidelines and questionnaire responses from administrators and music teachers with the MENC *School Music Program: Description and Standards*. Not surprisingly, recommendations included more specialist teachers, more in-service, more time, and better facilities. Given provincial jurisdiction over education, Brown's recommendation for the development of national standards for music education in Canada was more unexpected.

Siverson (1990) developed a questionnaire that undertook a national study in the United States to determine the degree to which utilitarian versus aesthetic goals were pursued in high school band programs. The results supported the researcher's belief that band teachers would prefer to teach for aesthetic outcomes but are required to spend more time on utilitarian objectives. The study, unfortunately, had only a very low return rate and used a rather simplistic questionnaire.

Demonstrating an increased interest in music curriculum across Canada, Shand and Bartel (1993) described in considerable detail 74 provincial music curriculum documents published between 1980 and 1992. The topics addressed in the reference tool were document characteristics, program orientation, characteristics of the recommended repertoire, and methodology. This study provides a helpful source for researchers.

Status reports are useful because they inform us about the state of affairs and provide a baseline for more local studies. These studies, however, are costly and time-consuming. Three examples are reports about the number of states that have adopted or are working toward implementing the American National Standards for Arts Edu-

cation (American Music Conference, 1996), the state of arts education in American elementary schools (Carey, 1995), and the status of adoption, implementation, and assessment of the standards in visual arts, music, theater, and dance in 176 school districts in Colorado (Colorado Alliance for Arts Education, 2000).

3. Development of curriculum/curricular materials. This kind of research has been most directly relevant to practitioners. It involves the development of theoretical models, curriculum, and music textbooks.

In addition to Gordon's music-learning theory, examples of theory development include Kuehmann's (1987) survey and review of the literature and design of a general music curriculum model for fundamentalist Christian elementary schools (based on Bandura, Skinner, Gagné, and Piaget); Musoleno's (1990) identification of 12 essential elements in a model middle school music program that addressed placement, operation, and content based mainly on responses from "experts"; Bourne's (1990) curriculum model for children's choirs based on observed instructional techniques used in rehearsals and interviews of six exemplary directors; and Clausel's (1998) music curriculum model for kindergarten and first-grade children that uses Cambourne's model of literacy learning and the Orff-Schulwerk method. These models have had only limited application.

Music textbooks continue to impact on music education at all levels, but especially in the elementary grades. Examples of curriculum and curriculum materials developed to assist teachers include:

- textbooks for elementary general music (*Holt Music* [Meske, Andress, Pautz, & William, 1988], *Share the Music* [Bond et al., 1995], *The Music Connection* [Silver Burdett Ginn, 1995], and *Jump Right In* [Bolton et al., 2000]);
- programs for choral music (*We Will Sing! Choral Music Experience for Classroom Choirs* [Rao, 1993]); and
- methods books for instrumental music classes (*The Comprehensive Music Instructor* [Froseth, 1986], *Jump Right In: The Instrumental Series* [Grunow & Gordon, 1989], *Essential Elements: A Comprehensive Band Method* [Rhodes, Bierschenk, Lautzenheiser, & Higgins, 1991], *Strictly Strings* [Dillon, Kjelland, & O'Reilly, 1992], *Standards of Excellence* [Pearson, 1993], and *Essential Elements for Strings* [Allen, Gillespie, & Hayes, 1994]).

In a current trend, the major publishers of elementary music textbooks have opted for reaching the greatest market over program coherence and a unified philosophy. The use of multiple authors may have contributed to this trend.

McLellan (1996) surveyed K–6 elementary music teachers about their use of and the effectiveness of elementary music series. Most teachers reported satisfaction with their

series and found them compatible with mastery learning theory and their school system's curriculum. These teachers wanted to continue using their textbooks. McLellan advised further research about the effectiveness of these series and alternative approaches.

What research informs music textbook development? In recent years, publishers have conducted marketing research that relies on information gathered from experts in the field; however, very few research studies on the effectiveness of music textbooks have been published. In an exemplary and critical study of Silver Burdett & Ginn's *World of Music* (Culp, Eisman, & Hoffman, 1988) that was based on a common set of framing questions across subjects, May (1993) concluded that research that informs the "design, structure, or content" of music textbooks is sparse, as is research about teachers' use of music texts (p. 17). Furthermore, "publishers' decisions most often rely on intuition, not on research" (p. 14). May also pointed out how little we know about the use of music textbooks in the classroom. Her remarks could apply equally well to instrumental and choral textbooks.

4. Curriculum development and trial. It is in curriculum implementation that the gap between the theory and practice is most evident. The piloting of curriculum and planned implementation research are ways of bridging this gap.

Byo (1999) examined Florida music specialist and Grade 4 classroom teachers' perceptions of their ability to implement the U.S. national standards. She concluded that specialist teachers should be responsible for the delivery of some of the standards and share responsibility with classroom teachers for others. Her findings showed a clear support for specialist music teachers at the elementary level.

Technology presents both challenges and opportunities to music education curriculum. Over 3 years, Nelson (1988) developed and piloted a middle school general music program that taught orchestration and music composition with the incorporation of computer-assisted instruction (CAI) and aspects of Gordon's music-learning theory. Nelson concluded that the computer can be used successfully at a Grade 7 level. Clarkson and Pegley (1991) developed and piloted the Technology in Music Programme (TIMP), a program of creative activities for Grades 7 and 8 students that included improvising, arranging, composing, sound production, performing, and listening. The teaching context was collaborative, and discovery was encouraged. In the pilot, 52% of the educational objectives were achieved, and students were very enthusiastic about the program. Replication studies are needed to determine whether it is novelty or something else that contributes to student enthusiasm when technology is used in the music classroom.

Comprehensive music education is an American contribution to the field. The next example illustrates a large-

scale, recursive, big-budget curriculum development and implementation process. The Hawaii Music Program was inspired by the Yale Seminar Report (Arberg & Palisca, 1964) and the documentary report of the Tanglewood Symposium (Choate, 1968). The research and development of the K–12 program involved "rethinking music as a discipline of knowledge" (Burton, 1990, p. 68). The result was the development and implementation of curriculum and materials organized around music concepts that promoted the principles of comprehensive music (Burton & Thompson, 1982; Thompson, 1974). In the Hawaii program, *comprehensive musicianship* referred to "the belief that a program of music education should be all-inclusive and all-embracing within the context of music as a discipline of knowledge" (Burton, 1990, p. 69), meaning that students should participate in music as performers, composers, and musicologists. A curriculum research and development group (CRDG) was formed; one of its purposes was to "conduct major curriculum evaluation projects" that assisted in "extensive evaluations, and a revision cycle that results in new editions" (p. 70). Burton, a director of the project since 1969, mentioned opportunities for longitudinal studies, but the focus seemed to have been on the use of research to develop new textbooks and implement the program successfully rather than the publication of research to show its effectiveness. Twenty years after the project originated, Burton wrote that many projects "were successfully tested . . . but were never used or known widely due to the lack of an ongoing implementation plan" (p. 72). According to Burton, the project published the only complete set of curriculum based on comprehensive musicianship, but the interest in comprehensive musicianship has not been limited to Hawaii (Johnson, 1992; Strange, 1990; Whitener, 1980).

5. Evaluation of existing curricula. Runfola and Rutkowski (1992) suggested that music education curriculum research has focused on "proving" rather than "improving" (p. 704). Perhaps that is one explanation for the small number of studies in this category and the lack of research on curriculum effectiveness.

Ardrey (1999) observed 20 middle school music teachers to identify teachers who best met the needs of adolescents and the extent to which they applied Dalcroze, Orff, and Kodály methodologies to solve some of the problems inherent in middle school teaching. During the observations, common problems in the teaching of 16 teachers were identified and solutions were drawn from the 4 teachers whose practice was deemed exemplary. Ardrey did not find the comprehensive application of any of the methodologies she had targeted but was reluctant to abandon her theory. She noted that the better teachers "naturally" applied the pedagogical principles of the methodologies she had targeted. A stronger theoretical basis would have made for a more valuable study.

Sweeney (1993) investigated the impact of the National Curriculum in England, particularly its assessment features, through a survey of existing practice and a case study examination of the implementation of material at Key Stages 1, 2, 3, and 4. He concluded that assessment and attendant lessons were not well developed in practice.

The lack of replication of studies has been one of the criticisms of music education curriculum research. Munsen's (1986) and Martin's (1992) studies are two exceptions. One of the Orff *Schulwerk*'s goals is to nurture student creativity and musical independence (Choksy, Abramson, Gillespie, & Woods, 1986, p. 97). Does the approach succeed? Munsen (1986) investigated the effectiveness of an Orff-*Schulwerk* program in developing melodic and rhythmic improvisation in students in Grades 1, 3, and 5. She concluded that the improvisation tasks peaked at Grade 3 and the attitude to music and music class became increasingly negative. Martin (1992) replicated Munsen's study with modifications. Her findings reinforced the negative view of music class as children got older. In the 1992 study, Grade 1 students were rated highest for melodic improvisation and Grade 5 students for rhythmic improvisation. More replication studies that establish a pattern of research are needed.

6. Curriculum development and comparative study. One area of research interest has involved comparing the effectiveness of one approach to teaching music with that of another. This debate has been particularly strong concerning the efficacy of the Kodály, Orff, and Dalcroze approaches compared with a variety of traditional methods, including music textbooks. As Swanwick (1999) explains:

> Teaching methodologies seem to shape the curriculum in different ways and there are often competing claims for the musical high ground by followers of Orff, Kodály, and Dalcroze, or the users of schemes published by Silver Burdett, MacMillan, and so on. (p. 103)

After an extensive review of the research about elementary general education methods, Costanza and Russell (1992) concluded that

> the studies that have compared various techniques or methods with each other or with a "traditional method" have found no differences between experimental and control groups, but have reported increases (some significant, some not) in gain scores for the experimental group. (p. 501)

Gordon (1992) questioned the value of comparative studies and outlined the problems with this type of research, including the difficulty of finding teachers equally skilled in both methods and of finding similar students and contexts (p. 63). In addition, the objectivity of many of the

researchers engaged in comparative studies could be questioned, since the hope is generally to prove the efficacy of the method they champion (Joseph, 1982; Madhosingh, 1984; Siemens, 1969). Has there been any change in the past decade?

Ironically, a number of studies have investigated the benefits of using Gordon's learning sequences. In a carefully designed study, McDonald (1991) applied Gordon's learning sequence to teaching recorder to third-grade students. The control group received a traditional note-reading method; the experimental group received a sound-before-symbol approach consistent with Gordon's sequence. McDonald found Gordon's sound-before-symbol approach was more effective in terms of superior performance and student enthusiasm. She also found support for Gordon's initial isolation of the tonal and rhythmic components of music.

In 1987 Shuler noted variations in how teachers incorporate Gordon's learning theory. A second study supported this conclusion. Shuler (1991b) used an experimental design to study the vocal performance achievements of a class of Grade 3 children. Using Gordon's learning sequence activities for 25% of the music class was compared with traditional classroom activities. No conclusions could be drawn regarding the effectiveness of the treatment. In spite of teacher expertise with Gordon's sequence, the teacher was the significant variable: "The effectiveness of the experimental treatment appeared to vary dramatically from one teacher to the other" (p. 127).

Stevens (1992) compared a small beginning instrumental class that used a technical skill development approach with one that used Gordon's skill-learning sequence to determine which method would result in better playing by ear. She found no significant difference in her results, a finding she attributed to flaws in her research design rather than to possible differences in the effectiveness of the methods.

Gouzouasis (1992) studied the effects of two types of tonal and rhythm pattern instruction on beginning Grade 6 guitar players. The first type of instruction used Gordon's pattern sequences from *Jump Right In: The Music Curriculum*, "Learning Sequence Activities"; the second used patterns selected from *Tonal and Rhythm Pattern Audiation Cassettes* but was not taught in a hierarchy of audition difficulty. Hierarchically ordered rhythm pattern instruction did result in better guitar performance, but hierarchically sequential melodic patterns did not contribute to better melodic performance on the guitar. Gouzouasis was also interested in the effectiveness of the two approaches on students with high and low levels of tonal aptitudes. He concluded that the level of students' music aptitude was responsible for the level of their performance. These studies related to Gordon's work seem to reinforce the difficulties inherent in this type of research.

Comparative studies continue to appeal to researchers. For example, Holmes (1997) compared the relationship between music and academic achievement and instrumental music programs. The 3-year study, which involved 389 Grade 5 students in nine schools, had the experimental group taking instrumental classes while the control group did not. Participation in instrumental music classes produced no significant difference in academic achievement; according to the data, the more academically proficient students chose instrumental programs.

Johnson (1992) used qualitative techniques to compare the Wisconsin Comprehensive Musicianship through Performance (WCMP) approach to choral teaching at two middle schools and two high schools in Wisconsin with traditional rehearsal techniques. The conclusions of the study were muddied because the non-WCMP teachers demonstrated WCMP attributes. The conclusions might have been more valuable had a phenomenological or hermeneutic study been undertaken.

Summary

The publication years of the works cited in this section provide evidence that the Tylerian Rationale remains an important factor in music education curriculum. Statistics and their use have become more sophisticated, but how well have researchers addressed the criticisms identified earlier? Some headway has been made, particularly toward attempts to provide theoretical bases and research foundations for curriculum and methodologies. There have also been a few more longitudinal and large-scale studies. In spite of small victories, however, much remains the same, including the difficulty of being truly objective (open) when trying to prove a pet theory and the need for more replication studies to build a credible body of knowledge. The literature still consists mainly of isolated studies, with little interest in what students or teachers are experiencing in classrooms. One notable exception to the isolation problem is the research generated by Gordon's music-learning theory. Assembling research in one issue, as the *Quarterly* did for Gordon's work (vol. 2, no. 1/2, 1991), may be a useful way of encouraging researchers to modify, support, or refute earlier findings. Without this larger vision we will be like the blind men who do not get beyond their limited experience of the elephant's tail or trunk (in Forsythe, 1993).

Music Curriculum Theory and Practice—A Reconceptualized View

In uncertain times the urge to simplify is often as strong as it is brutal; complexity, subtlety and doubting wisely all take courage, sophistication and intelligence.

> M. Ross and M. Kamba,
> The State of the Arts in Five English Secondary Schools

Given the earlier introduction to this view, what ideas would you expect to encounter in this section about re-conceptualized curriculum? Look for a critical examination of issues, a focus on understanding and meaning making, recognition of a variety of discourses and multiple realities, a tension among competing values, an interrelated view of theory and practice, a valuing of personal experience, an acceptance of paradox (not "either/or" but "and"), reality as a social construction, and challenges to the legitimacy of any privileged social order. Expect new ways of thinking about curriculum and curriculum issues. Bowman (2000), for example, commented on the "kind of inconsequential curriculum restructuring project with which music educators are all too familiar. We need to be wary of structural approaches to problems that require systemic, transformative solutions." These characteristics are consistent with a postmodern paradigm (Natoli, 1997). Qualitative research methods are one of the strategies used to promote understanding.

Pinar (1995) identified a number of texts (social realities) presented in the reconceptualized curriculum field. Four of these discourses have emerged in music education. Although the boundaries are fuzzy and in flux, we will seek to understand music education curriculum as institutionalized text, gender text, cultural studies text, and political text. Once again, space limitation necessitated selectivity in order to represent the scope of the issues and quality of the work.

Understanding Music Curriculum as Institutionalized Text

The emergent foci on values, processes and multiple perspectives promoted the development of new paradigms and methods [in research] attentive to the process rather than the product of teaching, and that were capable of capturing the voices of school practitioners, teachers and students.

L. Bresler, "Traditions and Change across the Arts"

Ideal curricula should provide students not only with instruction, but also with opportunities to actively process information and construct meaning.

W. T. May, "Teaching for Understanding in the Arts"

While understanding is an issue in this discourse, there is still considerable interest in school improvement and maintenance. "There are still those of us liberal enough to believe that curriculum theory can also serve a somewhat more traditional purpose: that is, to be more directly helpful to practitioners in planning and using actual curricula" (Barone, 2000, p. 51). Some writers attempt to understand the bureaucratic system by examining hidden assumptions. Issues include the changing role of the expert to a more

consultative role, the changing status of the teacher to an empowered decision maker, and an emphasis on collaboration. Whereas the main focus is on the schools, theory continues to play an important role in this discourse. We examine four areas of institutionalized text: generating curriculum, curriculum as lived experience, how we are doing, and policy issues.

Generating Curriculum. Curriculum development and theoretical frameworks are still needed. We look at two examples of school-based curriculum thinking in this discourse: E. Boardman's generative approach and Swanwick's curriculum model.

Although Boardman's generative theory of musical learning is realized in a music series textbook (*Holt Music* [Meske et al., 1988]), her discussion and application of the theory (1988a, 1988b, 1989) place her within this discourse. Boardman used philosophical theories (including aesthetic music education) and psychological theories (including Bruner's emphasis on structure and the spiral curriculum) to develop a theory of instruction. The generative theory was based on many years of classroom practice rather than on experimental research, which had not produced what Boardman thought was needed—information about how individuals respond to a musical whole. The generative approach seeks to encourage more learning in both teacher and students and fosters student independence. Boardman and Landis had addressed these philosophical and psychological concerns in curriculum development in the elementary music series *Exploring Music* as early as 1966. The hierarchical relationship of both music skills and concepts and of teacher and student is replaced by a view of music and music education that is holistic, relational, and synergistic. Music and music education are integrated systems (1988a, p. 27). Boardman identified six components for "a holistic learning environment": content, context, behavior, mode of knowledge representation, cognitive skill, and attitudinal climate (1998b). Boardman's language reads less like that of an expert and more like that of a collaborator in learning, but she is, nevertheless, traditional in her view of curriculum as specifying "the sequential development of the socially approved behaviors, values, and cognitive skills" (1988a, p. 27). With *Holt Music* no longer in publication, will the generative approach continue to evolve? Perhaps some of its tenets are already being absorbed by the field.

Swanwick's work harkens to the 1970s, when his *A Basis for Music Education* (1979) appeared, and he proposed a model for music education based on the acronym C(L)A(S)P (Composition, Literature study, Audition, Skill acquisition, and Performance). Since that time, Swanwick has continued to refine and support his theory using research to develop a sequence of musical development; this sequence subsequently has become a framework for un-

derstanding student development in composition (Swanwick, 1988; Swanwick & Tillman, 1986), performance (Swanwick, 1994, pp. 108–111), and listening (1994, pp. 112–117). The overall curriculum implication of the developmental sequence is that "we should focus our musical curriculum activities towards broad aspects of musical development" such as identified in the sequence (Swanwick & Tillman, 1986, p. 335). The 1986 Swanwick/Tillman study was replicated in Cyprus (Swanwick, 1991), with the data supporting the earlier sequence of developmental levels. Swanwick employs a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods in his research. One of Swanwick's major contributions to music education is the way he convincingly interweaves research, theory, and their implications for practice, especially in *Musical Knowledge* (1994). Musical understanding has become a unifying idea in Swanwick's work (1997; Swanwick & Franca, 1999). Swanwick and Franca's research (1999) demonstrated the need to integrate composition, performing, and audience listening since each activity reveals different levels of musical understanding.

There has been further corroborating quantitative and qualitative research that supports the developmental sequence. Hentschke and Oliveira (1999) used Swanwick's theoretical framework to develop and evaluate curriculum in Brazil. Hentschke (1993) tested a model of audience-listening development to examine the relationship between how English students construct their musical experience and Swanwick's developmental theory. Hentschke and Del Ben (1999) tested the application of the developmental sequence to the assessment of audience listening in Brazil with suggestions for ways of expanding the model to include opinions of the piece, style- or genre-related responses, and extramusical associations.

Swanwick's theories are evident in versions of the National Curriculum in England (Swanwick, 1992). His *A Basis for Music Education* (1979) was influential in all the versions of the curriculum in that "the musical activities of composing, performing, and audience-listening (curiously called appraising) are intended to be integrated," and in the latest incarnation (DfEE & QCA, 1999) there is "a kind of muddled version of the Swanwick/Tillman sequence" (personal correspondence, June 5, 2000). Addressing the problem of Key Stage descriptions in formative evaluation, Swanwick (1997) developed a model for assessing quality in the National Curriculum that integrates his sequence with general criteria for musical understanding, "the actual *quality* of what is learned" (p. 208). Swanwick's approach encourages teacher decision making; there is no textbook series, just anecdotes about practice in particular circumstances.

Curriculum as Lived Experience.   The studies in this section build on the research and type of questions that seek to discover children's development of music cognition by observing and listening to children as they construct musical meaning (Bamberger, 1982, 1991; Upitis, 1987, 1992). The research is based on children's understanding instead of an adult conception of knowledge and how knowledge is constructed. The implications for teaching and learning are many, including questions about when to introduce the expert's knowledge of a discipline and how to bridge the gap between intuitive and formal knowledge (see also Gardner, 1991). As Stowasser (1993) noted:

> Researches which are focused upon the way in which children perceive and respond to music are replacing the old preoccupation with testing children's musical abilities. Researchers are now more interested in what music can do for children than the other way round (p. 16).

MacInnis (1996) undertook an autoethnographic study of how 3 students experienced and understood a computer-based curriculum. She concluded that the old type of curriculum designed around the music elements of melody, rhythm, harmony, forms, texture, and dynamics may no longer be adequate. Curriculum should be built instead on students' understandings.

Kushner (1991), an educational researcher, was commissioned to study a performing-musicians-in-schools project that involved the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra and the Birmingham Local Education Authority. *The Children's Music Book* strove to give an account of the children's experience from their perspective while also presenting the teachers' and musicians' voices. Kushner makes us privy to the problems of undertaking this kind of research and focuses more on whether "connectedness to lived experience" was encouraged during musicians' visits rather than on musical learning. The responses of children from different cultures to the music experiences offered to them revealed some of the difficulties music teachers face when encountering conflicting cultural beliefs, difficulties that may not usually be voiced by students. Kushner noted that most musicians do not have "educational theories of their arts in schools activities," and he raised questions about the educational value of their visits (p. 81).

A study by Wiggins and Bodoin (1998) was a collaborative effort between a university researcher and a second-grade music teacher. Data were collected about teacher expertise and "the way students made sense out of musical ideas" (p. 285). The title of the article, "Painting a Big Soup," acknowledged the "messiness" of classroom practice. The study had the greatest (known) impact on Bodoin, who became more aware of the decisions she made when she taught as she uncovered that she, too, often misread what was occurring in her classroom and that "children needed to be able to establish their own contexts for understanding" (p. 297).

Brand (1998) asked 6-, 9-, and 12-year-olds to learn a short Zulu song on their own. Her purpose was to find out how children learn a song, noting errors as ways of understanding the mind: "The real way to improve accuracy may be to recognize and point out the *validity* of the inaccuracy, and only then to find ways to correct it" (p. 33). Some findings were that children can learn independently and that errors are revealing about how the children are thinking. Both findings have significant bearing on methodology and curriculum decisions.

Campbell (1998) used nonparticipant observation to reveal music and its meaning in children's lives. Through conversations reported as narrative tales, Campbell provided rich insight into what music means to 15 children. The implications of her study for the music curriculum are many, including that music is natural to children and more than exposure programs are needed to nurture the musical impulse; that the experience of music, rather than the sound alone, provides personal meaning; that "children are drawn to music for its personal and social uses" (p. 178); and that some children benefit more from enculturative instruction than from formal, sequential, didactic teaching.

The focus on how learners construct meaning is compatible with a recent theory of learning and knowing called constructivism. Constructivism is based on the work of Bruner (1986, 1996), Feuerstein (1990), and Vygotsky (1962, 1978), and can be recognized from the following principles:

1. Knowledge and beliefs are formed within the learner.
2. Learners personally imbue experiences with meaning.
3. Learning activities should cause learners to gain access to their experiences, knowledge, and beliefs.
4. Learning is a social activity that is enhanced by shared inquiry.
5. Reflection and metacognition are essential aspects of constructing knowledge and meaning.
6. Learners play an essential role in assessing their own learning.
7. The outcomes of the learning process are varied and often unpredictable. (D. Walker & Lambert, 1995, pp. 17–19)

Music educators have been slowly showing an increased interest in the principles of constructivism. The Mountain Lake Colloquium held in Virginia is one example of a discussion forum for these ideas (Wing, 1999). A second is found in Wiggins's new textbook, *Teaching for Musical Understanding* (2001), which clearly espouses a constructivist view of learning.

How We Are Doing. The studies in this section involve multiple locations and are larger in scope. More studies of this kind are needed. Swanwick (1989) reported on a study undertaken by the Music Department of the Institute of Education, London, to "map out the current context and practice of music teaching" (p. 155). A small section of England was selected, questionnaires were distributed, and in-depth multiple case studies undertaken. Swanwick's C(L)A(S)P model was used in the observation schedules. The researchers concluded that music in the schools was not in as unhealthy a state as some of the publicity had claimed but that music teachers needed opportunities "to expand their horizons" beyond their own classrooms (p. 170).

M. Ross and Kamba (1997) replicated on a smaller scale a 1971 study on the state of the arts in England. Using multiple assessment strategies, the researchers identified five schools and administered questionnaires to teachers and students. Students were also asked to create a timetable and fill in subject profiles. Of interest was the low ranking of music in both the 1971 and 1996 studies (11th of 11 subjects), although the general conclusion was that support for music is increasing (cf., however, Harland et al.'s conclusion that music was "the most problematic and vulnerable" of the arts in their large-scale 3-year study of English and Welsh schools [2000]). Ross and Kamba presented 25 conclusions and recommendations about arts education, which ranged from full parity for the arts to the need for political involvement by arts teachers.

In 1997–1998, Saskatchewan Education (1998) hired an independent research firm and a university research unit to undertake an evaluation of the implementation of its K–9 arts education curriculum, a process that began in 1990. The researchers used quantitative and qualitative methods to gather evidence from education partners, administrators, teachers, students, and the local arts communities. Saskatchewan Education had developed a curriculum organized around three components (creative/productive, critical/responsive, and cultural/historical) and four strands (art, dance, drama, and music), with classroom teachers often charged with the delivery. The research findings reflected misunderstandings of the new philosophy, lack of teacher expertise, and criticisms by a "minority group" (music teachers) of ineffective implementation (especially in music). That the study happened at all is remarkable. That it is thorough and available for public scrutiny and acknowledges diverse views makes it a model for large-scale government curriculum evaluation.

One research project that involves all the arts is a model of "service-oriented" case study and its value to education. For *Custom & Cherishing*, Stake et al. (1991) selected 8 schools that were not representative of any population or special arts schools for a holistic study of the school, the community, the school and community, and society. Real accounts of happenings in real schools were reported: "Ordinary classrooms are understudied, often misunderstood. . . . Effective reform is seldom born of goal-setting and standards-raising but rather of intensive analysis of prob-

CHAPTER 8. CONTEMPORARY CURRICULUM PRACTICES AND THEIR THEORETICAL BASES   131

lems and careful delineation of areas susceptible to improvement" (p. 6). The researchers' purpose was not to explain but to seek "understanding of particular situations" (p. 6). The eight in-depth portraits of school practice were realistic, honest, and sometimes distressing. The analysis of the data was revealing, addressing such issues as the contrast between beliefs and practice, teacher expertise (or lack thereof) in the different arts, and the need for leadership. The study is a rich source of insight about music education.

Policy Issues. Reinterpreting data from the 1991 study (Stake et al.), Bresler identified (1) three curriculum orientations in elementary school music programs (1993); (2) three orientations to teaching the arts in the primary grades (1995/1996); (3) a look at traditions and change across the arts, in which she concluded that "these traditions are not mutually exclusive and can be integrated in different ways" (1996b, p. 33); and (4) the meso (institutional), micro (teachers' beliefs and backgrounds), and macro (larger cultural and societal) contexts of school music (1998b). In the latter study, Bresler discussed the differing institutional contexts of classroom teachers and music specialists. In another study, Bresler noted that "the advocacies of arts educators and administrative reforms are not translated into public school curricula" because teachers are left out of the equation (1996b, p. 31). Her writing has increasingly focused on policy analysis. Bresler (1998a) also examined the concepts of "child art" (art created by children), "fine art" (masterworks), and "art for children" (art created for children). Each conceptualization impacts on what happens in the classroom. She noted that child art was rarely evident in music classes while art for children prevailed.

As music education is "expanding its horizons," policy analysis as it pertains to curriculum is becoming more important. Harris (1991) used a case study of 3 Canadian settings to examine music education in the broad school context, including philosophy, action, and educational policy. Questioning unexamined assumptions, she identified seven myths that underlie school music programs: the myth that there is a relationship between musical aptitude and high academic achievement, the myth of talent, the myth of taste, the myth of the prima donna, the myth that classroom teachers can teach anything, the myth of music for fun, and the myth that "children share equal access to musical opportunities in school" (pp. 251–258). Harris suggested that school music too often reproduces a musical elite.

Two other studies indicate an increased interest in policy. Dunsmore (1994) investigated the impact of government policy on choral music education programs in Newfoundland particularly in view of the (then) pending proposal for interdenominational schools and the possible effects on choral repertoire. Russell-Bowie (1993) exam-

ined the development and implementation of the *Music (K–6) Syllabus* (New South Wales Department of Education, 1984) 7 years after its implementation to see how well deficiencies identified when the curriculum was launched had been addressed. Policy suggestions were made to address identified problems.

Summary. While schooling remains a central interest as in the past, the ways of thinking about teaching and learning are changing, as is the role of the teacher, the student, the researcher, and understandings of the school context. The accepted "structure" of music is also being questioned (MacInnis, 1996; May, 1990, p. 9).

Not all recent music education thinking and research, however, expresses the strong reconceptualized view evident in the work selected. As noted previously, there are many studies that maintain the traditional stance and a goodly number that use qualitative research techniques without adopting a questioning of underlying assumptions (cf. Menczel, 1997; Scott, 1990). A postmodern view acknowledges multiple ways of seeking understanding; music education is benefiting from the conversation.

Understanding Music Curriculum as Gender Text

To engage in this discourse is to engage in "the ways we construct and are constructed by the prevailing system of gender" (Pinar et al., 1995, p. 359). Since the gender discourse is addressed more fully in part V, chapter 6, we examine only a few of the studies that relate to music curriculum.

Green (1997) considered gender from the point of view of ideology, "a collective mental force which both springs from and perpetuates pre-existing relationships of economic and cultural dominance or subservience between social classes" (p. 3). After giving a review of historical gender that affirmed and threatened ideology, Green described a questionnaire distributed to teachers in 78 secondary schools to examine their beliefs about gender. The assumption was that their underlying beliefs about gender significantly influenced how they interacted with boys and girls—their practice. She then interviewed boys and girls in secondary music classes, asking them some intriguing questions like: "Do you think that boys/girls feel the same way about music lessons as you do?" (p. 150). Green acknowledged that, at first, no problems were evident: "Like a *trompe l'oeil,* first one sees no gender issues, then one sees them" (p. 230). Among many other startling findings, Green reported that

> it is the very *fact* of girls' hard work that *proves their lack* of the attribute which history has made possessable only by males. But it is not only that girls are seen to lack the cerebral qualities that are necessary for genuine attain-

ment: more than that, this lack *constitutes* their femininity. (p. 228)

Green's teacher questionnaire was replicated by Hanley (1998b) in British Columbia, Canada, with similar findings.

Koza performed two gender studies related to public schools. In the first (1994a), she examined the way females were represented in the illustrations in music textbooks series for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. Koza selected the current music textbooks *Holt Music* (Meske et al., 1988), *Music and You* (Staton, Staton, Lawrence, Jothen, & Knorr, 1988), and *World of Music* (Culp et al., 1988). In spite of existing equity guidelines, Koza's quantitative analysis indicated that females were underrepresented in these books: "Unequal power relations persist in society and are manifested in cultural artifacts such as textbooks" (p. 166). In another study, Koza's (1994b) examination of choral methods textbooks revealed that in order to keep boys in the choir, girls are neglected and their interests overlooked.

Morton (1996) examined the place of music education in the curriculum and drew analogies between the low status of music and its perception as a feminine pursuit. She further attributed music's low status in the curriculum to the "ascendancy, in traditional Western thought, of mind over body and labour over leisure" (p. ii). Morton thinks it important for music educators to "address the politics of knowledge" if they are to achieve a higher status in the education system.

In a study somewhat related to Koza's (1994b) examination of choral textbooks, Costley (1993) realized an action research project in her secondary music class. The school had an equity policy, and students were aware that racist and sexist remarks were unacceptable. The research focused on the lyrics of songs and making students conscious of some of the issues that arise in the vocal repertoire. For example, girls sang boys' songs without obvious protest, but boys did not want to sing girls' songs unless the words were changed to apply to males. Both teacher and students became more aware of the way lyrics convey hidden messages as they negotiated a resolution to the issue.

Feminist scholars politicize gender relationships. There are many ways that gender impacts on curriculum decisions both positively and negatively. Becoming aware of underlying ideologies and socially constructed gender dynamics is a step to assuring equitable education for all students.

Understanding Music Curriculum as Cultural Studies Text

The practice of art is at one and the same time an essentially *social* practice.

                    J. Shepherd and P. Wicke, Music and Cultural Theory

To engage in curriculum as cultural studies text is to examine issues of cultural hegemony (see Apple, 1977, 1979a, 1979b, 1979c, for an early discussion of reproduction theory that maintains that education systems support the social and corporate status quo). The idea of a single, universal norm for music that has been a widespread legacy of Western dominance has been seriously challenged (Haughton, 1984; Martin, 1995; Shepherd & Vulliamy, 1994; R. Walker, 1996). The substantial history of this discourse harks back to Shepherd, Virden, Vulliamy, and Wishart's *Whose Music?* (1977). In their book the authors shattered many assumptions about the universal nature of classical music in an attempt to reform music teaching. More recently, Shepherd and Wicke (1997) sought links between music and cultural theory, while Small (1998) continues to challenge the assumptions of the Western musical tradition, stressing that music is an activity, not a thing. The cultural studies discourse is addressed more fully in chapter 34. We have selected a few studies related to curriculum to provide an example of the areas of understanding sought in this discourse.

Two dissertations articulate some of the major concerns. Using "grounded theory" and analytic induction, Haughton (1984) studied how cultural reproduction was legitimized in curriculum development in Ontario, resulting in the exclusion of minorities and reaffirmation of Western cultural hegemony, a particularly disconcerting finding given Canada's official stance on multiculturalism. Using critical theory and ethnographic interviews, Rose (1990) examined music education's role in cultural production and reproduction. According to Rose, music education has historically played a reproductive function. Rose sees the possibility of transforming music educators to change agents in the production of music and culture.

Part of the hegemony issue has involved the place of popular music in the curriculum. After a long struggle, popular music has generally won a reluctant legitimacy in the schools, sometimes as a way into the classics, sometimes in its own right. Green (in press) interviewed popular musicians to gain insight into how they learn music, their attitudes about what they do, and how they fit into traditional music education. She concluded that the informal learning practices of popular musicians could well have the potential to invigorate formal music education: "I believe that popular music will play an important part in the future of vernacular music learning practices, and that its role in this respect should not remain beyond the limits of formal music education" (chap. 1).

Multiculturalism, although it spans both the racism and cultural studies discourses, originated in music education through cultural studies issues. One consequence of this discourse at the school level has been the discussion about whose music should be included as part of the repertoire and, increasingly, how cultural issues can be respectfully ad-

dressed (Volk, 1998). R. Walker (1990) established the importance of underlying assumptions about music and the need to acknowledge belief systems if cultural understanding is to occur. Implementation issues have extended beyond token approaches to multiculturalism that sampled repertoire and instruments to a deeper examination of cultural issues, authenticity, and belief systems (Barbour, 1994; Campbell, 1993; Damm, 1998; Lea-McKeown, 1987; Morton, 2000b; Robinson, 1996). For example, Morton (2000a) seeks to replace what she calls liberalist and pluralist views of multiculturalism that allow educators to accept the status quo with a critical multiculturalism that

> retains a pedagogical commitment to challenge students to examine and appreciate the contingency of identity, and to question how people, their cultural ideologies and institutions, and even their art, shape the good life as well as the bad, the just as well as the unjust. (p. 118)

Examining time, metaphor, and the importance of worldview, Boyea's (1999) article about Native American musics in the curriculum is a fine example of how cultural beliefs and music interrelate.

The issues extend beyond what is taught in music classes. In a pluralist worldview, how music should be taught is also of concern. The assumption that concepts should be the basis for all music teaching may need to be reexamined. Commenting that "awareness of and response to the cultural origins of teaching approaches is rare in music education" (p. 137), Dunbar-Hall (2000) examined universalist and pluralist approaches to teaching music. He concluded that there is no single right way to teach music and that "a focus on the implications of music pedagogy for the construction of attitudes to music and the people who produce it becomes the impetus for rethinking the approaches through which music is taught" (p. 137).

One offshoot of cultural studies is the increased interest in issues of sovereignty. Brand and Ho (1999) examined the effect of the 1997 "recolonialisation" of Hong Kong by the People's Republic of China after many years of British colonial rule. They asked whose values and whose music were being fostered in music classes? Was "one country, two systems" being honored? The authors observed that "most schools avoid music with an emphasis on political or democratic dimensions as a means of guarding against involvement in social conflicts and political tensions" (p. 232). While there was more emphasis on encouraging Chinese music in the curriculum, a great shift from Western practice was not yet evident in their study. Music literature reflected neither democratic, political freedom nor "revolutionary or communist party content." Brand and Ho's observation of the apolitical nature of music education in Hong Kong is strongly reinforced by the absence of political references in Ng and Morris's (1999) description of music curriculum in Hong Kong secondary schools.

Whose music should be experienced in the schools is not only a question for non-European countries. Shepherd and Vulliamy (1994), building on earlier work that applied critical sociology to music education (Vulliamy & Shepherd, 1984), explored the ideological basis of the heated debate about "what should count as school music" that surrounded the English National Curriculum, with the conservative Thatcher government supporting an "Englishness" based on a classical European heritage and the Working Group that developed the curriculum supporting a multicultural perspective. The public nature of the debate brought national media attention to music education, catapulting the issues out of the academic closet. Understanding the curriculum as cultural studies text can only become more important in the years ahead as greater cultural understanding becomes an imperative.

Understanding Music Curriculum as Political Text

The emphasis of study upon a particular aspect of music is in itself ideological because it contains implications about the music's value.

L. Green, "Ideology"

The schooling system operates in such a way as to help perpetuate the social class structure of our capitalist society.

G. Vulliamy and J. Shepherd,
"The Application of a Critical Sociology to Music Education"

Understanding curriculum as political text means looking at curriculum in social, economic, and political contexts. Apple (1990b) claimed that "decisions about the curriculum, about whose knowledge is to be made 'official,' are *inherently* matters of political and cultural power" (p. 348). Ideologies are important in shaping beliefs and guiding action. Both the content and practice of curriculum are ideological, with the values of the dominant culture being promoted (Apple, 1990a). One concern in this text is the analysis of culture to determine whose ideas prevail and whose ideas are marginalized. This discourse as it is developing in music education presents a challenge to the status quo. Three examples will illustrate this curriculum discourse.

Green (1988) critiqued the elitist classical Western view of music, what she calls the ideology of autonomy (chap. 7). She developed a theory of "the inherent meaning (how 'notes' relate to each other) and delineated meaning (how the music relates to various social contexts), arguing that all music experience must engage dialectically with both types of meaning" (personal communication, December 12, 2000). Green criticized school music in England because "the demands of fetishised establishment music have

led straight to alienation, ambiguity, and mystification for many children" (p. 143). Explaining that what counts as music is a political issue, Green has contributed to a growing chorus that supports a movement away from "bourgeois" musical choices to an openness to diversity and multiple worldviews. In a chapter on the subject, she wrote that the ideology of music education has served to "perpetuate existing social relations" by rewarding those who share certain musical values (1999).

In addition to lambasting aesthetic music education as "the ethnocentric ideology of a bygone age" (p. 33), Elliott (1995) criticized the conventional music curriculum for "placing too much emphasis on the verbal specifications of teaching plans and too little emphasis on the procedural and situational nature of teaching" (p. 253) and for its linear rather than cyclical, interactive structure. He advocated a practical curriculum and proposed that teachers as reflective practitioners should be at the center of curriculum development. His model acknowledges seven interactive "commonplaces," open categories that teachers fill—aims, knowledge, learners, teaching-learning processes, teacher(s), evaluation, and learning context (p. 254)—and focuses on the process of curriculum making. Elliott argued against using verbal concepts as curriculum organizers; instead, musicianship should be at the core of music education. Drawing on developmental psychology and curriculum theory, he proposed a praxial orientation to music curriculum that is "interactive (not linear), context-dependent (not abstract), and flexible (not rule-bound)" (p. 256). For Elliott, curriculum is something that is experienced by teachers and students.

A group of music educators who were concerned about the social and political contexts of music education formed the MayDay Group in 1993. This group seeks

(a) to apply critical theory and critical thinking to the purposes and practices of music education and (b) to affirm the central importance of musical participation in human life and, thus, the value of music in the general education of all people. (Gates, 1999, p. 15)

The name as well as the international appeal of the agenda signal that "the education-based preservation system of music in 'western civilization' is headed for serious, systemic trouble and knowledgeable music educators sense something's wrong" (p. 24). Seven ideals guide the dialogue and explain the agenda of the group:

1. Musical action that is fully mindful of musical results is the necessary condition of music making and, therefore, of an effective music education.
2. The social and cultural contexts of musical action are integral to musical meaning and cannot be ignored or minimized in music education.
3. Since human musical actions create, sustain, and reshape musical cultures, music educators can and should formally channel this cultural process, influencing the directions in which it develops and the individual and collective human values it serves.
4. The contributions made by schools, colleges, and other musical institutions are important to musical culture, but these need to be systematically examined and evaluated in terms of the directions and extent of their influence.
5. In order to be effective, music educators must establish and maintain contact with ideas and people from other disciplines.
6. The research and theoretical bases for music education must simultaneously be refined and radically broadened . . . in terms of [both] their theoretical interest and practical relevance.
7. An extensive and intensive consideration of curriculum for music education is needed as a foundation to greater professional unity and must be guided by a sound philosophical process. (pp. 17–23)

Regelski has written voluminously on MayDay issues, especially those related to curriculum (e.g., 1998a, 1998b, 1999). In "Critical Theory and Music Education" (1998b), he raised a number of issues, some of which are listed here to illustrate the provocative tone of his writing: the need to be more critical of the beliefs that have guided us (e.g., modernist/positivist thinking); the need to reject theory that disempowers people; the need to see meaning as "personally constituted"; a rejection of "methodolatry," "taken-for-granted recipes," and the "endullment" of students; the importance of good results rather than merely good teaching or good materials; a reduced need for advocacy if music education actually delivered what it promised; an inclusive view of music education; and the need for curriculum theory in music education. Regelski sees the need to be aware of ideologies—the "system of seemingly rational ideas, practices, and paradigms that serve to justify or legitimate the values, vested interests, and beliefs of a particular group of people"—and to take action. Regelski supports an "action-learning" music curriculum (1998a) that is context-based, a curriculum that examines what is "good" for students in terms of what will be of personal and social benefit to students rather than what is deemed to be good for them, and a curriculum that involves students in and with music.

Curriculum as political text is a relatively recent discourse in music education. The purpose of this discourse is to ask questions and seek greater understanding. Its impact on classroom practice is yet to be determined.

Summary. Have those operating from the reconceptualized curriculum stance addressed the criticisms of curric-

ulum research listed earlier? While some of the criticisms are being addressed (larger scale and longitudinal studies, exploring student experience in the classroom, and the search for theoretical foundations), other criticisms do not relate to the way curriculum is being reconceptualized. Indeed, the very questions being asked about curriculum are changing.

Conclusion

We are at the edge of history.
> R. Rideout, On Leadership in American Music Education

The purpose of this chapter was (1) to examine practice and theory in music curriculum research from a "broad focus" in order to interpret the theoretical perspectives evident in curriculum research in music education and situate this research in the context of the general curriculum field and (2) to examine the more "narrowly focused" theoretical basis of music education practice and curriculum research. The complexity of the curriculum field is evident. What trends have emerged in the past 10 years? There is a growing interest in sociology (Horner & Swiss, 1999; Rideout, 1997b) as well as philosophy in providing theoretical foundations for music curriculum. There is greater emphasis on the need to understand curriculum theory and practice and therefore the importance of questioning assumptions. The use of qualitative research in conjunction with quantitative methods is providing a better portrait of what happens in teaching and learning. Collaboration is becoming the modus operandi for research as theory and practice are more closely linked.

Has music education moved beyond the having of "good ideas" to asking good questions (Wing, 1992)? At theoretical and research levels, the answer is a qualified yes: we are moving in this direction. The focus on understanding and identifying and questioning assumptions has generated new interest in curriculum and healthy international dialogue about the meaning of curriculum practice (Hargreaves & North, 2001; Leong, 1997).

What broad curriculum issues, challenges, and opportunities face music education? The issues are not new, but they are coming more sharply into focus: (1) the need to examine and understand music curriculum from a more global perspective, recognizing and learning from diversity (Leong, 1997; Lundquist & Szego, 1998); (2) the need to connect music curriculum research to general educational research (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education, 1999; J. Ross, 1990); and (3) the need to integrate music into the general curriculum (Detels, 1999; Livermore & McPherson, 1998; McPherson,

1995; Stowasser, 1993), without a loss of identity and integrity (see Colwell, 1995, regarding the impact of changing priorities). The last point is particularly significant at a time when arts education models and research and integrated curriculum models are favorably viewed by educational policy and decision makers (see Abbs, 1994, for a defense of a generic community of the arts and Detels, 2000, for a proposal that addresses what she views as the excessive specialization of music). And finally, there is the need to examine the politically motivated trend toward national (centralized) curriculum and its implications for music education (Hargreaves & North, 2001), encompassing student assessment and curriculum effectiveness.

There are also three areas of practical challenges and opportunities that face contemporary music educators as they make curriculum decisions. What content should be included—Western traditional music, national music, world music? What approaches should be used—universalist or pluralist (Dionyssiou, 2000; Dunbar-Hall, 2000), general or specialist (Hargreaves & North, 2001)? Who should be teaching music in the school—musicians, classroom teachers, music teachers (Lawson et al., 1994; Stowasser, 1993)? Who should be making curriculum decisions in music education—textbook developers, national consortia, teachers? These issues are increasingly being viewed from a reconceptualized perspective. Even the multiple authorship of elementary music textbooks could be seen as an attempt to address diversity (even though sales are the priority). As for curriculum planning, too often it seems that considerable effort is put into the development, less on the implementation, and even less on the impact of curriculum on student learning.

Curriculum issues are multiple and complex. Where should future curriculum research be focused? The needs and challenges identified in this chapter provide a research agenda for the future in terms of both understanding and implementing curriculum. A greater understanding of the big education issues but also of music teaching and learning is essential. The dialogue has begun; the conversation must continue. At the level of practice (necessarily embedded in theory), if music education is to be constructed on more than an intuitive level, then we need to work harder at developing a coherent body of knowledge that will inform our educational choices.

How should music curriculum research be conducted? We need to address Colwell's (1995) criticism that "the emphasis on qualitative research brings us rich descriptions of inadequate programs and no convincing data about which way to turn and how" (p. 23). Both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies can play a role; it all depends on the research question (Carlsen, 1994). As Geringer (2000) wrote: "We must be aware of each other's

work, talk with each other, and learn to make transfers across methodological borders" (p. 204).

We began by asking: "What is curriculum?" The answer depends on underlying assumptions about schooling. It is the question that is most important.

REFERENCES

Abbs, P. (1994). *The educational imperative: A defence of Socratic and aesthetic learning.* London: Falmer Press.

Allen, M., Gillespie, R., & Hayes, P. T. (1994). Essential elements for strings. Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard.

American Music Conference News. (1996). Standards implementation marches forward: Special report of the American Music Conference. *Arts Education Policy Review,* 98(2), 10–16.

Apple, M. (1977). *The curriculum and cultural reproduction.* Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Apple, M. (1979a). Curriculum and reproduction. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 9(3), 231–252.

Apple, M. (1979b). *Ideology and curriculum.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1979c). On analyzing hegemony. *Journal of Curriculum Theory,* 1(1), 10–27.

Apple, M. (1990a). *Ideology and curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1990b). Is there a curriculum voice to reclaim? In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (pp. 342–349). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Arberg, H., & Palisca, C. V. (1964). Implications of the government sponsored Yale Seminar in Music Education. *College Music Symposium,* 4, 113–124.

Ardrey, C. M. (1999). *Middle school general music: Kodály, Dalcroze, Orff and the developmental needs of adolescents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation. (2000). *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada arts education curriculum.* Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Author.

Atterbury, B. W. (1991). Some directions for research in elementary general education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* 109, 37–45.

Bamberger, J. (1982). Revisiting children's descriptions of simple rhythms: A function for reflection-in-action. In S. Strauss (Ed.), *U-shaped behavioral growth* (pp. 191–226). New York: Academic Press.

Bamberger, J. (1991). *The mind behind the musical ear: How children develop musical intelligence.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barbour, G. M., Sr. (1994). *An exploration into the acceptance and approbation of African and multicultural music into the standard music curriculum of three large public school systems of Atlanta (Georgia).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Barone, T. (2000). *Aesthetics, politics, and educational inquiry: Essays and examples.* New York: Peter Lang.

Beall, G. (1991). Learning sequence and music learning. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning,* 2(1/2), 87–96.

Boardman, E. (1988a). The generative theory of musical learning. Part I: Introduction. *General Music,* 2(1), 4–5, 26–31.

Boardman, E. (1988b). The generative theory of musical learning. Part II. *General Music,* 2(2), 3–6, 28–32.

Boardman, E. (1989). The generative theory of musical learning. Part III: Planning for learning. *General Music,* 2(3), 11–16.

Boardman, E., & Landis, B. (1966). *Exploring music 5.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bolton, B. M., Taggart, C. C., Reynolds, A. M., Valerio, W. H., Woods, D. G., & Gordon, E. E. (2000). *Jump right in: General music series.* Chicago: GIA.

Bond, J., Copeland Davidson, M., Goetze, M., Lawrence, V. P., & Snyder, S. (1995). *Share the music.* New York: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.

Bourne, P. A. S. (1990). *Instructional techniques for children's choirs: A curricular model.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe.

Bowman, W. (2000). *Déjà vu all over again: A critical response to Claire Detel's Helsinki Discussion paper.* Retrieved July 15, 2000, from http://members.aol.com/jtgates/maydaygroup/bowmandetels.html

Boyea, A. (1999). Encountering complexity: Native musics in the curriculum. *Philosophy of Music Education Review,* 7(1), 31–48.

Boyle, D. (Comp.). (1974). *Instructional objectives in music—Resources for planning instruction and evaluating achievement.* Vienna, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Brand, E. (1998). Children's learning: Implications for music teacher education. In R. R. Rideout & S. J. Paul (Eds.), *Innovations in music teacher education* (pp. 30–42). Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Brand, M., & Ho, W-C. (1999). China recaptures Hong Kong: A study of change for music education. *British Journal of Music Education,* 16(3), 227–236.

Bresler, L. (1992). Qualitative paradigms in music research education. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning,* 3(1), 64–79.

Bresler, L. (1993). Three orientations to arts in the primary grades: Implications for curriculum reform. *Arts Education Policy Review,* 94(6), 29–34.

Bresler, L. (1994). Formative research in music education. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning,* 5(3), 11–24.

Bresler, L. (1995/96). Curriculum orientations in elementary school music: Roles, pedagogies and values. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* 127, 22–27.

Bresler, L. (1996a). Ethnography, phenomenology, and action research in music education. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning,* 6(3), 6–18.

Bresler, L. (1996b). Traditions and change across the arts: Case studies of arts education. *International Journal of Music Education, 27,* 24–35.

Bresler, L. (1998a). "Child art," "fine art," and "art for children": The shaping of school practice and implications for change. *Arts Education Policy Review, 100*(1) 3–10.

Bresler, L. (1998b). The genre of school music and its shaping by meso, micro, and macro contexts. *Research Studies in Music Education, 11,* 2–18.

Bresler, L., & Stake, R. (1992). Qualitative research methodology in music education. In R. J. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 75–90). New York: Schirmer Books.

Brown, E. A. (1993). *Elementary music education curricula in the public schools of Canada.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Chicago.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1996). *The culture of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burton, L. H. (1990). Comprehensive musicianship—The Hawaii music curriculum project. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 1*(3), 67–76.

Burton, L. H., & Thompson, W. (Eds.). (1982). *Music: Comprehensive musicianship program.* Honolulu: Hawaii University.

Byo, S. J. (1999). Classroom teachers' and music specialists' perceived ability to implement the national standards for music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(2), 111–123.

Byrd, M. E. (1989). *A comparative analysis of Edwin Gordon's approach to sequential musical learning and learning sequences found in three elementary general music series.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Campbell, P. S. (1993). Cultural issues and school music participation: The new Asians in American schools. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 4*(2), 45–56.

Campbell, P. S. (1998). *Songs in their heads: Music and its meaning in children's lives.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Carey, N. (1995). *Arts education in public elementary and secondary schools* (Statistical Analysis Report). Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED388607)

Carlsen, J. C. (1994). The need to know: 1994 Senior Researcher Award acceptance address. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 42,* 181–189.

Choate, R. A. (1968). *Documentary report of the Tanglewood Symposium.* Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.

Choksy, L., Abramson, R. M., Gillespie, A. E., & Woods, D. (1986). *Teaching music in the twentieth century.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Clarkson, A. E., & Pegley, K. (1991). *An assessment of a technology in music programme* (Technical Report 91–2). North York, Ontario, Canada: York University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED341364)

Clausel, S. L. S. (1998). *Applications of Cambourne's model of literacy learning and the Orff-music method to the development of a curriculum model for Mississippi music education, K–1.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, Lafayette County.

Clay, G., Hertrich, J., Jones, P., Mills, J., & Rose, J. (1998). *The arts inspected.* Oxford, England: Heinemann.

Coalition for Music Education in Canada & Canadian Music Educators Association. (2001). *Achieving musical understanding: Concepts & skills pre-kindergarten to grade 8.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Author. Available from P.O. Box 52635, 1801 Lakeshore Rd., W., Mississauga, ON, Canada L2J 4S6.

Colorado Alliance for Arts Education. (2000). *Survey on the status of arts education in Colorado public school districts, 1999–2000.* Available from CAAE, 200 Grant Street, Denver, CO 80203 (email caae@artstozoo.org).

Colwell, R. J. (1979). *Silver Burdett competency tests.* Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett.

Colwell, R. J. (1985). Program evaluation in music teacher education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 81,* 18–64.

Colwell, R. J. (1990a). The posture of music education research. *Design for Arts in Education, 91*(5), 42–52.

Colwell, R. J. (1990b). Research findings: Shake well before using. *Music Educators Journal, 77*(3), 29–34.

Colwell, R. J. (Ed.). (1992). *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Colwell, R. J. (1995). Voluntary national standards and teacher education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 125,* 20–31.

Colwell, R. J. & Abrahams, F. (1991). Edwin Gordon's contributions: An appraisal. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 2*(1/2), 19–36.

Consortium of National Arts Education Associations. (1994). *National Standards for Arts Education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts.* Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Costanza, P., & Russell, T. (1992). Methodologies in music education. In R. J. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 498–508). New York: Schirmer Books.

Costley, C. (1993). Music and gender at Key Stage Three (11–14): An action research project. *British Journal of Music Education, 10,* 197–203.

Cox, G. (1993). Music in the National Curriculum: Some historical perspectives. *Curriculum Journal, 4*(3), 351–362.

Crook, E., Walker, D., & Reimer, B. (1974, 1978, 1981, 1985). *Silver Burdett music* [Grades 1–6]. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett.

Culp, C. E., Eisman, L., & Hoffman, M. E. (1988). *World of music.* Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett & Ginn.

Curriculum Corporation. (1994). *The arts—A curriculum profile for Australian schools*. Melbourne, Australia: Author.

Damm, R. J. (1998). *American Indian music in elementary school music programs of Oklahoma: Repertoire, authenticity and instruction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton.

Department of Education. (1992). *Music in the National Curriculum (London)*. London: HMSO.

Department of Education. (1995). *Music in the National Curriculum*. London: HMSO.

Detels, C. (1999). *Soft boundaries: Revisioning the arts and aesthetics in American education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

DfEE & QCA. (1999). *The National Curriculum for England: Music*. London: Author.

Dillon, J., Kjelland, J., & O'Reilly, J. (1992). *Strictly strings*. Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Dionyssiou, Z. (2000). The effects of schooling on the teaching of Greek traditional music. *Music Education Research, 2*(2), 141–163.

Doll, W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Dolloff, L. (1993). *Das Schulwerk: A foundation for the cognitive, musical, and artistic development of children* (Monograph No. 1, *Research perspective in music education*, L. Bartel [Ed.]). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto.

Doyle, W. (1992). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 486–516). New York: Macmillan.

Dunbar-Hall, P. (2000). Concept or context? Teaching and learning Balinese gamelan and the universalist-pluralist debate. *Music Education Research, 2*(2), 127–139.

Dunsmore, D. A. (1994). *The effect of Newfoundland government policy on choral music education: Voices and opinions about the past, present and future*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Eisner, E. (1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of education programs* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. (1992). Curriculum ideologies. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 302–326). New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. (1994). *Cognition and curriculum reconsidered* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Favaro, E. (1999). Looking back: An action plan revisited. In B. Hanley (Ed.), *Leadership, advocacy, communication* (pp. 7–10). Victoria, British Columbia: Canadian Music Educators Association.

Feuerstein, R. (1990). The theory of structural cognitive modifiability. In B. Z. Presseisen (Ed.), *Learning and thinking styles: Classroom interaction* (pp. 68–134). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Finter, L. A. (1995). *A study of elementary music curricula in Nevada as they conform to authoritative opinions (curric-ulum objectives)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Forsythe, J. L. (1993). The blind musicians and the elephant. In C. K. Madsen & C. Pricket (Eds.), *Research in music behavior: Applications and extensions* (pp. 329–338). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Foshay, A. W. (2000). *The curriculum: Purpose, substance, practice*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Fowler, C. B. (1984). *Arts in education/Education in arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.

Froseth, J. O. (1986). *The comprehensive music instructor: Listen, move, sing, and play*. Chicago: GIA.

Gane, P. (1996). Instrumental teaching and the National Curriculum: A possible partnership? *British Journal of Music Education, 13*(1), 49–65.

Gardner, H. (1991). *The unschooled mind: How children think and how schools should teach*. New York: Basic Books.

Gary, C. L. (Ed.). (1967). *The study of music in the elementary school—A conceptual approach*. Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.

Gates, T. J. (1999). Action for change in music education: The MayDay Group agenda. In M. McCarthy (Ed.), *Music education as praxis: Reflecting on music-making as human action* (pp. 14–25). The 1997 Charles Fowler Colloquium on Innovation in Arts Education, April 18–19, 1997. College Park: University of Maryland.

Geringer, J. M. (2000). Senior researcher acceptance address: On publishing, pluralism, and pitching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 48*, 191–205.

Gordon, E. E. (1965). *Musical aptitude profile*. Chicago: GIA.

Gordon, E. E. (1979). *Primary measures of music audiation*. Chicago: GIA.

Gordon, E. E. (1982). *Intermediate measures of music audiation*. Chicago: GIA.

Gordon, E. E. (1990). *A music learning theory for newborn and young children*. Chicago: GIA.

Gordon, E. E. (1992). A response to volume II, numbers 1 & 2, of the *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning. Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 2*(4), 62–72.

Gordon, E. E. (1993). *Learning sequences in music: Skill, content, & patterns*. Chicago: GIA.

Gordon, E. E., & Woods, D. G. (1985). *Jump right in: The music curriculum*. Chicago: GIA.

Gouzouasis, P. (1991). A progressive developmental approach to the music education of preschool children. *Canadian Music Educator, 32*(3), 45–53.

Gouzouasis, P. (1992). The comparative effect of two tonal pattern systems and two rhythm pattern systems for learning to play the guitar. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 3*(4), 10–18.

Green, L. (1988). *Music on deaf ears: Musical meaning, ideology, and education*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Green, L. (1993). Music, gender, and education. *British Journal of Music Education, 10*(3), 219–253.

Green, L. (1997). *Music, gender, education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Green, L. (1999). Ideology. In B. Horner & T. Swiss (Eds.), *Key terms in popular music and culture* (pp. 5–17). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Green, L. (In press). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education.* London: Ashgate Press.

Greer, R. D. (1980). *Design for music learning.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Grunow, R. F., & Gordon, E. E. (1989). *Jump right in: The instrumental series.* Chicago: GIA.

Hanley, B. (1989). Educators' attitudes to philosophies of music education. *Canadian Music Educator Research Edition, 31*(1), 1–23.

Hanley, B. (1998a). Creating a national vision for arts education in Canada. *Canadian Music Educator, 40*(1), 9–13.

Hanley, B. (1998b). Gender in secondary music education in British Columbia. *British Journal of Music Education, 15*(1), 51–69.

Hargreaves, D. J., & North, A. C. (Eds.). (2001). *Musical development and learning: The international perspective.* London: Continuum International.

Harland, J., Kinder, K., Lord, P., Stott, A., Schagen, I., & Haynes, J. (2000). *Arts education in secondary schools: Effects and effectiveness.* Berkshire, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Harris, C. (1991). *Administering school music in three Canadian settings: Philosophy, action, and educational policy.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Haughton, H. S. (1984). *Social and cultural reproduction in the (music) curriculum guideline process in Ontario education: Ethnic minorities and cultural exclusion.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Hentschke, L. (1993). *Musical development: Testing a model in the audience-listening setting.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.

Hentschke, L., & Del Ben, L. (1999). The assessment of audience-listening: Testing a model in the educational setting of Brazil. *Music Education Research, 1*(2), 127–146.

Hentschke, L., & Oliveira, A. (1999). Music curriculum development and evaluation based on Swanwick's theory. *International Journal of Music Education, 34,* 14–29.

Hodges, D. (1992). The acquisition of music reading skills. In R. J. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 466–471). New York: Schirmer Books.

Holmes, D. M. (1997). *An examination of fifth grade instrumental music programs and their relationship with music and academic achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Horner, B., & Swiss, T. (Eds.). (1999). *Key terms in popular music and culture.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jackson, P. W. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3–40). New York: Macmillan.

Johnson, J. P. (1992). *An investigation of four secondary level choral directors and their application of the Wisconsin comprehensive musicianship through performance approach: A qualitative study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Joseph, A. S. (1982). *A Dalcroze Eurhythmics approach to music learning in kindergarten through rhythmic movement, ear training, and improvisation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Koza, J. E. (1994a). Females in 1988 middle school textbooks: An analysis of illustrations. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 42*(2), 145–171.

Koza, J. E. (1994b). Getting a word in edgewise: A feminist critique of choral methods texts. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 5*(3), 68–77.

Kuehmann, K. M. (1987). *A theoretical model for curriculum development in general music for fundamentalist Christian elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe.

Kushner, S. (1991). *The children's music book.* London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Kushner, S. (1999). Fringe benefits: Music education out of the National Curriculum. *Music Education Research, 1*(2), 209–218.

Labuta, J. (1974). *Guide to accountability in music instruction.* West Nyack, NY: Parker.

Lamb, R. (1993). The possibilities of/for feminist music criticism in music education. *British Journal of Music Education, 10*(3), 169–180.

Lawson, D., Plummeridge, C., & Swanwick, K. (1994). Music and the National Curriculum in primary schools. *British Journal of Music Education, 11*(1), 3–14.

Lea-McKeown, M. Y. (1987). *The importance of native music culture in education at a Manitoba Ojibwa reserve from an ethnological perspective.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

LeBlanc, A. (1996). Building theory in music education: A personal account. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 4*(2), 107–116.

Lehman, P. R. (1999). National assessment of arts education: A first look. *Music Educators Journal, 85*(4), 34–37.

Leong, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Music in schools and teacher education: A global perspective.* Nedlands, WA: Callaway International Resource Centre for Music Education.

Leonhard, C. E., & Colwell, R. J. (1976). Research in music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 49,* 1–30.

Lindeman, C. A., Flowers, P. J., Jellison, J. A., Kaplan, P. R., & Price, H. E. (1998). *Thinking ahead: A research agenda for music education.* Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Livermore, J., & McPherson, G. E. (1998). Expanding the role of the arts in the curriculum: Some Australian initiatives. *Arts Education Policy Review, 99*(3), 10–15.

Lundquist, B., & Szego, C. K. (1998). *Musics of the world's cultures: A source book for music educators.* Reading, UK: International Society for Music Education.

MacInnis, P. (1996). *Experiencing and understanding a computer-based music curriculum: A teacher's story.* Un-

published doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Madhosingh, D. F. (1984). *An approach to developing comprehensive musicianship in the intermediate grades using the voice and ukulele.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Madsen, C., Greer, R. D., & Madsen, C. (1975). *Research in music behavior: Modifying music behavior in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Madsen, C., & Madsen, C. (1970). *Experimental research in music.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Major, A. (1996). Reframing curriculum design. *British Journal of Music Education, 13*(3), 183–193.

Mark, M. L. (1986). *Contemporary music education* (2nd ed.). New York: Schirmer.

Mark, M. L., & Gary, C. L. (1999). *A history of American music education* (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: Association for Music Education.

Martin, M. A. (1992). *An examination of the Orff-Schulwerk approach to music education in a public elementary school: A replication study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Martin, P. (1995). *Sounds & society: Themes in the sociology of music.* Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

May, W. T. (1990). Teaching for understanding in the arts: The Elementary Subjects Center at Michigan State University. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 1*(1/2), 5–16.

May, W. T. (1993). *What in the world is music in "World of Music"? A critique of a commonly used textbook series* (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 76). East Lansing: Michigan State University Institute for Research on Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED355155)

McDonald, J. C. (1991). The application of Gordon's empirical model of learning sequence to teaching the recorder. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 2*(1/2), 110–117.

McLellan, N. D. (1996). *Music teachers' opinions regarding the use and effectiveness of elementary music series books in Missouri public schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Kansas City.

McPherson, G. E. (1995). Integrating the arts into the general curriculum: An Australian perspective. *Arts Education Policy Review, 97*(1), 25–31.

McPherson, G. E., & Dunbar-Hall, P. (2001). Music education in Australian schools. In D. J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (Eds.), *Musical development and learning: The international perspective* (pp. 14–16). London: Continuum International.

Menczel, V. (1997). *The application of the Suzuki method in Israel and the United States: A comparative case study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.

Merrion, M. (Ed.). (1989). *What works: Instructional strategies for music education.* Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Meske, E. B., Andress, B., Pautz, M. P., & William, F. (1988). *Holt music* [Grades 1–8]. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Mills, J. (1994). Music in the National Curriculum: The first year. *British Journal of Music Education, 11*(3), 191–196.

Mills, J. (1997). A comparison of the quality of class music teaching in primary and secondary schools in England. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 133,* 72–76.

Montgomery, A. (1997). Orff or Kodály: What's all the fuss? *Canadian Music Educator, 39*(1), 11–13.

Montgomery, A. (In press). *Teaching musical understanding: From sound to symbol.* Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Pearson.

Morton, C. (1996). *The "status problem": The feminized location of school music and the burden of justification.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Morton, C. (2000a). Addressing bias in music: A Canadian case study. *Music Education Research, 2*(2), 111–125.

Morton, C. (2000b). In the meantime: Finding a vision for multicultural music education in Canada. In B. Hanley & B. A. Roberts (Eds.), *Looking forward: Challenges to Canadian music education* (pp. 251–272). Victoria, British Columbia: Canadian Music Educators Association.

Munsen, S. C. (1986). *A description and analysis of an Orff-Schulwerk program of music education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Music Educators National Conference. (1996). *Performance standards for music.* Reston, VA: Author.

Musoleno, R. R. (1990). *A model for a curriculum suited to exemplary practices of middle school education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education. (1999). *All our futures: Creativity, culture, and education.* Retrieved January 12, 2001, from http://www.dfee.gov.uk/nacce/index1.htm

Natoli, J. (1997). *A primer to postmodernity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Nelson, B. J. P. (1988). *The development of a middle school general music curriculum: A synthesis of computer-assisted instruction and music learning theory.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music, New York.

New South Wales Department of Education. (1984). *Music (K–6) syllabus and support statements.* Sydney, Australia: Government Printing Office.

Ng, F. Y-F., & Morris, P. (1999). The music curriculum in Hong Kong secondary schools—Intentions and constraints. *Arts Education Policy Review, 100*(5), 29–40.

OFSTED [Office for Standards in Education]. (1993a). *Handbook for the inspection of schools.* London: HMSO.

OFSTED. (1993b). *Music: Key Stages, 1, 2, and 3. First year 1992–1993.* London: HMSO.

Patchen, J. (1996). Overview of discipline-based music education. *Music Educators Journal, 83*(2), 19–26.

Patchen, J. H., & Harris, L. D. (Eds.). (1996). *A discipline-based music education handbook*. Chattanooga: University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

Paynter, J. (1993). Open peer commentary: Musical knowledge. *Psychology of Music, 20*, 175–177.

Pearson, B. (1993). *Standards of excellence*. San Diego, CA: Neil A. Kjos.

Persky, H. R., Sandene, B. A., & Askew, J. M. (1998). *The NAEP 1997 arts report card*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Phillips. K. (1992). Research on the teaching of singing. In R. J. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 568–576). New York: Schirmer Books.

Pinar, W. F. (1995). Understanding curriculum: An introduction. In W. F. Pinar, W. M. Reynolds, P. Slattery, & P. M. Taubman (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses* (pp. 3–65). New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Plummeridge, C. (1985). Curriculum development in music education: The limitation of theory. *Psychology of Music, 13*(1), 49–57.

Plummeridge, C. (1996). Curriculum development and the problem of control. In C. Plummeridge (Ed.), *Music education: Trends and issues* (pp. 27–40). London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Plummeridge, C. (1999). Aesthetic education and the practice of music teaching. *British Journal of Music Education, 16*(2), 115–122.

Pratt, D. (1980). *Curriculum design and development*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Prawat, R. S. (1993). *Commonalities and differences in views about ideal and actual curriculum in six subject matter domains* (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 101). East Lansing: Michigan State University Institute for Research on Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED356901)

Preston, H. (Ed.). (1994). Listening, appraising and composing: Case studies in music. *British Journal of Music Education, 11*(1), 15–55.

Rao, D. (1993). *We will sing! Choral music experience for classroom choirs*. New York: Boosey & Hawkes.

Regelski, T. A. (1998a). The Aristotelian bases of praxis for music and music education as praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 6*(1), 22–59.

Regelski, T. A. (1998b). *Critical theory and music education*. Retrieved September 17, 2000, http://member.aol.com/jtgates/maydaygroup/crittheory.html

Regelski, T. A. (1999). Action learning: Curriculum and instruction as and for praxis. In M. McCarthy (Ed.), *Music education as praxis: Reflecting on music-making as human action* (pp. 99–120). The 1997 Charles Fowler Colloquium on Innovation in Arts Education, April 18–19, 1997. College Park: University of Maryland.

Reimer, B. (1985). Toward a more scientific approach to music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 83*, 1–21.

Reimer, B. (1989). *A philosophy of music education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reimer, B., Hoffman, M., & McNeil, A. (1974, 1978, 1981, 1985). *Silver Burdett Music* [Grades 7–8]. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett.

Rhodes, T. C., Bierschenk, D., Lautzenheiser, T., & Higgins, J. (1991). *Essential elements: A comprehensive band method*. Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard.

Rideout, R. (1997a). Antecedents to a sociology of music education. In R. Rideout (Ed.), *On the sociology of music education* (pp. 65–70). Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Rideout, R. (Ed.). (1997b). *On the sociology of music education*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Rideout, R. (1998). *On leadership in American music education*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Robinson, K. M. (1996). *Multicultural general music education: An investigation and analysis in Michigan's public elementary schools, K–6*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Lansing.

Rose, A. M. (1990). *Reproduction, production, and hegemony*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Ross, J. (1990). The National Arts Education Research Center at New York University: Challenging tradition. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 1*(1/2), 17–21.

Ross, M., & Kamba, M. (1997). *The state of the arts in five English secondary schools*. Exeter: University of Exeter.

Runfola, M., & Rutkowski, J. (1992). General music curriculum. In R. J. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 697–709). New York: Schirmer Books.

Russell-Bowie, D. E. (1993). *Policy and practice in music education in New South Wales state primary schools (Australia)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wollongsong, Australia.

Sandner, L. (1999). Pan-Canadian projects. In B. Hanley (Ed.), *Leadership, advocacy, communication* (pp. 1–6). Victoria, British Columbia: Canadian Music Educators Association.

Saskatchewan Education. (1995). *Arts education: A curriculum guide for Grades 1 to 5*. Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada: Author.

Saskatchewan Education. (1998). *Arts education: Grades 1–9 curriculum evaluation report*. Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada: Author.

Schmidt, A. M. (1996). Who benefits? Music education and the national standards. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 4*(2), 71–82.

Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79* (4), 493–542.

Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language for curriculum*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *School Review, 81*(4), 501–522.

Schwab, J. J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for curriculum professors to do. *Curriculum Inquiry, 13* (3), 239–265.

Scott, S. S. C. (1990). *An ethnographic study of choral music education in two selected small school districts of Mississippi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.

Shand, P. M., & Bartel, L. R. (1993). *A guide to provincial music curriculum documents since 1980.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto.

Shepherd, J., Virden, P., Vulliamy, G., & Wishart, T. (1977). *Whose music? A sociology of musical languages.* London: Latimer.

Shepherd, J., & Vulliamy, G. (1994). The struggle for culture: A sociological case study of the development of a national music curriculum. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 15*(1), 27–40.

Shepherd, J., & Wicke, P. (1997). *Music and cultural theory.* Cambridge, UK: Policy Press.

Shuler, S. C. (1987). *The effects of Gordon's learning sequence activities on music achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester.

Shuler, S. C. (1991a). A critical examination of the contributions of Edwin Gordon's music learning theory to the music education profession. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 2*(1/2), 37–58.

Shuler, S. C. (1991b). The effects of Gordon's learning sequence activities on vocal performance achievement of primary music students. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 2*(1/2), 118–129.

Sibbald, M. J. M. (1989). *A humanistic approach to Discipline-Based Music Education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Siemens, M. T. (1969). A comparison of Orff and traditional instructional methods in music. *Journal of Research in Music, 17*(3), 272–285.

Silver Burdett & Ginn. (1995). *The music connection.* Parsippanny, NJ: Author.

Siverson, G. W. (1990). *An examination of the extent to which senior high school band programs reflect aesthetic and utilitarian goals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening.* Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Stake, R., Bresler, L., & Mabrey, L. (1991). *Custom & cherishing: The arts in elementary schools.* Urbana: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Stake, R., & Easley, J. (Eds.). (1978). *Case studies in science education.* Urbana: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Staton, B., Staton, M., Lawrence, V., Jothen, M., & Knorr, J. (1988). *Music and you.* New York: Macmillan.

Stevens, M. H. (1992). The comparative effectiveness of a traditional approach versus an approach based on Gordon's skill learning sequence on beginning wind instrumentalists' ability to play a song by ear. *Pennsylvania Bulletin of Research in Music Education, 18,* 50–64.

Stokes, A. A. (1996). Is Edwin Gordon's learning theory a cognitive one? *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 4*(2), 96–106.

Stowasser, H. (1993). Some personal observations of music education in Australia, North America and Great Britain. *International Journal of Music Education, 22,* 14–28.

Strange, C. M. (1990). *The development of a beginning violin curriculum integrating a computer station with the principles of comprehensive musicianship.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, New York.

Swanwick, K. (1979). *A basis for music education.* Windsor, UK: NFER.

Swanwick, K. (1988). *Music, mind and education.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Swanwick, K. (1989). Music in schools: A study of context and curriculum practice. *British Journal of Music Education, 6*(2), 155–171.

Swanwick, K. (1991). Further research on the musical development sequence. *Psychology of Music, 19*(1), 22–32.

Swanwick, K. (1992). *Music education and the National Curriculum.* London: Tufnell Press.

Swanwick, K. (1994). *Musical knowledge: Intuition, analysis, and music education.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Swanwick, K. (1997). Assessing musical quality in the National Curriculum. *British Journal of Music Education, 14*(3), 205–215.

Swanwick, K. (1999). *Teaching music musically.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Swanwick, K., & Franca, C. C. (1999). Composing, performing and audience-listening as indicators of musical understanding. *British Journal of Music Education, 16*(1), 5–19.

Swanwick, K., & Tillman, J. (1986). The sequence of musical development: A study of children's compositions. *British Journal of Music Education, 3*(3), 305–339.

Sweeney, S. E. (1993). *Music in the national curriculum: Implications of assessment for pupils, teachers and schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bath, United Kingdom.

Thomas, R. B. (1970). Rethinking the curriculum. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(6), 70.

Thompson, W. (1974). *Comprehensive musicianship through classroom music.* Belmont, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Townsend, K. C. (1998). *The beginning string class: Exemplary curricular content and processes in selected Indiana middle/junior high schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Upitis, R. (1987). Toward a model for rhythm development. In J. C. Peery, I. W. Peery, & T. W. Draper (Eds.), *Music and child development* (pp. 54–79). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Upitis, R. (1992). *Can I play you my song? The compositions and invented notation of children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Volk, T. (1998). *Music, education, and multiculturalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vulliamy, G., & Shepherd, J. (1984). The application of a critical sociology to music education. *British Journal of Music Education, 1*(3), 247–266.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. (E. Hanfmann & G. Vaker, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, D., & Lambert, L. (1995). Learning and leading theory: A century in the making. In L. Lambert, D. Walker, D. P. Zimmerman, J. E. Cooper, M. D. Lambert, M. E. Gardner, & P. J. Ford Slack (Eds.), *The constructivist reader* (pp. 1–27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Walker, D. F. (1992). Methodological issues in curriculum research. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 98–118). New York: Macmillan.

Walker, R. (1990). *Musical beliefs: Psychoacoustic, mythical, and educational perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Walker, R. (1996). Music education freed from colonialism: A new praxis. *International Journal of Education, 27*, 2–15.

Whitener, W. T. (1980). *An experimental study of a comprehensive approach to beginning instruction in instrumental music*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Wiggins, J. (2001). *Teaching for musical understanding*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wiggins, J., & Bodoin, K. (1998). Painting a big soup: Teaching and learning in a second-grade general music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*(2), 281–302.

Wilson, B. (1997). *The quiet evolution: Changing the face of arts education*. Los Angeles: Getty Education Institute for the Arts.

Wing, L. B. (1992). Curriculum and its study. In R. J. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 196–217). New York: Schirmer Books.

Wing, L. B. (Ed.). (1999). *Mountain Lake reader: Conversations on the study and practice of music teaching*. Manhattan, KS: AG Press.

Woodford, P. (1996). Evaluating Edwin Gordon's music learning theory from a critical thinking perspective. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 4*(2), 83–95.