Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

the refereed scholarly journal of the

Thomas A. Regelski, Editor
Wayne Bowman, Associate Editor
Darryl A. Coan, Publishing Editor

For contact information, please point your Web Browser to:
ACT Journal: http://act.maydaygroup.org
or
MayDay Site: http://www.maydaygroup.org

Electronic Article

Detels, C. (2000). Softening the boundaries of music in general education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education. Vol. 1*, #1 (April 2002).

The Editors and Author would like to thank Greenwood Publishing for allowing the republication of excerpts of Detels' book, *Soft Boundaries: Re-Visioning the Arts and Aesthetics in American Education* (Bergin and Garvey, 1999)

To The Reader

This inaugural issue of *Action, Theory and Criticism for Music Education* is devoted to papers presented at the interdisciplinary colloquium held June 11-15, 2000 in Helsinki Finland by the "MayDay Group" of musicians (MDG) and the "Artist, Work of Art, and Experience" group of artists (AWE). These proceedings were originally published in the *Finnish Journal of Music Education (Musikkikasvatus)*, Vol. 5, No. 1-2 (2000). With the permission of that journal, they are now made accessible to the international community of music education scholars. Two lectures by Professor Richard Shusterman, a leading pragmatist philosopher who has concerned himself centrally with the arts, were arranged by AWE to coincide with the colloquium and produced two interviews by Lauri Väkevä of the University of Oulu, Finland, the second of which is published here for the first time. Thanks are offered to Professor Shusterman for his contribution to the colloquium and for granting permission to publish the interviews.

By way of background, the MayDay Group (www.maydaygroup.org) is a group of international scholars from a variety of disciplines in music and music education. J. Terry Gates, SUNY Buffalo and Thomas A. Regelski, SUNY Fredonia (both now emeritus) created the group in 1993 to consider mounting challenges facing music educators and the status of music in society. Its analytical agenda is to interrogate traditional and status quo conceptions of music and music education from the perspectives of critical theory, critical thinking and research from all relevant disciplines. Its positive agenda is to inspire and promote action for change, both concerning how music and musical value are understood in the contemporary world of music and in the institutions responsible for music in society, particularly music education. The AWE Group (http://triad.kiasma.fng.fi/awe/WRITINGS/index.html) includes artists from several disciplines associated with several art schools and universities in Finland who share mutual interest in applying Pragmatism to important issues in art and art theory. Finnish philosopher Pentti Määttänen, a specialist in John Dewey and Charles S. Pierce, has been informal leader of this group.

MayDay colloquia are held once or twice a year, and each explores one of the seven "action ideals" posted on the Group's website. The Helsinki meeting focused on Ideal Five: "In order to be effective, music educators must establish and maintain contact with ideas and people from other disciplines." A joint meeting with artists was, therefore, very apt and produced much of mutual value. As a prelude to the colloquium, Professor Claire Detels, a musicologist at the University of Arkansas and a MDG member, agreed to produce a "study paper." This was drawn directly from her book *Soft Boundaries: Re-Visioning the Arts and Aesthetics in American Education* (Bergin and Garvey Publishers, 1999), a critique of how single-disciplinary specialization and scholarly and pedagogical insularity within and between art and music departments of universities and schools have produced negative consequences for the effectiveness of arts and music education. The study paper was not read at the colloquium; but because it was addressed directly by several papers and other participants, it is also included with the proceedings.

Given the commitment of the AWE group to pragmatism and a strong interest on the part of several MDG members in music and music education as *praxis*, a Pragmatist theme evolved that addressed distinctly post-modern, post-analytic and post-structuralist perspectives on art, music and music education. In contrast to the hegemony of modernist aestheticist accounts of art, music and music education, the pragmatist-praxial tone of these proceedings exemplified for the arts a trend in other disciplines that has recently been called "the practice turn."* In contrast to the "linguistic turn" of analytic, common language and formal language philosophy that occurred early in the 20th century, this newly burgeoning *practice theory* is concerned with human actions that are organized around praxis and pragmatic values, and that involve shared and embodied understanding, skills and know-how—where, in short, meaning arises in situated conditions of use.

Heidegger, Wittgenstein and a wide array of notable post-analytic, post-modern and post-structuralist philosophers, as well as second-generation critical theorists such as Habermas, have influenced the growth and direction of practice theory. It incorporates recent social philosophy and cultural theory and, in distinction to the rationalist bias of analytic theory, draws on empirical findings from the social sciences and cognitive studies, including neuroscience and consciousness research. The relevance for the arts and for music and music education in particular of this new emphasis on embodied praxis should be obvious; at the very least it offers the promise of new directions for thinking and research regarding the challenges facing music education. Thus, this collection of papers presents a variety of fresh and sometimes competing perspectives that otherwise have been overlooked, minimized, or even denied in many status quo discussions of music and music education. This new and sometimes provocative research is offered in keeping with the MayDay Group's agenda to facilitate and disseminate new ideas, to continue to promote analysis of and open-minded dialogue about both old and new ideas, and to help effect change for the betterment of music education and music in society.

* Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina and Eike Von Savigny, eds. *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Routledge: 2001.

Thomas A. Regelski, Editor.

Softening the Boundaries of Music in General Education

Claire Detels

University of Arkansas, USA

Part I. How and why music needs interdisciplinary connections

In 1983, cultural critic Christopher Lasch opened his speech to a conference of the future of music education with the following remarks:

> I accepted the invitation to address this distinguished gathering, I confess, in the hope that it would give me the chance to talk about a number of things I have decided opinions about: Beethoven's over-use of the diminished seventh; his addiction to chords in root position; the canard that Schumann couldn't orchestrate; the critical neglect of Ludwig Spohr; the Brahms -Wagner controversy (I believe the Wagnerites were dead wrong); the need for more compositions featuring prominent but easy parts for the viola.

Lasch's remarks were tongue-in cheek; he actually went on to address the need for music and all humanities teachers to challenge the narrow consumeristic approach that has characterized education and life in late industrial society, instead of just participating in specialized professional debates. Unfortunately, Lasch's suggestion was neglected in the discussions following his lecture. In the context of a conference on music curriculum, it was easiest for the participants to focus on music alone rather than on the larger challenge of improving education as a whole.

The trouble is, under the single-disciplinary structure of many of our educational systems today, there is almost no opportunity to consider the connections of music to other disciplines and activities for teachers or students, because music is represented in that system as a highly specialized discipline separate even from other arts disciplines with which it has frequently been combined in historical and cultural practice. Specialization has led to extraordinary levels of virtuosity and complexity in musical performance, composition, and research, but it has also had the unfortunate effect of isolating music teachers and students from contacts with other arts specialists, other academic disciplines, and other life activities in general. The result of this isolation has been an ever widening gap between academic music specialists and the public which has, in turn, been devastating to public understanding and support for education in music and all the arts.

Why has this problem developed and what can be done about it? That is the subject of this paper. In my view the problem is structured into our educational system according to a paradigm of educational practice that has been increasingly dominant since the Renaissance: the paradigm of hard, virtually impermeable boundaries between academic concepts and disciplines. As I will explain in Part II, hard boundaries have worked well for the sciences but have had a fragmenting effect on the arts that has led in turn to their declining influence in general education. Not only have the arts been marginalized as single-disciplinary specialties taught mainly by and for specialists, but, as I will discuss in Part III, further specialization has resulted in a fragmented approach to teaching the individual art forms, such that artistic practices are taught out of context with their history, theory, philosophy, and vice versa. In Part IV I will discuss the negative effects

that excessive specialization--actually fragmentation-- has had on music education. Part V focuses on why the Goals 2000 National Standards for Arts Education in the United States have failed to improve the situation there, despite their stated goals for interdisciplinary inclusion of music and the other arts. Finally, in Part VI I will propose soft-boundaried reforms in curriculum and teacher training at the college level that will allow for the mainstreaming of music and the other arts into the pre-college curriculum, in addition to continued single-disciplinary education for specialists. My hope is that these reforms may lead to a permanent improvement in education in music, the arts, and the whole curriculum. My proposals are designed with American education in mind, but I hope they may stimulate discussion about plans and possibilities elsewhere in the world.

Before I proceed, I should make some premises and definitions clear. First, my soft-boundaried paradigm leads me to view music, not as an activity separate and distinct from all others, but as a social practice with links to many other human activities and values, and with especially strong historical and social ties to the other arts. By "the arts" I mean creative human expressions in sensually perceivable media such as music, painting, sculpture, and poetry, among others. Although the arts are defined and represented in contemporary Western educational systems as separate disciplines, they have more often than not been joined in historical and cultural practice around the world, in such traditions as dance, drama, opera, and, most recently, film. They are also joined in the discipline of aesthetics, the study of human perception and judgment in all the arts and in other sensory experiences. Unfortunately, the recent dominance of the Anglo-American "analytic" approach to aesthetics has given the discipline a bad name outside of philosophy, at least in terms of its relevance to education. The arcane debates over the

definition of "art" and other terms that have dominated the discipline of aesthetics since the 1950s have frankly offered little of value to teachers. Bennett Reimer and the Getty Education Institute for the Arts have promoted a softer version of aesthetics to music and visual arts educators, but that softer version has also drawn fire as being overly formalist and Eurocentric, as in David Elliott's *Music Matters*, which recommends a praxis-based approach to music education, focused on doing more than thinking about it. While I understand the concerns of Elliott and others about the way aesthetics has been understood and taught, I think it is too important to leave out of arts education and education in general. In its broadest sense of making sense of sensory experience, aesthetics is not Eurocentric--there are Japanese, African, Indian, and many other aesthetic systems and approaches from which students have much to learn about the way we and others perceive the sensory realm. Actually, having aesthetics as a foundation and connection between music and the other arts avoids the Eurocentric trap that using historical canons as an organizing principle creates, wherein the traditional historical periods by which we date and analyze art forms are usually not relevant to non-Western cultures. Most important, I believe that aesthetic experiences, ideas, and discussion are essential to helping students understand the meaning of the artistic activities in which they engage. Without them, James Mursell warned in 1943, "Worthless materials may be used; routine procedures may be followed; emphasis may center narrowly on technical skills; the great literature of the art may never be opened up; nothing may be done to inspire and stimulate children to love and appreciate the beauty and the expressive possibilities of the art." Sadly, Mursell's warning reads today like a description of many American music education programs, focused primarily on training future band directors

for football game service with little or no concern for teaching general students about "the great literature" or "the beauty and the expressive possibilities of the art."

In my view, Elliott's focus on doing rather than studying music is not the answer to the marginalization of music and the other arts in our educational system. A far better answer, in my view, is to create a kind of music education that goes far beyond specialized technical skills; a music curriculum with stronger links to language and other arts, social studies, math, and science, than to athletics. I see aesthetics (NOT ATHLETICS) as the best foundation for those links. In fact, I would like to restore aesthetics to the position Immanuel Kant gave it, as one of the three central modes for human thought and judgment, along with scientific and moral reasoning. I believe it is, as Kant's contemporary Friedrich Schiller put it, "one of the most important tasks of culture to subject human beings to form even in their purely physical lives, and to make them aesthetic as far as ever the realm of Beauty can extend, since the moral condition can be developed only from the aesthetic, not from the physical condition." In other words, aesthetics offers far more than disembodied intellectual debates about concepts of art; it offers the experiential and intellectual key to connecting our minds with our bodies.

Because I believe aesthetics is central to our learning to understand music, the arts, and ourselves, I recommend using it from primary education through tertiary education as a fundamental basis for learning to explore how and why we hear, feel, think and create in music and other sensory experiences . With aesthetics positioned at the center of music education, music and the other arts can become more central as well: not in the sense of specialized pursuits taught by specialists primarily to and for other specialists, but as communally shared creative responses to human experience. Education in particular

skills, canons, and concepts will remain at more advanced levels for the training of specialists, but in general education, music and the arts can and must become a mainstream, non-specialized concern.

Part II. How we got there

A brief history of academic specialization and its effect on the arts

Since the scientific and industrial revolutions, human life has been characterized by increasing specialization: a tendency toward ever higher standards of competence for ever narrower goals. Ernest Gellner has defined this phenomenon as "single-purpose, instrumental/rational activity," in which individuals define and pursue specialized goals with far greater efficiency and uniformity than is possible in the "multi-purposed" behavior of less technologically-advanced societies. In industry, specialization has brought us the production line and a constant growth of technology and new consumer products. In academics, specialization has brought us a proliferation of knowledge in every imaginable area of human thought, leading to ever increasing specialization as disciplines and subdisciplines expand beyond the ability of individual scholars to understand them. In music and arts education, specialization has brought us a system of separate disciplines, courses, and specialists for the teaching of individual artistic practices that have often been joined in the actual history of the arts.

Specialization has taken root in academics in part because the needs for and benefits of academic specialization are so obvious. With specialization, the knowledge and skills in a discipline seem to be constantly growing, as new generations of specialists and specializations arise. In his History of Knowledge (1992), Charles Van Doren explains the historical development of academic specialization:

The Aristotelian ideal of the educated person, "critical" in all or almost all branches of knowledge, survived for centuries as the aim of a liberal education. . . [but] The twentieth century has seen radical change in this traditional scheme of education. The failure of the Renaissance to produce successful "Renaissance men" did not go unnoticed. If such men as Leonardo, Pico, Bacon, and many others almost as famous could not succeed in their presumed dream of knowing all there was to know about everything, then lesser men should not presume to try. The alternative became self-evident: achieve expertise in one field while others attained expertise in theirs. Much easier to accomplish, this course led to a more comfortable academic community. Now an authority in one field need compete only with experts in his field.

While academic specialization has served a necessary role in the advancement of knowledge since the Renaissance, it has also become a potentially destructive force in cases where specialists have become so narrowly focused within their disciplines and subdisciplines that they have lost the ability to communicate their knowledge with others. In his book *The Moral Collapse of the University*, philosopher Bruce Wilshire argues that specialization has become "professionalization," with the disciplines acting as elite closed communities whose exclusive "purification rites" answer identity needs of their own members, instead of advancing learning for the larger community.

The extremes of academic specialization described by Wilshire may be considered "hard-boundaried" extremes. That is, they are based on a paradigm in which clear-cut boundaries between disciplines and concepts are automatically preferred to softer, more permeable boundaries, regardless of their validity or the educational results. The paradigm of hard boundaries has worked fairly well in scientific disciplines where strict

definitions of experimental controls, variables, and results are essential to the growth of knowledge. In the arts and humanities, though, the results have been less fortunate. Because of the influence of the hard-boundaried paradigm over all academic disciplines in the twentieth century, faculty in the arts and humanities have come to emulate the hard-boundaried clarity of the scientific method with emphasis on quantifiable issues and methods, ignoring the more ambiguous areas of their disciplines. But there is one inherent ambiguity in the arts and humanities that cannot be evaded: their dependence on the communication and interpretation of ideas among other human beings: they must communicate to people if they are to be meaningful fields of study. When faculty in these disciplines become too specialized in their language and concerns, they lose the ability to communicate their ideas to their students and the public and along with that ability, lose their very meaning and purpose.

Some recent statistics on education in the United States show that the arts and humanities have indeed lost meaning in the eyes of the public there. For example, a 1993 poll by the National Cultural Alliance showed that only 31% of the public regarded their role as "major;" whereas 57% said the role was "minor" and 11% said they played "no role at all." In the wake of four decades of the Cold War-inspired math and science scare, arts education has particularly suffered. Today, in the United States, arts education at the primary and secondary levels is generally viewed merely as an enhancement to the main curriculum; consequently the arts are the first subjects affected when cutbacks of teachers and resources occur. Exposure to the arts in schools from age 5 through 13 is extremely limited in many if not most urban school districts (though richer suburban schools sometimes have fully staffed arts programs). At the high-school level (ages 13-17),

students are required to take only 1 of the 36 credits in the arts: a mere 2.8% of the curriculum. At the tertiary level, core requirements in the arts exist mainly for liberal arts students, and are often satisfied by one or two survey courses, i.e. 3-6 credits from a total of ca. 124, or 2.4 to 4.8% of the liberal arts curriculum. In colleges of business, engineering, agriculture, and forestry, other students may graduate with no arts courses at all; their limited core requirements in the humanities may be filled by courses outside the arts. As for the related field of aesthetics, its inclusion in the curriculum is even more haphazard, limited mainly to elective courses at the tertiary level, taught mainly to philosophy majors by philosophers whose experience and knowledge of artistic practices may be extremely limited.

For decades, educational experts in America such Howard Gardner and Charles Fowler, have argued against the deterioration of arts and aesthetics education, with little or no result. In his posthumous *Strong Arts, Strong Schools* (1997), Fowler showed convincingly that learning about the arts helps students with a variety of essential human lessons, including finding out who they are, seeing themselves as part of a larger culture, broadening their perceptions, expanding their abilities to express themselves and communicate, escaping the mundane, developing their imaginations, and evaluating and making judgments. I believe we now have evidence, through the shooting tragedies at Columbine High and other American schools, that we have made a serious mistake we in neglecting these essential human values and skills, and that the time is now ripe for a reemphasis in our schools of the arts and aesthetics, so that those values and skills can once again come to the fore of our educational program.

Unfortunately, the delivery system for education in the arts, both in the United States and in many other influential countries, is completely inadequate to the job of improving that education, even if public understanding and support are raised. The problem is that, under the single-disciplinary structure of these educational systems, the arts have come to be represented as highly specialized practices, largely unconnected to each other, to aesthetics, and to the general curriculum. As we enter the twenty-first century, the time now appears ripe for a reemphasis of the arts in the schools and the life values the arts can teach us. Specialists are trained in college-level departments of music, visual arts (called "art"), drama, and dance, and are hired as single-disciplinary specialists to teach their art forms in the schools, when positions are available. But positions are rarely available for each specialty, and the specialists are not trained to teach about arts outside of their specialty. Most American schools end up with only a music and a visual art specialist, each of whom have very limited contact with the students. While many specialists do an outstanding job of teaching talented students to produce artworks and performances, but the results of their work are not fully shared by general students beyond the elementary years, the very students who arguably need education in the arts as much or more than the talented students. Too, there is little opportunity in the single-disciplinary instruction offered in secondary education to discuss artistic concepts, let alone to allow for the repeated experience and thought that leads to genuine understanding. Repeated calls by single-disciplinary conferences and specialists for increased coverage of their art form or the arts in general fall on generally deaf ears; such coverage would have to come out of the time currently spent on other disciplines.

The situation in colleges and universities is not much better. There, one or two basic courses in the fine arts usually suffice to fill fine arts or humanities distribution requirements, while upper-level courses in arts departments are taken only by students majoring in the disciplines. The relevance of the arts to general education is lost in this hard-boundaried system. Teachers of general subjects rarely have the opportunity themselves to learn about the arts in an interdisciplinary, integrative manner; like everyone else, they usually fill their few arts requirements by choosing among single-disciplinary survey courses, where they learn the history of only one art form. Those college students who are training to be elementary teachers usually have required music and art education courses that supposedly help them make up for the lack of arts instructors at the elementary level, but these courses are too specialized to counter the neglect of the arts with which pre-service teachers are otherwise faced; while those training for secondary level teaching usually receive no preparation at all for teaching about the arts.

As a result, teachers of general subjects for which music and the other arts should be central concerns (especially social studies and language arts teachers) are unable to incorporate them into their teaching; they cannot teach what they themselves have not learned. As for those trained as single-disciplinary arts specialists, they are equally unprepared to teach about the connection of their art form to other arts, other disciplines, and other life activities; instead they are left with formal and stylistic issues that frequently distract attention from the connection of the arts to life. Thus, many arts specialists focus their attention on identifying and teaching students with talent in their disciplines, through the few available electives in band, choir, and studio art, while the

relevance of the arts to the Socratic task of understanding oneself, others, and the nature of existence is completely ignored.

Public ignorance of the arts is, of course, harmful to future funding and other support for public programs and education. It is also harmful for our mental and emotional health as individuals and as a society. If we view the arts in the largest sense as an aesthetic realm of sensory imagery, this is an era when the ability to recognize and interpret such imagery is essential to leading a thoughtful, disciplined life. In this highly technological age we have become consumers of sensory imagery in everything that we do, every thought that we have, every decision we make. Indeed, the actual aesthetic function of the human brain in imagining and objectifying experience is now reproducible on a massive scale by machines. The ability to function intelligently and morally in the midst of this computer-driven sensory immersion has become a greater challenge than ever, at least as great as the challenges of understanding modern science and mathematics. Without adequate education in the arts and aesthetics we cannot meet that challenge.

Part III. More hard boundaries: The separation of history, theory, philosophy, and practice in the arts

One of the worst aspects of specialization in music and arts education is the systematic separation of the teaching of artistic practice and performance from the intellectual teaching of the history, theory, and philosophy of those practices. Separating practical experience from intellectual inquiry in the arts is a serious mistake, because practical experience of the sensual basis of art is a necessary key for opening the imagination of every student, talented and untalented, to questions about the meaning,

purpose, and history of the arts. Separating practice from intellectual inquiry also results in an overly technical approach to making art among the artists and pre-college students--disconnected from questions about what the arts mean to us. At the pre-college level, the separation of practice from intellectual inquiry has led to a singular emphasis on practical issues of getting students "ready" for contests, concerts, and exhibits, and a neglect of philosophical questions and historical information that would add intellectual meaning to the performances. Then at the college level, many arts majors have trouble understanding why difficult and often dry history and theory classes are important to performers and artists at age 18, when they had no importance before.

The separation of experience from intellectual inquiry is only part of the reason we have failed to engage students and the general public in recognizing the importance of the arts to life. An equally important part of the picture is that intellectual inquiry has been further fragmented into separate areas of history, theory, and philosophy. Especially at the college-level, academic study in aesthetics courses (or in "philosophy of art--the other common title for aesthetics-related classes) is completely isolated from the study of history and theory, which are themselves fragmented among the separate art disciplines of drama, music, art (i.e. visual arts), architecture, film and dance. Each of these disciplines and subdisciplines have a tendency to develop their own organizations, journals, curricula and credentials, with the result that the perspectives of the specialists within them become increasingly narrow and parochial as their contacts with those outside their subdiscipline decline. As long as the hard-boundaried paradigm remains unchallenged, there is nothing to stop or even slow the proliferation of subdisciplines and the decline of contact of their respective specialists with the outside world.

For aesthetics, the single-disciplinary structure of our educational system has been particularly damaging. Far from its central position in both Kantian and Ancient Greek philosophy and education, aesthetics as an academic discipline is present only as a sub-discipline of philosophy rarely required of any students. This highly specialized view of aesthetics as separate from history and experience of the arts has produced rigorous philosophical arguments about definitions of artistic concepts, just as specialized historical research about individual art forms and practices has produced a flood of historical knowledge. However, it has also had the effect of separating philosophical inquiry about the arts and aesthetics from education in the history and practice of the arts, to the detriment of philosophy, history and practice; and it has lead to the neglect of aesthetic issues and values in the teaching of math, science, business, law, engineering.

The language and concerns of contemporary aesthetic discourse demonstrate the gap that excessive specialization can create between the scholars of a discipline on the one hand and students and the general public on the other. For instance, consider Jerrold Levinson's much reprinted and debated definition of a "work of art:"

X is an artwork+df X is an object that a person or persons, having the appropriate proprietary right over X, nonpassingly intends for regard-as-a-work-of-art, i.e., regard in any way (or ways) in which prior artworks are or were correctly (or standardly) regarded.

Philosophers specializing in aesthetics will understand this definition as one of more intricate analytic attempts to identify precisely the necessary and sufficient conditions of a "work of art." However, in terms of making sense of the history and practice of the arts, the definition is almost useless. Certainly, it does nothing to help

artists, teachers, or the public to understand what has happened and is happening in the arts and the culture; issues with which we very much need philosophical help.

There are just as many problems on the history side of this fragmented picture. For example, college-level courses in the history and appreciation of the arts generally consist of canonical histories of individual art disciplines: that is, the study of successions of "great" artists and artworks, often with exclusive emphasis on the Western tradition. Relying on canons to teach history in general is problematic, for it encourages students to memorize a traditionally accepted list of names and dates, rather than to attempt to understand historical relationships themselves. The emphasis on rote memorization is undoubtedly why so many students consider history "boring" and are unable to place the Civil War and other central historical events in the right half-century despite repeated years of lessons on the subject. However, canonical teaching of the arts is even worse, because it leads to an inescapable paradox. On the one hand, there is no point in teaching the history of the arts before students are mature enough to appreciate "greatness," (the usual basis for the canonical status of a work) so pre-college arts education has remained fixated on practice to the exclusion of historical and philosophical inquiry. On the other hand, however, if history and philosophy of the arts are only dealt with later on, the message is that the study and understanding of the arts is not very important, and students lose the opportunity, available in other mainstays of the curriculum to reinforce and deepen lessons learned in earlier years.

As a teacher of music history I know from painful experience how much the music-historical canon has lost touch with the reality of students who are being required to learn it. Even today this canon remains exclusively Western, despite the strong influences from

Africa, Asia, and Latin America on musical developments throughout the century. The canon includes many names of composers whose music my students will likely never hear outside of a music history class, but it excludes such prominent names as Madonna, Elvis Presley, and John Coltrane, about whom students have many questions. I can add those names and other information to make the history more relevant to my students' concerns, but that is only a piecemeal correction. Again, the root of the problem is the isolation of history from philosophical inquiry: if it were not so isolated, some hard philosophical questions would be asked about the meaning and purpose of the information provided in these textbooks and conveyed in these survey classes. Actually, students already ask these questions privately; we just don't hear them and we don't provide the answers they need.

Part IV. A really hard case: Fragmentation in the musical field

Of all the arts, music probably suffers most from excessive specialization. Specialization is so advanced in the discipline of music that it is more properly called fragmentation: a fragmentation of the musical field into separate subdisciplines of musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory, composition, music education, musical aesthetics, music therapy, music psychology, music sociology, popular music, music in general education, music performance, and conducting. Actually, it is difficult to list all the separate subdisciplines that currently fragment the musical field, because there are separate academic societies, journals, and programs for virtually every instrument and musical activity under the sun. Each specialty has a different perspective on what is important in research, education, and practice, with the result that music features more complex specialized methodologies, terminologies, and required courses than typically

exist elsewhere in academia, a factor that further limits communication between specialists, their students, and the general public whose support they ultimately need.

Fragmentation also characterizes the curriculum of college-level music departments. Except where the small size of a music department disallows specialization, music departments are generally divided among musicologists, theorists, educators, conductors, composers and performers, all of whom offer separate courses and programs in their specialties. Pre-college education in music rests on specialization as well: music, like the arts, are considered to be under the purview of music and art specialists, who unfortunately may not be available on the teaching staffs of many schools. In fact, there is nothing in the system to limit specialization or its increase, regardless of the harmful extremes of fragmentation that can result. Like other groups, specialists in an area tend to try to maintain or increase the power and position of their specialty, even if that specialty is rendered less important by social or technological change. During the last century, changes in technology and society have altered the nature of musical knowledge, production and distribution. Yet because of the entrenchment of multiple groups of specialists on music faculties, music curricula have changed very little.

Ironically, the problems of fragmentation in our musical field are probably due in part to the comparative strength of general musical education in our past, in contrast with education in the other art forms. That is, the long entrenchment of music in American education has allowed for longer and more elaborate layers of separate specialties to develop. American musical education goes back to the strong hymn-singing tradition of the colonial period, wherein singing schools and teachers taught parishioners how to sing the hymns of their liturgy without the help of the organs and professional choirs that had

been the mainstay of European church music, at least until sixteenth-century Reformation leaders discouraged their use. Because of the strong hymn-singing tradition, the American colonies had a fairly literate musical culture, in which music was spread through published collections of psalms, and other settings of sacred texts that were learned in singing schools and performed in church. But the education offered in the singing schools was almost entirely practical and performance-oriented; that is, it was designed to produce adequate musical performances, rather than any more general understanding of music, and that focus has set the pattern for American musical education ever since.

By contrast, the scholarly study of music in musicology--which was highly influential on musical education in Europe in the nineteenth century -- didn't gain a foothold in the United States until the middle of the twentieth century. A mere nine individuals established the American Musicological Society in 1934. Further, although American musicology grew after World War II, its influence was still limited by the tendency toward hard-boundaried specialization at that time, leading to the fragmentation of musicology into separate camps of history and theory, and the establishment in the 1960s of a separate discipline of music theory. The latter was largely populated by composers seeking patronage from universities after losing audiences to popular music in the first half of the century; once in the university they were assigned basic music theory classes for the teaching of Western tonal harmony. The limited knowledge and focus of most of these composer/theorists and their musicologist colleagues on Western music alone weakened the influence of both subdisciplines and led to the growth of the

additional subdiscipline of ethnomusicology, the study of musical cultures outside the Western art music tradition.

With musicology acting as a late-arriving, fragmented influence on American musical education, the way was left clear for music educators to organize and develop their practical focus more effectively, especially after the founding of the Music Educators' National Conference in 1909 (originally called the Music Supervisors' National Conference, with the name change following in 1934)--the largest and most powerful of all arts education organizations. Throughout the twentieth century the MENC has been most successful in promoting the use of large choruses, orchestras, and bands as the primary focus of music education at the secondary level. These large ensembles have been popular with administrators in that they were economical--large groups of students could easily be placed with a single instructor--and they were useful in promoting schools, through performances and contests. Under the large-ensemble model of music education, a single teacher could serve an entire school or even several schools, often teaching many more students at a time than was standard in other classes. Large-ensemble-based music education made it difficult for instructors to go beyond rehearsal and performance of simple music in a few limited genres, but this problem became largely invisible at the secondary level, because those students and teachers who might have preferred a broader form of music education were likely to have already left the system. Thus, the system worked to reproduce itself by encouraging and rewarding students and teachers that liked the large-ensemble-based approach, to the neglect of other musical skills and knowledge at both the K-12 and college levels.

Although choirs were the most common large ensemble in nineteenth century American schools, bands emerged as the dominant force in the twentieth century, in large part due to the use of marching band for the promotion of athletic programs. Unfortunately the increasing dominance of marching bands has drawn energy away from the broader array of musical and artistic traditions towards a singular focus on marching band repertoire, which then became a dominant focus of college-level music study as well; while the connections of music to other social practices and disciplines are completely neglected. Indeed, the dirty secret of many large college music departments is that many if not most music majors are high school band members recruited by means of scholarship money provided by well-funded college athletic programs with the expectation that the recipients will serve the programs' interests. In short, the power of athletics and of habit has kept American schools and colleges mainly in the business of producing bands and band directors, to the neglect of many other more culturally central musical activities and career skills.

The dominance of large bands is not the only fragmenting factor that has served to weaken American musical education. Rather, it is the combination of all the fragmented perspectives of the various ensemble directors, performers, musicologists, theorists, and music educators that has created a field in which communication is difficult. While musicologists focus on arcane research into obscure facts about obscure music, theorists analyze pitch structures without reference to historical or social context and meaning, music educators perform statistical research about the relative success of educational models and methods, and performers struggle to keep alive traditions of European art music without understanding or teaching about their connections to other popular,

American, and world traditions. Given their training and separate perspectives, journals, and conferences, members of these subdisciplines often have little to say to each other, let alone to teachers and students of other disciplines.

The fragmentation of perspectives and approaches in the musical field makes curricular reform very difficult, not only because of the lack of communication among subdisciplines, but also because of the tendency of each subdiscipline to protect its turf rather than to consider the problems and possibilities of education in music as a whole. As a result, American music departments have not kept up with the enormous musical changes in the world in the last half-century, especially the growth in music technology and musical multiculturalism. Our departments are still mainly organized around the studying and performing canonical works of Western art music from the common practice period (c. 1700-1900). The separate subdisciplines of music may not agree about much, but they are united in their conservative, formalistic approach to understanding music primarily as a set of structural relationships. With the rise of non-formalistic postmodern and feminist theoretical approaches in the 1970s, scholars in the literary and visual arts moved away from formalism to explore other, more culturally-connected forms of interpreting and understanding the arts. Those developments in turn have led to a softening of the literary and artistic canons in the direction of including study of non-Western and popular arts. In the music curriculum, though, the stunning growth and fusion of popular musics, world folk and art traditions, and "World beat" have yet to receive appropriate recognition in the American curriculum.

As long as musical education is so fragmented and isolated, it fails to have a real impact on education and life. As Benjamin Willis said back in 1954, we need to find a

way to redirect our energies "to the stake of music in education and not to the individual music specialist's stake in education." In my view, that redirection must take account of music's connections to other disciplines and to life in general.

Part V. Why the American Goals 2000 Standards won't help music education

The omission of the arts in 1990 from Education 2000--the United States' national program designed in the wake of the Carnegie Report in 1984--was a shock that helped music and other arts educators there realize how badly they had failed to create public understanding for the importance of our fields. In response to this omission, a consortium of arts educators from music, visual arts, dance and drama joined together in 1992 to prepare a set of national standards for teaching the arts that were then incorporated into the final version of Education 2000, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and passed into law by the United States Congress in 1995. Since 1995, national and state budgets have made funds available for grants to help implement the standards, and arts organizations such as the Getty Education Institute for the Arts and the Music Educators National Conference have actively promoted their use.

At first, the new standards seemed like an extraordinary step forward in arts education. The range of skills and knowledge called for in the standards went far beyond the traditional emphasis on practical skills; in fact, the general goals called for integration of intellectual knowledge in the theory and history of the arts with experiential learning at all grade levels and for special emphasis on interdisciplinary connections among the arts and other disciplines, as the following listing shows:

General Goals of the National Standards for Arts Education (NSAE)

* They [K-12 students] should be able to communicate at a basic level in the four arts disciplines-dance, music, theater, and the visual arts--dance, music, theater, and the visual arts. This includes knowledge and skills in the use of the basic vocabularies, materials, tools, techniques, and intellectual methods of each arts discipline.
* They should be able to communicate proficiently in at least one art form, including the ability to define and solve artistic problems with insight, reason, and technical proficiency.
* They should be able to develop and present basic analyses of works of art from structural, historical, and cultural perspectives, and from combinations of those perspectives. This includes the ability to understand and evaluate work in the various arts disciplines.
* They should have an informed acquaintance with exemplary works of art from a variety of cultures and historical periods, and a basic understanding of historical development in the arts disciplines, across the arts as a whole, and within cultures.
* They should be able to relate various types of arts knowledge and skills within and across the arts disciplines. This includes mixing and matching competencies and understandings in art-making, history and culture, and analysis in any arts-related project.

Unfortunately, despite the integrative interdisciplinary nature of the general goals, the actual breakdown of the general goals into content and achievement standards at each grade level made no allowance for integrative, interdisciplinary implementation. Instead, all responsibilities for teaching the arts were left to single-disciplinary specialists in the

various arts disciplines, as if schools commonly have specialists in all four disciplines, and as if students commonly take courses in each of those areas at every level--which is, as discussed earlier, far from the case . In practice, students are unlikely to be exposed to many of the standards, even in the arts that are covered.

For instance, take the nine content standards for music , including the activities of performing, improvising, composing, arranging, reading, notating, listening to, analyzing, and evaluating music, as well as understanding relationship between music, the other arts, other disciplines, history, and culture.:

Content Standards for Music, NSAE

1. Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music.

2. Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music.

3. Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments.

4. Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines

5. Reading and notating music

6. Listening to, analyzing, and describing music

7. Evaluating music and music performances

8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts

9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture

Is the student that fills their high school arts requirement with band going to get instruction in all these areas? It isn't very likely. Chances are, their ensemble experience will only cover content standard #2: "performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music," and even that is questionable given the frequent absence of solo opportunities and the varied repertoire mentioned in the standard. Think: this student will fulfill their high school arts requirement while achieving none of the standards for the visual arts, drama, and dance, and only part of one of the nine standards in music!

The detailed breakdown of student learning expectations for the content standards shows even more clearly the unlikelihood of their implementation under current conditions. Consider, for example, the student learning expectations for Content Standard #9: Understanding music in relation to history and culture. The expectations that students in grades 9-12 (see below) will be able to "classify by genre or style and by historical period or culture unfamiliar but representative aural examples of music" seems unrealistically high even if music was a regular part of the curriculum--which is far from

the case. This is not to say that teaching recognition of styles to middle-schoolers is inherently impossible, but it is highly unlikely under the current large-ensemble dominated curriculum. The fact is, the pragmatic handling of secondary and middle-school musical education through large ensembles has led to a singular focus on learning repertoire reserved for those ensembles, often without consideration of historical and theoretical issues of that repertoire, let alone other genres and styles. The occasional teacher who goes beyond this model exists but is not likely to be encouraged. Teachers who stick to a strict diet of rehearsal and performance, on the other hand, can receive regular administrative, parental and student approval for their tangible results in terms of concert, contest and athletic-event performances.

STUDENT LEARNING EXPECTATIONS FOR MUSIC CONTENT STANDARD #9: UNDERSTANDING MUSIC IN RELATION TO CULTURE, GRADES 9-12

PROFICIENT

3.2.9 classify by genre or style and by historical period or culture unfamiliar but representative aural examples of music and explain the reasoning behind their classifications

3.2.10 identify sources of American music genres (swing, Broadway musical, blues), trace the evolution of those genres and cite well-known musicians associated with them.

3.2.11 identify various roles (entertainer, teacher, transmitter of cultural tradition) that musicians perform, cite representative individuals who have functioned in each role, and describe their activities and achievements

ADVANCED

3.2.12 identify and explain the stylistic features of a given musical work that serve to define its aesthetic tradition and its historical or cultural context

3.2.13 identify and describe music, genres or styles that show the influence of two or more cultural traditions, identify the cultural source of each influence, and trace the historical conditions that produced the synthesis of influences

Because of their weaknesses, the Goals 2000 National Standards for Arts Education are unlikely to result in real improvement in American education on their own. Already, efforts to establish consistent testing for the teaching of these standards in the individual arts disciplines have floundered, because of the differences of what's available from one school to the next. Interdisciplinary testing according to the goals of the general standards would work far better, but there are no plans in the national agency which creates the tests (collectively known as the National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP]),

to develop a more interdisciplinary approach. Apparently the hard-boundaried paradigm controls the thinking in Washington, D.C., as much as anywhere.

PART VI. A BETTER WAY: SOFT-BOUNDARIED REFORMS IN CURRICULUM AND TEACHER TRAINING FOR MUSIC AND THE OTHER ARTS

The fragmentary, over-specialized nature of education in music and the other arts leads to a "vicious cycle," in which inadequate education for one generation leads to more inadequate education for the next. Breaking the cycle will require changes in the structure of the educational delivery system, starting with changes in how future teachers learn their subjects at the college level. In music, that means moving beyond the fragmentary nature of current college level music instruction to a more soft-boundaried, integrative approach in which students learn music history, theory and performance of music of a variety of cultures around the world in context with each other. In terms of the arts in general, it means a modification of the single-disciplinary structure of current arts education at the college level in order to allow for integrative interdisciplinary education in music and all the arts for future primary and secondary teachers.

The paradigm of hard-boundaried specialization must be changed if music is to be represented in our schools as an exciting, influential, and complex medium of communication, instead of the training ground for bands and choirs to which it has in many cases devolved. In my view, the key is a restructuring of the college-level curriculum for the academic side of music--the music history and theory programs--so that students can learn the history and theory of major musical styles in context with each other and with a greater connection to practical application of this knowledge in the

classroom and in more specialized applied study. This restructuring would extend the fairly common "comprehensive musicianship" approach of combining theory and history instruction with practice for Western art music to include the study and practice of non-Western and popular musics that are mainly neglected in current education for college music majors.

The following 6-semester plan shows how music history, theory, and practice of music around the world can be integrated and made accessible to non-music students as well as to music majors. It is an intensive, 5-day-a-week program combining music history, theory, and some practice. (It is assumed that applied performance and ensemble courses will remain available for more specialized practical training.) This particular plan is designed for American schools, where, I believe, knowledge of the development of Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, and Modern Western traditions and their cross-pollination with African, Middle Eastern, Asian, and Native American traditions is still important, along with learning about other prominent world traditions of folk, popular, and art music. In other countries, a similar plan would probably emphasize the development of musical styles within their own traditions, along with study of the cross-pollination of those traditions with those of other cultures, and with the fuller context of musical traditions throughout the world.

A brief look at the plan (see below) shows that there is far more coverage of the history and theory of other major world music traditions than is standard in Western educational systems. And, in addition to the classroom learning, there are weekly practicums which allow for practical application and experience of the multiple music

traditions studied, using the contemporary technology that students will encounter in music-related job markets outside the university.

Given a new emphasis on contemporary knowledge and skills, core college music classes such as these could attract many students from other fields that use music, such as business, journalism, engineering, psychology, and electronics. To encourage their involvement and input, any of the last five semesters could be opened to all students, not just music majors, assuming they had the pre-requisite of Semester 1. This would make upper-division music courses available to general students on a similar basis as upper-division courses in English, history, and other subjects of general interest, among which music must be included if it is to be taken seriously. Wider participation of general students in music department course offerings could have the effect of increasing interest and involvement in music of general students during their college years and afterwards, as well as training music majors and professors in how to communicate with those outside of their discipline.

Plan for an Integrative Music Curriculum

Semester 1. History and theory of folk and popular musics around the world including folk songs, spirituals, blues, rock-and-roll, and world beat. Comparison of basic textures, scales and harmonic systems of different world musics, including the major-minor scale system and simple chord progressions of Western tonal harmony.

Practicum: Computer- and keyboard-assisted recognition of folk and popular music styles and forms; exercises in singing and composing in these styles.

Semester 2. History and theory of music to 1600, including ancient and medieval styles in Europe and Asia, and the emergence of European musical styles in the late Middle Ages and Renaissance.

Practicum: Computer- and keyboard-assisted recognition, singing and simple composition exercises of chant, organum, motets, and Renaissance counterpoint.

Semester 3. History and theory of music, 1600-1750, including Baroque European music, and music of the Americas during the first centuries of European settlement.

Practicum: Computer- and keyboard-assisted recognition of Baroque European and some American styles and forms; singing, playing (on keyboard) and composition of basso continuo, monody, fugues, and chorale settings

Semester 4. History, theory, and analysis of classical music, c. 1750-1800, including intensive analysis of sonata form, rondo, song form, minuet, and theme-and-variations movements.

Practicum: Computer- and keyboard-assisted recognition, singing, and simple composition exercises in classical styles and forms, chord progressions, and modulations.

Semester 5. History and Theory of Nineteenth-Century Music.

Practicum: Computer- and keyboard-assisted recognition and analysis of nineteenth-century styles and forms; recognition, singing and composition exercises of Romantic-style songs and chamber music.

Semester 6. History and Theory of Twentieth-Century Music, including the global fusions of music in minimalism and World Beat.

Practicum: Computer- and keyboard-assisted recognition of twentieth-century styles; composition exercises in major styles of the century

Given the often limited background and slow progress of students on Western music history and theory as covered in the current curriculum, the expansion of that curriculum to include contemporary non-Western and popular musics may appear

unrealistically ambitious. But, as Jerome Bruner has pointed out, the apparent slowness with which students learn may come from teachers assuming a "blank slate" model of education, and failing to recognize and deal with the knowledge and theoretical paradigms that students have formed before they reach the classroom. Following Bruner's suggestion, if we as music instructors recognize and connect with our students' interest and knowledge of popular music, we can do much to improve our students' learning, as well as bringing critical, philosophical questions about how and why any and all musical styles and all elements -- not just pitch -- work the way they do to the forefront of the classroom. Many instructors may find themselves learning about texture and rhythm from the more sophisticated ears of their students, which may lead to more enlivened analysis and discussion that in turn may influence future K-12 teachers to enrich their curricula with a broader approach than is currently practiced in the schools.

Just as a more integrated college music curriculum can positively influence music education at all levels, so college-level interdisciplinary education in the arts and aesthetics can help to mainstream the music and the other arts into general education, in a way that the current single-disciplinary survey and studio classes in individual art forms cannot hope to achieve. The promotion of "discipline-based art education" (DBAE) by the Getty Education Institute in Los Angeles has been a step in the direction of integrative arts education; unfortunately the Getty Institute has had little influence in the field of music. In my view, what is needed is an interdisciplinary-based arts education (IBAE), wherein practice in all of the arts is related to aesthetic principles and cultural history. Interdisciplinary arts education could begin in the earliest grades with discussion and interpretation about the meaning of artistic activities carried on in and out of class,

including those of other historical times and cultures. Study and experience of the arts would include many Western and non-Western traditions, as well as cross-disciplinary arts that are presently neglected in arts education. Discussions of the various art traditions would link issues of artistic style to the understanding of the cultures and/or historical periods in which they appeared. Such discussions would not have to exclude popular arts that are enjoyed by the general public, such as television shows and music videos. Instead of alienating students by ignoring or denigrating the artistic experiences that have had the most meaning for them, teachers could draw on those very experiences to engage their interest in the arts of other times and cultures. Knowledge of the enormous variety of ways in which humans express themselves artistically could lead students to a more critical attitude toward the popular arts of their own culture, and a critical understanding of how and why they function so successfully. Such critical attitudes and skills are crucial to the ability to function as a thinking human being in the age of electronic media at which we have now arrived. Perhaps more than any past culture, our society literally requires us to be, as former Labor Secretary Robert Reich has put it, "symbolic analysts," and the arts are the most appropriate place to teach students how to read and interpret the symbols of our complex world.

The integrative, interdisciplinary approach presents difficult new challenges for teachers trained in a single art discipline, because they must learn how to integrate historical and theoretical issues with practice in a variety of art forms and cultures. In addition, general teachers of social studies, language skills, and even science and math must also learn to incorporate relevant knowledge and experience of the arts into their courses. One way to make the transition to a more interdisciplinary style of education is

to develop interdisciplinary arts courses at the college level for future elementary/secondary teachers in general education. Such courses may be taught or team-taught by faculty interested and broadly educated enough to act as "interdisciplinary specialists." Interdisciplinary arts courses or minor degree programs should probably be required as a credential for teaching the high-school "fine arts survey" courses as well as for other general subjects--especially language arts and social studies. Interdisciplinary-trained arts teachers could also serve as consultants in their schools for developing special arts-oriented festivals celebrating particular cultures and historical periods, and for engaging with artists and arts activities available in the local community. Such special events and local opportunities should not substitute for regular arts education--as they often do--but they can be a very important part of general education if there is someone with interdisciplinary arts expertise and interest to help with long-term preparation and integration. Having an arts educator who takes this kind of responsibility for the school can also help administrators, parents, and students recognize the importance of the arts to the overall educational quality at their school, so that cutting funding for arts education may become as unlikely as cutting athletics.

Many music specialists may be uncomfortable with the idea of interdisciplinarity, fearing that it will function to "water down the arts and to lessen the energy of the individual art forms," as Libby Chiu put it during the American debate over the National Standards for Arts Education. Some music educators argue, based on recent research about the "Mozart effect" of music on the intellect, that music should fight for representation apart from the other arts, because it has the best statistics on value for overall education. But this argument is instrumental and ultimately consumeristic; it

views music education as serving the purpose of thinking faster, getting better grades, and making more money, rather than serving a broader purpose of enriching understanding and life. Besides, single-disciplinary education is no guarantee of depth, especially when it results in the absence of any coverage at all for some art disciplines.

Single-disciplinary music and other arts specialists also may fear that their jobs will be endangered by the interdisciplinary spread of knowledge and skills. I believe this thinking is short-sighted, like the fear among computer programmers in the 1980s that widespread use of personal computers would put out of business, instead of, (as actually happened), making them even more central to the economy. Similarly, it is far more likely that interdisciplinary, integrative reforms in arts education will raise recognition of the need for arts specialists as the nature and importance of their disciplines are more widely understood.

In my department at the University of Arkansas we have introduced an interdisciplinary course in the arts and aesthetics that is available to all students in fulfillment of core fine arts and humanities requirements, and that we hope to have required for all education majors. In our approach, aesthetics provides a foundation for understanding issues of form, content, style, and meaning in each of the main art disciplines. The use of aesthetics rather than history as the structural foundation of the course allows for consideration of arts from all cultures and periods. Aesthetic grounding also encourages philosophical discussion of issues of art and aesthetics in contemporary culture, about which students will likely be most interested and aware. One can then extend the excitement of considering contemporary issues to the understanding of other art cultures of the past. The course structure also calls for some single-disciplinary

consideration of art forms, so that complex issues of media and style are not ignored. Experiential exercises are used to enhance the understanding of each major art form, giving students the opportunity to relate historical and theoretical concepts to artistic creation or experience.

The course plan appears in the Appendix at the end of this paper. It begins with an opening unit on the arts and aesthetics in general, followed by discussions and experiential exercises in each of the main art forms, starting with drama, in an order that allows for cumulative understanding of how the arts work together as the course progress. There is necessarily less emphasis here on canonical facts and dates, that often fill the time of arts survey courses without necessarily reaching the hearts of the students. In fact the course forces its instructors to look beyond the traditional academic treatment of the arts--which is not working--to create a new structure. Some terms and canonical figures have to go, but that may be better than having them stay without being questioned. At the same time, the breadth of the course allows for more consideration of issues of value and meaning in the arts than is possible in single-disciplinary courses. The fact that all this can be achieved with only one three-credit course leaves room in most students' schedules for choosing an additional single-disciplinary course, a choice that can be better made after the interdisciplinary introduction. The course may also be help future teachers of fine arts survey courses and all general subjects to incorporate interdisciplinary arts and aesthetics issues into their teaching.

Individual countries, states, and schools can be laboratories in which we try out various interdisciplinary improvements to education in music and the other arts. Through this process of curricular reform, we can and we must find ways to help students and the

public better appreciate the meaning and importance of music, the arts, and the whole breadth of sensory experience in the world, and prepare them to understand the even more challenging virtual realities of our future.

Our failure to provide integrative, interdisciplinary education in music and all the arts has resulted in the proliferation of disciplinary and subdisciplinary specialists that interact mainly with one other, and the neglect of the arts in general education. Ultimately, this approach leads to isolation and irrelevance. The way out lies in softening the disciplinary boundaries of music and reconnecting with the world.

Appendix

Syllabus: An Interdisciplinary Introduction to the Arts and Aesthetics*

**This course plan is based closely on the syllabus used by Professor Frank Scheide and myself for Humanities 1003 at the University of Arkansas starting in the Fall of 1998. It is assumed that the course plan will vary each time the course is taught depending on the backgrounds and interests of the teachers, the visiting artists, and the arts events available in the community.*

UNIT I. Introduction to Aesthetics and the Dramatic Arts

Week 1. Introduction to aesthetic terms and issues

What is meant by art, the arts and aesthetics, and why are they (or aren't they) important to us?

Common classifications of media, disciplines, and forms in the arts

Discussion of formalist, emotivist, functionalist, and transcendentalist aesthetic traditions in arts from around the world

Plato, Aristotle, and the origins of Western aesthetics; mimesis and catharsis in tragedy and comedy

Week 2. Style, Culture, and Meaning in the Arts

Slide show and discussion on style and stylistic changes in Western vs. Eastern art traditions; "high" vs. "low" art forms; media and style in the pictorial arts

Realism and abstraction in Islamic, Byzantine, and Renaissance art

European vs. Chinese landscape painting

Abstraction in twentieth century painting: recent pattern art

Art and the museum (Discuss "museum culture" and its effect on aesthetic theory and learning.)

Experiential Exercise 1: Museum project (Bring a photograph or other representation of an artwork that you admire for display in class, along with a written statement of what you find meaningful about the work, to display alongside the work. Class members will tour and discuss exhibit, including comparison of the aesthetic tastes and perspectives represented.)

Week 3. Introduction to the Dramatic arts

Roots of drama from religious ritual to Greek drama; Plato vs. Aristotle on imitation and catharsis

Dramatic crafts: lighting, scene design, direction, acting, music

Experiential Exercise 2: Class rehearsal and performance of scene from Greek drama

Week 4. Drama Continued

Lecture on Asian dramatic styles, with emphasis on Japanese Kabuki theater

Experiential Exercise 3: Eastern vs. Western acting techniques

Week 5. Dance

Principles and techniques of dance; cross-cultural comparison of African dances and cultures with Western ballet

Experiential Exercise 4: Learning African dance movements and techniques

UNIT II. Visual, Musical, and Environmental Arts

Week 6. Visual arts

Opening hour: Midterm Examination on Unit I

Design as the common aesthetic principle in the visual arts

Media and style; individual style and creative vision

Guest lecture, slide show, and discussion with visiting artist

Week 7. Visual Arts continued.

Development of realism in Western painting, c. 1400-1700; Discussion of James Burke's "Masters of Illusion" and John Berger's *Ways of Seeing*

Guest lecture, slide show, and discussion with visiting artist

Experiential Exercise 5: (Create and be prepared to discuss a small sketch or other work of visual art representing something in your environment and write a brief essay

discussing the relationship of the abstract to the representational in your work. The medium may be anything, including collage, sculpture, installation work, etc.)

Week 8. Musical arts

Experiential introduction to the musical elements and their use through humming and dance exercises

Sampling and discussion of musical styles, social function, and expression around the world -- chant, blues, raga, fugue

Week 9. Musical arts continued

Music in the concert hall -- sonata form and motivic manipulation

Music and culture in the twentieth century: jazz, rock, world beat, MTV, Cage and the avant-garde, serialism, minimalism, etc.

Experiential Exercise 6: Desert Island musical excerpts (Present and discuss a 1 minute excerpt of your favorite musical work with an analysis of its stylistic and expressive content, and the relationship of its style to its social function.)

Week 10. Environmental arts

How aesthetics applies to architecture and environmental arts -- designing and understanding the physical environment of a culture; the "sense of place"

Issues of media, technology, geography, and style in the early history of architecture: Egypt, Greece, Rome, China, Islamic, Gothic, Renaissance, and Baroque

Exploring the Ruins of Pompeii to Understand Ancient Roman Culture

Experiential Exercise 7. (Take an architectural tour of assigned sites in your town. Comment on the different styles, materials and histories of the buildings you see, and

comment on what they say about the lives and attitudes of their architects and inhabitants.)

Unit 3. The Arts in the Twentieth Century

Week 11. Camera Arts: Photography and Film

Opening hour: Midterm Examination on Unit 2

Is photography an art? What effect has its development had on twentieth-century culture?

History and technology of photography

Experiential Exercise 8. Designing lighting for a photograph or film scene (The visual side of drama involves staging, scenery and, in film, lighting for emotional effect. In this exercise students will place lights to create various effects for a brief movie scene and discuss their intentions and results.)

Week 12. Film

The development of film technology

Editing techniques

Experiential Exercise 9: (In groups of 4-5, students will construct a brief film demonstrating various techniques of editing, after which the films will be shown and discussed with the class.)

Week 13. Shapes of the Present and Future

Installation, Performance and Feminist Art: Judy Chicago's *Dinner Table*

Computer art and virtual reality; aesthetic experience in the future

Week 14. Critics' Circle

In-class discussion and critique of assigned performances from outside class using terms and concepts from the rest of the semester

Week 15. "Bad Art Party"

This week we will end the semester with a more informal gathering at the instructor's home, in which we will share, explain, discuss and laugh at our favorite examples of "bad art," including discussion on what "bad art" means. Also the final take-home exam will be distributed, to be due on the final exam date.