Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

David J. Elliott
Editor

Vincent C. Bates
Associate Editor

Electronic Article

Re-setting Music Education's "Default Settings"

Thomas A. Regelski

_____

Re-setting Music Education's "Default Settings"

Thomas A. Regelski, PhD
School of Music, SUNY Fredonia (Emeritus)
Helsinki University, Finland (Docent)

Introduction

In his account of the "construction of social reality" philosopher John Searle (1995) describes how what he calls "Background" is central to the process by which *social realities* are constructed, sustained, and transmitted. Searle's account of Background involves three elements: a practical need, collective intentionality, and constitutive rules.

The first assigns praxial *functions* to (or imposes them on) artifacts and actions. He writes:

> In the case of some artifacts, we build the object to serve a function. . . . In the case of many naturally occurring objects, such as rivers and trees, we assign a function . . . to a preexisting object. We say, "That river is good to swim in," or "That type of tree can be used for lumber." (1995, 14)

Such functions always advance values that "are never intrinsic: they are assigned relative to the interests of users and observers" (19). Thus, they always involve social needs, interests, and practices (26).

The second element, therefore, is *collective intentionality*. "Intentionality" is the 'aboutness' of an action: the goal it is 'for' or intended to accomplish (Searle 1995, 85-110). In addition to individual goal-directedness there is collective intentionality: "If I am a violinist in an orchestra I play *my* part in *our* performance of the symphony" (23; italics original). The decisive aspect of what Searle calls "We intentionality" (24) is "a sense of doing (wanting, believing, etc.) something together, and the individual intentionality that each person has is derived *from* the collective intentionality that they share" (25; italics original). Searle calls a "social fact" any 'reality' resulting from collective intentionality; institutional 'facts', such as are involved in music and music education, are examples of such social realities.

_____

The third and final element involves *constitutive rules*. Regulative rules govern already existing activities, while constitutive rules create certain activities to begin with; such as the rules creating various games. In consequence,

> the structure of human institutions is a structure of constitutive rules [. . , and] people who are participating in the institutions are typically not conscious of those rules; often they even have false beliefs about the nature of the institution, and even the very people who created the institution may be unaware of its structure. (127)

Accordingly, human institutions involve a normative component that is socially created and regulated (146), and institutions only function given their Background conditions—those "abilities, dispositions, tendencies, and causal structures generally" (129) that, among other influences,[1] structure consciousness (133) and experience (135). Searle writes:

> Of course, in some cases we actually are following the rules. I might teach you a new card game and you might memorize the rules and follow the rules of the game. But for many institutions, particularly after I have become expert at operating within the institution, I just know what to do. I know what the appropriate behavior is, without reference to the rules. (137)

This concept of Background is somewhat similar to the "lifeworld" of Jürgen Habermas[2] and to Pierre Bourdieu's "habitus."[3] All three deal with the attitudes, dispositions, values, social institutions, paradigms, and practices that shape who we are, what we conceive and value, and what we can create.

Background is explained further by reference to what Searle later called "default positions"; that is, "the views we hold prereflectively so that *any departure from them requires a conscious effort and a convincing argument*" (1998, 9; italics added). Such taken-for-granted default positions are the Background governing our thinking and discourse, particularly "all of our intentional states, all of our particular beliefs, hopes, fears, and so on" by which we "cope with the world" (108) and create social realities and institutions. The default positions behind social realities and social facts can be understood by comparing the human mind to computer software; namely, that Background provides our mental *default settings*—i.e., the 'factory'-like settings passed on by predecessors that structure an institutionalized mind to function according to a preordained, 'normal style template'.

Of course, such settings *do* allow the computer—or, analogously, the mind—to function at all. Thus, they are not necessarily problematic. But they can lead to problems, especially for those unaware of what the default settings *are* that they rely upon mindlessly (or what the functional values are that the default settings supposedly serve) and who thus

_____

proceed to employ them[4] unaware of or unconcerned with their built-in biases and limitations. Many problems in the world result from such dysfunctional default settings.

An enormous fund of default settings are the taken for granted bases of schooling. Their prereflective status makes them seem intuitive, like common sense.[5] If problematic settings *are* identified, teachers are often unable (or unwilling) to adjust new alternatives to advantages beyond the 'factory' settings they inherited. Being limited, therefore, to the 'normal style template', their norms are guided not by reasoned, informed professional choices but depend, instead, on complacency or lack of curiosity about new settings that could produce improved results. Worse, perhaps; some *love* their default settings—have come to love their chains—and are comforted by and dependent on the predictability and familiarity of their preferred settings, despite typically problematic results. They thus reject arguments for new default settings and actively resist change. Failure of students to learn properly, and many 'discipline problems', for example, are typically a result of certain default settings teachers accept uncritically.[6]

This paper explores the effects and problems of one highly influential default setting of the 'normal style template' of music education and proposes some alternatives. These do not require abandoning all traditional templates for school music. But re-setting our default settings does depend on reconsidering the promised *function* of school music—music education in the *general education* of *all* students and thus serving the community— especially in contrast to the default settings of higher education in music, the function of which are to produce an elite cadre of professional musicians. Also needed is reappraisal of the taken-for-granted collective intentionality among music teachers that sustains certain limited or limiting default settings and the usually unspoken constitutive rules that define "the way things are" in the profession. This reappraisal depends especially on praxial accounts of music and music education, itself a major alternative default setting to traditional practices. And the alternatives proposed here are thus inspired by praxial premises.

Participatory versus presentational performance

First, many 'factory settings' of school music—particularly the most influential ones—are modeled on university music schools and departments. A separate critique can be made that those influential institutions often function as 'factories' for producing professional musicians, including music teachers. Countless default settings from higher education are

_____

thus inscribed in the minds and practices of school music teachers. Many of these university practices are beset with their own often dysfunctional templates, yet they get filtered down to school-based music education despite the entirely different *functional agendas* of the two educational institutions. Thus school music has adopted many default settings that are contrary to its expressed function as a basic part of general education.[7] These settings represent a prereflective and uncritically taken for granted collective intentionality that creates the facticity of a teacher's very *identity* as both "musician" and "teacher" (Roberts 2004) and that directly promotes the normative 'rules' by which music education programs are typically constituted in schools.

Among the most prevalent default setting is the dominance of what ethnomusicologist Thomas Turino (2008) calls *presentational performance*. This term describes "situations where one group of people, the artists, prepare and provide [*sic*] music for another group, the audience, who do not participate in making the music or dancing" (26). In contrast, *participatory performance* involves performances where "there are no artist-audience distinctions, only participants and potential participants performing different roles, and the primary goal is to involve the maximum number of people in some performance role" (26). Turino writes that participatory performances

> are more about *the doing* and social interaction than about creating an artistic product or commodity. Singing in church and playing music at home with friends 'just for fun' are common examples of the latter type in North America, but there are many other pockets of participatory music making and dance ranging from contra, salsa, hip hop, and swing dancing to drum circles, garage rock bands, bluegrass or old-time jams, and community singing that takes place in bars, coffeehouses, community centers, and private homes on a weekly basis. (25; italics original)

He goes on to argue that

> these situations of participatory music making are not just informal or amateur, that is, *lesser* versions of the 'real music' made by the pros but that, in fact, they are something else—a different form of art and activity entirely—and that they should be conceptualized and valued as such. (25; italics original).

My primary proposal is that these forms of musical praxis should also be valued, addressed, and advanced by school music. Instead, school music has largely perpetuated only the presentational performance defaults that characterize higher education training programs. However, those defaults have had distinct liabilities for school music, as Turino reports:

> Ethnomusicologist Melinda Russell has shown that participation in school music programs falls off as students progress to higher grades and as the pressure to reach a specialist standard becomes more pronounced.[8] School music programs at all levels are geared toward

_____

> presentational performances and do not involve collective music making among all ages as a
> normal part of valued social occasions—a normal part of being social. (98)

Such predictably declining participation of students in presentational performance ensembles is an economic liability that often contributes to ever-more diminished administrative support for school music. For example, a rural school board noted the large drop-out rates at each of the levels for band, and reduced the staff from two band teachers to one.

Furthermore, the many advantages of the participatory performance ethos detailed by Turino (23-65)—most of which are *socio*-musical pleasures—are simply missed in large ensembles.[9] Thus, despite the seemingly high levels of excellence of many school ensembles,[10] the overwhelming majority of high school musicians do not make music one of their adult 'social realities' after graduation. Their musical 'activities' in school ensembles fail to promote compelling dispositions or default settings (intentionality) for musicing in their adult lives—at least those that can be credited to school music.

Given this problem, I propose an infusion of chamber musics, ranging from solos to small groups that have one or two performers per part. Even though most music teachers have experienced the pleasures of chamber musics in their professional training, this default setting is often resisted or rejected for school music, despite its many musical and pedagogical advantages.[11] First of all, such groups develop independent musicianship skills better: in large ensembles the averaging effect of large numbers covers up individual weaknesses, and weaker students come to rely on the more advanced or confident performers in their sections.[12] But chamber groups also have the advantage of modeling the life-long benefits of participatory performance because finding a few other like-minded friends to get together is easier than scheduling a large group rehearsal into busy adult lives. Such groups also can engage students with musics not addressed by large ensembles and can be savored without regard for presentational performance standards.

I first encountered this practice from the example of three faculty wives[13] who just 'read through' all the literature they could find for piano, oboe, and flute.[14] And there was also the group of university faculty—perhaps two dozen men—that got together occasionally to drink beer and enjoy singing the naughty catches and glees that were a research interest of the English professor who convened the group. One member once proposed giving a concert but was immediately voted down because the presentational mode would require rehearsing that would negatively impact the sociality ethos of participatory performance. According to Turino, this ethos places priority

_____

on encouraging people to join in regardless of the quality of their contributions. In highly participatory traditions, the etiquette and quality of *sociality* is granted priority over the quality of the sound per se. Put another way, participatory music and dance is more about the social relations being realized through the performance than about producing art that can somehow be abstracted from those social relations. (35; italics original).

Of course, many formerly participatory traditions have been transformed into presentational ones, thus often denying the pleasures of participation to interested performers who lack the skills or commitment required by presentational standards. Take, for instance, the social history of the piano: once often found in middle class homes, it provided a musical focus of family social life until its ethos was eclipsed by virtuoso performance standards (Loesser 1990). Such transformations affect not just Western concert music but also indigenous musics adapted for presentational performance (Turino 2008, 59-61). Madrigal singing is an example of an originally participatory music that has been co-opted for presentational praxis. However, chamber musics (of all kinds) can be enjoyed for their participatory values without succumbing to the criteria of presentational performance (Booth 1999).[15]

Models exist in school music of ensemble directors who require, inspire, or otherwise promote the additional participation of members of large ensembles in small groups—usually organized and rehearsed by the students themselves with minimal (if any) teacher coaching and pursued mainly for participatory values. Even where these may occasionally result in presentational performances—for example, performing informally for the full ensemble during a rehearsal period,[16] or in casual 'recitals' where students share their efforts with like-minded peers[17]—the models for life-long musicing, the progress of musicianship, the sociality of the participatory ethos, and the "social synchrony" (Turino 2008, 41; quoting Edward Hall) of getting 'in a groove' together are all worth promoting. And in schools with no string programs, string chamber groups offer a literature and sociality otherwise denied to string players. Even piano students can enjoy duos and four-hand arrangements[18] otherwise denied them in their private lessons and practicing.

Music teachers can also expand school programs to maximize the participatory ethos and thus motivate long-term interest. Whether it is barbershop singing, steel drum bands, bell choirs, drumming circles, folk guitar for sing-alongs, karaoke, or so-called recreational instruments (e.g., harmonica, electronic keyboards, etc.), students experience musical

pleasures that can promote life-long involvement.[19] In many instances, traditional default settings can be easily re-set.

One elementary teacher, for example, stopped having his elementary choir perform in assembly periods for K-4 students because the 'audience' was always restless and did not seem to benefit musically. Instead, the assemblies were converted into sing-alongs where students sang en masse (and therefore more powerfully and with more satisfaction) many of the well-liked songs learned in general music class. An unexpected side-benefit was dramatically increased membership in the choir! Sing-alongs, at least in the US, are being sponsored more and more in local communities—but not by schools.[20]

Another example was the band teacher who had a once a month, 30 minute after-school "blast-a-thon" for her first-year band students. This consisted in large part of *sound compositions* (see Regelski 2004) 'orchestrated' as a general music teacher improvises a rhythm band activity. These produced substantial musical satisfactions and growth,[21] and in the process familiarized students with a contemporary musical genre.

Yet another example was the high school choir director who gave up his scheduled five-day-a-week choir rehearsal (!), and divided his choir into five balanced SATB chamber groups. Each weekly meeting (during the former choir rehearsal period) featured a group voice lesson and music theory rudiments related to sight-singing.[22] But most of the time involved singing chamber literature that was never performed in public, literature that sampled musics well beyond what the choir performed, and that practiced music reading and vocal skills *in context*, not as drill. The choir met only two times a week during the after-school activity period and, according to the director, attendance was excellent, and (not surprisingly) the choir actually performed at a higher level and learned music more quickly as a result of the chamber group lessons.[23]

A further example is the band teacher who used his group lessons for band students[24] innovatively. During the lesson, each student got a short individual lesson while, as they waited for their own lessons elsewhere in the room, the others practiced chamber arrangements.[25] The lesson concluded with a performance of the chamber arrangement students had been practicing; their musical reward, so-to-speak, and one that savored all the usual participatory values.[26]

In a school where K-3 general music classes taught music reading via recorder, after-school time was created for students in later grades to participate in recorder groups.

_____

Beginner groups played either in unison or easy two-part arrangements. Others sampled more advanced and more authentic recorder literature. These were rarely performed in public: just getting together to perform was—well—satisfying enough! The same is often true for hand bell and hand chime choirs.

Of particular interest regarding participatory performance is the general music protocol developed by Rick Bunting[27] based on the British-Appalachian musical tradition. His middle school general music classes were largely participatory. Students performed on a wide range of traditional instruments, from dulcimers, to ocarina, fiddle, keyboards, guitar and other fretted instruments (e.g., banjo, ukulele, string and electric bass, etc.), to autoharp, recorders, penny whistles, and the like—all 'real' instruments, not classroom or 'toy' instruments.[28] Everyone played, and classes were devoted to learning arrangements Rick devised where all students could contribute at their individual levels of ability. He marveled that when he arrived for class students had arrived early (!), had gotten out their instruments, tuned them, and were already practicing their parts in anticipation of the participation awaiting them.[29]

This default setting requires teaching all these instruments at an entry level, coping with *heterogeneous* grouping and thus with *multiple* and *parallel* sequencing of technical progress. The latter is a major departure from the pedagogical default setting of *individual sequencing* where students progress at their own rate by moving to ever-new and technically more demanding literature. With multiple and parallel sequencing—and entirely in line with the participatory template—students perform on a part designed for their present stage of ability. This requires arrangements that have very simple parts and other parts that progressively involve more complex and demanding skills. Students progress from easier parts to more difficult versions of the same pieces at their own initiative.[30] This practice also accommodates transfer students who thus can immediately participate.

In one instance, this approach remedied a totally dysfunctional practice where teaching assignments by building in a wealthy suburban school had resulted in middle school instrumental teachers teaching general music classes—something they were unprepared to do and did unenthusiastically. An obvious solution was to have them teach instruments. After the school's purchase of such instruments and a series of workshops, the new default became very popular with students—including minority students, despite the folk literature. However,

_____

there is no reason to be restricted to that literature, although it can have certain educational advantages.

In a small rural school, the success of this participatory format in middle school general music classes provides a foundation for a level of high school music participation that is, I think, without equal. In a district of fewer than 900 students K-12, fully 200+ are enrolled in high school music electives—including many general music electives.[31] And students ask to use the facilities outside the school schedule. As a result, this small school has widespread community support for its music program and, thus, four full-time music teachers.

Many students these days can be involved with new music technology. Take for example, the computer software that 'follows' live solo performances of singers and instrumentalists[32] thus affording students the musical rewards of having their solos accompanied. Such experiences while they are still students provides a basis for continued performance throughout adult life as 'serious' amateurs. MIDI instruments make possible performing without disturbing others.[33] And composition software makes possible creating sound tracks for videos, photo shows, and personal websites. Music 'apps' for smart phones and e-tablets are a major industry today.[34] Such technology can be promoted mainly with teacher-guided 'start-up' input and students can then 'learn by doing', as they do with their computer skills. Many are motivated to acquire their own devices and software, and as they become skilled they can serve as peer-tutors to other students—the participatory enthusiasm they have acquired thus being passed on from student to student. Focus on such forms of musicing is often derailed by the exclusive focus on presentational performance and, thus, school music lags far behind the potential offered by such new music technology.

Community musicing

Schools are a major expense in any community. Yet outside of the school day, except for special events and sports, the facilities are not used fully. Beyond the traditional presentational performance default setting, and the benefits of increased participatory praxis, are the benefits of expanding school music to empower greater musical participation by the community.

While this institutional default setting is not as easily implemented as, say, increasing participatory musicing in schools, many steps are possible without much fuss. Take, for example, the earlier mentioned sing-along movement. As noted in the *New York Times* in

_____

2008: "From Hawaii to Santa Cruz to the Philadelphia suburbs, in living rooms, churches and festival tents, . . . gatherings—called community sings, or singalong's [*sic*]—draw together the average-voiced and bring old songs into common memory" (Ratlif 2008, 1) A published song-book literature supports the praxis, yet schools have contributed little beyond occasionally being a site for events organized by non-teachers.

One step toward the school as community music center would be for the school to sponsor such sing-alongs. Singing seasonal songs en masse for 15 minutes at the end of the winter concert would be a good first step. Subsequent sing-alongs can be scheduled where choir students bring friends, parents, or other adults—not just promoting participation but modeling the adult pleasures of participation for students.

During the 70s, there was a migration of 'new age' residents from nearby New York City to my little home town. They converted the defunct bowling alley into a community arts center that offered a variety of arts and crafts (for a fee), including, on a strictly participatory basis, recorder ensembles, madrigal singing in chamber groups, various duets, trios and quartets of classical music, and a choir that performed arrangements of much the same literature that is the repertoire of today's sing-along movement. Such participatory musics can be sponsored by the school; for example, through present structures of adult education. Often others in the community can lead such functions *if* the school promotes and sponsors the activity.[35]

Many schools already have websites that advertise school music events and acknowledge student achievements. These sites can be expanded into a community bulletin board of musical activities and opportunities; a place to find someone with whom to play duets; to locate an accompanist; to find a banjo teacher; or to find students (of any age) eager to play the harmonica. If run largely by students with guidance from journalism or technology teachers, these sites could also involve music blogs and forums of interest to the community; for example, where reviews of new recordings or of certain kinds of musics can be posted,[36] where CD collectors can communicate, and where virtual musical 'clubs' can function.

Classes can be offered to adults and students alike that use the school's music facilities during after-hours. In particular, a variety of participatory musics can be promoted using the school facilities or other local venues. "House concerts" can be promoted and advertised on the community site. This kind of musicing is another popular and growing

_____

musical praxis that has gone virtually un-noticed and un-supported by schools.[37] And whatever happened to "amateur hour" programs? In their heyday they were often competitions,[38] but they can be sponsored—perhaps in cooperation with local music stores, private teachers, etc.—simply as opportunities for local musicians and amateurs to occasionally perform for each other. The more adults involved, the greater the modeling for school-age students of adult musicing—in this case, shared with the community from time-to-time.

Conclusions

The most popular default setting in school music, presentational performance, has typically led to school ensembles 'imitating' collegiate ensembles.[39] The risk has been that these serve the social fact of the *director's* default settings as "musician" more than promoting students' skills and dispositions for life-long musicing. To recall Searle's first element of social reality, it is thus quite unclear what educational or musical "function" these concerts 'institutionalize', so-to-speak. They might be said to provide live music not otherwise commonly heard by local audiences and can show off a group's accomplishments. But they also are all too susceptible to problems of rote teaching, drill, and the like that—while resulting in polished sounding performances—too often do not advance students' skills and dispositions in ways that outlast the school years. They do draw upon "We intentionality," but that lasts only until graduation. And, as Turino noted, those ensembles get smaller and more selective over the school years.[40] A "We intentionality" with a 'shelf-life' of more than eight years is much more likely in connection with chamber groups that embrace many genres, and with other participatory musics. With these, the social and musical 'norms' that are the dispositions to engage in musicing uniquely 'institutionalize' each instance of praxis in people's lives.

Presently, the dominant presentational performance default setting is ill-suited in many regards for school music. It's "functionality" as a social fact is thus called into question. The common criterion that the repertoire 'covered' by presentational performance is a satisfactory "curriculum" (Reynolds 2000) is a default setting that at least needs to be rethought and complemented and enhanced by participatory and chamber musics. And the 'normal style template' of school music also needs to expand to include the community and adult music praxis. As music education identifies new functions to promote (such as

_____

participatory and community musicing), then new forms of collective intentionality will result in new practices, the social fact of each of which will be constituted by its own 'rules' or norms.

The main impediment to such re-setting of the presentational default setting and to the isolated and declining status of school music is the unwillingness or inability of school music educators to address functions (and thus default settings) that have not been promoted or modeled by university schools of music and departments—in particular, those that do not feature the teacher "performing" the ensemble.[41] Lacking these bridges to the vast and highly active music world of participatory musicing that exists outside of schools, music education is likely to continue to find itself isolated, locked into the many limitations of its 'normal' (and taken for granted) default settings. No amount of advocacy of these can overcome the long-term irrelevance of school music for many graduates and most communities. Widening our selective use of other default settings can begin to exploit the fuller potential that school music can offer as its functional contribution to graduates' musical lives and can help it restore its factual status as a vital social reality in the school and community.

References

Booth, Wayne C. 1999. *For the love of it: Amateuring and its rivals.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loesser, Arthur. 1990. *Men, women and pianos: A social history*. New York: Dover.

Ratlif, Ben. 2008. Shared song, community memory. *New York Times* October 2, 2008. Online: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/10/arts/music/10ratli.html?pagewanted= 1&ref=arts. February 2011.

Regelski, Thomas A. 2004. *Teaching general music in grades 4–8: A musicianship approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reynolds, Robert. 2000. Repertoire is the curriculum. *Music Educators Journal* 87(1): 31–33.

Roberts, Brian. 2004. Who's in the mirror? Issues surrounding the identity construction of music educators. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 3(2): July. Online: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Roberts3_2.pdf.

Searle, John. 1998. *Mind, language and society*. New York: Basic Books.

_____

———. 1995. *The construction of social reality*. New York: Free Press.

Turino, Thomas. 2008. *Music as social life: The politics of participation*. Chicago: The
University of Chicago Press.

Notes

[1] For example, influences stemming from geography, climate, and other variables. Thus, indigenous musical instruments are made of locally available materials, as are the 'social facts' of clothing, shelter, food, etc.

[2] For Habermas, "lifeworld" refers to informal, unregulated spheres of everyday sociality; the shared meanings and understandings that provide the context for social dealings with others. The lifeworld is sustained through communication and depends on a pragmatic degree of consensus—thus Habermas' focus on "communicative rationality." The lifeworld is contrasted with the "system"; the public sphere that involves money and formal power structures and that thus features "instrumental rationality." Habermas argues that the lifeworld is being 'colonized' by the system, leading to a growing range of social pathologies in both spheres.

[3] Except that Bourdieu's "habitus" attempts to explain behavior as regulated without obedience to "rules" *per se*. Thus, habitus is both a *structured* (by society, by one's personal history, etc.) and *structuring* milieu of dispositions, values, feelings, habits, dispositions, perceptions, and practices that operate in a particular "field"–the social space or place in and of which such structuring takes place. The music world is such a "field" within which different institutions (e.g., music education, music industry, etc.) are involved in a dynamic competition for prestige, ascendancy, money, etc. (see, e.g., Turino 2008, 25-26). And schools are a field within which different subjects and activities are involved in a competition for limited time and resources. School music has not fared well in this field in many places in the world.

[4] "Strategically," in Habermasian terms; that is, in purely 'instrumental' ways. Thus, *means* are chosen without questioning or rethinking the value of the *ends* at stake, which are taken for granted.

[5] The sociology of education, a topic rarely studied by most teachers, administrators, or politicians, analyzes these default settings. Various sociological theories of schooling (e.g., critical theory, symbolic interactionism, feminist theory, ethnomethodology, etc.), argue for striking changes to the 'standard' cognitive, political, economic, and social functions (i.e., default settings) of schools described by *functionalism*—the sociological default setting for most people and, thus, for most formal schooling. That default position is primarily concerned to transmit and reproduce 'accepted culture', while the newer alternatives focus on the social (and thus evolving) construction of meaning and seek to transform individuals and improve society. See, e.g., deMarrias and LeCompte, 1998, 1-42.

[6] For example, the K-3 general music teacher who insisted on seating students in straight rows of chairs 5 rows deep. Thus, students in the back rows were regularly overlooked, more frequently exhibited 'off task' behaviors, and were not adequately monitored as to their skill

_____

proficiency (e.g., matching pitch, etc.). While this teacher allowed her student teacher to arrange the students in a circle on the carpet when I visited to observe (and thus was aware of the alternative), she otherwise was 'stuck' in her preference for a default setting that was clearly dysfunctional and one that had long-since been abandoned by most music teachers at that level in favor of a circle or having students seated randomly on the carpet, either arrangement allowing the teacher to move among them at ease (along with other advantages).

[7] This is also true of much studio instruction where private lessons are guided by conservatory literature, standards, and pedagogies (etc.) as though all beginners will (or should) become professional musicians. This default setting, of course, 'turns off' an enormous number of students who resist practicing or quit lessons (in the long-run, usually both). The re-set would be to offer lessons as though all students will become committed amateurs, the best or most motivated of whom can model their efforts on professional standards, as 'serious' amateurs do in sports. These self-selected few can thus reasonably aspire to professional careers or standards.

[8] Source uncited.

[9] "Obviously the musicians in any type of ensemble participate with each other making music, and so they will experience many of the social and musical aspects such as syncing described for participatory music. But the goals of presentational musicians go beyond this to fashioning music for nonparticipating audiences, and this goal generates a variety of different values, practices, and style features that distinguish the participatory and presentational fields. Participatory music is *not for listening apart from doing*; presentational music is prepared by musicians for others to listen to, and this simple distinction has many ramifications" (Turino 2008, 52; italics original).

[10] Often, in fact, the progressive result of the aforementioned attrition—voluntary, encouraged, or enforced—of those less interested, less committed, less advanced students who nonetheless deserve performance options suited to their musical and other needs—needs often not addressed by the typical presentational default settings of school-based large ensembles. Worse, such a semblance of excellence can and often is the result of rote teaching and a host of other pedagogical default modes that work against developing independent musicianship on the part of students of the kind that can sustain musicing of all kinds throughout life.

[11] It is difficult not to wonder whether this is due to the fact that the teacher/director is not publicly seen as, and thus credited with, "performing" the groups in question. A young middle school teacher who did include chamber musics in her concerts was criticized by her colleagues for "not being good enough to 'pull off' a full band concert"!

[12] A paper delivered at the *Nordic Network for Research in Music Education Conference* (April 2011, Copenhagen, Denmark) conclusively demonstrated the problems of individual skill development in large ensembles. Using close-up individual microphones and multi-track recordings, individual singers were compared and leaders/followers were identified. The problem, of course—and as this paper clearly demonstrated—is that the leaders can be wrong! Thus, in the rehearsal studied, the tenor section actually got more inaccurate as it progressively followed a confident singer who was singing the wrong notes! Contact Sverker Zadid for details of research still in progress: sverker.zadig@oru.se.

_____

[13] One was the wife of a music faculty member and conservatory piano graduate, and the others were wives of non-music faculty who had studied music as collegians, but not towards musical careers. All three had infants and met in the home of the pianist, whereupon they deposited the babies in a bedroom and pursued their musical pleasures for several hours a week.

[14] The wind players also transposed parts so they could perform music originally composed for other instruments. Today, they might avail themselves of inter-library loan services. Thus, certain 'non-musical' skills (such as locating new music) should be part of praxially-focused music education.

[15] Condoleezza Rice, former U.S. Secretary of State, an accomplished concert pianist in her youth, regularly performs chamber music with a group of lawyer friends, all of whom are conservatory graduates. Booth (1999) details the hugely popular world of chamber music "amateuring" where enthusiasts travel around the world just to spend time participating with like-minded others and where 'concerts' or 'recitals' are not the point: *performing sociality* and "music as social life" (Turino 2008) are the focus.

[16] Thus benefiting other ensemble members in audience-listening skills—skills that are not necessarily the same as the listening skills needed to perform; e.g., exposure to chamber and solo literature, listening holistically (etc.).

[17] In one school, after a short chorus concert, choir members move to the school cafeteria where a platform is set up and, in a casual (and highly social) cabaret ambiance, perform solos and small ensemble literature (of all imaginable kinds!) *for each other*—again profiting audience listening competencies of peers—to wonderfully supportive peer support, accompanied by treats prepared by their parents. Many students thus learn, for example, how to use a microphone.

[18] And literature; for example, four-hand reductions of symphonies, etc. An Internet search of "piano duos" and "piano four-hands" reveals a wide range of repertoire lists for all levels of ability.

[19] I am reminded of the minister attending a summer workshop who early every morning (too early!), on the bluff behind the dormitories, 'practiced' his trumpet (i.e., played through his favorite tunes) to no one's pleasure beyond his own. And of the father who, after loading the van with his wife, son, and an array of camping gear, struggled to find room for a guitar. To my compliment about his son bringing the guitar along on vacation, he replied: "It's mine. I always bring it when we go camping."

[20] On the sing-along movement, see Ratlif (2008). More on this default setting below.

[21] E.g., embouchure, just getting the instrument to respond, and developing flexibility in tone production, fingering, dynamics, tonguing (etc.).

[22] E.g., recognizing and hearing skips of chord tones, scalar passages, upper and lower "neighbor" tones (etc.).

[23] This teacher presented a session at the state convention. The default settings of teachers who attended were so pronounced that, very quickly, many started to leave (impolitely)—finding the whole idea of sacrificing the scheduled choir rehearsal to be preposterous—and, by the end, only a handful remained. Some choir teachers have a scheduled choir rehearsal

_____

period *and* scheduled voice classes. Often, however, the chance for the latter to engage in participatory chamber musics is spent, instead, on drilling the notes of the chorus literature. The same is too often the case for instrumental teachers whose individual or group (often sectional) 'lessons' drill the large ensemble parts—this without even the holistic musical satisfactions of the rest of the ensemble.

[24] Where students were excused from their regular classes on a rotated basis to attend their weekly music lesson. This was in a very small rural school where middle and high school students together constituted "the band."

[25] This practice was abetted by the arrival of a new studio teacher at the local school of music who—to the total amazement and often consternation of his professor peers and their pedagogical default settings—offered a combination of small-group lessons (on the premise that key input for one student was usually applicable to others and should not have to be repeated in individual lessons) and short private lessons that diagnosed and attended to individual needs. The high school band teacher compiled a truly impressive collection of arrangements—published and his own—to facilitate his approach. He was fortunate to have a former gymnasium for his band room and thus these different activities could be spatially separated effectively and, in the presence of the teacher, students were inclined to "stay on task." Teachers who have practice rooms adjacent to their rehearsal room, however, could use them for the two different functions, but the "on task" aspects would depend on the appeal of the music to the students, not on the teacher's presence.

[26] My understanding from student teachers was that the same arrangements were practiced in subsequent lessons until the *students* wanted to move on to a new arrangement, having reached a sufficient level of musical satisfaction from their efforts with the previous arrangement. Arrangements also sampled a wide range of musical styles.

[27] Rick Bunting, *Teaching traditional music and instruments: A classroom approach.* Traditional Music Materials, 8 Kirby Street, Bainbridge NY 13773. Bunting is a former university voice professor, opera director, and choral conductor who returned to public school teaching—talk about a default re-set.

[28] And, thus, providing the 'entry-level' for out-of-school and adult interest in continuing to perform on those instruments. In one 8th grade general music class, a granddad attended to perform on his fiddle along with his granddaughter, who he had taught to play country fiddle and who thus had an outlet for it in school.

[29] In one school, some years later a "graduate" of these classes became the teacher, thus continuing the tradition. Otherwise the school is small and does not offer strings.

[30] See Regelski 2004, 214-225, for details and examples.

[31] Westfield (NY) Academy and Central School. Contact Kent Knappenberger (kknappenberger@WACS2.wnyric.org) for details.

[32] Formerly known as Vivace® and now part of the SmartMusic system: http://www.smartmusic.com/Educators/Research.aspx.

[33] And plenty of other advantages and practices made possible by the software.

_____

[34] See, e.g., Rob Walker, "The machine that makes you musical," *New York Times Magazine* 11/27/2011: http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/27/magazine/smule.html?pagewanted=all.

[35] For example, rather than waiting for interested local musicians to propose a particular musical activity, school music teachers can seek out such likely people, who thereafter become responsible for it.

[36] These could originate as writing assignments in music, English, and journalism classes, but also could solicit input from interested community members.

[37] See, e.g., http://www.concertsinyourhome.com/ or search "house concerts" on the Internet for evidence of both the popularity of these events and for ideas about sponsoring them.

[38] Alas, as a 14 year-old, my sole foray into this praxis—a Beethoven piano sonata movement—resulted in a third-place finish, after a yodeling guitar player and an accordionist playing a medley of favorite polkas.

[39] American teachers cannot even begin to comprehend a default setting for school music that does not feature presentational ensembles directed by the music teacher; but that is exactly the default setting in Japan! There, ensembles are "clubs" run and conducted by students (using school facilities) with very little teacher input; usually, only 'coaching' the student-elected conductor(s). Peer teaching is the norm, including of band and orchestra instruments. In fact, teacher training in Japan involves only voice and keyboard students who will become general music teachers. The 'tail-wagging-the-dog' situation with American school-based large ensembles is also quite rare in much of the European Community.

[40] Even schools that offer non-auditioned, general membership ensembles often suffer from attracting a small and declining percentage of the total student body, and these ensembles also fail to develop independent musicianship skills for life-long musicing, and fail to engage or promote the participatory ethos described by Turino (2008).

[41] A separate case can be argued for the greater presence in higher music education of participatory musicing that would thus serve as model for, and as validation of, the many life-enriching forms of participatory performance. These might be advanced if started by music education professors (and students) and made available to all majors—including non-music majors. Many of the latter have given up their musicing for lack of opportunities outside of "school music" and are often intimidated by (or not capable of or unwilling to submit to) the high standards required of presentational performance groups of music majors.

About the Author
Thomas A. Regelski is Distinguished Professor of Music (Emeritus), SUNY Fredonia NY. He took his Master's degree in choral music education at Teachers College, Columbia University and his PhD in Comparative Arts at Ohio University. He is the co-founder of the MayDay Group and, in addition to over 85 published journal articles, is author of *Principles and problems of music education* (1975), *Arts education and brain research* (1978), *Teaching general music* (1981), *Teaching general music in grades 4-8* (2004), and co-editor (with J.T. Gates) of *Music education for changing times* (2009). He is presently a docent at Helsinki University (Finland).