

Appendix B

Student Survey

1. How many days a week did your ensemble rehearse?
2. How many minutes was each rehearsal?
3. Approximately how many years of teaching experience did your director have?
4. For any given piece your ensemble was preparing to perform, how much time would be spent on:
(Please use a scale of 0-5, zero being never and 5 being every rehearsal)
 - a. the history of the piece? _____
 - b. the theory, form, or analysis of the piece? _____
 - c. listening to and/or evaluating what you hear (whether your own group or a professional recording)? _____
 - d. activities related to the piece that required you as students to either improvise or compose? _____
 - e. relating the piece to culture and the other arts? _____
5. How often would your director invite students to comment on how they feel the performance of pieces could be improved? (Circle one)

Never

Occasionally

Often

Every Rehearsal

Appendix A

National Standards for Music Education

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.

Walker, Darwin E. Teaching Music: Managing the Successful Music Program,
2nd ed. Belmont, CA, 1998.

Wiggins, Jackie. Teaching for Musical Understanding. New York, 2001.

- Mark, Michael L. Contemporary Music Education, 2nd ed. New York, 1986.
- McCarthy, Cameron et al. Sound Identities: Popular Music and the Cultural Politics of Education. New York, 1999.
- Mursell, James L. Principles of Musical Education. New York, 1927.
- Music Educators National Conference. Music in American Life Commission VI: Music in the Senior High School. Washington, D.C., 1959
- Paynter, John. Music in the Secondary School Curriculum: Trends and Developments in Class Music Teaching. Cambridge, 1982.
- Pontious, Mel. "Comprehensive Musicianship Through Performance: A Paradigm for Restructuring." Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Available at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsis/cal/mucmppap.html>. Updated 5/3/2002. Accessed 8/19/2005.
- Reimer, Bennett. A Philosophy of Music Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1989.
- Rideout, Roger. "Whose Music? Music Education and Cultural Issues." Music Educators Journal, 91 (4). 2005. pp. 39-41.
- Rodriguez, Carlos Xavier; ed. Bridging the Gap: Popular Music and Music Education. Reston, VA, 2004.
- Ross, Malcolm. "What's Wrong with School Music." British Journal of Music Education, 12. 1995. pp. 185-201.

Bibliography

Barret, Janet R. "Planning for Understanding: A Reconceptualized View of the Music Curriculum." Music Educators Journal, 91 (4). 2005. pp. 21-25

Boardman, Eunice. Dimensions of Musical Thinking. Reston, VA, 1989.

Choksy, et al. Teaching Music in the Twenty-First Century. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Dunbar-Hall, Peter. "Colliding Perspectives? Music Curriculum as Cultural Studies." Music Educators Journal, 91 (4). 2005. pp. 33-37.

Elliott, David James. Praxial Music Education: Reflections and Dialogues. Oxford, 2005.

Elliott, David James. Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education. New York, 1995.

Green, Lucy. "The Music Curriculum as Lived Experience: Children's 'Natural' Music-Learning Processes." Music Educators Journal, 91 (4). 2005. pp. 27-32.

Hanley, Betty and Janet Montgomery. "Challenges to Music Education: Curriculum Reconceptualized." Music Educators Journal, 91 (4). 2005. pp. 17-20.

House, Robert W. Instrumental Music for Today's Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.

Madsen, Clifford; ed. Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education. Reston, VA, 2000. Available at <http://www.menc.org/publication/vision2020>.

Music teachers need to build their programs from a strong foundation that will withstand pressure from critical administrators and tight budgets that threaten to undermine their programs and reduce financial and other support. This sturdy foundation comes from upholding a philosophy that incorporates aspects of music that go beyond singing and playing instruments. Once this philosophy is in place, the next step for the field of music education is to provide teachers with sufficient training in how to teach comprehensive musicianship, so that they can successfully carry out the philosophy in practice. If teachers can start with this philosophy and then actively apply it to their classes, the profession will be well on its way to proving that the school subject of music is both musically and educationally valuable.

The field of music education has already started down this path; it just needs to keep working to get all of its members moving confidently in the same direction. Finally, the field needs to maintain forward progress in this direction. It needs to be careful not to fade and lapse back into the familiar territory of only preparing concerts, as has tended to happen historically within the profession. Music educators need to continue following both the guiding light of the modern philosophy and the steady heartbeat that first gave the profession life: teaching musical skills that will be useful to the students in society.

More research similar to this study should be done in the music education field. Larger subject pools and a wider geographical range would be very useful to get a better picture of the state of the profession. More studies like this one can help show music educators that there are deficiencies in the favored performance-based curriculum. This evidence can then help boost the profession into more unified and confident action toward an improved curriculum.

Conclusion

Historical and current practices of American music education seem to reflect that the profession values keeping performance of music as the central part of the curriculum. It involves actively experiencing the subject, thus engaging students in learning, as well as giving students an authentic experience rather than a simulated one, such as the tests that other academic subjects utilize. However, evolving music education philosophy emphasizes a need to go beyond mere performance to increase the subject's value for students' lives. Incorporating more comprehensive musicianship knowledge and skills into music classes would accomplish this goal by giving students useful tools for interacting with music in society. As the results from my research suggest, comprehensive musicianship does not currently have enough presence in schools to meet the profession's philosophical goals. Although my research data is limited in size and geographical range, it seems to suggest a trend of programs focusing too narrowly on performance to support the stronger educational philosophy that the field is trying to uphold.

Standards. This data all suggests that the profession does in fact have problems teaching to the standards through performance-based curriculums.

Comparing the students' answers to the teachers' answers shows very similar data regarding amount of time spent with each of the National Standards. Students appear to be picking up on the musicianship content of these lessons when they do occur. The responses were not as similar, however, for the amount of input students get to make for musical decisions in class; twelve per cent of students reported never being asked for musicality suggestions, as opposed to zero per cent for teachers. This suggests the possibility that some teachers are not inviting as much student musical opinions as they think they are. However, it is important to note that one limiting factor in my study was that the teachers and students surveyed did not come from the same school programs, and therefore the comparisons are not entirely accurate in reflecting teacher and student discrepancies. More studies, particularly ones surveying a group of teachers and their own students, should be done to further explore the possibility that music educators are not teaching everything they think they are.

Overall, this study supported my hypothesis that most teachers are using performance-based curriculums, and that the amount of coverage of the National Standards is low. However, it contradicted my secondary hypothesis that teachers with fewer years of experience teach music more comprehensively than teachers with more experience. My study found no correlation between the two items. This is an interesting finding, since professional organizations such as MENC have been making efforts in recent years to promote more comprehensive musicianship training in teacher education. It is a topic that would be interesting to further explore in other studies.

minutes per week; there were not enough different types of programs for me to make a useful comparison in this aspect. For teaching experience, I sorted the subjects into the following groups: zero to five years, six to fifteen, and sixteen or more. The average answers within these groups were all very close to the overall averages; thus there appears to be no significant correlation between amount of teaching experience and type of learning that occurred in the classroom.

Discussion

A broad view of my results highlights a few significant findings. First, it is worth noting that all of the subjects from both the student and teacher pools reflected music programs in which performing ensemble classes were the main component. While some of these programs also had other music classes, such as theory, appreciation, or jazz, the part of the program common to all subjects was the traditional performance ensembles. This suggests that most Wisconsin music education programs focus on the performance-based approach, as opposed to the newer proposed methods such as the popular music approach, the world cultures approach, or the creativity approach.

Another important conclusion that seems to result from this study is that inclusion of the National Standards in local Wisconsin music classes is relatively low. The highest average of these standards was listening and evaluating, with a 2.7 from the students and a 2.8 for the teachers, which is still only a middle-range figure. Three of the five categories relating to standards were even below 2.0 averages. Further, a significant number of students seem to be missing out entirely on one or more of these National

improvisation and composition activities, and 1.2 for time spent relating music to culture and the other arts. Sixty-four per cent of the students reported a zero in at least one category. Twenty-eight per cent reported zeroes in two or more categories.

The teacher subject pool revealed averages of 1.9 for history of music, 2.1 for music theory and analysis, 2.8 for lessons in listening to and evaluating music, 0.9 for improvisation and composition activities, and 2.0 for time spent relating music to culture and the other arts. About forty-two per cent of the teachers reported a zero in at least one category. Only eleven per cent reported zeroes in two or more categories.

Regarding the question about students giving input to musical performance decisions, twelve per cent of the students responded every rehearsal, forty-one per cent answered often, thirty-five said occasionally, and twelve per cent reported never. For the teachers, twenty-two per cent said every rehearsal, forty-four per cent answered often, thirty-three per cent responded occasionally, and zero per cent claimed never.

When asked how well they felt they had been prepared to teach comprehensive musicianship, given the choices of not prepared, minimally prepared, and thoroughly prepared, sixty-five per cent of the teachers answered minimally prepared, thirty-three per cent said thoroughly prepared, and two per cent claimed not prepared.

The final analysis performed dealt with sorting the subjects into different pools based on the answers they gave to the logistics questions and then looking at the average answers to the curriculum questions again within the new subgroups, to see if there were tendencies to respond a certain way for teachers with similar amounts of teaching experience and class time per week. However, when I tried to sort the subjects by class time, I found that almost all of them reported ensembles that meet between 200 and 250

music classes were offered, and one asking how well they felt they had been prepared to teach music in a comprehensive style.

In accordance with my design, I had two pools of subjects. The students I surveyed were members of the UW-Oshkosh Symphonic Band. They had all graduated from various high schools within the last four years, and they all participated in high school music classes. The teachers I surveyed were all current secondary school music teachers in Wisconsin. The participants were volunteers who were attending the Wisconsin Music Educators Association state conference. Both the student survey and teacher survey were conducted in October 2005.

Results

Since the study involved two different sets of subjects, I analyzed the responses separately, and then compared the data to find similarities or discrepancies. For the series of questions relating to the National Standards, I first tabulated how many of each number, from zero to five, was recorded for each separate musical aspect, then I performed two different analyses on this data: average number on the scale of zero to five, and percentage of subjects who had at least one zero. For the question about how much student input was invited for making musicality decisions, I calculated the percentages for each of the four possible responses: never, occasionally, often, and every rehearsal.

The student subjects reflected average responses of 1.5 for history of music, 2.3 for music theory and analysis, 2.7 for lessons in listening to and evaluating music, 1.3 for

have been teaching for more than 15 years, on the other hand, would not have had college training concerning the new approaches to music curriculum.

Methods

The design of my study involved two parallel questionnaires: one directed at students, asking them to describe their secondary school music class experience (See Appendix B), and one directed to teachers, asking them to describe the secondary music classes they teach (See Appendix C). This type of design allowed me to compare student and teacher perceptions on the topic of curriculum.

The two versions of the survey included the same questions, simply reworded to match the subjects toward which they were directed. The first part of the questionnaires involved logistical questions, specifically concerning amount of class time per week and number of years the instructor had been teaching. These were intended to determine if amount of class time or teaching experience correlated to the type of curriculum used.

The second part of the questionnaires asked the subjects to approximate how much class time was spent on learning music history, theory and analysis, listening and evaluating, improvising and composing, and relating music to culture. Subjects were asked to use a scale of zero to five, zero being never and five being every rehearsal. These questions reflect aspects of music that the National Standards dictate should be taught. Finally, the surveys asked a question about how often students participate in musical decision-making, because this is a large part of developing musicianship. The teacher version of the questionnaire had two additional questions: one asking if other

evidence from studies. Consequently, I was very curious to find out whether it was truth or myth that the majority of music teachers in secondary schools are stuck in performance-based programs.

I wanted to investigate the types of lessons that are currently occurring in secondary music classes. Specifically, I wanted to know if music educators are including all of the National Standards, as set forth by MENC, in their teaching (see Appendix A). I also was interested to learn whether or not music teachers are actively involving students in making their own musical decisions. Having students take part in suggesting musical improvements is important because it develops student musicianship much more than situations in which students simply follow the teacher's instructions. It also fosters a learning environment with the students, not the teacher, at the center, as highlighted by one of the recent modified approaches to curriculum. Finally, I was curious as to whether amount of teaching experience, time schedules, availability of other music classes, and preparation to teach comprehensive musicianship affected the types of lessons music teachers are teaching.

My main hypothesis was that the majority of teachers are teaching performance-oriented programs, rather than any of the newer methods. Further, I expected that within these performance programs, the amount of time dedicated to lessons involving the various National Standards would be low, as most of the class time is spent preparing for concerts. Concerning the secondary interest of my study, I predicted that teachers with only a few years of experience would be including more comprehensive musicianship and activities working toward the National Standards, because these are the directions toward which the profession is supposed to be training its new members. Teachers who

Advocates of performance curriculums claim that they teach about music through making music, but a lot of the problems in the field surround debate about this belief. Some critical educators point out that performance is often unreflective, becoming merely technical skills (Bowman 150). The profession could gain a lot from investigations into what students are actually learning in music classes – whether they are just experiencing music and learning how to play instruments, or whether they are really gaining musicianship skills that they can use to interact with music in their daily lives. Such evidence could help unify the field’s belief about the best approach to teaching music, and solidify its determination to move toward one direction to improve its curriculum.

Problem

The absence of unification is a problem in the field of music education. On the one hand, having a lot of different methodologies to draw from is a great resource for teachers. However, this same benefit becomes problematic when the profession as a whole attempts to state its philosophies and objectives, because the different approaches uphold different beliefs.

The problem is further complicated by the belief that many music teachers are not actually working toward the ideas they claim to stand for, but instead are merely directing pieces for performance. Currently, this thought is largely conjecture; I did not come across documentation proving this to be either true or false. I have often heard somewhat casual comments that music students are just learning to perform specific pieces and not learning larger goals of musicianship, but these statements don’t seem to be based on

performance groups reinforcing one another and combining their aims (Chosky 158). Goals for this type of program include helping students to gain insight into the nature of music, relate and synthesize isolated facets of musical experience, and view music with a global perspective (Chosky 119). This approach also advocates studying music across cultures and time periods and actively involving students in the learning process through personal discovery and immediate use of music concepts (Chosky 123). Comprehensive musicianship is most likely a widely accepted curriculum because it combines aspects from all the other innovative approaches. This benefit also ironically contributes to its greatest difficulty: teachers must be well-rounded in music, knowledgeable about world music and popular music, and comfortable with the use of composition and improvisation as teaching devices.

Many music educators follow the route of merely defending performance-based curriculums. After all, they have been in place for more than half a century, and thus certainly have many benefits. One of the strongest points in favor of performance is the widespread belief in education that physically experiencing things is the best way to learn. Many music educators express similar beliefs specifically for their field (Paynter viii, House 102, Music Educators National Conference 50, Elliott 1995, 266). The famous educational psychologist Howard Gardner stated that practicum models of instruction, like performance curriculum in music, may be the means of instruction that best suits the way most young people learn (Elliott 1995, 270). Another popular aspect of performance programs is that they foster deeper understanding of music because they present it as it really exists in life, instead of teaching isolated and abstract knowledge out of real context (Regeleski 227).

culture. Instead, they have been written by American or European composers and are labeled as cultural because they include some stereotypical characteristics of music from Asia or Africa or other parts of the world. This is not the type of music that this curricular approach advocates using; it is important to remember that this approach promotes the use of authentic music – music written for people of that culture by people of that culture.

A different, subtler type of curricular change involves reconceptualizing how music is being taught, rather than what is being taught. It's more about organization and philosophy than content. It asks teachers to reconfigure what they are doing, not abandon it (Barrett 23). This restructured curriculum fosters spiral, connective learning as opposed to linear, sequential lesson plans (Barrett 22). It also centers around student experience; teachers are supposed to step back a little from their role as directors to engage the students more in making musical decisions (Barrett 24). In general, this type of curriculum aims to enhance students' independent musicianship (Hanley 43). The most important goals with this method are deeper student interpretations of music and greater insights about the role of music in their lives (Barrett 25). It is quite feasible to work this type of approach into the existing performance-based curriculums, as it would simply require some minor adjustments to what music teachers are comfortable with already. This makes it a promising possibility for the field.

The most popular recently suggested curriculum is based on comprehensive musicianship. It's built on the premise that all facets of music study should be integrated and related (Chosky 115). Comprehensive musicianship programs are ideally started in the elementary schools and carried on through high school, with all the music classes and

in a performing ensemble, but it would be a different type than the traditional bands and orchestras.

One drawback to this approach is that doesn't necessarily open students up to a wider world of music, since it sticks with the pop culture products with which they are already familiar. It would also require entirely different resources than those in place in most schools across the country, because the nature of pop music calls for different instruments than band and orchestra music. In general, this method is radically different than existing music curriculum, and would require a lot of major changes for instructors, administrators, and students.

A much less drastic curriculum adjustment is a method based on world cultures. Educators who promote this approach advocate that it solves music education's biggest challenge: relevance (Dunbar-Hall 37). By learning to appreciate music of different peoples, students meet the educational goals of gaining tolerance and worldly perspective. The cultural-studies curriculum focuses on the social impact different musics have on individuals and societies around the world. Lessons are similar to those existing in most music programs today in that they still involve listening, performing, discussing, and analyzing music, but from a pluralistic standpoint, taking into account authentic cultural practices and perspectives (Dunbar-Hall 36).

One important aspect to note about this approach is that for it to be truly successful, teachers must present the music as it really would exist in that culture, and teach things that are important about the music to the people who created it, rather than forcing a Western influence on it (Dunbar-Hall 36). Similarly, a lot of music already exists that claims to represent other cultures, while in truth it didn't really come from that

education as the country experiences severe budget problems and more educational reform favoring “academic” subjects.

New approaches have begun to be tried accordingly. One suggested route has creativity at the core of its values and goals. This type of program largely abandons traditional performing ensembles, instead suggesting teaching musical techniques and structures, and from that starting point leading to a lot of student exploration and experimentation, based on professional works (Paynter 39). Creative activities motivate students, because they like the opportunity to use their own ideas in classes, as two studies in England suggest (Ross 188). Further, musical play allows students to learn from their mistakes, thereby individualizing learning and enhancing retention of that learning (Ross 195). This type of program was found difficult to maintain, however, as its energy tended to burn out after a few weeks (Paynter 43). The good thing about it was that it worked toward improvisatory and compositional goals, so it may be beneficial to keep in mind for use as a unit or subset of a broader program.

Another recent approach utilizes music of popular culture. Advocates of this method point out that students have great interest in this music, so they are motivated to participate in learning (Green 29). Young people also identify with this music. Through this collective identity, the students experience the social and historical context of music; they are part of a musical community (McCarthy 448). Lessons in this type of program usually involve a lot of listening, as well as identification and imitation of musical elements in the popular music. Students might also learn to improvise and/or compose based on trends they encounter in the music (Green 29). Activities can be conducted on both an individual and a group basis. Consequently, students can still experience music

reform as part of an attempt to beat the Russians in future endeavors. Although the original focus of the educational reform was on the core academic subjects, music also got caught in its momentum (Reimer 218).

Thanks to these national education reforms and the money they suddenly made available to the schools, the field of music education worked toward incorporating more comprehensive musicianship through the performance classes already in place. A group of professionals gathered in a special meeting called the Tanglewood Symposium to establish a set of goals for the type of music education people should receive (Walker 298). Projects such as Young Artist Competitions and Composers-in-Residence were created to give students professional, real-life experience, and saw some success where funding was available (Walker 294).

Since then, however, as the hype of needing to beat the Russians began to fade in the early 1970's, so did the zealous efforts to improve education, and music programs largely regained comfort by sliding back to the state of their familiar, performance-oriented curriculums. Studies in the 1980's showed that students completing music courses were still not prepared to interact with music independently; they were not learning the cognitive skills of musicianship (Boardman 2).

A critical look at all those positive projects and advancements even reveals that they still shared a reflection of the primary focus being on performance; they were fitting goals of musicianship into the performance curriculum already in place, rather than making them of central importance in a new curriculum. It makes sense, then, that they didn't leave much of a lasting impact on the profession. Now, within the last decade, the field of music education is again feeling pressure to prove its worth or be cut from

educators' philosophical views (Reimer xi). It held such a prominent position because it essentially stood alone until 1995, when David Elliott, having found limitations in Reimer's views, wrote an alternative philosophy, *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education*. His viewpoint focused on musicianship as the central goal of music education, and a praxial curriculum as the best method to achieve it (Elliott 1995, 72). While the two philosophies view music education very differently, both have helped to bring cohesiveness to the profession, giving music educators a solid base from which to work. They have started moving the profession's thinking away from strictly performance curricula, toward broader goals. They both put forth lofty ideals for what music instruction should accomplish.

However, despite the professional organization, advocacy efforts, the carefully argued philosophies, and the National Standards, much of the field is still not following through in action what they believe in theory. Further, many statements of advocacy have been discredited because they boast of learning that is not unique to music, but can be learned through other classes and activities. The validity and importance of music in public schools is still questioned, and programs are still threatened.

While there has not been a lot of action as a result of the philosophies, there have been a few noteworthy instances during the last half of the twentieth century. Most secondary music instruction prior to the 1960's consisted of band, orchestra, and choir ensembles, in which students learned to sing or play the instruments so they could prepare concerts and contests (Music Educators National Conference 50). During the 1960's, however, music education reached a turning point. The Russians launched Sputnik into the air in 1957, and consequently launched our country into educational

The first efforts toward this purpose were made with the formation of the professional organization Music Educators National Conference (MENC), which later changed its name to the National Association for Music Education. Though the organization did not publish an official philosophy, they included philosophical points in the materials they produced. MENC's position was that performance should be the key component of music education, since it is the principal means by which music exists (Music Educators National Conference 7). Further, they believed performance would help accomplish a goal of elevating the level of cultural taste (Music Educators National Conference 7). MENC also published advocacy materials. They cited music as being important because it teaches concentration, direction toward a goal, respect for balance, listening skills, manners, and communication skills (Music Educators National Conference 7-17). They also stated that music contributes to a sense of identity and improves human relations (Music Educators National Conference 19). Finally, a great step was made in 1994, when MENC created the National Standards for Music, giving the field the thorough and cohesive curriculum that it needed to have the stability enjoyed by other academic subjects (Chosky 257).

A lot of the work that has been done toward the unification of the field's goals is philosophical. The first strong and clear philosophy came in 1970, when Bennett Reimer, a leading figure in modern music education, published *A Philosophy of Music Education*, in the first major attempt to unify the field's beliefs and state its positions. In his aim to advocate that music be treated as a valuable and unique subject, he focused on music education as aesthetic education, saying that experiencing art educates feeling (Reimer 37). The document has been so influential that it is still a foundation for many music

the most effective way to teach students to read music (House 19). Then of course there were the many benefits for public relations and character development that helped band and orchestra in their early and middle stages (Music Educators National Conference 17-19). Band, in particular, was very successful, partly due to the new military band development in this country, and partly because teaching kids to play band instruments showed concrete results more quickly than other areas of music did (House 103).

After World War I, music education began to fall further away from its original intentions of providing moral and musical instruction to aid young people in joining society. Band began to be associated with parades and athletic events, and thus was pushed into the commercial realm with uniform companies, music publishers, and instrument producers (House 7). Further, contests were established in the 1920's due to the community-boosting sentiment of the jazz age (House 7), and ensemble directors' focus was distracted away from teaching, and toward winning. Ironically, these new functions helped instrumental music education flourish out of its infancy, but now they are part of the reason it is having difficulty defending itself as an integral and essential part of the school curriculum.

As the field of music education grew and expanded to meet these new functions, it also began to diverge in form. Programs and courses were different, depending on the abilities and interests of individual directors. Music education began to face instability due to this lack of standardized form that other subjects maintained (House 10). From this peak, around the 1960's, music educators began to recognize the need for a more unified and educationally valuable approach to their profession.

improving pupils' musical participation in society. The first singing school recorded was in Boston in 1717, and from there they spread until the mid-1800s (Walker 281). Around that time, the philosopher Pestalozzi asserted that the purpose of education was to develop individuals' talents through direct sense impression and experimentation (House 5). With Pestalozzi's principles as a guide, a man named Lowell Mason officially brought music into the public schools in the 1830's (Walker 289). Lowell Mason was also responsible for initiating a music education program that begins with young children instead of adults (Chosky 7). For many years, however, the curriculum only consisted of learning to sing.

Around the turn of the twentieth century, Will Earhart led an expansion of high school music curriculum to include harmony, music appreciation, orchestra, and band (Walker 293). These new areas of study reflected a belief that musical intelligence and feeling should be taught (Mursell ix). Instructors wanted students to be able to comprehend the elements of music, such as melodic and harmonic structure, and apply them to performance (Mursell 62). They also wanted these student ensembles to play music as perfectly as possible, in hopes of raising the standards of musical taste in youth (Mursell 200), because at that time it was believed that students liked to listen to "uncouth and barbarous music" (Mursell viii). Thus a performance-based instrumental music curriculum was born.

Performance classes became increasingly popular and helped the growth of music education. They were liked because they featured instruction through active and constant application of knowledge, rather than simply promising eventual application, as many academic subjects did (House 102). Instructors also found that performance classes were

valuable for students – an assertion that has faded over time as music teachers worked toward other goals and functions.

If the field of music education can develop, agree on, and implement a curricular approach that imparts to students knowledge and skills that will be useful to them outside of the public school world, it will experience more security and success in the public school system. The learning that takes place in music classes needs to be universal enough and applicable enough to societal life that a general public that isn't well versed in music is convinced of its importance.

Promising advancements in music curriculum have been suggested and tried, but not on a wide enough scale throughout the profession to hold much power. As research presented here will show, many teachers are stuck with curricular approaches that do not have the type of value needed; they still focus narrowly on the skills of performance, which are arguably sound goals musically, but not educationally. The field of music education needs to unify all its branches into both the philosophy and action of one curriculum that is both musically and educationally valuable.

Literature Review

A look into the history of American music education reveals very humble beginnings. The first settings of formal group music instruction were singing schools, which were organized by clergy and other musically skilled people, with the main purpose of improving church singing (Walker 281). Although today this may look like a shallow and unimportant goal, at the time it actually reflected a much broader goal of

Opening Section

American music education was born in 1717 with the creation of the first singing school, a manifestation of society's belief in the importance of learning music in order to interact with it in community life. Since that time, the field of music education has expanded and developed immensely, in keeping with general public instruction. It has established a place in public school curriculum nationwide, and has formed its own philosophies and standards. However, American society is gradually losing commitment to the need for music education to remain in our public schools, favoring the spending of time and resources on traditional "academic" subjects instead. This shifting societal attitude has been creating problems for music education over the last forty years.

What began as well-intentioned educational reform and necessary budget limits has escalated into a severe problem for music education at the current time. Budget cuts continually cut deeper, particularly targeting music and the other arts, since society's present obsession lies with improving students' math, science, and reading abilities. Today, music educators are suddenly finding that they need to defend their programs on a constant basis to avoid having them drastically reduced or even eliminated from the school curriculum.

In response to this growing problem, the music education profession is evolving in attempts to regain a firm foothold in the education system. It is exploring ways to meet contemporary needs while staying true to the goals of its roots: music instruction to aid pupils in society. It needs to demonstrate that learning music is necessary and

Sarah Tauchen

Changing Approaches to Music Curriculum in Secondary School

Dr. Rob McWilliams, Advisor

Paper presented at the UW Oshkosh Honors Symposium, December 8, 2005