Chapter Two: PERSPECTIVES

– The Discourse in Ethnomusicology and Music Education

Introduction
Two major academic areas have made important contributions to the discussion on cultural diversity in the development of musicians and musical thinkers in educational settings over the past five decades (with a few visionary incidents from the first half of the twentieth century): ethnomusicology and music education. In this chapter, a number of the views developed within these and related disciplines such as musicology, anthropology, sociology, educational psychology, philosophy and pedagogy will be discussed.

Ethnomusicology and Cultural Diversity
The Norton/Grove Handbook Ethnomusicology – an introduction defines the discipline primarily as "the division of musicology in which special emphasis is given to the study of music in its cultural context – the anthropology of music" (Myers, 1992a, p. 3). Although this reflects an important aspect of the work of ethnomusicologists over the past four decades, a brief overview of the discipline reveals a history of various approaches, many of which are still part of the practice today, or emerging as new perspectives.

The beginnings of ethnomusicology (and those of its predecessor Comparative Musicology) are usually traced back to Adler’s Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft (1885), although there have been studies that would qualify as ethnomusicology from more than a hundred years earlier. Bor (1988, 1995) and others have argued that studies dating back to the eighteenth century, describing the music of non-Western cultures in considerable detail, are in line with what the discipline represents, and should in fact be considered the first serious ethnomusicological studies.

In the late nineteenth century, the angle seemed to be mostly to study musics from other parts of the world from the viewpoint of the Western researcher, inspired by recent scientific developments, making extensive use of recent inventions for pitch measurement and sound recording. One of the implicit purposes of this exercise appears to have been to establish an evolutionary hierarchy leading to the top of the pyramid, Western art music (Bohlmann, 1988, p. 35). This parallels the approach in anthropological works of the time, such as The Golden Bough (Frazer, 1922).
In the 1950s, the Dutch lawyer Jaap Kunst introduced the term ethnomusicology, which recognised that the connection between individual expressions of music and its creators rather than comparison between different forms of music was a subject worthy of study. In the 1960s, with Merriam's *Anthropology of Music* (1964) as the key publication, the focus shifted away for good from a comparative, evolutionary approach to studying musics. Music was to be studied primarily as a product of the society that produced it.

Initially, the objects of study were mostly 'stable' traditions in relatively stable environments, looked at as a fairly static products of their surroundings. In the 1970s, processes of change were added to the relevant areas of study. The ambitions were set high by John Blacking: "Research in ethnomusicology has expanded our knowledge of the different musical systems of the world, but it has not brought about the reassessment of human musicality which this new knowledge demands. Ethnomusicology has the power to create a revolution in the world of music and music education, if it follows the implications of its discoveries and develops as a method, and not merely an area of study" (1973, p. 4). Blacking added that "it is the task of the ethnomusicologist to identify all processes that are relevant to an explanation of musical sound" (ibid., p. 17), which would include music teaching and learning.

Two of the crucial aspects of change that ethnomusicology identified were urbanisation and globalisation, particularly in the sense of strong Western influence in other cultures. Although these phenomena are addressed at length from the 1980s, early observations go back more than half a century. In *Die Musik der Araber* (1974), Habib Hassan Touma cites Bernhard Lewis, who postulated as early as 1950 that the Arab people have three choices in their further development: to be assimilated in one or another aspect of Western culture, to turn their back on Western culture, or to try to innovate in such a way that a harmony can be reached between the values of the West and the traditions of their forefathers on the basis of equality. Touma continues:

> Now that Arab musician is faced with the same problem of new orientation, like Arab society at large, he has not turned his back on the capitalist West, the socialist East, the Third World, to which he also belongs, nor his own tradition and culture that has been handed down, in order to decide on a clear, transparent, homogenous line of action or thought. (Touma, 1974, p. 129; my translation from German)

In a manner typical of pre-1980s purist ethnomusicologists, and showing little insight into the mechanisms of musical development, Touma implies that holding on to the tradition is the preferred direction. He proceeds by mourning the tendency of contemporary musicians to play to public taste, with "new developments [that] are nothing but horrid deformations of traditionally handed down music by applying foreign elements from non-Arab musical cultures, such as musical instruments, rhythmic structures, form, arrangements, polyphony, orchestration, and the performance practice itself" (ibid.). It is striking how the lively exchange of musical ideas and principles can be considered both as a great creative force and as a mortal enemy to musical practice, with arguments on either side.
The post-modern era may not have brought more clarity, but certainly more of a sense of contemporary realities to the discipline. After referring to Appadurai’s 1990 vision of the global cultural economy as a set of landscapes (*ethnoscap.es, mediascapes, technoscap.es, finanscapes, and ideoscapes*), Slobin convincingly argues that:

The implications of this worldscape for a view of music are worth considering for an ethnomusicology that is itself unmoored from older ideologies, adrift in the movement of technologies and media, and confused by constant deterritorialization of music makers. (Slobin, 1993, p. 15)

In discussions on tradition and change, which has been a frequent theme of conferences in the latter half of the 1990s, musical transmission has generally been an underexposed part of the study of the musics of the world: most publications focus on professional musical practice, genres, instruments, musical structure, and social and cultural context. Few ethnomusicologists have made in-depth studies of processes of musical transmission and the effects these have on preservation and change in musical cultures, while the approaches to education obviously have a major impact on shaping music over generations, as various chapters in this study will try to demonstrate.

In his 1980 article “Ethnomusicology: definitions, directions, and problems,” Bruno Nettl, a recognised chronicler of developments in his discipline, admits that there is a lot of work to be done in this field: “Finally, we are still frustrated by the fact that while we are enormously interested in the development of musics as a whole or as the product of one culture, and as an individual song or piece, over a period of time, and we wish to know how music is created, taught, learned, changed and perpetuated, we realise that we are a long way from knowing the answers ...” (1980, p. 8). Nettl reiterates the importance of this area of research a few years later in his publication on *The Study of Ethnomusicology*: “… a musical system, its style, its main characteristics, its structure, are all very closely related with the particular way in which it is taught, as a whole and in its individual components” (1983, p. 324).

Less than ten years later, Nettl presents a different view of the actual practice: “One way ethnomusicology has changed since the 1950s involves the vastly increased importance of learning and teaching” (1992, p. 388). However, the evidence of this is relatively meagre. The 487-page handbook from which this quote is taken devotes just over one page to teaching and learning. An overview of ethnomusicological work in music transmission in the *New Handbook of Research in Music Teaching and Learning* confirms this impression:

The ethnographic study of music transmission and learning in ethnomusicology predates that of music education. Still, ethnomusicologists and folklorists have spent relatively little time studying these processes or the ways they are shaped by culture. Because of the holistic nature of ethnography, ethnomusicological accounts do frequently contain reference to music transmission and learning; but
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these references, embedded in larger discussions of socio-musicological phenomena, often are very brief or very general. (Szego, 2002, p. 710)

There are some examples that qualify this perception. Szego himself mentions two examples: Booth (1996), who compared the Indian rhythmic system of qaidas to the Western pianistic tradition, and Trimillos (1983), who examined the relative importance of musical and extramusical properties in ancient Hawaiian chant, South Indian drumming, Philippine vocal and Japanese court music (2002, 710). We could also list a number of publications such as Neuman (1980), Berliner (1982), Knight (1984), Gutzwiller (1992), Ranade, (1999), Anderson Sutton (2002), and Stock, (2002). Campbell (personal communication, September 2003) adds recent publications of Wong (1998), and forthcoming articles by Rice and Bakan. Most of these publications do contribute to aspects of understanding teaching and learning world music, and will be quoted in relevant places in the following chapters. However, the literature on this subject remains a relatively modest body of works amongst the multitude of publications and pages devoted to organology, musical structure, history, performance practice, and music in culture, but the publication dates and content do suggest a growing and more focused interest in this subject.

Looking at cultural diversity in music at large, Nettl claims that “what has characterized ethnomusicology most throughout its history is a fascination with, and a desire to absorb and understand, the world’s cultural diversity” (1991, p. 15). However, what I would like to call “the study of music out of culture,” or at least out of its culture of origin, is a subject that has received only limited attention, with Slobin (1993) and Farrell (1997) as notable exceptions. What happens to musical traditions when they are displaced forcefully or voluntarily? A number of studies have been published, predominantly on popular forms of music (e.g. Manuel, 1988; Frith (ed), 1989; Sweeney, 1991) on black music in the Americas (e.g. Southern, 1971), and on musical diaspora (e.g. Slobin, Frith, see above). However, much work remains to be done in this area.

This limited interest for cultural dynamics as opposed to ‘pure’ traditions may partly be explained by what Howard describes as a self-inflicted marginality. He argues that ethnomusicology “is a discipline concerned with the minutiae of obscure musical traditions,” (1995, p. 268) “narrowing our focus to take in only what we perceive as ‘authentic’ or ‘traditional’” (ibid., p. 276). The same limited interest, which Howard attributes to personal tastes of ethnomusicologists rather than a weakness of the discipline, was responsible for an aversion to popular music and a virtual absence of its study as a major force in global musical realities until the late 1980s. From that time, the general attitude seems to have shifted somewhat. When reporting on the meetings with a wide range of ethnomusicologists in the late 1980s that ultimately led to the publication of The Garland Encyclopedia of World Music in 2002, Stone confirms this impression: “For many years, work in the field had emphasized studies centered on geographically bounded units. But a shift to topics that transcended political and
geographical boundaries was beginning in the late 1980s, and this new tendency has increased since then” (2002, p. x). In that way, the road to new approaches to the dynamics of world music has opened up.

It is of some interest to briefly consider how these views have translated into formal (higher) music education. In terms of practice at universities, ethnomusicology in the USA has gone through a slightly different development over the past decades than the Dutch - and indeed than most European - universities. Ironically, it was a student of the Dutch ethnomusicologist Jaap Kunst who instigated the shift in the USA. Jaap Kunst, the great authority on Indonesian gamelan, had probably never actually played a gamelan in his life (Mantle Hood, personal communication, November 1995), and Colin McPhee, scholar of Balinese music, was a violinist rather than a gamelan musician. Nevertheless, in 1954, Mantle Hood decided to start playing on a small Javanese gamelan which he had brought from the Netherlands with his students at the Music Department of UCLA. This small initiative meant “the first American university study group in the performance of non-Western music had been launched. That group of both university students and members of the community-at-large became a model emulated today in many parts of the world” (Hood, 1995, p. 56). The new approach gained Mantle Hood both praise and scorn. A colleague from the East Coast told him that he was referred to as “the Dean of ethnomusicology,” but also as the “mad professor who sits students on the floor and has them beating pots and pans in the name of music” (ibid.).

In 1960, Mantle Hood published his now classic article “The Challenge of Bi-Musicality” in *Ethnomusicology*. In it, he distances himself from the view that ethnomusicologists should work from an outsiders’ perspective without learning the elementals of the music themselves: “The basic study and training which develops musicality is known by several names: musicianship, fundamentals of music, solfeggio. I have never heard a musician suggest that this sine qua non might be by-passed, that the beginner should start with musical analysis and criticism.” Yet, he observes “Occidentals … have usually limited their interest in non-Western studies to passing observation, working with informants and museum studies” (Hood, 1960, p. 55). Many of the ethnomusicological publications of the time reflect this methodology.

Hood’s views were followed in the 1960s by people such as Robert E Brown, who established the first world music programme at Wesleyan in the same spirit, in what he describes as “a conscientious attempt to restore the cart behind the horse, with living music as sound in a primary position and ethnomusicology as its subsidiary in a position of support” (Brown, 1995, pp. 7-15). With it, he tried to reverse the approach “of trying desperately to minimise the element of cultural interaction” (ibid., p. 10) of earlier ethnomusicology programs: musical practices and master musicians from other cultures became a substantial part of the program.
In spite of the developments in the 1960s, Mantle Hood feels that his battle to gain acceptance for his views was not won until 1977, when at Indiana University, “I was asked to be on a panel with Alan Merriam, Bruno Nettl and George Liszt to discuss performance in ethnomusicology. Begrudgingly my three colleagues, one-by-one, cautiously conceded that there might be some value in the notion.” He adds, in 1995: “Today, I believe, we can agree that every significant program in ethnomusicology includes training in this kind of performance” (Hood, 1995, p. 58).

This process has advanced slowly at universities in Europe. Although some performance practice may be found at some universities, suspicion towards being an insider has lingered for a long time to the heirs of the scholars who studied world music predominantly by transcribing field recordings in their studies, supported by a rigid division between the worlds of practical training and academic pursuit, which are only now beginning to be reunited (Kors et al, 2003, p. 74). Until the end of the 1990s, it was theoretically possible to obtain a Master’s degree in ethnomusicology at the University of Amsterdam without being exposed to more than a single trimester of gamelan practice once a week. Although the interest of the students tended to make this more exception than rule, the curriculum allowed it in principle. A similar situation existed at other universities in most of Europe (ibid., p. 78).

It is not certain whether this has been an entirely counterproductive situation, as it did give Conservatoires in several places, such as Rotterdam, the possibility to develop extensive world music programmes in an atmosphere of musical practice rather than theory (Bor, 1995, p. 75). And at the time of writing this study, a joint Master’s degree between the University of Amsterdam and Rotterdam Conservatoire is being planned, with a balance between theory and practice.

After referring to the dichotomy between higher professional education and academic courses, Van Zanten observed an increase in performance practice amongst ethnomusicologists in the Netherlands some years earlier (1995, 31). But that appeared to be rather an increase in practitioners than in practical university subjects, as a growing number of students chose to learn a style in some depth outside of the University curriculum. Yet for Europe in general, the dichotomy remains. And the demands the academic world rightfully makes of a scholar on the music of Mozart - considerable understanding of the actual music before one embarks on publishing a book on the subject - still does not apply to the world music scholar in the same way. Many authors cannot play the music on which they publish at professional or even advanced amateur level. This has led Bor to exasperated repetitions of his view: “How can one understand the musician’s view and that of the audience, and at the same time remain a detached outsider? Isn’t this a silly paradox? How long will it take before ethnomusicologists realise that studying music with a questionnaire, a cassette recorder or a video camera will only reveal the surface, the generalities of that music?” (1995, p. 72).
Nowadays, it seems the ethnomusicological misconception about the value of being an outside observer has all but evaporated, and participant observation, including learning the basics of the music, is encouraged (Myers, 1992, 31). But very often it remains at this basic level. Bor argues that “living in a single locale for a year or so can be an interesting and novel experience. But as we are all aware, it usually takes more time to get acquainted with a new environment, and many years of dedicated study to understand and absorb the music one writes about to become sufficiently familiar with the musicians so that the ‘opening up’ about the ‘real’ issues requires even more time” (1995, p. 71). This is corroborated by the experience of many who have had the privilege of delving into a tradition for many years. There are countless examples: when asked when his instrument was invented, an Indian sitar player is quite likely to refer to Amir Khusro in the thirteenth century, although research shows the instrument in fact did not emerge until the eighteenth century (Miner, 1993, pp. 18-24). Similarly, when one asks members of the Baba Allauddin Maihar Gharana how old the father of their style school was when he died, they are likely to answer 106 or 109, while evidence points in the direction of 89 (Schippers, 1998). This is not an expression of ignorance or of dishonesty, but rather a sense that exact chronology is less important than attributing an ancient beginning to something that deserves great respect (cf Vansina, pp. 173-174).

A young discipline, ethnomusicology still seems to be struggling with a number of fairly basic issues. Yet it is clear that little work has been done on cross-cultural comparison or overviews of transmission systems, which Szego identifies as one of the emergent directions for ethnomusicological research in music transmission and learning (2002, p. 710). This may also strengthen the emerging link to music education, as we will see in the following pages.

**Cultural Diversity and Music Education**

The various approaches to cultural diversity discussed in Chapter One translate remarkably well to music and music education, as we have established. A monocultural approach generates a curriculum in which generally only Western classical music is taught (note that even pop music, also a culture in its own right, has been virtually absent from formal music education in most countries until quite recently). A multicultural approach may lead to a situation where all Turkish students are expected to learn saz and everyone of African descent is expected to become a drummer. A majority of projects in education involving world music over the past decade can be described as multicultural (presenting music form other cultures as completely separate, with a strong link to ethnicity) or intercultural (focus on meeting of musical cultures, as in fusion music). Transcultural music education, to the best of my knowledge, does not exist on any noticeable scale.

Much of the literature on cultural diversity in music education focuses primarily on world music in education, i.e. the practice of cultural diversity within primary and secondary school systems (e.g. Campbell 1994, 1996a/b; Floyd 1996; Volk 1998, Colwell & Richardson (Eds.), 2002). As it is an
acknowledged academic discipline in the United States, the development in the USA is well-documented, and will serve as an illustration of the development of relevant ideas in this field; the discussions on musical structures and the case studies in the following chapters will juxtapose this to developments and perspectives in the Netherlands. In *Music, Education, and Multiculturalism*, Volk mentions a number of approaches to multiculturalism that have developed in general education in the United States. Her analysis supports the argument on approaches to cultural diversity in the previous chapters, although we need to translate the diverse terminology into the language of this thesis.

Speaking of approaches to education in general, Volk mentions four prominent views held by leading researchers in the USA. As early as 1976, Gibson distinguished a form of “benevolent multiculturalism” she calls *Education for the cultural different*, which is aimed at making representatives of other cultures “fit in” a regular school program. Next come the programs that aim at nurturing understanding for other cultures for all students, which she calls *Education about cultural differences*. When education aims at preserving the integrity of specific cultural groups she refers to *Education for cultural pluralism*. Producing competency in a dominant culture and one other is termed *Bicultural education*. When this is taken further and extended to multiple cultures, “leading away from a dichotomy between cultures toward a fuller range of human interactions,” Gibson refers somewhat confusingly to the term *Multicultural education* (Volk, 1998, p. 9).

Banks, a prominent thinker on cultural diversity education, is slightly more direct in most of his terminology, but follows roughly the same pattern as Gibson. He mentions the *Anglo-American-centric model*, which he emphatically describes as a monocultural model, maintaining the status quo. In the *Ethnic additive model*, no changes are made to the educational model either, but information about other cultures is “tagged on.” Banks’ *Multiethnic model* approaches cultures from different angles, with “no one perspective superior or inferior to another,” while his rather misleadingly named *Ethnonational model* in fact advocates a global perspective (Volk, 1998, p. 10; cf. Banks, 2002). These ideas already closely echo the division of approaches as described in Chapter One.

Pratte distinguishes no less than six “Ideologies of Cultural Diversity.” In his view, *Assimilation* refers to learning values and attitudes of the dominant (Anglo-Saxon) culture; *Amalgamation* to learning about “intercultural interaction”; *Insular cultural pluralism* deals with individual ethnic cultures; *Modified cultural pluralism* with learning about multiple cultures; *Open Society* stimulates students to form their own identity irrespective of cultural distinctions; and *Dynamic pluralism* encourages people working together on the basis of mutual concern to “solve the problems of the larger society” (Volk, 1998, p.10).
The fourth and final division of approaches quoted by Volk, formulated by Grant and Sleeter, echoes many of the views expressed above. Teaching the exceptional and culturally different is aimed at the integration of students into mainstream society. The Human relations approach emphasises the need to be able to live and work together. Single group studies are aimed at the study of one, specific culture, as the name suggests. Grant and Sleeter characterise Multicultural education as an affirmation of diversity by “redesigning the educational program so it reflects the concerns of all diverse groups.” Multicultural and social reconstructionist education goes a step further and works “toward a reformed society with greater equity for its members” (Volk, 1998, p. 10).

The apparent diversity of views of these researchers can be simplified considerably by translating them into the terminology as developed in Chapter One. In the table below, the four divisions above are listed with a translation into the terminology of this study in italics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1 Terminology and approaches to cultural diversity in the USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margaret Gibson:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education for the culturally different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education about cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education for Cultural Pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bicultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James A. Banks:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anglo-American-centric model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethnic additive model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-ethnic model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethnonational model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard Pratte:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amalgamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insular cultural pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modified cultural pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dynamic pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carl A. Grant &amp; Christine E. Sleeter:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching the exceptional and culturally different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human relations approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single group studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural and social reconstructionist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the confusion and inconsistency of terminology, it is striking that even at the ideological level, approaches that would be termed multicultural in the terminology of this study are the most common, and that a ‘progression’ in the descriptions from monocultural towards transcultural is shared by all.

The concern for cultural diversity has been reflected in the activities of the key national body for music education in the USA. For decades, the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) has developed activities in the field of cultural diversity in the USA since the late 1930s (Campbell, 1994, p. 67). For a deeper insight into the rationale behind these activities, however, we need to go back another hundred years. In a discussion of the influential Pestalozzian system of learning music step by step (see also Chapter Four), which was introduced in the USA in 1838 by Mason, Volk reports: “Like much of American education in the latter half of the nineteenth century, music education was based on Pestalozzian theory … [and] the song material chosen reflected the cultural standards of American society, which also looked to Europe, particularly Germany, for ‘quality’ music. In this light, it is not surprising that Mason chose to anchor his school music materials in the Euro-Germanic classical music tradition, or that almost exclusive use of this tradition continued to be accepted in music teaching until well after the turn of the century” (Volk, 1998, p. 26).

Mason’s successors incorporated German examples teaching many rote songs before they introduced music reading. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, music from other cultures was not exactly en vogue yet. Mason focused on what he perceived as ‘good’ music in the ethical sense, echoing the ideas on education in Plato’s Republic (Book II, verses 376 – 403; Book V). Volk quotes Mason as stating in 1822: “We should see that the songs of your families are pure in sentiment and truthful in musical taste. Avoid negro melodies and comic songs for most of their tendencies is to corrupt both musically and morally” (1998, p. 27). Embracing new approaches to music was still far removed from thinking on music education.

In fact, the parameters for music education in the West were being firmly set by a number of thinkers on music and music education. Herbart, who was heavily influenced by Pestalozzi, went on to develop a system of scientific, organized lessons with measurable results in the first decades of the nineteenth century. To him, “access to the power of an artwork could only be guaranteed through analysis” (Daverio, 2003). He even went to the point of claiming that the actual sound of a score was an inessential property (ibid.). This emphasis on analysis translated into the note-reading methodology by Holt, as well as the widespread tonic sol-fa system of notation advocated by John Curwen. As Volk states, these were in fact “in conflict with the more Pestalozzian ‘rote first’ approach and the controversy continued until the turn of the century, though both ‘rote’ and ‘note’ methods were accepted in music education” (1998, p.26-27). We find examples of both approaches to this day.
Herbart's views on aesthetics came to full fruition in the key work of Hanslick: *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* (1854; translated as *The Beautiful in Music* by Gustav Cohen in 1891). The formalistic approach to music exposed in this treatise propagated that the aesthetic effect of music could best be understood by its structure (Goehr & Bowie, 2003). This came to greater prominence in the decades to follow, with substantial impact on music education curricula across the world. This featured the work of Schenker in Vienna in the first decades of the twentieth century. As Cook attests, Schenkerian analysis "became more and more widely used after the Second World War in conservatories and university music departments, showing that most compositions in the classical tradition could be understood to be based on a single musical phrase that is massively expanded by a series of elaborations" (Cook, 1998, p.31). These influences may explain why all conservatoires seem to have theory and analysis as core subjects, but few aesthetics. On deeper reflection, this is quite striking in professional training for students whose primary aim it is to become practising musicians.

Other influences of considerable importance were the formal beginnings of Musicology and Comparative Musicology, which are usually traced back to Adler's *Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft* 1885, which we referred to earlier in this chapter. Although it emphatically included the study musics from other parts of the world, it did so from the viewpoint of the Western researcher, making full use of analysis, partly through the recent inventions for pitch measurement and sound recording. According to Bohlmann (1988, p.35), one of the implicit purposes of this exercise appears to have been to establish an evolutionary hierarchy leading to the top of the pyramid, Western art music. This created an atmosphere conducive to raising principles that seemed to work for Western classical music to universal applicability.

The first sparks of interest in what we would now call world music education appeared towards the end of the nineteenth century. The Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) was founded in 1876. "The bulk of the proceedings of the MTNA dealt with vocal production, finger technique and music literature. However, the MTNA was also one of the first forums to acquaint music educators with the musics of other cultures." Volk quotes Japanese music as an example. Yet she concludes that "at the end of the nineteenth century, music education, like education in general, reflected a European viewpoint, heavily influenced by advances in German educational methodology, especially that of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart." As for world music, "at the turn of the century, although music educators were willing to hear about the music of other cultures, music education essentially taught only one music culture, the Euro-Germanic art music tradition." Volk concludes that "the methodologies and materials of the music curriculum of the late 1890s are the foundation of music education as we know it today" (Volk, 1998, 31). She considers the main differences to be the - not inconsiderable - influences of Kodály, Orff, and technology. Although this may seem an overly bold
statement considering the vast shifts in musical material and methodologies used for music education in classrooms in recent decades, an interesting point can be made for the view that the nineteenth century values we have just described, which underly the curriculum, are perpetuated. We will return to this discussion in the context of modes of transmission in Chapter Four.

Real awareness, with some sense of equity, only took effect after the Second World War. In 1968, the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) formulated the landmark Tanglewood Declaration, which states: “Musics from all periods, styles, forms, and cultures belong[s] in the curriculum ... including avant-garde music, American folk music, and the music of other cultures” (Choate, 1968; Appendix A1). In the USA, cultural diversity in music education is still commonly referred to as multicultural music education, but several authors (e.g. Campbell, 1994; Lundquist, 2002) indicate the term is problematic, for the reasons discussed in Chapter One.

Meanwhile, taking a look at the rest of the world, the International Society for Music Education (ISME), established in 1953 by UNESCO, devoted considerable attention to cultural diversity. Marie McCarthyy researched the role of ISME in the promotion of world music in education from its inception in 1953 until the time of writing the article in 1998 (McCarthy, 1999, 12-24). She perceives a gradual rise of awareness of the importance of this field over the decades, and distinguishes between three periods in this development: the stimulation of the East-West dialogue (1953 - 1969); recognition of national cultures (1970 - 1982); and sharing musics of the world (1982 – 1998).

The first period fed on the spirit of ‘International dialogue’ that had been inspired by the recent memory of two World Wars. But as early as 1961, the dream of a ‘universal language’ was discarded by ISME President Gerald Abraham. He rejected an easy emphasis on commonalities, and pleaded for celebrating diversity instead: “What we should do, is to study each other’s musical cultures: try to understand them and appreciate their masterpieces” (Quoted in McCarthy, 1999, p. 14).

This in fact heralded the second period of ISME’s development of a policy on world music, where individuality of individual traditions was emphasised, and during which a fairly static position was adopted towards cultural diversity. In the Conclusions and Recommendations section of the 1974 International Music Education ISME Yearbook, the opening of the section on the education of musicians and their public in Asian and African countries reads:

Music education in most non-Western countries assumes a particular character. It is dependent on personal instruction and is based on a special relation between teacher and pupil. Traditional music instruction is an integral part of the music tradition itself, and one cannot preserve the tradition without preserving its methods of instruction. Changing instruction strikes an inexorable blow at the musical structures. (Kraus (ed), 1974, p. 169)
Although the awareness of the importance of music education in relation to the musical culture was an insight of great value at the time, the last sentence takes away much of its impact with its lack of insight into demonstrable musical realities. Many great musics, including Western classical music, Indian raga music and jazz, have survived a number of these "inexorable blows." At that time - and we can detect this trend to the present day - music educators and musicologists failed to check their conclusions about world music against the source about which they were best informed, Western classical music.

The argument is continued quite intelligently, however, speaking of "the needs of an apprenticeship based on a completely different logic than that which is applied to classical occidental music," and, foreshadowing the discussion in studies like this work: "It is less a question of 'creating' a pedagogy than it is of using a pedagogy that is in the midst of undergoing a transformation" (ibid., pp. 169-170). Tools for understanding this transformation in various contexts are developed in Chapters Four to Six.

In 1990, ISME established the Commission on the World's Musical Cultures. Its manifesto contained outspoken ideas about the importance and approach to cultural diversity in music education, which reflect the developments above, such as the statements that all musical systems are valuable and worthy of comprehension and study, that music should be seen as a cultural universal, but that the world of music should be seen as a group of discrete musics (ISME, 1992; Appendix A2). Basically, this represents a multicultural approach.

During the 1990s, general conferences on music education increasingly devoted attention to cultural diversity. At the 22nd ISME World Conference in Amsterdam, 1996, almost 30% of the presentations were devoted to the subject (Kors et al, 2003, p. 124). As we have seen, the largest organisation for music education in the USA, the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), consistently devoted attention to cultural diversity. The topic featured on the agenda of numerous regional and national conferences. From the 1970s, it tried to assist music teachers to include aspects of world music in the curriculum, culminating in a national symposium on Multicultural Approaches to Music Making with the Society for Ethnomusicology and Smithsonian Institution in 1990 (Volk, 1998, pp. 110-118). This link between ethnomusicologists and music educators is promising for cultural diversity in music education, and beginning to yield its first results, both in practice and thought (e.g. Campbell 1996b, 1998).

Besides ISME and MENC, other international organisations put cultural diversity on the agenda, such as the Association of European Conservatoires (AEC, Vicenza, 2000) and the European Association for Music in Schools (EAS, Riga, 2001). A number of specialist conferences were organised outside of formal music education networks: Teaching World Music 1, (Den Bosch,
Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1992); Teaching Musics of the World (Basel, Switzerland, 1993), Teaching World Music 3, (Rotterdam, the Netherlands, 1995), Music Education in a Multicultural Society (International Music Council, Aarhus, Denmark, 1998), Cultural Diversity in Music Education 1 (Dartington, UK 1997), 2 (Malmö, Sweden, 1999), and 3 (London, UK, 2001). In addition, international traffic has been growing through programmes of the European Commission such as Socrates, with research trips and exchange of students and teachers, and EC-sponsored projects such as Music Education in a Multi-cultural European Society (AEC, 1999-2001) and Sound Links (Academy for Music and Dance, Rotterdam, 2000-2003). The discussions, examples of good practice and outcomes featured in these projects and gatherings have not led to a single solution to the challenges of cultural diversity. However, a greater maturity of thought, better definition of obstacles, and increased coherence in efforts to address these can be observed in the course of the 1990s (e.g. AEC, 2001; Kors et al, 2003). The latter summarises ten key concerns and directions in a pamphlet advising institutions for higher music education on “what to do in case of cultural diversity entering your institute” (see also Appendix A4):

1. Open all doors and windows: receive the new influences in the same spirit of curiosity and receptiveness that have been at the core of most major developments in the history of music across the globe.
2. Set realistic, tangible aims and targets for pilot projects or long-term initiatives, and relate them to the key motivation for including these activities in terms of artistic, personal and organisational outcomes.
3. Be aware that cultural diversity does not only refer to many musical sounds and structures, but also to a wealth of approaches to teaching and learning that can benefit the entire institution.
4. Quality criteria are complicated within traditional conservatoire subjects; activities in cultural diversity call for an even more flexible set of criteria, with fitness for purpose and relevance to context.
5. The success of cultural diversity in higher music education also depends on its position in the structure, ranging from optional workshops to credited parts of the core curriculum.
6. Cultural diversity has been high on the cultural and political agenda for some time. Placing it carefully in the political and funding climate will benefit the activities and the institution at large.
7. As a new area of development, cultural diversity lends itself very well for making connections: in the community surrounding the institute, the national arts world, and international networks.
8. Experience shows that successful initiatives in cultural diversity centre around inspired people, well supported in the hierarchy. This has implications for leadership, organisation and management.
9. Cultural diversity may lead to the formation of isolated islands within the institution. Constantly involving staff and students in planning, process and results will help to avert this danger.
10. It is relatively easy to realise a single, successful initiative. The greater challenge lies in ensuring sustainability by creating a climate that will contribute to an open and inspiring learning environment.

(Kors et al, 2003)
Leading authors such as Volk share the optimistic tone of this pamphlet in her appraisal of the developments over the past decades: "By 1990, music education had come to see Western art music as only one of other equally valid musics in the world. Perhaps the most influential factor in effecting this change in perspective was the contact between music education and ethnomusicology. Music education now advocates teaching music from a multicultural perspective where all musics fit into a music curriculum that is based upon ... the teaching of an understanding and valuing of music" (Volk, 1998, p. 125). Others see no shortage of lofty ideas, but still relatively little actual practice to back it up. When speaking of the activities of the influential Music Educators National Conference, Campbell claims it is “teeming with advocacy papers, and the handful of truly successful projects are too few and far between [...] In this land of unparalleled cultural diversity, the time for rhetoric and happenstance is past. If music education is to survive and flourish in the climate of the next century, it will take the full-scale efforts of musicians and educators ...” (Campbell, 1994, p. 75).

With such limited practice available, a large number of the real questions remain unanswered. Ideas on teaching methods from other cultures are still in their infancy (Volk, 1998, pp. 180-185). In an overview in the *New Handbook for Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, Lundquist states: “Too little is known about bimusicality, about bimusical educators, about kinds and degrees of bimusicality, and the implications of cross-cultural competence for musical life. The picture that emerges is that the gap between vague theory and concrete practice is wide” (Lundquist, 2002, p. 633). Forty years after it was raised by Mantle Hood, there is no evidence that the discussion on bimusicality has extended much beyond ethnomusicological rhetoric and methodology. In 1995, an issue of the *Journal of American Folklore* devoted to bi-musicality did not advance this area significantly by concurring with Hood that it “allows ethnomusicologists to enter into realms of feeling, value and social relations opened up by music and to experience them in ways that deepen and amplify the results of observation and explanation” (Rice, 2003). Although bi-musicality is becoming increasingly widespread (cf Nettl, 1995, pp. 87-89), the literature search for this study has not yielded significant contributions to understanding this specific phenomenon.

Of the literature on cultural diversity in music education that has developed over the past fifteen years, some can be placed in the field known as Philosophy of Music Education. Prominent international thinkers on music education such as Keith Swanwick, Bennett Reimer, John Paynter, Christopher Small, and David Elliott have contributed to the discussion on the subject. Swanwick was one of the first to break a number of preconceptions about music education in culturally diverse settings in *Music, Mind and Education*. He reacted against the strong contextual bias in most practices of culturally diverse music education. “One way of dealing with prejudicial value systems - which can set like concrete around potential musical responses - is to avoid labelling altogether until the music
has really been experienced. Music educators do well to follow the dynamic of the spiral [Swanwick’s model of musical development] and focus first on the ways sounds behave and the necessary mastery of controlling them, along with encouraging the perception and articulation of expressive character and structural relationships; for it is on these elements of musical experience that real valuing is built” (Swanwick, 1988, p. 97). This subject will be looked at in detail in the paragraphs on context in the next chapter.

Besides Swanwick, two major influences on the philosophy of music education in the past decade have undoubtedly been Reimer and Elliott. Reimer, whose Philosophy of Music Education has now seen three editions over more than three decades (1970, 1989, 2003), defends himself against criticism of over-emphasizing music education as aesthetic education in the latest edition of his key work, and addresses cultural diversity extensively. But he expresses himself carefully:

> Are we not being hopelessly idealistic to think that we can be multicultural at will but also disrespectful to each culture’s music outside our own, treating it as so much “material” to be homogenized, or cloned, into a resemblance of familiarity so we can treat it as a tamed, comfortable variation of what we already know? (Reimer, 2003, p. 179)

Although he does not answer this question (rich in implicit political correctness!) in a straightforward manner, it is apparent from his treatment of the issue that he does not see cultural diversity as a reality on the inside of music education, but rather as a foreign presence on the outside, something to be dealt with from an established frame of reference. He does not seem willing to question the basic parameters of an essentially Western philosophy of music education, taking as a starting point the need for people to be rooted in understanding one (Western classical music?) culture, and comes to the conclusion that people can only “genuinely experience” music from other cultures “to some extent” (Reimer, 2003, p. 191). Reimer’s views express an awareness of cultural diversity as inevitable, but rather inconvenient.

Elliott, whose Music Matters has become an important influence on the thinking of many music educators since its publication in 1995, does challenge the parameters of Reimer’s philosophy by what he terms a praxial approach: placing the “praxis” of music making itself at the centre of his philosophy. He sees cultural diversity as an organic part of music education: “If MUSIC consists in a diversity of music cultures, the MUSIC is inherently multicultural. And if MUSIC is inherently multicultural, then music education ought to be multicultural in essence” (Elliott, 1995, p. 207). Simplistic as this reasoning may seem, it does express awareness that for a full understanding of music it is necessary to address cultural diversity. Elliott argues it should be the basis of music education rather than treated as an inconvenient intrusion.

He continues to link culturally diverse approaches to music with the central concepts in his book.
If it is accurate to say that music education functions as culture as much as it functions in relation to culture, then induction into unfamiliar musical cultures offers something few other forms of education can provide. A truly multicultural MUSIC curriculum connects the individual self with the personhood of other musicians and audiences in other times and places. And the effectiveness of music in this regard resides in its essential nature as praxis: as thinking-in-action. A MUSIC curriculum centered on the praxial teaching and learning of a reasonable range of music cultures (over a span of months and years) offers students the opportunity to achieve a central goal of humanistic education: self-understanding through “other-understanding.” (Elliott, 1995, p. 209)

It is interesting to note that Elliott does not see the cultural gap that Reimer identifies as an obstacle for active engagement with world music, but equally interesting is that his aim seems to be humanistic rather than musical praxis. His early analyses of concepts of multicultural music education appear to be based on Pratte, which we discussed earlier in this chapter. He favours Dynamic multiculturalism, in which “musical concepts original to the culture replace a strictly Western aesthetic perspective” (Volk, 1998, pp. 11-12). This addresses one of the challenges Reimer leaves us with, but fails to fully take into account the dynamics of contemporary culturally diverse societies, in which the musical concepts original to individual cultures are increasingly difficult to identify, or have even become irrelevant.

In Bridging Experience, Action and Culture in Music Education, Westerlund discusses the polarity between Elliott and Reimer, and argues that neither of them gives sufficient consideration to the full scope of musical events in relationship to their surroundings. She discusses this in relation to the African concept of ubuntu, which refers to the combination of music, dance and a social event which make up integral parts of many musical events in Africa. She finds the aesthetic focus of Reimer and the praxial approach of Elliott give insufficient emphasis to the importance of the context of a musical event, and therefore cannot make any valid claims about desirable or undesirable situations in music education (Westerlund, 2002, p. 23, pp. 144-147).

While Reimer seems to take the hegemony of Western classical music in the way Cook described it as a starting point, Elliott challenges the core of the organisation of Western music education as creating a modernist learning environment in a postmodern reality. Elliott criticises Western education as “based on modernity’s scientific-industrial concepts, including standardized curricula, standardized achievement tests, teacher-centred methods, restricted instructional time, and age segregated and ability segregated classes” (Elliott, 2002, p. 86). This calls to mind the work of Bourdieu, with his stern criticism of a culture that creates inequality, supported by “an educational system offering (very unequally) the possibility of learning by institutionalised stages in accordance with standardized levels and syllabuses” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 328). Conservatorium curricula and musical skill tests such as the
graded examinations carried out all over the world by The Associated Board of Royal Schools of Music are prime examples of such a system.

These discrepancies between the organisation of education and the spirit of the times seem to be highlighted by cultural diversity. Banks states:

Multicultural education is postmodern in its assumptions about knowledge and knowledge construction. It challenges Enlightenment, positivist assumptions about the relationship between human values, knowledge, and action. Positivists, who are the heirs of enlightenment, believe that it is possible to structure knowledge that is objective and beyond human values and interests. Multicultural theorists maintain that knowledge is positional, that it relates to the knower’s values and experiences … (Banks, 2002, p. 6)

This is an argument of crucial importance to the discussions in this thesis. As I will argue, one of the main obstacles for successful transmission and learning of world music in the twenty-first century is not an active rejection of other forms of music or their value, but a passive threshold created by the structure and organisation of music education.

There is a strong and logical argument to be made (and I hope to do so in Chapter Five) for considering institutionalised teaching as a reflection of the educational views at the time of its inception. Most of our institutionalised music teaching and the ideas underlying it took their present form in the nineteenth century. Consequently, outdated educational ideas on absolute truths and the ability to ‘mould’ a society through a one-size-fits-all educational system may well stand in the way of the postmodern, pluralist musical realities knocking at the door of institutions for music education.

As discussed in the introductory chapter, the subject of this thesis is well-placed in the context of the sociology of music education, which has been described as addressing “both the structure of educational settings and the processes involved in education” (Paul & Ballantine, 2002, p. 566). The sociology of music education is a relatively new field, which has developed since the 1950s, emanating from the sociology of education, which has its roots at the beginning of the last century (ibid., p. 567). The importance of the sociology of music education for the study of music out of context is that it emphatically looks at aspects of music that fall outside the direct production of musical sounds, such as the structures and processes in groups and organisations, the role of the media, the impact of popular culture, choice of culture to be passed on, change in educational systems, achievements in different countries (ibid., pp. 567-568). In considering cultural diversity, these are of evident relevance.

The sociology of education also provides a number of interesting theoretical approaches, such as the view that “structure and interaction reflect each other and must be viewed together to understand educational systems,” leading to possible mismatches by which “students from working class
backgrounds are at a disadvantage in the school setting because schools are essentially middle class organizations" (ibid., p. 570). These thoughts, reminiscent of the writings of Elliott and Bourdieu, reflect the thoughts of Bernstein (1975, 1990), and provide an instrument for looking at possible mismatches between choices in musical transmission and their context through interaction theory.

At the level of educational theory, the concepts of constructivism and social constructivism are relevant. The former "regards meaning-making as an individual process. Learning is facilitated by the teacher by creating 'cognitive dissonance' in order to give opportunities for the learners to reorganize their cognitive maps" (Paul & Ballantine, 2002, p. 571). The latter goes a step further and "focuses meaning making on social interaction" (ibid.), implying a substantial challenge to ideas of absolute truths that can be transmitted through education. Both cognitive dissonance and meaning making through social interaction play a role in the approach to processes of musical transmission and learning across cultures that are the subject of this study.

In an overview of the field, Paul & Ballantine state that many studies in the sociology of music education from the 1960s have addressed five issues: music as a cultural pattern; education as perpetuation of culture; the value of music in society; the role and status of music teachers; and the study of music education being based primarily in the two disciplines of psychology and sociology (2002, p. 573). This underpins the importance of the musical transmission process, as does the work Lundquist, who was actively involved with cultural diversity in American classrooms from the 1960s. In 1986, she formulated a new research perspective as part of a "sociomusical research agenda for music in higher education":

Where the development and refinement of a pancultural theory of music is the goal, the focus of sociomusical research becomes the identification of common structures and processes underlying the relationships between human beings and music phenomena and identifying the principles by means of which they interact.

(Lundquist, 1986, pp. 53-70)

At least at the theoretical level, the scene is set for innovative and in-depth research into cultural diversity in music education.

If we consider the various motivations for teaching world music we have encountered over the past two chapters, approaches driven by sociological considerations stand out: creating understanding for other cultures; stimulating tolerance, global understanding; dealing with ethnic diversity; empowering members of minority groups; stimulating social cohesion; market considerations; and finally teaching music out of pure musical interest. Only one of these motivations is musical: the rest have a real or imagined basis in social processes. For music in schools, each has different implications for choosing specific traditions, materials and methods. Various examples of approaches highlighting non-musical aims can be found throughout this study. In the discussions on a descriptive model, however, the
argument will focus on practices that are chiefly based on the position that music education is primarily concerned with the teaching and learning of music, while other aspects are seen as conscious or sub-conscious side effects.

Conclusions
Considering sources from ethnomusicology and music education, a number of conclusions can be drawn about both disciplines and their interaction in relation to cultural diversity and world music:

- (Ethno)musicology has been devoted to the study of what we now refer to as world music for more than two centuries. Gradually the focus has shifted from descriptions of the product (instruments, pitches, structure) to the process (context, tradition and change).
- The anthropological and sociological approach to world music has recently led to studies on the globalisation of music, rather than exclusive attention for individual traditions in their original environment. Both provide useful backgrounds to the subject of this study.
- In ethnomusicology, there is a growing awareness of the importance of teaching and learning specific traditions. An increasing number of studies address the subject, but much work remains to be done.
- The two developments that have generated the rise of world music education in the West - music travelling and learning music from different cultures than one’s own - have not been studied in conjunction: there is little ethnomusicological research on learning specific traditions out of their original context.
- Music education has its roots, and is still firmly rooted in, the decades around the beginning of the twentieth century. That has created a solid basis for teaching Western classical music. In the past decades, a more inclusive concept of music has begun to be addressed in education.
- Recent major influences on the discipline have been new sociological and philosophical insights, partly inspired by postmodernist phenomena such as the gradual disappearance of belief in absolute truths, the possibility of 'moulding' a society, and the distinction between high and low art. Cultural diversity is increasingly embraced as a force to be reckoned with.
- In music education, particularly in the United States, a large body of works dealing with world music has developed over the past two decades. This includes both practical learning material and theory. It is almost exclusively focused on use in schools, with methodologies that seem to be derived more from school music than based on practices and ideas from the cultures themselves. Although solid conceptual foundations have been established, there is no convincing evidence that substantial new educational practices have evolved from these initiatives to date.

Both ethnomusicology and music education have touched upon a number of issues relevant to understanding teaching and learning world music in culturally diverse surroundings. Ethnomusicology
has contributed to the discourse through its studies into forms of world music in their original environment, and more recently through studies into the dynamics of music in the contemporary world, while music education is becoming aware of the tensions between the positivist ideas - associated with modernity - that inform the structure and organisation of education on the one hand, and contemporary insights in the 'construction' of personal knowledge associated with postmodernism on the other. Music education has also embraced - at least in theory - the concept of cultural diversity. In practice, this is mostly limited to dealing with specific traditions rather than the dynamics of music in the global arena. The promise of a synergy between ethnomusicology and music education has only begun to be explored. This potential will form the basis for the next three steps in the search for a descriptive model for teaching and learning world music: a closer study of approaches to tradition, authenticity and context, an examination of foci of musical transmission and learning, and an exploration of structures for formal, non-formal and informal music education.