# Songs of Resilience

# Songs of Resilience

Edited by

# Andy Brader

Songs of Resilience, Edited by Andy Brader

Meaningful music making for life Series, Book 3,
Series Editors Steve C Dillon & Elizabeth Mackinlay

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Evolutionary science will go someway towards explaining the book's snake design cover. I was invited to edit this volume after reading about resilient snakes in Australia. Biologists have shown that the toxic cane toad has placed evolutionary pressure on snakes to adapt their body shape. Certain species of snake have grown longer, an adaptation that makes them better able to survive their toxic meal. The most remarkable aspect of this adaptation is the speed at which it took place. These changes in body length have arisen over the past seventy years since farmers introduced the cane toad to Australia. These snakes have evolved to become resilient to cane toad's poison because of their desire to thrive. Each snake derives its physical capacity for resilience in response to the conditions to which it is exposed; its access to, and availability of resources – in the snake's case - natural and environmental ones. Similarly this book seeks to show how musicians, as members of ecological human systems, are evolving to master the sophisticated amalgamation of statistical and qualitative indicators with their music practices. Like the snake successful music practitioners will adapt to become more effective at helping others' thrive in adverse conditions. Over time, they will document social and individual gains in well-being and happiness more effectively.

# PREFACE

> Not only have measures of well-being and happiness ceased to rise with
> economic growth but, as affluent societies have grown richer, there have
> been long-term rises in rates of anxiety, depression and numerous other
> social problems (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010 p.5)

This is a quantifiable research statement presented in a recent scholarly
book aimed at general readers. In that book – *The Spirit Level* – peer-
reviewed articles from reputable economics and health professors support
the statement above with overwhelming international, large-scale statistical
evidence. As a whole, their evidence clearly shows that for the first time in
human history the poor are, on average, fatter than the rich; that developed
countries with high income disparity display a propensity towards
isolation and mental illness amongst individuals, whilst those countries
with closer income equality consistently score higher on happiness and
well-being indicators. Although this causality debate requires more careful
scrutiny of data, the inference that a strong correlation exists between
national and state based income inequality and major health and social
problems is beyond reasonable dispute.

*The Spirit Level's* research findings have implications for musicians,
artists, health, education and social work practitioners who work in both
rich and developing countries to sing songs of resilience. Whether they
like it or not, these large-scale statistical comparisons of health and social
indicators signal the backdrop against which funding applications are to be
justified, won, and lost. The politicians in most countries nowadays,
whether large or small, rich or poor, recognise the importance of
promoting artistic and cultural events, which bring citizens together
peacefully and voluntarily. Most national, federal, and state governments
also subsidised a mixture of public/private partnerships for such gatherings
through their social, cultural and economic policies.

Creative practitioners whose work (paid or voluntary) intersects with these
policies and funding arrangements can all benefit from ascertaining, and
reporting on, the levels of well-being, happiness, and equally depression,
distrust, and anxiety in their local region and respective countries. As *The
Spirit Level* further disseminates this statistical analysis, aligned with what

Schultz & Northridge (2004) call the "Social Determinants of Health", these indicators will become increasingly significant measures of successful music projects.

Many skilled practitioners manage to demonstrate that sustained musical activities can contribute to reductions in anxiety, depression and numerous social problems, and they are well established in networks throughout the globe. Some of them have contributed to this book. They continue to show us that an ability to focus the outcomes of a music project toward a health, education or social intervention is complicated because it can often detract from artistic intention, group dynamics and the like. Yet the well-connected authors in this book believe in their own and others' ability to share expertise in order to find a common-ground where evidence-based research, storytelling and music making sit alongside one another in a collegial manner.

This book, the third in the **Meaningful Music-Making For Life** series, is intended as a call to action for creative practitioners to report on musical successes against reputable indicators in meaningful ways. All musicians know what they do – musically that is – can act as a source of power and inspiration. And in modern societies musicians certainly serve several purposes. But I for one wish more of the general public were aware of health, education and social researchers reporting quantifiable benefits associated with music, and artistic activity generally. This book goes someway towards filling that gap as it documents a series of music practices that report on successes using statistics, narratives, case studies and songs to reflect their resilient attributes. Yet as the editor of this volume I acknowledge that certain things – the musical character and lyrical content of songs for instance - cannot be measured and analysed without losing some of the meaning individuals and groups attached to them.

Twelve chapters were carefully chosen because they represent part of the rich tapestry of resilient music making. Part one offers two review chapters. The first conceptual chapter draws on my own reflections of practitioners aiming to secure and sustain funding for music services that enhance individual and communal resilience. Chapter two presents a psychological review of the contemporary literature on resilience to investigate what we actually mean by wellbeing, quality of life, and resilience. It asks important questions about these constructs validity across domains of scientific research.

I presented an early version of chapter two by Lemerle and Stewart to the rest of the contributors as a conceptual framework that could prove beneficial in their documentation of songs. The book's second section contains the remaining practice-led chapters that all respond to Lemerle and Stewart's provocative review using contemporary and historical songs of resilience from Sweden, the United States, Vanuatu, Australia and England. More than half of the book's contributors are music practitioners for whom this book represents their first publication, and for some of those English is not their first language.

## Song of Resilience online

Early in 2009 Steve Dillon (series editor) and I made a concerted effort to increase the online audio-visual documentation of songs of resilience through a free web service. Supported by the Save-to-Disc Network this WIKI encourages registered users to upload and publish evidence of their songs of resilience online. That developing resource now supports this book as a form of complementary evidence that cannot be represented through text alone. I invite readers to explore the additional audio-visuals supporting each chapter, and more importantly to join us by adding to the collection.

http://songsofresilience.wikispaces.com

## References

Schultz, A. and Northridge, M.E. (2004). Social Determinants of Health. *Health Ed & Beh*, 31(4): 455-471.
Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, K. (2010) The Spirit Level. Penguin Books. London.

# PART ONE:

# REVIEW -
# A SOCIOLOGIST'S REFLECTIONS
# AND A PSYCHOLOGICAL LITERATURE
# REVIEW

# CHAPTER ONE

# PRODUCING BETTER OUTCOMES:
# MUSIC AND PUBLIC SERVICES

## ANDY BRADER

## Introduction

Plato made the following observation about the qualities of music:

> For the modes of music are never disturbed without unsettling of the most fundamental political and social conventions. Republic 424b-c. (Hamilton, 1961, reprint)

Music has played an important role in social life for thousands of years, and its varied forms of communication have significantly influenced the types of public services reported in this book. It is now time for practitioners and academics to sing songs of resilience that reinvigorate the public's understanding of the positive role music can play in all of our lives, and for public services to better resource music projects. The last twenty years have seen major advances in studies of music and its affects on the brain's neuroplasticity, but as yet no one has managed to provide a comprehensive response to Oliver Sachs' (2006) question: why does music, for better or worse, have so much power? This book seeks to demonstrate the power of those music making experiences that bridge the gap between the physical and social sciences across commercial, social and cultural contexts.

Developing resilience through varied modes of music is the common theme of this book's chapters. Internationally renowned and early career academics have collaborated with practitioners to sing songs of resilience; some of which are narratives that report on the effects of music practices for an individual or general population, and some are based on a specific approach, genre or service. Others are quite literally "songs" that demonstrate aspects of resilience in action. These chapters offer one way to gain a clearer understanding of how songs play an important role in the

development of innovative public policy reform across health, education and social services.

In populist terms resilience depicts a capability to bounce back from an adverse experience, but the essays before you examine the concept from distinctive musical modes and perspectives. Detailed research literature on theories of resilience, mostly in the psychology of health and education, has deepened our understanding of how individuals access appropriate resources that assist them in their attempts to bounce back (Ungar, 2008, Stewart et al., 2004; Luthar, 2006). Despite theoretical and ideological differences between these approaches to resilience and how they might inform the public policy reform agenda, they share arguments based on an ecological view of human systems. Resilience and public sector reform literature both argue that the roles information, buildings, roads, infrastructure and facilities play in successful health, education and social service outcomes are often underestimated and misrepresented. Subsequently, a costly education invention that reports on its own success can falsely attribute positive outcomes solely to their intervention without acknowledging the overlapping nature of other services that contributed to the success of said education intervention. Let us take the case of senior citizens in need of basic computer literacy training – they are recipients of ecologically linked public services that are not immediately recognisable in educational interventions. The quality of local libraries, community centres and training providers also make important contributions to those senior citizens' educational achievements, and it is proper recognition of these networked relationships in the reporting of outcomes that is central to ecological understandings of human systems.

In to order make ecological arguments about the value of publicly funded musical activities, the traditional conception of the public sector as set of large, cumbersome institutions that redistribute tax revenues towards essential services must change (James, 2009). According to policy think tanks and political analysts, the future of publicly funded institutions such as hospitals, schools, housing and welfare services in social democratic societies is dependant upon the success of new delivery strategies that focus on co-production processes and outcomes in collaboration with clients (Carey, 2009; Dunston, 2009). Leading figures in policy reform argue that the new direction of public services will have a fundamental concern with relationships, interaction and mutuality (Clark & Newman, 2009; Leadbetter, 2004, 2007). These concerns have been central to the

work of music practitioners for many years, and more recently in online social media networks (Grinnell, 2009).

This book documents projects that have redistributed public funds to engage people from diverse backgrounds in some form of musical relationship. Based on their engagement with these communities, music practitioners and academics offer valuable insights about relationships, interaction and mutuality that should inform these public service reforms. The rest of this chapter ties together my professional and conceptual reflections with the experiences of academics and practitioners who aim to secure and sustain funding for music services that enhance individual and communal well being.

## Music and resilience

The following chapters form a persuasive chorus of social practices that advocate the use of music to help build the capacity for resilience in individuals and groups. As a whole they demonstrate that publicly funded music projects, some of which aim to build resilience, share common features aligned with an ecological view of reform in health, education and social work systems. I hope to make this connection between music, resilience and public services explicit by posing the following questions:

> Do music projects in education, health and social services build a measurable capacity for resilience amongst individuals?

> Can we replicate these projects' outcomes to develop a capacity for resilience in diverse cultural groups?

> Does the shared use of the term resilience help to secure funding for innovative musical activities that provide tangible health, education and social outcomes?

In order to discuss the challenges facing public services, they need to be set in the context of book's main focus - the role of music in building an individual and group capacity for resilience. Some definitions are required from specialists in each area to make these connections explicit.

Denora (2003) suggests the active properties of music have shifted our focus from the music and society paradigm towards socio-musical research, which posits the "socialising role of music in its broadest sense" (p.175). I define music as a socialising medium of communication where

humans orchestrate instruments to create patterns with sound and silence. These sounds and silences are often arranged as songs, both literal and metaphoric, which include organised and intentional performances, spontaneous outbursts, rehearsals, recordings and listening activities. I am well aware that this definition is biased, culturally and historically available to English speakers, and along with my questions, it is applicable to most art forms. I intend it to accommodate different perspectives of music as well as the dominant western understanding – itself multiple and contested. I intend this definition to further inform practitioners' ability to discern more tangible outcomes for people who currently participate in socio-musical activities.

Ungar (2008) outlines a three-part definition of resilience that speaks directly to social workers, nurses, teachers, youth and community developers as well as those people facing adversities with whom they work in collaboration. Ungar argues that most theories of resilience have focused on characteristics of individuals, but currently these theories are better understood from an ecological perspective that implicates those mandated to help in the process of intervening. He states:

> First, resilience is the capacity of individuals to navigate their way to resources that sustain well being; second, resilience is the capacity of individuals' physical and social ecologies to provide these resources; and third, resilience is the capacity of individuals and their families and communities to negotiate culturally meaningful ways for resources to be shared (2008. p. 23).

In the next chapter Lemerle and Stewart expand on this definition to include the availability and accessibility of resources required by individuals, families and communities in public health systems. Ungar makes a similar point when he describes the matrix of service providers and community resources that support wellbeing. Yet the second part of Ungar's definition, which refers to ecologies, does not fully acknowledge the persistence of structural inequalities that fuel unequal access to resources, nor the micro level power relations between local clients and their service providers. Ungar's definition is strong, but like previous individualistic theories of resilience, it underplays the powers that markets and communities bring to bear on an individual's ability to navigate their way towards appropriate resources.

As a sociologist I take my view of power from Touraine (2000) who argues that we live in a period of de-modernisation, where all human

subjects have to develop their own strategies to reconcile the power that markets and communities exert upon them. In this context the capacity to access resources that provide individuals with the capabilities to realise resilience is repeatedly thwarted by the interplay between overarching forces of macro level market conditions and micro level communities of practice. How frustrating it must be for a person experiencing mental anguish to have a practitioner inform them about resources that may help him/her, only to find their access repeatedly blocked by economic and cultural variants that they interpret as beyond their control.

The literature emanating from the field of critical social policy since the mid 1970s (see Titmus' 1974 residual model of welfare) continues to highlight severe cycles of deprivation experienced by marginalised groups in western societies and how this reproduction can act as a self-fulfilling prophecy. More recently this line of argument has been reinvigorated by health and economic statistical analysts, who argue that increases in income inequality are socially corrosive to public health (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). If the capacity for resilience in action depends upon access to appropriate resources, then micro and macro power relations must be acknowledged and reconciled. But who is responsible for making resources both available and appropriate? Public services in health, education and social work certainly have a major role to play in creating, outsourcing and signposting suitable resources, but these providers cannot be held responsible for the myriad of structural and cultural barriers that may hinder group or individual access.

Although inevitable problems arise when we unpack definitions of music and resilience, there are benefits to bringing these concepts together with the ongoing debate about public service reform. I believe that linking these debates engenders a common language amongst health, education and social work practitioners that could extend resources for music projects which increase participants' capacity for resilience.

It is interesting to note that this book's contributors had never described or conceived of their work as "songs of resilience" until the editors invited them to do so. A most fascinating feature of this edited collection is how authors have interpreted and responded to the research literature on resilience using distinct technical registers. All the chapters report on academics and practitioners advocating for music's ability to heal and connect humanity by using justifications based on their own and others' experiences. For example, the language of a socio-cultural perspective that

derives from Vygotskian education theory and the language of socio-ecological perspectives used in public health literature could have both framed this book to argue that social, cultural and environmental factors have been neglected in traditional fields of positivist research and practice. Further examples of divergent terminology in education, health and social work perspectives refer to the names given to resources available to individual and groups. The resources to which Ungar's definition and the public health literature refer are commonly called capitals in sociology literature (see Bourdieu, 2001, forms of capital – social, cultural, symbolic, institutional, or Adam Smith for a much earlier exposition of human capital). It is open to debate whether the language of resources, capitals or currencies is most salient, but until there is a general agreement about which concept to use consistently the problem of evaluating outcomes remains unresolved. I would add to this ongoing debate that consolidating language patterns to report on outcomes which attract and sustain public funding is just one of many solutions. The future version of resources, capitals, or currencies that manages to reach a consensus across disciplines, and accommodates an assessment of macro and micro power relations in action, will have a level of clarity that outweighs current definitions.

## Multi-faceted musical activities in public services

The policy-funding-practice nexus remains complex and requires more contextual description here as it links resilience building activities with all public services, but especially those designed to respond in times when citizens face severe adversity. Admittedly, public services do not carry universal meaning and my understanding of what constitutes them will differ from readers who reside in countries without a historical link to the welfare state model. At a base level, however, my argument should resonate with any reader interested in the effective redistribution of tax revenues towards those citizens in need of additional support.

Since the mid 1990s the theme running through my work has been popular music production in education, youth and community settings across local and national policy contexts. In both a practitioner and academic capacity I have co-produced publicly funded projects (as an employee and volunteer) for fifteen years, where humans interact with and through technologies related to music, education and social justice. In the UK and Australia I have witnessed many policy attempts to regenerate marginalised communities, and I continue to analyse the political shifts and dominant

positions within such public policies whilst also applying for funding to implement and evaluate innovative music projects locally.

My participation in and theorising of these public services relate to what some academics call a crisis of legitimacy for governments charged with the delivery of public services in networked societies. Castells (1999) argues that national governments are too large to make a difference locally and too small to affect global change without sharing sovereign power (see Habermas, 1975, for an earlier exposition of the crisis of legitimacy for nation-states). Most western governments have recognised their crisis of legitimacy, and have moved strategically towards more decentralised and regional decision making. This move acknowledges that governments cannot deliver public services in ecological terms without working in collaboration with citizens as co-producers.

The current reform of public policy, funding and services is a delicate balancing act that requires consideration of and consultation with several stakeholders. Important music projects within this reform agenda present cutting edge action research projects that evaluate the effects these resilience-building activities have on individuals and groups. The questions I presented in the previous section arise from framing music projects in this way, and fundamentally they are about the currency of the term "resilience" and its uses in reporting the outcomes of public services that involve musical activity.

Of course public services encapsulate levels of complexity that this synopsis will not discuss. There are however general trends in proposed reforms that cross traditional political boundaries and commentaries from key policy think tanks (e.g., Demos and other "think tanks"), academic journals (e.g., Critical Social Policy) and politicians of all persuasions (e.g., Liberal, Labour, Conservative, Green, Independent) agree that a whole-systems approach to public services is the future, and that it will be organised poles apart from the fiscal model of social policy outlined in the Beveridge Report of 1942 (Abel-Smith, 1992). Whilst the use of information and communication technologies provides us with an almost infinite range of joined-up possibilities, the current vision of reform remains focused on the efficient allocation of scarce resources. For example, Leadbetter (2009) describes the future of smart public sector reform as a move away from services where governments do things "for" and "to" it citizens towards a co-production model. This is hardly a new concept for those who engage disadvantaged communities with musical

activities, and in response, practitioners have outlined some of the specific problems with youth participation in such social work reform (Brader, 2010; Carey, 2009), but still acknowledge the general reform agenda as necessary. In order to engage with this debate, and to argue that musical activities have an important role to play in these ongoing discussions with government, I summarise the direction of this reform agenda in three areas.

First, public services dealing with acute health, education and social needs demand "conversations at critical junctures, not just transactions" (Leadbetter, 2009, p.2). The dominant policy discourse supporting this reform agenda states that better outcomes depend on the quality of this interaction. Those espousing this agenda argue that instead of simply providing a hospital bed or schooling service, most people in crisis want to discuss all their options with a knowledgeable professional. Accordingly, public health professionals should follow up the unfortunate conversation, "you have X condition and require Y treatment", with in-depth discussions that inform clients about the possible combination of service options.

In terms of music related activities, this could involve a purposeful conversation with a mental health client about the individual benefits of music therapy and the social benefits of participating in a group activity. Both options require a concerted resource allocation for that mental health patient, yet the type, cost and outcomes of these resources vary dramatically. Whilst one client might build their capacity for resilience through an informal music group, another might require costly one-to-one therapy sessions to arrive at a satisfactory and sustainable outcome. Regardless of the outcome's cost there are several musical options available for mental-health clients that require conversations, not just transactions. Stephen Clift and his colleagues argue in chapter six that amateur singing groups perform a proactive health function, which provide a measureable difference to participants' sense of wellbeing and quality of life. These issues – about the preventative role music can play in producing better health, education and social outcomes – rarely form part of the public service reform debate, but they should.

Second, government policies of the future will aim to create a greater sense of capability in consumers of public services. A popular example taken from this debate focuses on recuperative care for the elderly, where the aim is not to continue provision, but to withdraw it over time. Many education and juvenile justice strategies share a parallel concern with this example; they try to re-engage and/or rehabilitate those at-risk and youth

offenders with mainstream norms and values. In the future this capability to resume a former lifestyle, or adhere to mainstream norms and values, is presumably accomplished through more informative conversations at critical junctures.

This focus on increasing consumer capability in the pursuit of better outcomes also refers to self-help and at-home solutions that provide combinations of face-to-face and technologically mediated modes of delivery. Take the case of the child with a speech impediment who is offered outpatient care after intensive therapy sessions facilitated in a local education setting. As the capability to sing has been well documented as a suitable coping strategy for those who stutter (Colcord & Adams, 1979), it would be appropriate in this situation for a health care professional to help their client access information about singing groups and other relevant resources through whatever technology is available.

Third, scaling new solutions for large populations is a major interest for governments and it is inevitable that the public servants who administer them will encounter the brunt of client complaints. Traditionally, increases in public spending implied institutional investments made on our behalf, in buildings, facilities and wage increases. Nowadays the ecological and networked basis of all complex human systems means that investment in one part (usually a visible part) of the network is particularly difficult to evaluate because it affects and is influenced by other parts. Leadbetter (2009) cites the statistics of fires in homes, which have fallen dramatically over the last ten years because of relational variables such as cheap smoke alarms, less smokers and more accessible information about flammable materials. The traditional government solution to the reduction of fires in homes was to invest in more fire engines, which are expensive, inflexible infrastructure assets with high-fixed costs locked into multi year finance arrangements.

According to Leadbetter, historically most public service investment has been in metaphoric, reactive fire engines. In the current economic environment a wise institutional investment of public funds would opt for the solution that has the most ecological breadth and scope. The cases presented in this book offer examples of ecologically minded investments in users and providers of musical activities and their micro level resources, which together can provide the conditions necessary to sustain the capacity for resilience amongst individuals and groups.

In terms of musical activity that builds a capacity for resilience, I argue that this notion of ecological public services has the potential to account for outcomes within which music has played an often-invisible part. It is now widely accepted that the quality of information, buildings, roads, infrastructures and facilities play a large part in successful health, education and social service outcomes, but they are rarely acknowledged in evaluations of current schemes. Take a mundane, but crucial example of role that musical activity plays in the delivery of key public services. If we include listening to music as a well-being activity that nurses have documented as a beneficial health intervention (McCaffrey & Locsin, 2002), then the number of public services using music as part of their delivery mode increases exponentially. Presenting citizens with social opportunities to listen to music in youth and community centres, schools, aged-care and prison facilities, hospitals, public recreation areas and festivals is a good use of public funds, which is a difficult, but not an impossible task to evaluate. This ecological argument for scaling up and decentralising public services through co-production serves the interests of those advocating increases in funding for musical activity because it makes the (often auxiliary) uses of music more visible.

Music has saturated social life to the extent that we often forget how much we are exposed to it on a daily basis. Take a minute to consider this all encompassing concept of music and the number of uses it has within major and ancillary public services such as health, education and social work. Then consider this expanded view of the role music plays in social life alongside public health research, which shows that the vast majority of positive health outcomes actually happen at home or five minutes from home at the pharmacy or local doctors. This view of reform in public health resources, focused on home and community based systems, is slowly replacing the traditional view of public service funding, so that fire engines and other large physical investments are peripheral, not central costs. If this reform agenda becomes a reality and public services of the 21st century start allocating more resources from a "needs and outcomes" perspective, and less via the visible institutions such as hospitals and schools, then socio-musical activity that builds the capacity for resilience has a bright future. Such a move towards a more efficient, needs-based public sector relegates the "to and for" and promotes services "with and by" clients in collaborative, interactive relationships built on mutual benefits.

# The evaluation problem

Successful long-term solutions for public services will learn to identify the complex type and nature of adversities to which individuals and groups are exposed. In a crude distinction these experiences of adversity take two major forms – those that are insurmountable and those that are not. Adverse conditions that can be overcome are also referred to as structural experiences of social exclusion or marginalisation (see Byrne, 1999), they are often simultaneous, overlapping and ephemeral, and they are frequently reported to produce what seems like a single continuous negative experience for many individuals. Public service providers have a history of treating these adverse experiences as static states of being that somehow remain constant through time and space so that an individual's experience of adversity is not reflected accurately by the public systems providing access to social and economic resources (Brader, 2010).

These forms are distinct from the chronic type of adversity in which a physical or mental condition has obvious no cure (see chapter nine where Donald DeVito's depicts Autism Spectrum Disorder as an enduring form of adversity). According to Lawford & Eiser (2001), the nature and frequency of adverse experiences determine the types of life skills necessary to adapt and traverse that experience, whilst also determining the specific resources that may be accrued. The implication for those providing publicly funded socio-music activities is that individuals and groups with health, education and social issues, which tend to overlap and change frequently, require iterative assessments of need; the solutions have to be ongoing, flexible and measurable over time and across different spaces.

The traditional fiscal model that funds and delivers health, education and social work provisions are being challenged from several angles: cultural studies, sociology, social and positive psychology, community organisations, public health promoters, narrative arts and alternative therapies. Active practitioners in these fields are making significant inroads into public policy and funding, and especially in private healthcare where several non-medical therapies are now accepted as legitimate. Large-scale research studies agree that the published literature lacks an overview of rigorous empirical studies, which summarise and compare successful music-based projects claiming to build a capacity for resilience (Sachs, 2006). Those reviews that have managed to address such concerns have organised their reports around themes associated with primary

medical outcomes. It would appear many researcher/practitioner teams are involved with their own musical specialities in ways that inadvertently overlook the collection of valuable formative and summative assessments that support ongoing research into music's multiple and recurrent value as a social practice. For example, there are possibilities for music projects, funded and delivered through the public health sector, to agree upon a set of risk/protective factors and map their progress against an education project that uses the same terminology to report on distinct but related outcomes. Elements of this crossover between education and health initiatives exist in this book (Lemerle & Stewart chapter two, Harris et al., chapter four) but these examples have also encountered difficulties when trying to report on outcomes using the appropriate discipline terminology. A shared language would offer both sectors opportunities to report on improved outcomes that build the capacity for resilience and provide larger, longitudinal datasets that strengthen the claims each sector makes about the role music played in these outcomes. In short, the type of research reviews required cannot proceed without some agreement on common terms of reference.

From my perspective three terms require more detailed investigation and resolution: 1) Risk factors 2) Protective factors and 3) Resources. I assert that trans-discipline working definitions of these terms need to be agreed upon as the basis of research questions, data gathering and reporting, in order for there to be a comprehensive evaluation of music's ability to assist individuals and groups build a capacity for resilience. This definition must incorporate an analysis of local and global power relations that affect individuals and groups' abilities to create and access appropriate resources. Viewing the entire public sector as part of an ecological system necessitates that these terms be defined in ways that all stakeholders can report upon, understand and relate.

Risk factors have been dominant indicators in education, health and social work for more than two decades now. These well-established concepts change according to the time and space in which they are investigated. The way researchers and practitioners interpret risk factors often transform the overall direction of their project and the reported outcomes. This leads to inconsistencies across disciplines that report on divergent research outcomes, particularly in studies about strategies to overcome adversities. As a concept risk has been criticised for being overly individualistic (see Beck, 1992, and Douglas, 1992) and in this context it could lead a research team to report attribution errors about perceived risks from medical or

education perspectives. For example, Abbot-Chapman's (2008) research demonstrates that support and protective factors are adult-centric concepts, which assume that young people engaged in "risky" activities do not "trust" in the ways that adults expect.

Similarly, protective factors in policy and practice have been criticised for not fully incorporating informal support networks (Brader, 2010; Rutter, 1990), thus attributing any positive outcomes to an intentional and formalised health, education or social work intervention. Protective factors and certain family and social resources are often used interchangeably to depict qualities that fend off adversities. To properly evaluate the positive benefits of diverse music activities that claim to build a capacity for resilience, these inconsistencies in terminology need resolution so there can be a general consensus about how we identify, intervene and report on risk and protective factors.

We also need to agree on what it means for individuals and groups to access resources. As mentioned before, the theories used by several education researchers (Grenfell, 1996; Albright & Luke, 2007) use Bourdieu's later work (2001) to argue that economic, social and cultural forms of capital have shaped our understanding of resources in modern societies. Both embodied and objective states of these capital forms have expanded to now include symbolic, institutional, psychological and organisational subtypes. Regardless of the exact typology and its relationship to Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus and doxa, there is a direct correlation between the ways academics talk about the acquisition, development, decline, use and access to resources that build the capacity to resilience, and this notion of capitals. When disciplines display divergent ways of explaining the same phenomena, and respond in contrasting ways to those facing persistent adversities, they often compound rather than alleviate inequitable access to resources. Neither this nor the following chapters can resolve this important issue, so I encourage readers to ask questions about their own interests and specialist areas whilst reading this book. Take time to consider the in/visible networks of power relations between music, resilience, public services, risk and protective factors, capitals and resources within your field of practice.

# Discussion

Reformed public policy in its broadest sense aims to produce proactive, efficient solutions in collaboration with citizens, and innovative music projects certainly have a role to play here. Despite current attempts to reform political and social conventions of the day, traditional models of funding musical activity in health, education and social work prevail, and there is a lack of coherence in the growing number of approaches challenging them. To sustain funding that allows resilience to flourish amongst individuals and groups, socio-music projects need to evaluate their outcomes in a more structured fashion that does not comprise nor over formalise their flexible modes of delivery and diverse practices. Promoting this critical mass of work and research surrounding music without homogenising the diversity of practices presents an arduous mission.

Music continues to prosper as an artform, commercially and as a social practice in formal, non-formal and informal modes. Physical and social sciences remain fascinated by its effectiveness and prolific appeal, which has made music adaptable and amenable to technological advances in commercial, governmental and community fields. From classical to rock to hip-hop, we have witnessed the articulation of rebellion and critique through music. Sachs, DeNora and contributors to this book advocate for musical activity as a legitimate form of socialisation in and of itself. Yet history reminds us that musicians are generally resistant and sceptical towards being enrolled in the delivery and marketing of products and services other than their own. We know that music already plays an ancillary role in many public services, and that it is gaining ground as a form of therapy and alternative education in its own right. What then is the best way forward for those interested in improving the status and acceptance of music, and the arts more generally, in public service reform?

I started this chapter with Sachs' question – why does music have so much power? Whilst Sachs talks of music's impact on the individual, and DeNora its ubiquity within everyday social life, I have argued that its power is derived from its ability to traverse and connect the networks of individuals and groups, in and through, markets and communities. Producing better outcomes for those experiencing both ephemeral and continuous adverse conditions requires music practitioners to communicate and document the development of sustainable resources that lead to a resilience-building capacity. These resources are present in physical,

virtual, individual, social, cultural, and economic forms; it is proper and right for musicians, practitioners and academics to work with their peers, colleagues and clients to identify and capitalise upon the (in) visible values they provide.

# References

Abbott-Chapman, J., C. Denholm, et al. (2008). Social support as a factor inhibiting teenage risk-taking: views of students, parents and professionals. Journal of Youth Studies 11(6): 611-627.

Abel-Smith, B (1992). The Beveridge Report: Its origins and outcomes. Blackwell Synergy - International Social Security Review, Volume 45 Issue 1-2 Page 5-16, January 1992. Retrieved 2008-05-19.

Albright, J. & Luke, A. Eds. (2007). *Pierre Bourdieu and Literacy Education*. London: Routledge/Erlbaum.

Beck, U. (1992). The Risk Society: Towards a new modernity. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). The forms of capital. In M. Granovetter & R. Swedberg (Eds.), The Sociology of Economic Life: (2$^{nd}$ ed., 96-111).

Brader, A. (2010). *Youth Identities: Time, Space & Social Exclusion*. Saarbrucken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Carey, M. (2009). Critical Commentary: Happy Shopper? The Problem with Service User and Carer Participation. British Journal of Social Work 39(1): 179.

Castells, M. (1999). The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Volumes I, II, and III." Journal of Planning Education and Research 19: 211.

Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (2009). Elusive Publics: knowledge, power and public service reform. In: Gewirtz, Sharon ed. *Changing teacher professionalism: International trends, challenges, and ways forward*. UK: Routledge, pp. 43–53.

Colcord, R. D. and M. R. Adams (1979). Voicing duration and vocal SPL changes associated with stuttering reduction during singing. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research 22(3): 468.

DeNora, T. (2003). Music sociology: getting the music into the action. British Journal of Music Education 20(02): 165-177.

Douglas, M. (1992). *Risk and Blame: Essays in cultural theory*. London: Routledge.

Rutter, M. (1990). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology 3, 49-74.

Dunston, R., A. Lee, et al. (2009). Co-Production and Health System Reform–From Re-Imagining To Re-Making. Australian Journal of Public Administration 68(1): 39-52.

Grenfell, M. (1996). *Bourdieu and Education*. London: Falmer.

Grinnell, C. K. (2009). From Consumer to Prosumer to Produser: Who Keeps Shifting My Paradigm? (We Do!). Public Culture 21(3), 577.

Habermas, J. (1975). *Legitimation crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hallam, S. (2001). "The Power of Music. The strength of music's influence on our lives." The Performing Right Society: MCPS-PRS Alliance.

Hamilton, Huntington & Cairns (1961). *The Collected Dialogues of Plato Including the Letters*.  New York: Pantheon Books, 340, 1294-95, 665-66, 643-44, 1174-75.

James, O. (2009). Evaluating the Expectations Disconfirmation and Expectations Anchoring Approaches to Citizen Satisfaction with Local Public Services. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 19(1), 107.

Lawford, J. & Eiser, C. (2001). Exploring links between the concepts of Quality of Life and Resilience. Pediatric Rehabilitation 4(1): 209-216.

Leadbeater, C. (2004). Personalisation through participation: a new script for public services. London: DEMOS.

Leadbeater, C. and H. Cottam (2007). The User Generated State: Public Services 2.0. Public Matters: The renewal of the Public Realm, London: Politicos: 95–116.

Luthar, S. (2006). Resilience in development: a synthesis of research across five decades. In Cicchetti, D. & Cohen, D.J. (Ed). (2006). Developmental Psychopathology, Vol 3: Risk, disorder, and adaptation (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons.

McCaffrey, R. & Locsin R. (2002). Music listening as a nursing intervention: a symphony of practice. Holistic nursing practice 16(3): 70.

Sacks, O. (2006). The power of music. Brain 129 (10), 2528.

Stewart, D; Sun, J; Patterson, C; Lemerle, K; & Hardie, M. (2004). Promoting and building resilience in primary school communities: Evidence from a comprehensive "health promoting school" approach. International Journal of Mental Health Promotion 6 (3): 26-33.

Titmuss, R. (1974). *Social Policy*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Ungar, M. (2008). Putting Resilience Theory into action. In Liebenberg & Ungar, *Resilience in Action*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto pp.16