Future Prospects for Music Education

Future Prospects for Music Education: Corroborating Informal Learning Pedagogy

Edited by

Sidsel Karlsen and Lauri Väkevä

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Future Prospects for Music Education:
Corroborating Informal Learning Pedagogy,
Edited by Sidsel Karlsen and Lauri Väkevä

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3658-3, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3658-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THEORISING THE FORMAL-INFORMAL NEXUS: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF FUTURE POSSIBILITIES FOR MUSIC EDUCATION PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

In this anthology, we have collated articles that address in different ways what has come to be known as *informal learning pedagogy* within the music education field. Informal learning pedagogy refers to pedagogical approaches that build on strategies found within learning situations or practices outside formal settings, such as school lessons (Folkestad 2006). The aim of this book is to corroborate such approaches by subjecting them to a scholarly examination, hopefully strengthening and further developing the discussion of music-related informal learning in music education scholarship.

In our view, part of the maturation process of any scholarly field is to engage in discussion concerning its appropriate philosophical and theoretical underpinnings. It is also important to consider the areas of applicability and reciprocal relationships between the theory and practice of such frameworks. Thus, the articles selected in this book discuss ontological and epistemological frameworks, as well as both the potential and challenges that informal approaches entail for teaching and learning music.

Informal Learning in Music Education

As musicians, music educators, and music scholars educated within the Nordic field of music education, we have encountered various forms of informal learning pedagogy during our careers. One area where these forms are prevalent is popular music. As of this writing, popular music has been part of Nordic compulsory school music curricula for at least 30 years. In 1971 a music teacher education programme (SÄMUS) was

launched in Gothenburg, Sweden, embracing such musical styles as jazz, folk music, pop and rock (Olsson 1993). The programme quickly spread to Malmö (in 1973) and Piteå (in 1976). Similar programmes soon emerged in the higher music education institutions of the other Nordic countries—for instance, in Finland, popular music has been a part of music teacher training since the early 1970s (Väkevä 2006; Westerlund 2006).

The pedagogical approaches in Nordic school music often build on learning strategies that popular musicians employ when acquiring their skills and knowledge in informal situations or practices. This is reflected in the increase in empirical research on the learning styles, strategies and environments of popular musicians from the mid-1990s onwards (see e.g. Berkaak and Ruud 1994; Fornäs, Lindberg and Sernhede 1995; Gullberg 2002; Johansson 2002; Lilliestam 1995). Such research has encouraged further studies investigating and discussing musical learning in other types of informal learning settings (see e.g. Balsnes 2009; Karlsen 2009; Partti and Karlsen 2010; Salavuo 2006; Söderman 2007; Vestad 2010; Wingstedt 2008).

Since the appearance of Lucy Green's book *How Popular Musicians Learn* in 2001, music-related informal learning has also been a topic of major interest and debate in the field of international music education (see e.g. Rodriguez 2004). Green's subsequent research on the implementation of informal learning in "new classroom pedagogy" (2008) added yet another dimension to the discussion. It also provided something that the Nordic music educators had not yet been able to develop: a comprehensive, research-based popular music pedagogy. Green's work has engendered a new array of pedagogical possibilities, the value of which is acknowledged throughout the field of international music education (Lines 2009).

While the pedagogical significance of informal learning has been debated, sometimes critically, sometimes appreciatively, we find that only a few scholars have engaged in a thorough *theorising* of the formal-informal nexus, and in building a *philosophical basis* for research that further explores the possibilities for music education inherent in informal learning practices. It is this realization that motivates this book, with a hope that the debate will continue and bring forth new perspectives on how informal learning may be implemented in music education.

Angles of Corroboration: a Brief Overview

The articles gathered in this anthology address informal learning pedagogy from different angles and through various theoretical perspectives. Taken together, they offer a multiplicity of points of departure for scholarly

discussion and critique. In order to identify and highlight some main areas for debate, the articles are grouped according to what we consider to be their main angles of corroboration.

Part I of this book sheds light on the general challenges and consequences of transforming the field of music education through altering its pedagogy with modes of informal learning.

In her contribution, Ann C. Clements suggests that music educators, instead of following "ready-made" solutions for implementing informal learning practices, should focus on developing multiple models for such approaches and engaging in further experimentation. She points to culturally responsive teaching as one possible framework within which such explorations can be made.

Randall Everett Allsup and Nathaniel J. Olson call for a "second-wave" of research on the teaching of popular music in schools, in order to critically examine research on informal learning practices that are associated with the ways popular musicians learn. Drawing on a Deweyan pragmatist framework, they emphasize the ethical responsibilities of the teacher and the need to establish sound educational frameworks that build on informal learning.

The Deweyan pragmatist perspective is also evident in Lauri Väkevä's article, in which he problematizes the idea—derived from Green's work—that informal learning captures "naturally arising learning practices." He also unpacks Green's research on the informal learning of classical music and considers it in connection to digital musicianship and ICT-based music learning.

Part II focuses on earlier or parallel attempts to establish informal learning as part of formal music education, as well as on the experiences and implications of such efforts.

Greg Gatien conducts a historical reconstruction of the formalization of jazz education, an endeavour that he finds synergetic with Green's research. In particular, he discusses the challenges of upholding certain modes of transmission within academic structures.

In her article describing a Swedish higher music education programme for rock musicians, Sidsel Karlsen shows how educational environments that take account of popular musicians' needs might be developed through research and theoretical insights from within the framework of socio-cultural learning theories. She also critically examines this particular education's self-proclaimed "authenticity", and raises questions concerning its actual informality.

Eva Georgii-Hemming and Maria Westvall investigate the current discourses on music education in Sweden, which during the last twenty

years have been dominated by popular music and informal learning pedagogy. They survey recent evaluations and studies that show how this approach may lead to a limitation of repertoire, content and teaching methods as well as to a general "lack of direction", and how it may in fact fall short in facilitating students' creative engagement with music.

Part III concentrates on informal learning within music teacher education and looks into different paths and possibilities, while also highlighting challenges.

Carlos Xavier Rodriguez discusses the problems with informal learning that he has encountered working as a teacher of both a high school rock band and of pre-service music educators at the university level. He pays particular attention to how, for formally trained students, informal learning pedagogy may provide inefficient tools for learning and even create a feeling of alienation.

Drawing on perspectives from critical theory and pedagogy, Panagiotis Kanellopoulos and Ruth Wright suggest that free improvisation could be used as a tool for helping student music educators acquaint themselves with modes of informal learning, and for fostering the qualities that are required in working with informal pedagogies in music education.

Finally, in *Part IV*, Lucy Green gives an account of the experiences and findings of a recent research-and-development pilot project focussed on informal and aural learning in instrumental music lessons. This project, building on her previous work, is an attempt to apply the strategies used and described in her book *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008) in traditional one-on-one instrumental tuition. The findings are promising, as they chart possible paths for the renewal of this form of tuition, often characterised by practices inherited from the classical conservatoire pedagogy.

The Exploration of Frameworks

As mentioned above, the articles of this collection examine informal learning pedagogy through different perspectives. The theoretical and philosophical perspectives we find most fruitful in this connection are (1) *culturally responsive teaching*; (2) *socio-cultural learning theory;* (3) *pragmatism*; and (4) *critical pedagogy*. In the following, we examine these four perspectives with regards to their implications for the scholarly discussion of future informal learning pedagogy.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

The resources that people have access to in schools or in other formal environments, and also the kinds of learning environments and knowledge accessible to them in informal contexts, have proved to differ greatly with such social strata as race, ethnicity, class, gender and language group (Villegas and Lucas 2002). There is no reason to believe that music education is an exception. Hence, a music education scholar who wishes to engage in investigations of the formal-informal nexus would do well to educate herself as a culturally responsive researcher. This would necessitate being able to capture a variety of learning experiences, instead of focussing merely on those that are recognisable as being connected to persons with a similar background as that of the researcher. It would also necessitate the recognition of patterns of omission and exclusion. These patterns might be discerned, for example, in how certain modes of musical transmission correspond with those found within the social surroundings of a specific group of students, leaving the other students to learn in ways that are unfamiliar to them. Through their creation of a conceptual framework for educating culturally responsive teachers, Villegas and Lucas (2002) offer theoretical, research-based and practice-oriented perspectives that carry relevance for research into the formal-informal nexus of music transmission and learning. In the following, we will focus on their six strands of "essential dispositions, knowledge and skills" (xxi) needed in order to function successfully in multicultural and multilingual societies, as a point of departure for culturally responsive research within music education.[1]

In *strand one*, Villegas and Lucas (2002) affirm that in order to act in culturally responsible ways, aspiring teachers need to *gain socio-cultural consciousness*; that is, they need to become aware of how their life experiences, "as mediated by a variety of factors, chief among them race/ethnicity, social class and gender" (27), have shaped their worldviews. Tying this more closely to music education, we would like to argue that in order to work successfully in the realm of formal/informal music learning, researchers need to become aware of how their own teaching and learning histories have shaped their views of what constitutes knowledge and skills in music and the means by which these should be transmitted.

In *strand two*, the authors remind us of the necessity to *develop an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds*. In other words, as educators or researchers who have grown up within the realm of the dominant cultural norms, we need to change the belief that our culture is "inherently superior to the cultures of marginalized groups in society" (35). While this should serve as a reminder to music education

scholars, it could also be applied in a more practical way, helping the researchers working within the range of the formal-informal nexus to maintain an affirming attitude towards musicians who come from musical-cultural backgrounds different than their own.

Strand three presents the idea that culturally responsible teachers need to *develop the commitment and skills to act as agents of change*, an idea that should also be relevant for researchers in the field of music education (this idea is also clearly manifested in Green's work). Through the investigation of previously unexplored informal-musical territories, researchers could discover practices and ways of organising learning that could act as models for the transformation of classroom practices. Furthermore, they could employ action research in order to transform classroom music from within, through a collaborative negotiation between the researcher, teacher and students (see e.g. Rikandi 2010).

The *fourth strand* implies that teachers need to *embrace the constructivist foundations* of their framework. Central assumptions here are, for example, that knowledge is always "filtered through the knowers' frames of reference" (Villegas and Lucas 2002, 68), that the meanings given to educational content are always based on the learner's pre-existing knowledge and experiences, and that learning is an active process of constructing experience. Transferring these assumptions to the field of research entails that culturally responsive researchers build their work on paradigms that acknowledge research findings as something that is not "found" but, rather, "co-constructed" in the negotiation between the researcher and the other participants in the study. Such presuppositions are already implicit, for example, in ethnography, action research and narrative inquiry.

Stating that the overriding task of the teacher within such a constructivist perspective as outlined above is to "build bridges between [students'] prior knowledge and experiences and the new ideas to be learned" (79), Villegas and Lucas emphasise in *strand five* that the teachers need to *learn about students and their communities* so that they know their students and are able to help them feel connected. A similar attitude of curiosity might also be needed when trying to connect informal and formal music making as a music education researcher. In our rapidly paced multicultural society, new contexts and new ways of making music are constantly emerging. A researcher who wants to keep up with the times needs to ask herself such questions as: What, if anything, are the kids learning from playing e.g. Guitar Hero? Do Idols competitions have any educational value? What are the learning implications of participating in online music communities? What is happening at a private music school

set up by an immigrant association (see e.g. Sæther 2010)? Furthermore, the researcher needs to linger on such matters as: Given that there are conditions of learning music that students already experience outside of school, how do they experience their formal music education?

In the *sixth strand*, the authors draw together the five previous strands in order to remind that it is necessary to *cultivate the practice of culturally responsive teaching* in order to provide good education and meet the needs of a changing student population. For music education researchers, this framework may serve as a basis for forming a new *attitude* towards research, and towards the process of constructing research-based knowledge; moreover, it can help them to establish a position from which they can interact responsively with their surroundings and thus collect rich and multifaceted data which opens up matters of inequality, exclusion and social justice. This would certainly be an asset in the future exploration of the possibilities for music education inherent in informal learning practices.

Socio-Cultural Learning Theory

One of the paradigms underlying culturally responsive teaching is the socio-cultural perspective on development and learning. This perspective ranges from the work of Piaget and Vygotsky to recent developments such as Engeström's cultural-historical activity theory (Engeström 1987; North and Hargreaves 2008). In what follows, however, we shall focus on socio-cultural learning from the standpoint of *situated learning*, as found in the works of Lave and Wenger (1991; see also Wenger 1998, 2006), and in the related theories of Säljö (2000). We will put a special emphasis on how these ideas can be utilised for uncovering learning among the members of *communities of practice* and in the exchange of knowledge between different communities.

Lave and Wenger (1991) describe a "community of practice" as "a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice" (98). Following Wenger's (1998) more explicit ideas of what characterises such communities,[2] it should be evident that many of the musical practices found on the informal side of the formal-informal nexus could be defined as communities of practice. What we usually think of as music-related peer or affinity groups (Gee 2001)—for example garage bands, music festivals, online communities, and local choirs—may be understood as communities of practice and analysed according to what is going on within them in terms of learning and distribution of knowledge.

Deliberately avoiding the acquisition metaphor of learning, Lave and Wenger (1991) describe how learning is integral to "generative social practice" and how the process of gaining knowledge can be explained as "legitimate peripheral participation" (35). In other words, acting within a community of practice, an individual gradually learns what the community is about and what she has to know in order to participate in it, in order to move from the peripheral position of a newcomer to the more mature stage of "full participation" (37). In order to capture the learning processes within such a community of practice, one must consider the relationship between the newcomers and the old-timers, as well as the relationship between the participants, activities, identities, and artefacts of the community. Hence, this theoretical framework allows investigation into the learning processes that occur, for example, when the newcomers and the more experienced members of an amateur brass band negotiate ways of exchanging information, or when amateur digital musicians stage, narrate and negotiate their musical identities in virtual space (Partti and Karlsen 2010). Another possible angle, elaborated by Säljö (2000), is to look into the role that communal artefacts play in the mediation of knowledge and how "human knowledge, insights, conventions and ideas [that] are built into apparatus" (82) are released when the artefacts are put to use. For example, one may investigate what role a mixing console plays in the act of creating and playing music in a rock band, and what kinds of music making it allows, supports or restricts.

In connection to the formal-informal nexus, socio-cultural theories of learning also provide tools for discussing the exchange of information that takes place between different communities of practice. For the purpose of describing the process of inter-community knowledge exchange, Wenger (1998) applies the concepts of *boundary objects* and *brokering*, which imply, respectively, the "artefacts, documents, terms, concepts, and other forms of reification around which communities of practice can organize their interconnections", and the "connections provided by people who can introduce elements of one practice into another" (105). Making use of these concepts, it is possible to define and understand the mediations and negotiations performed by a musician moving between different music-making contexts and bringing his or her artefacts, knowledge and skills from one arena to another. A recent example is mentioned by Partti (2010), who describes how digital musicians travel between different musical communities of practice and transfer their knowledge and skills, thereby also transforming them and the communities they become a part of.

Moreover, socio-cultural theories of learning can provide information on the routes that individuals use to move within specific learning contexts. Wenger (2006) refers to these routes as *learning trajectories*: personalised pathways through practices, communities, networks and institutions that together constitute the "*multi-scale social learning systems*" (4) of our time. For researchers setting out to explore how musicians are, for instance, enculturated into a specific musical style, the notion of learning trajectories may be useful because it can help them to map the whole range of the musicians' learning experiences as they make their way through contexts that provide various degrees of ownership and intentionality (Folkestad 2006).

As with most theoretical frameworks, socio-cultural theories have their limitations. One of the most obvious of these limitations is that they provide little information on how to design educational environments and how to teach within these environments. Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasise that "legitimate peripheral participation is not itself an educational form, much less a pedagogical strategy or a teaching technique. It is an analytical viewpoint on learning, a way of understanding learning" (40).[3] Another possible weakness is the rather positive belief that, among members of a community of practice, *learning will just take place.* Little effort is put into describing instances in which newcomers are denied access to knowledge, are interrupted in their efforts to strive towards full participation, or are subjected to an imbalance of power within the community. Hence, in order to discuss matters of exclusion, inequality and social justice, researchers of musical learning communities might want to look elsewhere.[4] As we shall see next, the philosophical perspectives of pragmatism and critical pedagogy may be useful in this quest for a normative framework.

Pragmatism

One philosophical framework in which accounts of culturally responsive teaching and socio-cultural learning can be situated is pragmatism. Pragmatism has its roots in the late 19th century and early 20th century American discussion concerning the relevance of functional psychology and evolutionary biology to philosophy. Classical pragmatists formulated philosophical theories of knowledge, meaning and value based on the activity of human organisms in their biological and social-cultural environment. From an educational standpoint, the most important developments in classical pragmatism emerged from the work of John Dewey, who conceived philosophy as an endeavour to solve problems of

everyday life (Dewey 1924/MW 12).[5] Dewey saw education as philosophy's laboratory, a practice in which the implications of philosophical ideas can be tested, and through which prevailing social habits can be transformed in ways that promote social life through the reconstruction of the shared realm of meaningful experience (Dewey 1916/MW 9).

For Dewey, the most important task of both philosophy and education was to alleviate problems brought along by modernity, problems that prevented the blooming of the positive freedom of individuals in democratic community life (Dewey 1946/LW 15, 154–169). The most severe of these problems was the alienation of the modern subject from her environment, a problem that, according to Dewey, had led to the separation of individual agency from the ethical needs of public social life. In his philosophy, Dewey vigorously attacked all dualisms that suggest a breach between the subjective and objective realms of values and science: he wanted to reconstruct philosophy as a holistic view of how different realms of experience can come together most constructively in social-cultural life.

Dewey's philosophy provides tools for immanent cultural critique, with education acting as its mediator. While education has an important role in the transmission of the social values of a culture, it also makes possible the critical examination of these values in terms of their future implications. Thus, education is not the mere presentation and reproduction of habits previously accumulated. By calling education a "laboratory" Dewey wanted to emphasize that its primary task, whether it takes place inside or outside school, is to provide tools with which to reflect on our shared cultural realm, so as to be better prepared to meet future situations of conjoint life. In a complex society, education becomes a necessary condition for social growth, or the expansion of the realm of meaningfulness that, according to Dewey, frames democratic life as a forum to negotiate different opinions, attitudes, and convictions as practical guidelines (Dewey 1916/MW 9).[6]

In philosophical research on music education, Deweyan pragmatism has been one of the frameworks that comprises diverse sets of ideas related to the meaning and implications of music in social life, especially as concerns the role of music education in promoting democracy, agency and equality (Bowman 2003; Väkevä 2004; Westerlund 2002; Woodford 2005). From this standpoint, there is no pedagogical meaning of music apart from the general meaning of education, and the general meaning of education amounts to growth. Growth is not just the accumulation of skills and ideas; it is the formation of an active ethical disposition, manifest in

the ways in which we participate in conjoint efforts enhancing the conditions that make our shared lives meaningful. This necessitates active working, experimentation and negotiation with the subject matter of musical learning. Music education cannot be merely taken as the transmission of tradition, but it must also frame new possibilities for interpretation and ingrain new habits of thinking and action, and thus open new fields for agency in which musical traditions can be reconstructed and revalued in terms of their possibilities for enhancing the quality of future experience.

One of the consequences of applying the Deweyan pragmatist perspective to education is that it leaves the curricular framework open, by emphasizing the importance of learning situations. Because all learning (and thus, all teaching) is considered to be situational, it makes little sense to peg our pedagogical practices to established values, standards and norms, derived from bygone situations. Thus, as part of general education, music education can be seen as a practice constantly adapting to change, in which constant negotiations of meaning take place over the value and significance of what is learned, how and why. This implies that music is not seen as a collection of established musical practices or canonized masterworks, but as a constantly evolving cultural field, intertwining with other cultural fields through which we make sense of our lives as social beings. Pragmatism suggests that we heed the actual processes in which music is made and re-made, disseminated and enjoyed, and accept them as situational points of departure for pedagogical practices, always keeping the more extensive goal of social growth in sight.

In its openness and recognition of the challenge of constant cultural change, Deweyan pragmatism provides a normative basis on which we can justify the demand for cultural responsiveness and the related need to examine learning as sociocultural practice. For music educators, it can also provide a tool to avoid fixed notions of the function of pedagogical methods and goals. By emphasizing the dynamic nature of growth as a constant expansion of our meaningful relations to each other and to our environment, and by further underlining individual agents' ethical relationship to society, pragmatism puts agency in focus. From the pragmatist standpoint, music education aims at more than developing musical agency: musical agency is one way to find one's place in the shared reality of ethical life. With this recognition comes an enhanced awareness of the power relations that condition social relationships. By suggesting that education is immanent cultural critique, pragmatism also suggests that we take seriously the possibility of social change through acknowledging the power structures of the society.

Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy is an educational perspective, and a pedagogical program, that applies the ideas of critical theorists to the issues of becoming human in society. Critical pedagogy posits that education and growth are a constant negotiation of one's place in society, and that culture is the medium in which this negotiation takes place. From this position, critical pedagogy derives its two tasks: to examine how power relations work in education, and to suggest educational practices more conducive to emancipation.

There are several ways to specify what this approach means for educational research and teaching practice. According to Aittola, Eskola and Suoranta (2007, 6), critical pedagogy includes different theoretical perspectives, "united by the critical interest of knowledge and the quest for the possibility of change for a more just society that stems from the perspective of hope." In other words, the critical perspective is as much a political program of action as it is a theory. In this sense its agenda can be related to Freire's "pedagogy of hope", developed and applied in Anglo-American cultural settings by e.g., hooks (1994), McLaren (1995) and Giroux (Giroux and McLaren 2001).

Critical research on education can focus, for example, on issues related to gender, ethnicity, social strata and globalization. A constant subject of discussion in critical pedagogy is power, its distribution in society as well as its practices. One way to look at this distribution is to link power with knowledge and to argue that it is through ownership of knowledge that society defines access to its discourses (Foucault 1980, 2005, 2010). By recognizing the conditions of this ownership, critical pedagogues can suggest ways to empower the marginalized by providing conditions to develop their critical thinking. Thus, critical pedagogy implies the transformation of society through developing the awareness of how people come to know and understand themselves as agents of their own understanding.

In music education, critical pedagogy has been suggested as an alternative to music-centered philosophical and theoretical approaches. For instance, Regelski (2002) argues that critical theory can guide the focus of the profession to recognize the needs of marginalized groups. The solution to the problem of different perspectives and opinions in music cannot be found in rampant multiculturalism; we need a mutually accepted rational framework within which to negotiate the significance of different claims for power. Regelski suggests Habermas' communicative rationality as this kind of a uniting base.

Thus, it can be argued that a basic problem for critical music pedagogy is to mediate the needs of communicative reason and the multifarious cultural needs of a rapidly fragmenting society. As concerns the formal-informal nexus in music education, it becomes vital to create the means to bridge various situations of learning in a normative setting that provides a forum for developing the critical knowledge of the mechanisms and techniques used in society to distribute power. In communicative action, participants in negotiations do not just argue for the legitimation of their idiosyncratic views, but seek a common ground in which to recognize different lifeworlds. A key issue is to avoid the hegemonic determination of the pedagogical value of music before this common ground is established. From the critical standpoint, a major problem with Western institutionalized music education is its association with the "cultural patriarchy" of Eurocentric high culture and its techniques of skill mediation, knowledge and attitudes. The recognition of different ways of learning music outside of this system of mediation is an important step in expanding music educators' sensibility to communicative situations. This necessitates critical awareness in the form of a willingness to recognize the meaning potential of different lifeworld-related practices—not only for the practitioner but also on the part of the music education researcher.

Concluding Remarks

In this introductory chapter, we have aimed at exploring four possible frameworks for the scholarly investigation of the formal-informal nexus in music education. Despite their obvious differences, these frameworks also display similarities, perhaps best explained as a need for researchers to be attentive and observant and to critically examine and constantly expand their own views and assumptions about what musical competencies and learning might look like, and where they could be achieved and enhanced. Moreover, all frameworks emphasise—in various ways and through using different metaphors and theoretical concepts—the significance of the "links of learning" that weave in and out of both informal *and* formal learning arenas, or Wenger's (2006) "learning trajectories."

By exploring the remaining chapters of this book, interested readers may discover more points from which informal learning pedagogy can be corroborated. For example, there seems to be a further need to examine how embedding informal modes of transmission into academic structures transforms not only the latter but also the modes of transmission themselves. More work is also needed on the matter of recreating students' experiences of authenticity. Another fruitful angle might be to perform a

deeper investigation into formally trained students' resistance to or discomfort with informal learning pedagogy and ask how it could—or whether it should—be overcome. Overall, as hinted at in the beginning of this introduction, we believe in discussing the appropriate theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of such research, not just in order to engage in the general growth of the field, but also because there is a need to elicit such frameworks' specific ethical, moral and political implications and consequences through scholarly conversations. If, for example, our goal in focussing on the formal-informal nexus is to contribute to a democratisation of the music education field, then we ought to make sure that we build from frameworks and practices that will enable, not restrict, such efforts.

It is our hope that this book will guide future studies in directions that we, at the present, cannot foresee. It is hoped that the theorising of the formal-informal nexus both in this chapter and throughout the anthology, through the presentation of a wide range of experienced scholars' viewpoints, will provide fertile soil for such explorations.

References

Aittola, T., J. Eskola, and J. Suoranta. 2007. "Johdanto [Introduction]." in *Kriittisen pedagogiikan kysymyksiä* [Problems in Critical Pedagogy], eds. T. Aittola, J. Eskola, and J. Suoranta, 5–8. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Balsnes, A. H. 2009. *Å lære i kor. Belcanto som praksisfelleskap* [Learning in Choir. Belcanto as a Community of Practice]. PhD diss., Norwegian Academy of Music. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner 2009:6.

Berkaak, O. A., and E. Ruud. 1994. *Sunwheels. Fortellinger om et rockeband* [Sunwheels. Stories about a Rock Band]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bowman, W. 2003. "Re-Tooling 'Foundations' to Address 21st Century Realities: Music Education Amidst Diversity, Plurality, and Change." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 2 (2). http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bowman2_2.pdf

Dewey, J. 2003. *The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882–1953. Electronic Edition.* Charlottesville: InteLex Corporation.

Engeström, Y. 1987. *Learning by Expanding: An Activity Theoretical Approach to Developmental Research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.

Folkestad, G. 2006. "Formal and Informal Learning Situations or Practices *vs* Formal and Informal Ways of Learning." *British Journal of Music Education* 23 (2): 135–45.

Fornäs, J., U. Lindberg, and O. Sernhede. 1995. *In Garageland. Youth and Culture in Late Modernity*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Tarkkailla ja rangaista*. [Surveiller et punir]. Helsinki: Otava.

—. 2005. *Tiedon arkeologia* [L'archéologie du savoir]. Tampere: Vastapaino.

—. 2010. *Sanat ja asiat: Ihmistieteiden arkeologia* [Les mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Gee, J. P. 2001. "Identity as an Analytic Lens for Research in Education." In *Review of Research in Education 25*, ed. W. G. Secada, 99–125. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Giroux, H., and P. McLaren. 2001. *Kriittinen pedagogiikka* [Critical Pedagogy]. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Green, L. 2002. *How Popular Musicians Learn. A Way Ahead for Music Education.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

—. 2008. *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Gullberg, A.-K. 2002. *Skolvägen eller garagevägen. Studier av musikalisk socialisation* [By Learning or Doing. Studies in the Socialisation of Music]. PhD diss., Luleå University of Technology.

hooks, b. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* London: Routledge.

Johansson, K.-G. 2002. *Can you Hear What They're Playing? A Study of Strategies Among Ear Players in Rock Music*. PhD diss., Luleå University of Technology.

Karlsen, S. 2009. "Learning Through Music Festivals." *International Journal of Community Music* 2 (2/3): 129–41.

—. 2010. "Revealing Musical Learning in the Informal Field." In *Sociology and music education*, ed. R. Wright, 193–206. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Lave, J., and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lilliestam, L. 1995. *Gehörsmusik: blues, rock och muntlig tradering* [Playing by Ear: Blues, Rock and Oral Tradition]. Gothenburg: Akademiförlaget.

Lines, D. 2009. "Exploring the Contexts of Informal Learning." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 8 (2): 1–6. http://act.maydaygroup.org/php/archives_v8.php#8_1

McLaren, P. 1995. *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era*. New York: Routledge.

North, A., and D. J. Hargreaves. 2008. *The Social and Applied Psychology of Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olsson, B. 1993. *SÄMUS—en musikutbildning i kulturpolitikens tjänst? En studie om en musikutbildning på 70-talet* [SÄMUS—Music Education in the Service of a Cultural Policy? A Study of a Teacher-Training Programme during the 1970s]. PhD diss., University of Gothenburg.

Partti, H. 2010. "The Construction of Music and Technology Related Identities in Narratives of Digital Musicians." Paper presented at 3rd International Conference on Narrative Inquiry in Music Education (NIME3), Brisbane, Australia, November 2010.

Partti, H., and S. Karlsen. 2010. "Reconceptualising Musical Learning: New Media, Identity and Community in Music Education." *Music Education Research* 12 (4): 369–82.

Regelski, T. 2002. "'Critical Education', Culturalism and Multiculturalism." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 1 (1): 1–40. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Regelski1_1.pdf

Rikandi, I. 2010. "Revolution or Reconstruction? Considering Change in Finnish Piano Pedagogy." in *Mapping the Common Ground. Philosophical Perspectives on Finnish Music Education*, ed. I. Rikandi, 162–77. Helsinki: BTJ.

Rodriguez, C. X. ed. 2004. *Bridging the Gap: Popular Music and Music Education*. Reston: MENC.

Salavuo, M. 2006. "Open and Informal Online Communities as Forums of Collaborative Musical Activities and Learning." *British Journal of Music Education* 23 (3): 253–71.

Säljö, R. 2000. *Lärande i praktiken. Ett sociokuturellt perspektiv* [Learning in Practice. A Socio-Cultural Perspective]. Stockholm: Prisma.

Sæther, E. 2010. "Music Education and the Other." *Finnish Journal of Music Education* 13 (1): 45–60.

Söderman, J. 2007. *Rap(p) i käften. Hiphopmusikers konstnärliga och pedagogiska strategier* [Verbally Fa(s)t. Hip-Hop Musicians' Artistic and Educational Strategies]. PhD diss., Lund University.

Vestad, I. L. 2010. "To Play a Soundtrack: How Children Use Recorded Music in Their Everyday Lives." *Music Education Research* 12 (3): 243–55.

Villegas, A. M., and T. Lucas. 2002. *Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers. A Coherent Approach.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Väkevä, L. 2004. *Kasvatuksen taide ja taidekasvatus. Estetiikan ja taidekasvatuksen merkitys John Deweyn naturalistisessa pragmatismissa* [Art of Education and Art Education. The Meaning of Aesthetics and

Art Education in John Dewey's Naturalist Pragmatism]. PhD diss, University of Oulu. Acta Universitatis Ouluensis E Scienitae Rerum Socialium 68.

—. 2006. "Teaching Popular Music in Finland: What's Up, What's Ahead?" *International Journal of Music Education* 24 (2): 126–31.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2006. *Learning for a Small Planet.* http://www.ewenger.com.

Westerlund, H. 2002. *Bridging Experience, Action, and Culture in Music Education*. PhD diss., Sibelius Academy. Studia 16. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy.

—. 2006. "Garage Rock Band—A Future Model for Developing Musical Expertise?" *International Journal of Music Education* 24 (2): 119–125.

Wingstedt, J. 2008. *Making Music Mean. On Functions of, and Knowledge about, Narrative Music in Multimedia.* PhD diss., Luleå University of Technology.

Woodford, P. 2005. *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Notes

[1] Villegas and Lucas' (2002) six strands concern teachers first and foremost, however we believe that their points are also applicable to the world of music education research.

[2] See Wenger (1998, 125) for a comprehensive list of indicators.

[3] This stand does not prevent Wenger (2006), in later writings, from expressing strong opinions concerning how education should be designed in a globalised world.

[4] See for example Karlsen (2010) on how socio-cultural theories, when combined with perspectives borrowed from sociology, afford power-relations within music-related communities of practice.

[5] Our references to Dewey (2003) are abbreviated EW for The Early Works, MW for The Middle Works and LW for The Later Works, followed by part and page numbers.

[6] Interestingly, Dewey also criticized the modern tendency to compartmentalize art and the aesthetic into their own realm, distinct from everyday life. He argued that aesthetic experience should be regarded as focal part of a humane way of life; in turn, he saw art as a general attempt to deal with an ever-changing environment, at best in ways that afford qualitative experiences that can be felt as consummatory, or "esthetic" (Dewey 1934/LW 10). In *Experience and Education* (1938/LW 13) Dewey also emphasized that it is the ultimate goal of education to contribute to the quality of subsequent experience.

PART I

CHAPTER ONE

ESCAPING THE CLASSICAL CANON: CHANGING METHODS THROUGH A CHANGE OF PARADIGM[1]

ANN C. CLEMENTS

Preface

Lucy Green's *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education* (2002) describes her research in the realm of popular musicians and music transmission. Through her more recent publication *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008), Green has found many innovative ways in which to move from the realm of research and inquiry to the practical application and examination of that application through practice—a gap that many researchers fail to traverse. I feel that as we examine her work in a critical way and seek our own unique forms of implementation of the ideas she has presented, we must keep in mind that this latest text is an attempt to bridge the all too elusive gap between research and practice, and that in doing so there is room for experimentation. Through this publication she has exposed her research and teaching practices in a very intimate and personal way and we are indebted to Green for providing a model of "research to practice" that is so greatly needed in the field of music education.

Introduction

First I would like to focus my attention on three strands that are apparent throughout Green's work: (1) student centered learning or students as source, (2) the role of teachers in informal learning, and (3) the organic nature of music learning. Each of these areas will be discussed in relation to popular musics and classroom music education. These conversations are a mixture of my personal response to her work and

examples of practical applications of her work in American music classrooms, in the attempts to look beyond prior knowledge and practice towards new possibilities for the implementation of Green's work.

Student Centered Learning

Key to Green's work is the concept of student centered learning. She constructs a good argument that it may be time to experiment with, or perhaps withdraw from, formal western music traditions of music teaching and learning—in which the teacher is often thought of as the end all be all of musical knowledge, and that to be successful as a teacher is to install knowledge upon the unknowing student. Green's experiment of application in *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008) is an in-depth acknowledgement of students as sources of knowledge. Her methodology is based on partnerships of students, shared responsibilities among student-centered groups, and acknowledgement through the respect and valuation of students' pre-existing interests, abilities and preferences by the classroom teacher. In particular, student preference and knowledge become the primary starting points from which students expand outwards into different musical styles, genres and cultures.

Within the field of multicultural education the notion of culturally responsive teaching has raised awareness of students' individuality. "This approach to educational practice takes into consideration the needs, experiences, and perspectives of culturally diverse students, where its main purpose is to help students with their cultural and social identities in such a way that learning in any subject is made more relevant" (Abril 2008, 5). Culturally responsive teaching embraces constructivist views of teaching and learning, in which learning is viewed as an active process by which learners give meaning to new information, ideas, and principles and other stimuli, and in which teaching is viewed as inducing change in students' knowledge and belief systems (Villegas and Lucas 2002). While Green does not reference much literature regarding cultural diversity or learning practices for world musics in music education, which is rather disappointing, the practice of her evolving pedagogy is very much based on these principles. The consumption of music by youths, their musical preferences, and their musical knowledge can very easily be described as "youth culture" (or cultures), a generational and cultural grouping that is not often given serious consideration in a positive way. Youth culture, which is heavily comprised of musics and musicians, is a source that

Green acknowledges as legitimate and worthy of study for its own merits, including adolescents' culture and musical preferences and knowledge.

The largest portion of music makers in the United States cannot be found in professional or community bands, choirs, and orchestras. Instead, they are found in basements, pubs, garages, worship teams, computer labs, dance clubs, and recording studios. One can argue that lessons learned in one musical community—for example musical lessons from band, choir, and orchestra—can be transferred to other communities, but this is not necessarily true. Teachers frequently complain about students' inability to transfer knowledge from the general music classroom to the instrumental classroom or from the elementary music classroom to the middle school music classroom. If transfer between somewhat like musical idioms is difficult at best, how can we expect students to make the connections between musical systems that to them may have little-to-nothing in common? Transfer has to be taught, and unless you are teaching how to transfer to and from multiple musical cultures it has no lasting meaning or relevance.

It has been estimated that only 20% of high school students in the United States are participating in formal music instruction. Where are the missing 80%? The answer to this is quite simple, they're musicking (in Small's (1998) sense of the term)! Visit any local high school Battle of the Bands competition and you will see many students who may fall outside formal musical instruction but have musical skills and passion that are enviable by some of our best traditional singers and players.

How do we reach this missing 80%? Green believes that the time has come for music to be just that—music, unattached from our preconceived notions of "good" and "bad" and with an understanding that there is no hierarchy or superiority of particular genres; there is only personal preference. Music around the world is created, listened to, adapted, danced and moved to for the same reasons: it defines, represents, symbolizes, expresses, constructs, mobilizes, incites, controls, transforms, unites, and much more (Wade 2006). If we want to draw these students in and invite them to participate in an education that will bring them into adulthood and foster continued learning beyond and outside of classrooms, we must move towards pedagogies that are inclusive—and, shouldn't we pay more attention to their preferences than we do our own? It may be a balancing act, but I agree with Green that the time has come to tip the scales in their direction.

Teachers and Formal Music Education

As Green expresses her created curriculum in *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008) we begin to witness changes in the role of "teacher." Throughout the Musical Futures program (the curricular program that is the primary focus of this text) the teachers are asked to step back and allow for student centered learning. Green indicates that this was not always an easy role for teachers to adhere to. During each of the seven stages of this curriculum teachers were asked to "establish ground rules for behavior, set the task going at each stage, and then stand back and observe what the pupils were doing" (Green 2008, 74). Debbie, one of the teachers in this project framed her anxiety by stating "I'm terrified about the lesson today; just letting the students go off and jam. I'm actually scared of letting them do this . . . " (30).

I believe much of the disconnect between formal music education and learners' preferences and knowledge can be traced to institutions of higher learning. These institutions, serving as gatekeepers to the profession, generally reserve admittance to students whose training in Western art music qualifies them to continue such pursuits. Our institutions can be seen as an integral part of the reciprocal cycle of music teacher preparation—we only accept a portion of those for whom formal music education has "worked", and only if their voice or instrument is needed in a particular ensemble or studio. It is completely the wrong way to go about selecting the next generation of education hopefuls. While NASM has begun to make acceptations for the acceptance of a broader array of students (NASM Handbook 2007), very few programs are taking advantage of these changes—again, what can we do when there are no studios or ensembles to cater to various kinds of musicians?

Carlos Abril (2008), in a recent study of one teacher's journey to create a mariachi program in her central Chicago high school strings program, found that while she was willing to work for change, she felt she did not have the skills needed or perhaps even the confidence needed to risk change. While as a university musician she participated in the traditional string ensembles, she also played violin in a local Emo band (a style of emotional punk rock or heavy metal music). However, she was reluctant to even mention this band participation to the researcher as she thought he would be uninterested. Her participation in the band was a facet of her musical self that she claims did not inform her work as a university student or music educator years later. She never thought of them as being related. My own research (Clements and Campbell 2006) found a similar disconnect for teachers between what was required of them for the degree