



EDITED BY

CATHY
BENEDICT

PATRICK
SCHMIDT

GARY
SPRUCE

PAUL
WOODFORD

≡ The Oxford Handbook of
SOCIAL JUSTICE IN
MUSIC EDUCATION

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

SOCIAL JUSTICE

IN MUSIC

EDUCATION

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

SOCIAL JUSTICE

IN MUSIC

EDUCATION

Edited by
CATHY BENEDICT,
PATRICK SCHMIDT,
GARY SPRUCE,
and
PAUL WOODFORD

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of
Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research,
scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide.

Oxford New York
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by
Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

© Oxford University Press 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior
permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law,
by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization.
Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the
Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
The Oxford handbook of social justice in music education / edited by Cathy Benedict, Patrick Schmidt,
Gary Spruce, and Paul Woodford.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-19-935615-7 (hardcover: alk. paper) 1. Music—Instruction and study—Social aspects.

2. Social justice. I. Benedict, Cathy. II. Schmidt, Patrick K. III. Spruce, Gary.

IV. Woodford, Paul, 1955–

MT1.O96 2016

780.71—dc23

2015010695

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

<i>Preface: Why Social Justice and Music Education?</i>	xi
<i>Contributors</i>	xvii

SECTION I UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL JUSTICE IN MUSIC EDUCATION CONCEPTUALLY, HISTORICALLY, AND POLITICALLY

Introduction—From Pioneers to New Frameworks	3
PAUL WOODFORD, SECTION EDITOR	
1. Intersecting Social Justices and Music Education	7
ESTELLE R. JORGENSEN	
2. Understanding Social Justice from the Perspective of Music Education History	29
MARIE MCCARTHY	
3. The Ethics of Policy: Why a Social Justice Vision of Music Education Requires a Commitment to Policy Thought	47
PATRICK SCHMIDT	
4. Facing the Music: Pursuing Social Justice Through Music Education in a Neoliberal World	62
STEPHANIE HORSLEY	
5. Educational Policy Reforms and the Politics of Music Teacher Education	78
GABRIEL RUSINEK AND JOSÉ LUIS ARÓSTEGUI	
6. The Promotion of Multiple Citizenships in China's Music Education	91
WAI-CHUNG HO AND WING-WAH LAW	

7. What Did You Learn in School Today? Music Education,
Democracy, and Social Justice 107
JOEL WESTHEIMER

SECTION II RECLAIMING DIFFERENCE IN MUSIC EDUCATION

- Introduction—Beyond Toleration: Facing the Other 119
CATHY BENEDICT, SECTION EDITOR
8. Disjunctured Feminisms: Emerging Feminisms in Music Education 122
ROBERTA LAMB AND NIYATI DHOKAI
9. A Jazz Funeral in Music Education 140
ELIZABETH GOULD
10. The Space Between Worlds: Music Education and Latino Children 156
JACQUELINE KELLY-McHALE AND CARLOS R. ABRIL
11. Music, Social Justice, and Social Inclusion: The Role of Collaborative
Music Activities in Supporting Young Refugees and Newly Arrived
Immigrants in Australia 173
KATHRYN MARSH
12. Hidden in Plain Sight: Race and Racism in Music Education 190
DEBORAH BRADLEY
13. Ableism and Social Justice: Rethinking Disability in Music Education 204
ALICE-ANN DARROW
14. Gender and Sexual Diversity Challenges (for Socially Just) Music
Education 221
LOUIS S. BERGONZI
15. Beyond Toleration—Facing the Other 238
RICHARD MATTHEWS

SECTION III EPISTEMOLOGICAL SHIFTS AND JUST PRACTICES

- Introduction—Socializing the Value of Equity 253
PATRICK SCHMIDT, SECTION EDITOR

16. What Do We <i>Think</i> We Know? CATHY BENEDICT	257
17. Multiculturalism and Social Justice: Complementary Movements for Education in and Through Music J. CHRISTOPHER ROBERTS AND PATRICIA SHEHAN CAMPBELL	272
18. Music Education, Social Justice, and the “Student Voice”: Addressing Student Alienation Through a Dialogical Conception of Music Education GARY SPRUCE	287
19. Informal Learning as a Catalyst for Social Justice in Music Education FLÁVIA M. NARITA AND LUCY GREEN	302
20. Musical Creativity and “the Police”: Troubling Core Music Education Certainties PANAGIOTIS A. KANELLOPOULOS	318
21. Music Education and Social Reproduction: Breaking Cycles of Injustice RUTH WRIGHT	340
22. The Imperative of Diverse and Distinctive Musical Creativities as Practices of Social Justice PAMELA BURNARD, LAURA HASSLER, LIS MURPHY, AND OTTO DE JONG	357
23. Music Teachers’ Repertoire Choices and the Quest for Solidarity: Opening Arenas for the Art of Living with Difference SIDSEL KARLSEN AND HEIDI WESTERLUND	372
24. Youth Empowerment and Transformative Music Engagement SUSAN A. O’NEILL	388
25. You Gotta Fight the Power: The Place of Music in Social Justice Education GLORIA LADSON-BILLINGS	406

SECTION IV TOWARD SOCIAL JUSTICE PEDAGOGY: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Introduction—Rethinking the Ways We Engage with Others GARY SPRUCE, SECTION EDITOR	423
---	-----

26. Social Justice in the English Secondary Music Classroom 426
CHRIS PHILPOTT WITH JASON KUBILIUS
27. Hospitable Music Making: Community Music as a Site for Social Justice 446
LEE HIGGINS
28. Social Justice and Urban Music Education 456
RUBÉN GAZTAMBIDE-FERNÁNDEZ AND LESLIE STEWART ROSE
29. Social Justice and Music Technology in Education 473
PAUL LOUTH
30. Music First and Last: Developing a Socially Just Pedagogical Approach to Music Education with Technology 487
JONATHAN SAVAGE
31. Rescuing Choral Music from the Realm of the Elite: Models for Twenty-First-Century Music Making—Two Case Illustrations 501
ANDRÉ DE QUADROS
32. Music Education Assessment and Social Justice: Resisting Hegemony Through Formative Assessment 513
MARTIN FAUTLEY
33. Critical Reflection for Social Justice and Inclusion in Music Education 525
CAROLYN COOKE
34. Can Music Teaching Be a Powerful Tool for Social Justice? 539
JOHN SLOBODA

SECTION V SOCIAL JUSTICE IN PRACTICE: EXAMPLES OF EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS FROM BEYOND THE SCHOOLS AND AROUND THE WORLD

- Introduction—Description, Questions, and Challenges for Researchers 551
PAUL WOODFORD, SECTION EDITOR

35. Behind Different Walls: Restorative Justice, Transformative Justice, and Their Relationship to Music Education	554
MARY L. COHEN AND STUART PAUL DUNCAN	
36. Relationship, Rescue, and Culture: How El Sistema Might Work	567
ERIC SHIEH	
37. Negotiating Gender, Popular Culture, and Social Justice in Music Education	582
JOSEPH ABRAMO	
38. Music Education and the Invisible Youth: A Summary of Research and Practices of Music Education for Youth in Detention Centers	598
MAUD HICKEY	
39. Music: An Alternative Education in the South African Freedom Struggle	614
SHEILA C. WOODWARD	
40. New Faces in Old Spaces: Mexican American Musical Expressions and Music Equity within the Music Curriculum	631
AMANDA SOTO	
41. The Intersection of Music Teacher Education and Social Justice: Where Are We Now?	644
JULIE BALLANTYNE AND CARMEN MILLS	
42. Striving for Justice with Determination and Hope: An Epilogue	658
JANET R. BARRETT	
<i>Index</i>	669

PREFACE

Why Social Justice and Music Education?

CATHY BENEDICT, PATRICK SCHMIDT, GARY
SPRUCE, AND PAUL WOODFORD

Social justice remains a critical challenge for any democratic space. It is a term that is often employed in the educational literature as a catch-all expression and a political call to action for those seeking the amelioration of any number of social problems relating to, for example, class, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability, and cultural identity. The alleviation of inequity, powerlessness, and discrimination has long been the goal, although, as will become evident to readers of this Handbook, the pursuit of social justice in music education implies more than just recognition of difference and allowing for greater diversity and inclusivity in the classroom and other educational spaces. Social justice is a complicated endeavor involving, among other things, adjudication of conflicting values and interests, political action, and a concern for the welfare of the public, but especially of those who have been marginalized or oppressed.

If self-righteousness and oversimplification are to be avoided, speaking about and working toward social justice must start from the recognition of the complexity of lived and shared experience, coupled with a concern for humanity as a whole, and not just this or that group. Ultimately, as philosopher John Dewey (1921) expressed it, the goal should be the creation of more equitable environments where growth is feasible and the capacity for communicative acts can revitalize democratic communities; otherwise the pursuit of social justice might only benefit a fortunate few, possibly at the expense of others suffering equally compelling claims to injustices. One need only look around the world today to realize that justice for some can all too easily result in, or be perceived as, injustice for others.

Among the many problems with which researchers, teachers, and community practitioners must grapple if they are to be successful in creating more equitable educational environments is that the term “social justice” (as well as social *injustice*) is itself vague and conceptually fleeting. Its practical dynamics can also make effective implementation and sustainability remarkably challenging. Social justice can be pursued and

experienced in many different ways and settings, and can be triggered by a range of factors. Nor for many of the same reasons is there much in the way of common understanding of the concept of social justice—it is often defined differently by particular individuals, groups, policies, and laws. Moreover, the social justice ideal is itself sometimes appropriated by hegemonic groups as a rhetorical device (including governments and religious factions), and unfortunately can be used to mask the perpetuation of social injustice and inequality. Such tensions, then, place a premium on defining social justice as a form of moral and ethical agency while locating it—as an ideal, a set of dispositions, and tangible practices—at the center of any educational endeavor. As the authors in this Handbook help to explain and illustrate, only through an understanding of social justice in all of its conceptual, political, ethical, practical, and pedagogical complexity can there be much hope of ensuring that educative action (be it scientific, vocational, or artistic) contributes to a more just and humane society.

This point bears some elaboration as it goes to the crux of *why* and *how* the pursuit of socially just musical and educational practices should matter to those engaged in educational enterprises. The fundamental issue is one of equity, particularly in this age of neoliberal globalization, when the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen. A concern with and practices aimed at achieving social justice can help to mitigate some of the worst effects of social and educational Darwinism by taking student differences into account while ensuring what philosopher John Rawls (1999) calls “fair equality of opportunity.” Implied here is the framing of a more equitable and just distribution of educational resources according to students’ needs. We place this in contradistinction to the rather simplistic, and often pernicious, notion of equality of opportunity in order to draw attention to a process that tends to favor the talented and culturally privileged, who are thought to be most able to benefit from access to scarce educational resources. Thinking through issues of equity, rather than equality of opportunity, can potentially better help to dismantle the long dominant and persistent economic argument for the status quo that is premised on a deficit model of education, where resources are assumed to be permanently insufficient and certain individuals and communities are perceived as constantly lacking.

Indeed, as education philosopher Jane Roland Martin (1998) remonstrates, “The world has grown so accustomed to adopting a framework of thought whose fundamental premise is scarcity, we forget that in the case of culture the issue is one of superabundance” (p. 24). In formal music education, this deficit model of education is often epitomized by an overly narrow definition of what counts as legitimate musical knowledge, which intimidates children who lack the appropriate cultural capital while allowing teachers to ignore much of the wealth of music that exists in the world. As Roland Martin continues,

Were cultural wealth a concept devoid of practical import this might be of little consequence. However, the wealth of cultures constitutes the material out of which curricula are constructed: it is the source not only of curricular content and subject matter, but also of education’s goals and its methods of instruction. (p. 25)

The focus here is not so much on the importance of inclusivity and diversity *per se*—although it is of course on that, too—as it is on critical engagement, empowerment, and creativity.

Central to this Handbook is the notion that diverse and inclusive curricula and educational practices that facilitate the critical examination of any musics and music education methods, and thereby also wider participation and communication, are more likely to enhance personal and collective agency and satisfaction, while also contributing to a more creative, equitable, and productive society (Freeland, 2012).

At the same time, and because the world is a complex place that is often characterized by conflict and ignorance, proponents of social justice need to be careful not to patronize or rush to judgment of cultural and educational workers who have successfully utilized traditional music or methods to address serious social problems in sometimes challenging circumstances and sociopolitical contexts. There are many encouraging pathways for music education action taking place both inside and outside the “normal” and traditional institutional parameters of schooling that can help us to make tangible Dewey’s notion of participatory democracy as an ethical ideal and communal way of life resulting in a releasing of human capacity. Alternative programs and instructional models can potentially challenge teachers and others to rethink their understandings of the democratic purposes and responsibilities of educational institutions and programs to contribute to a more equitable and just society.

Dewey, however, also warned that the kinds of authoritarian, hegemonic, and hierarchical educational practices implicit or embedded in, for example, Western classical music and its pedagogical traditions could potentially discourage creativity and growth by limiting opportunities for exploration and by discouraging individual interest and responsibility. This should give pause to teachers or social activists wishing to adopt programs, models, or “brands”—such as Venezuela’s renowned El Sistema program—for their own regional and national contexts without first taking into account important political and cultural differences and also determining whether their proposed programs are actually consistent in purpose, ideology, and pedagogical approach with the parent program and thus warrant the name.

This Handbook therefore underscores the fact that there are no facile answers to the complex enterprise of music and education. Put plainly, context and professional intent matter, and practices that are deemed to be hierarchical and hegemonic in one social context may in certain locations and situations be successfully employed as means of ameliorating social problems. Alternatively, some musics, programs, and methods may not travel well and might only exacerbate problems by, for example, diverting scarce government funding from existing social programs. Then, too, there is always the possibility of abuse or ethical lapse. As already suggested, governments or other organizations might use music programs or methods for their own ends and in ways their creators would never have condoned (e.g., as propaganda), just as individual instructors, owing to insufficient pedagogical knowledge or inattention to children’s needs, might fail to achieve or maintain equitable educational spaces. There are no panaceas or easy and formulaic programs and pedagogies for teachers or others seeking to identify appropriate

educational practices that can work safely and reliably within and across different social or cultural contexts to guarantee success in alleviating inequity, powerlessness, and discrimination for all. For all of these and other reasons, teachers wishing to promote social justice in and through their own programs and practices will need to exercise careful thought and professional self-reflection.

This recognition of the complexity and difficulty involved in pursuing a social justice agenda for music education brings us to another of the central themes of the Handbook, which is the importance of fostering critical awareness of music and pedagogy among researchers, teachers, and students alike. The call for a renewed educational emphasis on the development of critical thought and awareness of music among pre-service teachers and children is especially important in this age of casino-capitalism and hyper-commercialism. As corporate marketers seek to go beyond the schools and universities to “infiltrate the most intimate spaces of children and family life” and create “consuming subjects rather than civic minded and critical citizens” (Giroux, 2010, p. 415), vigilance, recognition, and responsibility must be part and parcel of the educative space. When lacking awareness of how major corporations seek to monopolize virtually all forms of communication, and the ways in which popular music and media “hold sway over the stories and narratives that shape children’s lives” (p. 415), the latter might not realize the processes of indoctrination to consumer culture and thus may be rendered silent “before the spectacle of commodities” (Attali, 1985, p. 112). And when that happens, and because music is “absorbed by children as entertainment and often escapes any critical or self-reflection,” they may have no authentic voices of their own, thereby failing to realize their creative potential (p. 415).

For many of the same concerns raised in the foregoing discussion, the pursuit of social justice as a political call to action should itself be critically examined, lest it exacerbate existing problems or result in other unintended negative social consequences. Music education has had a historically tense relationship with social justice. Educators concerned with music practices have long preoccupied themselves with ideas of open participation and the potentially transformative capacity that can be fostered within musical interaction. On the other hand—as already suggested, but which needs to be said more explicitly—they have often done so while privileging particular musical practices, traditions, forms of musical knowledge, or ideologies, resulting in the alienation or exclusion of many children, youth, and adults from music education opportunities. Multicultural practices, for example, have historically provided potentially useful pathways for music practices that are thought to be socially just. However, the intent behind these practices has sometimes been negated through the mapping of alien musical values onto other music(s) and has been grounded in simplistic politics of difference, wherein “recognition of our differences” limits the push that might take us from mere tolerance to respect and to renewed understanding and interaction.

Regardless of the historical challenges, music education as a field of inquiry, as a global community, and as a set of practices—within schools, in communities, and as part of nongovernmental organizations—is experiencing an awakening. Discussions linking music education to the challenges of urban education, gender and sexual inequality,

class difference, cultural identity, racial segregation, and corporate intrusion into and control over music education have grown exponentially and are now widely seen in both scholarly work and as part of teacher education and professional development. At the levels of curriculum, pedagogy, and content development, many educators concerned with musical practices have focused more attention on the formation of democratic classroom environments, the development of agency-driven student participation, the support of critical pedagogies, and the expansion of interactive forms of multiculturalism, and less attention on “sampling exotic” musical cultures. But it remains unclear the extent to which the pursuit of social justice and socially just practices has moved beyond the rhetoric of, for instance, inclusion, literacy, creativity, educational access, and market equality in ways that would help us better envision and enact music as a formative element in how we see ourselves as “global citizens.” Discovering ways to engage in socially just music educational practices is a process deeply linked to discoveries of who we are and how we can better relate to and interact with others within and outside our communities and one that underscores the purpose of this Handbook.

WHY THIS BOOK?

Regardless of the extraordinary importance of social justice as an educational outcome today, and despite the pervasive manner in which related issues are discussed among some quarters of the music teaching profession, no significant effort has been expended thus far to frame this theme as a widespread, artistically and educationally vital aim or goal within music education practices both *within* and *beyond* the school and university. This book is intended to meet this need by serving as a diverse and authoritative source for conceptual, research-based, and practically oriented guidance for how music educators can further define social justice’s purposes and forms, its goals and aims, and for revealing some of the many guises under which socially just musical and educational practices can be made manifest and explored in the home, school, and community. As we continue to consider social justice in our society and in music education, in our practices and in our daily lives, this book will serve as a source of insight and guidance for the field of music education as a whole.

This book, however—for the reasons identified earlier as to the importance of contextualizing social problems—is not intended as a prescriptive guide to *daily* teaching practice. Rather, its purpose is to facilitate the development of a complex but accessible understanding of social justice for the field of music education by addressing key themes that frame social justice action within music teaching and learning globally. It is intended as an idea book that will hopefully provoke and inspire teachers and scholars to rethink their understandings of their own practice and whether, to what extent, and in what ways it contributes to the creation of a better world.

Each section is prefaced with a brief introduction to the major themes addressed in the various chapters therein. The invited authors from around the world, many of whom

are the foremost experts in each of the areas selected, and themselves scholars and practitioners with national and international reputations, present a collection of ideas, models, concepts, and strategies for how best to solidify and expand our understanding of the relationship between music education and social justice as global concerns. Further, because the pursuit of social justice often implies recognition of common purposes and, if it is to succeed, collaboration, the editors have sought to go beyond merely aligning and coordinating themes to establish linkages with allied disciplines and fields of inquiry. To that end, several authors from outside the immediate field of music education were invited to write commentary chapters for the larger thematic sections of the book, helping to locate music education research and practice within broader social, educational, and political contexts and developments. A concluding synthetic chapter draws out and emphasizes shared strands of thought, common problems, and recommends potentially fruitful new directions for future research and practice. We hope that, by virtue of its scope, diversity of foci, and balanced approach, the book will be helpful to the uninitiated and inviting to experts.

REFERENCES

- Attali, J. (1985). *Noise: The political economy of music* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dewey, J. (1921). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: MacMillan.
- Freeland, C. (2012, May 19). Equality fosters strong economy. *The London Free Press*, p. E8.
- Giroux, H. A. (2010). Stealing of childhood innocence—Disney and the politics of casino-capitalism. *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies*, 10(5), 413–416.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of social justice*, rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Roland Martin, J. (1998). The wealth of cultures and problems of generations. In S. Tozer (Ed.), *Philosophy of Education Society yearbook* (pp. 23–38). Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.

CONTRIBUTORS

Joseph Abramo is an Assistant Clinical Professor of Music Education in the Neag School of Education at the University of Connecticut, where he teaches undergraduate and graduate courses. He has publications in journals including the *Music Educators Journal*, *The Journal of Research in Music Education*, *The Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, and *The Philosophy of Music Education Review*, among others. He also regularly presents at national and international conferences. He serves on the advisory committee of the *Music Educators Journal* and is Chair of the Philosophy Special Research Interest Group of the National Association for Music Education.

Carlos Abril is Associate Professor and Director of Undergraduate Music Education at the Frost School of Music at the University of Miami, where he teaches courses in cultural diversity, music in childhood, and philosophy of music education. Abril's research focuses on sociocultural issues in music education, music education policy, curriculum, and music perception. His work has been published in books, research journals, and professional journals. He serves on many editorial boards, including the *Journal of Research in Music Education*. Abril received a Ph.D. in music education at The Ohio State University, M.M. in performance at the University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music, and a B.M. in music education at the University of Miami.

José Luis Aróstegui is Professor in the Department of Music Education at the University of Granada, Spain. He has presented papers at many international conferences and has published papers in international journals and books. Appointed by the European Commission to coordinate a major evaluation of music teacher education programs in Europe and Latin America, he has served as a commissioner of the Music in Schools and Teacher Education Commission (MISTEC) from 2004 to 2010, and was Chair from 2008 to 2010. He is a member of the ISME Board and editor of the *Revista Internacional de Educación Musical* journal.

Julie Ballantyne is known for her work in the areas of music teacher identities, social justice, music teacher education, and the social and psychological impacts of musical engagement. Her latest research project, www.musicteachersproject.net, aims to investigate developing teacher identities while supporting those at the beginnings of their careers as music teachers. A Senior Lecturer in the School of Music at The University of Queensland, Julie has published work in key music journals, has published a book *Navigating Music and Sound Education*, and teaches preservice and in-service teachers at the Bachelor and Master's Level, as well as supervising several Ph.D. students.

Janet R. Barrett is the Marilyn Pflederer Zimmerman Endowed Scholar in Music Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research interests include the re-conceptualization of the music curriculum, secondary general music, interdisciplinary approaches in music, qualitative research pedagogy, and music teacher education. Barrett has published widely in music education and is an author or editor of five books, including the 2014 *The Musical Experience: Rethinking Music Teaching and Learning* (with P. Webster, Oxford University Press). She serves as editor for the *Bulletin for the Council of Research in Music Education*.

Cathy Benedict joined the Music Education faculty at Western University, Ontario, Canada in July 2015. She has taught at New York University and served as Undergraduate Coordinator for Music Education at Florida International University. She has taught classes such as elementary pedagogy, Orff, curriculum design, music psychology, critical readings, and music and special needs students. Her scholarly interests lay in facilitating environments in which students take on the perspective of a justice-oriented citizen. To this end, her research focuses on the processes of education and the ways in which teachers and students interrogate taken-for-granted, normative practices. She has published in such journals as *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *Music Education Research*, and *Research Studies in Music Education*, and the Brazilian journal *ABEM*.

Louis S. Bergonzi is the Daniel J. Perrino Chair in Music Education, and Professor of Orchestral Conducting at the University of Illinois, where he teaches courses in the sociology of music education, orchestral conducting, and string education. He is Music Director of the Philharmonia Orchestra. He was co-director of *Establishing Identity: LGBT Studies and Music Education I and II* (2010/2012), symposia designed to provide energy to the discussion of how LGBT issues operate within music education in terms of research, curriculum, teacher preparation, and the musical lives and careers of LGBT music students and teachers.

Deborah Bradley was Assistant Professor in Music Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison from 2006 to 2010. Since retiring, she has taught at the University of Toronto Faculty of Music and Emmanuel College. She is a leading scholar in anti-racism and critical multiculturalism in music education; her work is published in such journals as *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *Music Education Research*, and *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*. She has also published several book chapters, including a chapter in the 2012 *Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Music Education*.

Pamela Burnard is Reader in Education at the University of Cambridge in the United Kingdom. Her research interests include diverse creativities, digital technologies, intercultural arts-based practices and knowledge building in education, industry, and community. Her books include *Musical Creativities in Practice* (Oxford University Press), *Creativities in Higher Music Education* (Routledge), *Activating Diverse Musical Creativities* (Bloomsbury), *Bourdieu and the Sociology of Music*, *Music Education and*

Research (Ashgate), *Music Education with Digital Technologies* (Continuum), and *Teaching Music Creatively* (Routledge). She is Co-convenor of the British Educational Research Association (BERA) *Creativity in Education* SIG and Convenor of the *Creativities in Intercultural Arts Network*, <http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/centres/cce/initiatives/projects/cian>.

Patricia Shehan Campbell is Donald E. Peterson Professor of Music at the University of Washington, where she teaches courses at the interface of education and ethnomusicology. She is the author of *Music in Cultural Context* (1996), *Songs in Their Heads* (1998, 2010), *Teaching Music Globally* (2004), *Music and Teacher* (2008), co-author of *Music in Childhood* (2013, fourth edition), co-editor of the Global Music Series and *The Oxford Handbook of Children's Musical Cultures* (2013). Campbell was designated the MENC Senior Researcher in Music Education in 2002, and in 2012 received the Taiji Prize for the preservation of traditional music. She is Chair of the Advisory Board of Smithsonian Folkways and President of the College Music Society.

Mary L. Cohen is Associate Professor, Area Head of Music Education, and Dean's Scholar at the University of Iowa. She researches wellness through music making in prison contexts, writing and songwriting, and collaborative communities. In 2009, she founded the Oakdale Community Choir, a joint inmate-volunteer choir that performs original songs inside the prison. Her research is published in the *International Journal of Research in Choral Singing*, *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *Australian Journal of Music Education*, *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education*, *Journal of Correctional Education*, the *International Journal of Community Music*, and the *International Journal of Music Education*.

Carolyn Cooke is currently completing a PhD at the University of Aberdeen focusing on music student teachers' perspectives on music pedagogy. Previously, she studied at Durham, Bristol, and The Open University. She has worked as a music teacher and Head of Department in a large secondary school, as a national curriculum regional advisor, and as a Lecturer in Music with particularly responsibility for initial teacher education. In addition she has taken an active role as a Regional Representative and Vice Chair of the music subject association (NAME), has written for a variety of music education publications both in print and online, and is currently working as a consultant writer and editor for online educational materials. Her publications and research interests include music teacher development, critical pedagogy, metacognition, and inclusion in music education.

Alice-Ann Darrow is Irvin Cooper Professor of Music in the College of Music at Florida State University. Her areas of research and clinical specialization include nonverbal communication in the classroom, and disability in music education. She is co-author of *Music+ in Special Education* (2005), *Music Therapy and Geriatric Populations* (2005), and editor of *Introduction to Approaches in Music Therapy* (2008). She has served on the editorials boards of *JRME*, *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*,

General Music Today, *Bulletin for the Council on Research in Music Education*, *Reviews of Research in Human Learning and Music*, and *Florida Music Director*.

Niyati Dhokai received a Ph.D. in Music (Ethnomusicology) from the University of Alberta in 2012. Her research has focused on the institutionalization of diasporic music practices and urban music cultures in Gujarat, India, from the time of Indian Independence to the present. During her graduate studies and research in India as a Fulbright Scholar, she developed a strong interest in applied ethnomusicology, specifically community integration through music. She currently works with participants who are recovering from traumatic brain injury in a community-based rehabilitation program as a music instructor and ethnomusicologist in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area.

Stuart Paul Duncan received a D.M.A. in composition from Cornell University in 2010 and is currently finishing his Ph.D. at Yale University in Music Theory, which explores issues surrounding meter and hypermeter in Benjamin Britten's early vocal music. Duncan is currently a Yale Teaching Center Fellow, where he helps design and lead workshops on various areas of pedagogy. In addition to his research in education and prisons, other interests include the music of twentieth-century British composers and rhythmic and metric theory. Stuart is also the music director and organist at St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Cheshire, CT.

Martin Fautley is Professor of Education at Birmingham City University, United Kingdom, where he is Director of the Centre for Research in Education. He teaches widely across a range of programs, including undergraduate and postgraduate teacher education courses, and supervises research and doctoral students. For many years he was a secondary school music teacher, subsequently undertaking his Doctoral research at Cambridge University, investigating the teaching, learning, and assessment of composing in the classroom. He is currently researching assessment in music education, and the teaching and learning of composing in secondary schools. He is the author of eight books, including *Assessment in Music Education*, published by Oxford University Press, and has written numerous journal papers and book chapters on aspects of music education, creativity, and assessment.

Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández is an Associate Professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. He teaches courses in curriculum theory, cultural studies, and the arts in education. His current research focuses on the experiences of young artists attending urban arts high schools in Canada and the United States. He is also the Principal Investigator of *Proyecto Latin@*, a participatory action research project with Latin@ youth in Toronto. His theoretical work focuses on the relationship between creativity, decolonization, and solidarity. He is particularly interested in the pedagogical and creative possibilities that arise from the social and cultural dynamics of urban centers.

Elizabeth Gould joined the University of Toronto faculty in 2005, and teaches philosophically based courses in music education. Her research interests include gender

and sexuality in the context of feminisms and queer theory. In addition to serving as lead editor for the book *Exploring Social Justice: How Music Education Might Matter* (2009), Gould has published articles in a variety of journals, including *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *Music Education Research*, *Women and Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture*, *College Music Symposium*, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, and the Brazilian journal, *labrys: études féministes estudos feministas*. She has served in leadership roles with professional organizations such as Gender Research in Music Education-International and the International Society for Philosophy of Music Education, and organized the conferences, *musica ficta: A Conference on Engagements and Exclusions in Music, Education, and the Arts* (2008), and *Feminist Theory and Music 6: Confluence and Divide* (2001).

Lucy Green is Professor of Music Education at the London University Institute of Education. Her research is in the sociology of music education, specializing in meaning, ideology, gender, popular music, informal learning, and the development of new pedagogies. She created the informal learning pathway of Musical Futures, and then took the work into the instrumental tuition context. She is the author of five books and scores of articles, the editor of two anthologies, and sits on the boards of 13 journals. She was a private piano teacher, then a secondary Head of Music, before joining the Institute of Education in 1990.

Laura Hassler was born and raised in New York. From an early age, she was active in US civil rights and peace movements. She studied cultural anthropology and music, then worked for social change organizations in the United States and Europe. After moving to the Netherlands in 1977, she built a career in music. In 1999, Laura mobilized her large network of socially conscious musicians to found Musicians without Borders. Today, still drawing on this ever-broadening network, Musicians without Borders is one of the world's pioneers in using music to bridge divides, build community, and heal the wounds of war.

Maud Hickey is Associate Professor and Coordinator of Music Education at the Bienen School of Music, Northwestern University, in Evanston, Illinois. Her research interests revolve around creative thinking through improvisation and composition. Hickey has recently been focusing on youth in detention and the potential for music creativity in their lives. She has published articles in several music education research journals and recently published a book titled *Music Outside the Lines: Ideas for Composing in K-12 Music Classrooms* (2012).

Lee Higgins is the Director of an Associate Professor of Music Education at the Boston University School of Music, USA and Director of the International Centre of Community Music based at York St. John University, UK. Committed to people, places, participation, inclusivity, and diversity, he is a community musician who has worked across the education sector as well as within health settings, prison and probation service, youth and community, and orchestra outreach. As a presenter and guest speaker, Professor Higgins has worked on four continents in university, school, and NGO

settings. He is the senior editor for the *International Journal of Community Music* and was author of *Community Music: In Theory and in Practice* (2012, Oxford University Press).

Wai-Chung Ho is Professor in the Department of Music, Hong Kong Baptist University. She received her Ph.D. from the University of London, Institute of Education. Her main research areas are the sociology of music, music education curriculum, values education, and the comparative study of East Asian music education. Her articles have been published in top-ranking journals such as the *British Journal of Music Education*, *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *International Journal of Music Education*, *Music Education Research*, *Popular Music*, *Popular Music and Society*, and *Comparative Education*.

Stephanie Horsley is Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Department of Music Education at Western University, London, Ontario, Canada. Her research interests include global economic systems and their effects on music education reform at the state and local pluralize—levels. Her recent work examines the development of neoliberal education policy and the ways in which it has shaped and been shaped by sociohistorical events at the state level and the subsequent development of music education policies and programs. She is particularly interested in the field of comparative education. Her work has been published in *Arts Education Policy Review* and has been presented at numerous international symposia.

Otto de Jong is a choir and orchestra conductor specialized in working with large groups of children. Since 1999, he has been working as a trainer for Musicians without Borders, training others to work with children. His music workshops, lessons, and rehearsals demonstrate and teach trainers to use the power of nonverbal communication and team building. For de Jong, music is a means for children to receive attention, to learn to concentrate, to be in a safe environment in a group setting and, last but not least, is a source of joy.

Estelle R. Jorgensen is Professor Emerita of Music (Music Education), Indiana University Jacobs School of Music and Contributing Faculty Member, Richard W. Riley College of Education and Leadership at Walden University. She is the author of *In Search of Music Education* (1997), *Transforming Music Education* (2003), *The Art of Teaching Music* (2008), and *Pictures of Music Education* (2011), and her articles have appeared in leading journals and essay collections in music education. She is the editor of the *Philosophy of Music Education Review* and of the *Counterpoints: Music and Education* book series published by Indiana University Press.

Panagiotis A. Kanellopoulos is Associate Professor of Music Education at the University of Thessaly, Greece. His interests include sociocultural perspectives on musical creativity, ethnographic approaches to musical improvisation, as well as possible junctures between philosophy of music education and political philosophy. Panagiotis has co-edited the volume *Arts in Education-Education in the Arts* (Athens, Nissos, 2010);

his work has been published in international edited volumes and major research journals (including *Psychology of Music*, *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *Action Criticism & Theory for Music Education*, *British Journal of Music Education*, *Educational Philosophy & Theory*). He is active as a mandolinist, performing and recording in a variety of contexts.

Sidsel Karlsen is Professor of Music Education at Hedmark University College in Norway as well as docent at the Sibelius Academy, University of the Arts, Helsinki, Finland. She has published widely in international research journals and is a contributor to anthologies such as *Sociology and Music Education* (2010) and *Collaborative Learning in Higher Music Education* (2013). Her research interests cover, among other things, multicultural music education, the interplay between formal and informal arenas for learning, and the social and cultural significance of music festivals. Currently, she is also involved in a research project investigating musical gentrification and sociocultural diversities from a Norwegian perspective.

Jacqueline Kelly-McHale is Associate Professor and Coordinator of Music Education at DePaul University in Chicago, Illinois. Kelly-McHale's research focuses on culturally responsive teaching in K–12 music classrooms, issues of social justice, and composition in K–12 classrooms. She has published articles in *Journal of Research in Music Education* and *Mountain Lake Reader*. Kelly-McHale is an active presenter, having presented sessions at state, national, and international conferences. Kelly-McHale earned her doctorate at Northwestern University, an MAME degree from The University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, and a BSME from Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Jason Kubilius is Head of Creative Arts at George Green's school in Tower Hamlets, and previous to that he spent most of his career at Forest Hill School in Lewisham as Head of Music and Director of the Performing Arts Specialism. He has taught for 18 years and has tried to make the music department accessible and inclusive for all. Forest Hill School has been a Musical Futures Champion School and has been involved in leading INSETs for teachers and PGCE students interested in making a music department successful and inclusive.

Gloria Ladson-Billings is the Kellner Family Chair in Urban Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Faculty Affiliate in the Departments of Educational Policy Studies, Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, and Afro-American Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Roberta Lamb is Associate Professor in Music and Music Education at the School of Music, Queen's University. She is cross-appointed to the Faculty of Education and Department of Gender Studies. She is a docent in Music Education at the Sibelius Academy, Helsinki University of the Arts, Finland, where she advises graduate students in music education. Lamb was a founding member of Gender Research in Music Education, and, according to one of her high school teachers, was a feminist before the

word existed. In addition to academic writing, she is proudest of her work to establish the Symphony Education Partnership (since 1993) in Kingston, Ontario, and her project for teaching university students how to teach ukulele to grade 6 and 7 students in the Limestone School Board.

Wing-Wah Law is Professor in the Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong. He received his Ph.D. from the University of London, Institute of Education. His research interests and publications cover the areas of education and development, globalization and citizenship education, education policy and legislation, education reform and Chinese societies, music education and social change, and culture and school leadership. His publications have appeared in international journals in education, including *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *Compare*, *Comparative Education*, *Comparative Education Review*, *International Journal of Educational Development*, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *Music Education Research*, and *Teachers College Record*.

Paul Louth works at Youngstown State University in Youngstown, Ohio, where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in music education methods, philosophy, technology, and research. He holds Ph.D. and Master's degrees in Music Education from the University of Western Ontario, as well a Bachelor of Education and a Bachelor of Music (performance) degree from the University of Toronto. He is particularly interested in philosophical and sociological issues in music education. His research involves applications of critical pedagogy to music education, music, and lifelong learning, and issues surrounding the use of technology in music education.

Kathryn Marsh is Associate Professor of Music Education at the University of Sydney. She has undertaken large-scale cross-cultural collaborative research into children's musical play in Australia, Europe, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Korea. Her research interests also include children's creativity and cultural diversity in music education, most recently exploring the role of music in the lives of refugee children. She is editor of *Research Studies in Music Education* and has written numerous scholarly publications, including *The Musical Playground: Global Tradition and Change in Children's Songs and Games*, published by Oxford University Press and winner of two international awards.

Richard Matthews is a political philosopher and peace scholar with specific interests in violence, evil, and the nature of oppression. In particular he is an expert on the nature and ethics of torture. His main publication is *The Absolute Violation: Why Torture Must Be Prohibited* (Montreal & Kingston: MQUP, 2008). In addition he has published a variety of essays on torture, as well as articles on ethics and metaphysics. He teaches philosophy at Huron University College at the University of Western Ontario.

Marie McCarthy is Professor of Music Education at the University of Michigan, and prior to this position she was on the faculty of the University of Maryland from 1990 to 2006. Her research studies address the historical, social, and cultural foundations of music education, the transmission of music in cultural context, and spiritual dimensions

of music teaching and learning. Her publications include two books, *Passing It On: The Transmission of Music in Irish Culture* (1999), and *Toward a Global Community: A History of the International Society for Music Education, 1953–2003* (2004).

Carmen Mills is Lecturer in the School of Education at The University of Queensland, Australia. Her research interests are informed broadly by the sociology of education and specifically by issues of social justice in education, schooling in disadvantaged communities, and teacher education for the development of socially just dispositions. Her current research as a chief investigator on an Australian Research Council project explores social justice dispositions informing teachers' pedagogy in advantaged and disadvantaged secondary schools.

Lis Murphy is the UK Founder and UK Director of Musicians without Borders. She has pioneered the use of singing and songwriting workshops, to find a way of enabling refugees and torture survivors to find peace through expression and collective experience. Lis is also a professional performing musician, who previously supported New Order, Billy Bragg, and Balkan Beatbox. Lis has also performed with Mali superstars Amadou and Mariam and a world premiere by William Orbit.

Flávia M. Narita is Lecturer at Universidade de Brasília (UnB/Brazil) and, from 2007 to 2010, she coordinated the Music Teacher Education course offered by that university through the Distance Education program of the Open University of Brazil. She is currently finishing her Ph.D. studies at the Institute of Education, University of London, under the supervision of Professor Lucy Green. She completed her first degree in Music Education at the Universidade de São Paulo (USP/Brazil).

Susan A. O'Neill has an interdisciplinary background with graduate degrees in three disciplines (music performance, psychology, education). She is Associate Professor in Music Education at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada. She is Director of MODAL Research Group (Multimodal Opportunities, Diversity and Artistic Learning) and Research for Youth, Music and Education (RYME). She has held Visiting Fellowships at Trinity College Dublin, University of Melbourne, and University of Michigan, United States. Her international projects explore young people's music engagement in ways that contribute to expansive learning opportunities, positive values, self-identities, motivation, resiliency, learning relationships, and cultural understandings. She has published widely in the fields of music psychology and music education.

Chris Philpott is Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor and Reader in Music Education in the Faculty of Education and Health at the University of Greenwich, United Kingdom. He became a teacher-educator after working for 16 years as a secondary school music teacher. He has research interests in the pedagogy of teacher education, the body and musical learning, and music as language. He has written and edited books, online texts, and resources widely used in initial teacher education programs.

André de Quadros is a professor of music and chair of the Music Education Department at Boston University, where he also holds positions in African, Asian, and Muslim

studies and in prison education. He directs several international ventures, including a new socially responsible conducting course in Sweden. He conducts the Manado State University Choir, Indonesia, and partners with several community projects in Mexico, Israel, and the Arab world.

J. Christopher Roberts teaches K–5 music in Seattle, Washington, and is an Affiliate Assistant Professor of Music Education at the University of Washington. He holds degrees from the University of Washington (Ph.D., M.A.) and Swarthmore College (B.A.), with research and clinical interests in children's musical cultures, cultural diversity in music education, and the nature of children's interest in music. Recent articles have appeared in publications including *Oxford Handbook of Children's Musical Cultures* (2013), *Journal of Research in Music Education* (2013), *Multicultural Perspectives in Music Education* (2011), and *Alternative Approaches in Music Education* (2011).

Leslie Stewart Rose is faculty member in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. She brings her experiences as a classroom teacher to her work at OISE, which has included teaching music education courses, serving as Director of the elementary teacher education program, and leading research and teacher inquiry in partnership with Toronto District School Board's inclusive education initiatives. Related major publications include *Exploring Social Justice: How Music Education Might Matter* (2009) and *Deepening Inclusive And Community-Engaged Education in Three Schools: A Teachers' Resource* (2014).

Gabriel Rusinek is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Education, Complutense University of Madrid. He edits the peer-reviewed open access research journal *Revista Electrónica Complutense de Investigación en Educación Musical* (<http://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/RECI/>). He is a member of the editorial boards of ISME's *International Journal of Music Education-Practice* and *Revista Internacional de Educación Musical*, and of the advisory boards of the *International Journal of Education & the Arts* and *Music Education Research*, and a commissioner at ISME Music in Schools and Teacher Education Commission. His research interests include collaborative composition, inclusive teaching practices, school failure, and audience experience.

Jonathan Savage is Reader in Education at the Faculty of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom. He has a number of research interests, including implementing new technologies in education, cross-curricular approaches to teaching and learning, creativity and assessment. He is Managing Director of UCan.tv (www.ucanplay.tv), a not-for-profit company that provides support and advice for educators using music, audio, and video technologies. He is a widely published author, having written and edited for Routledge, Oxford University Press, Open University Press, SAGE, and Learning Matters. Jonathan runs an active blog at www.jsavage.org.uk and can be followed on Twitter @jpjsavage.

Patrick Schmidt is Chair and Associate Professor of Music Education at Western University in London, Ontario, Canada. He also served as the Associate Director of Florida International University's School of Music in Miami, and taught at the Westminster Choir College. His innovative work in critical pedagogy, urban music education, and policy studies is recognized nationally and internationally. His most recent publications can be found in the *International Journal of Music Education*; *Arts Education Policy Review*; *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*; *Philosophy of Music Education Review*; *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*; *ABEM Journal* in Brazil; and the *Finnish Journal of Music Education*. He has co-edited the 2012 NSSE book with Teachers College Press and a special issue of the education journal *Theory into Practice*. Schmidt is currently working on a single-authored book on policy for Oxford.

Eric Shieh is a founding teacher at the Metropolitan Expeditionary Learning School in New York City and author of numerous articles and chapters on progressive music pedagogies and curriculum reform. He is a former policy strategist for the New York City Department of Education and has founded music programs in prisons across the United States. In 2012, he was awarded a Fund For Teachers Fellowship to research educational responses to poverty and youth violence in Caracas, Venezuela. Eric holds degrees in music education, multicultural theory, and curriculum policy from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and Teachers College, Columbia University.

John Sloboda is Research Professor at the Guildhall School of Music, in London, and Emeritus Professor at Keele University. He was a staff member of the School of Psychology at Keele from 1974 to 2008, where he was Director of its Unit for the Study of Musical Skill and Development. Sloboda is internationally known for his work on the psychology of music. He is a committee member of the Society for Education and Music Psychology Research, and was Editor-in-Chief of its journal *Psychology of Music* from 1985 to 1989. He was the recipient of the 1998 British Psychological Society's Presidents Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychological Knowledge, and in 2004 was elected to Fellowship of the British Academy. John is also co-director of Every Casualty Worldwide (www.everycasualty.org) and co-founder of the Iraq Body Count Project (www.iraqbodycount.org).

Amanda Soto is Assistant Professor of Music Education at Texas State University. She co-teaches the Smithsonian Folkways Certification Course in World Music Pedagogy. After earning her teaching certification at the University of North Texas, she taught middle school band in South Texas, where she was born and raised. She also taught general music to children within the Seattle Public Schools. She completed an M.A. in Ethnomusicology and a Ph.D. in Music Education from the University of Washington. She has undertaken certification studies in Orff and Kodály pedagogical approaches and holds a certification in world music pedagogy from the Smithsonian Institute.

Gary Spruce is Senior Lecturer in education at The Open University and subject leader for the university's music teacher training course. Before coming to the university he was a head of music in two comprehensive schools in Birmingham, United Kingdom.

He has published widely, including co-editing a number of key texts on music teacher education as well as presenting papers at national and international conferences. From 2007 to 2012 he was co-editor of the *British Journal of Music Education* and from 2007 to 2010 was involved in developing a national CPD program for primary music teachers, which was used by over 4,000 teachers. Gary is a practicing musician with a particular interest in music for the theater.

Heidi Westerlund is Professor at the Sibelius Academy, University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland, as well as the Administrative Chair of the Center for Educational Research and Academic Development in the Arts (CERADA). She has published widely in international journals and books, and she is the co-editor of *Collaborative Learning in Higher Music Education*. She has served as an Associate Editor or reviewer in several international journals and she is the Editor-in-chief of the *Finnish Journal of Music Education*. Her current research interests cover teacher education, higher music education, collaborative learning, cultural diversity, and democracy in music education.

Joel Westheimer is University Research Chair in Democracy and Education at the University of Ottawa and education columnist for CBC Radio's *Ottawa Morning Show*. He began his career teaching in the New York City Public School system before obtaining a Ph.D. from Stanford University. He has published more than 50 scholarly and professional articles and book chapters and frequently addresses radio and television audiences nationally and internationally. His award-winning books include *Among Schoolteachers: Community, Autonomy and Ideology in Teachers' Work* (1998) and the edited collection *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools* (foreword by the late Howard Zinn, 2007). His third book—*What Kind of Citizen?*—was published in 2015 by Teachers College Press.

Paul Woodford is Professor of Music Education at Western University in London, Ontario, Canada. He is past Co-Chair of the executive committee of the International Society for the Philosophy of Music Education (2005–2007) and is a member of the International Advisory Boards of the *British Journal of Music Education*, the *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, and the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*. His interests in philosophical and historical issues affecting the profession have led to many publications, including his 2005 book, *Democracy and Music Education*, and many chapters and articles in leading books and journals.

Sheila C. Woodward is Chair of Music and Associate Professor of Music at Eastern Washington University, United States. She is a native of South Africa and earned her Ph.D. from the University of Cape Town and a Performer's Licentiate in Organ from the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music. Dr. Woodward is President of the International Society for Music Education. She previously served two terms as an ISME Board member and as Chair of the Early Childhood Music Education Commission (ISME). Dr. Woodward's research focus is music and well-being, exploring this from before birth to adulthood.

Ruth Wright is Associate Professor in the Don Wright Faculty of Music at Western University, London, Ontario, Canada. Wright's earlier career included teaching high school music, maintaining a large private piano studio, and lecturing in music education at the University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (now Cardiff Metropolitan University). She received her PhD in Education from this institution in 2006. She is the co-founder of Musical Futures Canada, an informal learning music program, and publishes regularly in books and refereed journals on the subjects of sociology, social justice, and music education. Her edited book *Sociology and Music Education* was published by Ashgate Press in September 2010.

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

SOCIAL JUSTICE

IN MUSIC

EDUCATION

SECTION I

UNDERSTANDING
SOCIAL JUSTICE
IN MUSIC
EDUCATION
CONCEPTUALLY,
HISTORICALLY, AND
POLITICALLY

INTRODUCTION

From Pioneers to New Frameworks

PAUL WOODFORD, SECTION EDITOR

WHAT is social justice, and how might it apply to music education? These are the primary questions explored in this first section of this Handbook in which the authors work to explain and illustrate what social justice means and what it might imply for professional practice, while also contextualizing its pursuit in and through the field of music education with reference to history and contemporary politics. As historian Marie McCarthy explains in Chapter 2, the study of music education's history can help us to better understand some of the roots and causes of social *in*justice in our own field, while also realizing why and how music education has always been inextricably linked with politics. Such study might expose long-term patterns of oppression that have gone unnoticed, and thus unchallenged, while revealing gaps in the historical record with respect to the untold stories of marginalized or persecuted groups. In short, historical research and study can inform our understanding of present circumstances by revealing how our beliefs, practices, and ways of thinking have to a significant extent been shaped by the past. It can also, of course, help individuals to realize that history is itself a politically charged and contested subject, the study of which involves—or should involve—adjudication of often conflicting interpretations of the historical record, because this record is inevitably incomplete and therefore only partial.

The pursuit of social justice, however, whether through historical or other research and study, presupposes an interest in creating or fostering a more humane society. This involves questioning or otherwise challenging the authority of the status quo; otherwise individuals, especially children, are not likely to notice or recognize oppression, let alone develop a sense of moral agency and social responsibility. Estelle Jorgensen, in Chapter 1, explains why music educators of all kinds should be interested in this task, while also warning against overly simplistic understandings both as to why social justice should matter to them and of the concept itself, which is in reality complex and difficult. Jorgensen carefully teases out a “multifaceted view of social justice” involving various overlapping, and sometimes conflicting, conceptions of social justice that provides a

conceptual framework for virtually all that follows in these pages. For this reason, her chapter has accordingly been placed at the beginning of this Handbook and section, followed by McCarthy's chapter on the need for historical perspective.

The next three chapters in this section are more directly concerned with issues relating to policy. Patrick Schmidt in Chapter 3 makes an ethical call to music teachers at all levels to attend to, and become more involved in, policymaking, lest they continue to be marginalized in policy discourses affecting them, their students, and society as a whole. If policy provides the political means for enacting some collective vision, policymaking is the realm wherein that vision is created and honed through discourse. Policy discourse, though, is inevitably biased because it is influenced by politics and power and thus is selective, privileging some people and their ideas and values, while excluding or devaluing others. Thus, if music teachers committed to fostering social justice in and through their own teaching and programs are to be realistic and effective in striving to accomplish their goals, they need to become more aware of, and savvy about, policy, while finding ways to lend their voices to that discourse so that they can be heard by government and others.

Whereas the chapters thus far in this section are relatively general in nature inasmuch as they involve concerns about the concept(s) of social justice, the need for historical perspective, and greater and critical involvement in educational policymaking, the next two chapters are more specific in nature, albeit still related to policy issues. Stephanie Horsley in Chapter 4 summarizes and critiques the essential elements of the neoliberal ideology that is now so pervasive in our world, including policy discourse, while explaining that it is based in significant part on a conception of negative rights (e.g., equality of opportunity) that favors capitalist over democratic interests and that may in certain respects be inimical to the pursuit of social justice. She proffers several recommendations for how music teachers might work to counter some of the more Darwinian aspects of the neoliberal social and educational agenda so that they can better contribute to a more inclusive and humane society.

Gabriel Rusinek and José Luis Aróstegui, however, writing from a European perspective in Chapter 5, take a somewhat different tack in observing that some transnational institutions associated with neoliberal education reform contend that an "economy-based curriculum" can work to promote social justice by improving academic achievement among disadvantaged children, thereby reducing income inequality in the future. This might seem a contentious claim to some readers since, as just suggested, neoliberal education reform tends to favor the already privileged while reducing education for the masses of children to technocratic or vocational training. Rusinek and Aróstegui, however, argue that if music is to remain a part of the school curriculum, and thereby accessible to the majority of children, then teachers must be able to convince government of the relevance and efficacy of those programs in meeting the goals of compulsory education. As in other subject areas, music teachers will have to rely to a greater extent than before on standards and quantitative measures for purposes of accountability, but there is also a need for the development of evidence-based qualitative assessment tools that more accurately represent the kinds of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that

children have traditionally learned in music classes that are important to their future economic success *and* personal fulfillment. The profession has not done an adequate job of explaining and demonstrating to government and the public how, in what ways, and to what extent the study of music and the arts exercises critical thinking, creativity, and imagination—qualities and habits of mind that are, or should be, of value as much to business elites as to the arts community (Winner, Goldstein, & Vincent-Lancrin, 2013). Hence there is a need for alternative forms of assessment that can show politicians what music teachers have always known: that music matters profoundly to society in ways that cannot be assessed by quantitative measures alone. Viewed thusly, the development of more and better qualitative assessment tools of the sort described by Rusinek and Aróstegui might arguably be seen as a form of political resistance, as a bulwark against those who would eliminate school music programs because they are perceived as educational frills and therefore are expendable.

The last two chapters in this section help to place the ideas presented in the foregoing chapters into broader context by linking music education more explicitly to citizenship education. In Chapter 6, Wai-Chung Ho and Wing-Wah Law explore how the Chinese government uses music and music education to help shape the public's ideas of citizenship and national, regional, and ethnic identity in this age of globalization and free trade. There is a tension in Chinese education policy affecting music education as the government attempts to acknowledge, while tempering, the growing materialism and individualism among youth that are associated with globalization by also recognizing music education's potential contribution to social stability, nation building, and the "Chinese Dream." Thus far, the Chinese government has had little to say about democracy and social justice as they relate to education, but some music educators are attempting to engage the state in a broader conversation about social justice and the role of music education in an increasingly complex world.

It is fitting that we conclude this section of the Handbook with a commentary by Joel Westheimer, University Research Chair in Democracy and Education at the University of Ottawa and author of the book *What Kind of Citizen?* (Teachers College Press, 2015). His Chapter 7, entitled "What Did You Learn Today? Music Education, Democracy, and Social Justice," engages with and builds on ideas presented by other authors in this section, with a view to relating music education to wider developments in education and other disciplines and fields. Clearly, as Westheimer realizes, music education is subject to the same social, political, and cultural forces that would reduce all education to technical or vocational training. Far from defeatist, however, he believes that music and arts teachers can inspire other educators who are opposed to what he describes as "myopic education reform goals." Among the themes raised in the preface to this Handbook was that the pursuit of social justice, if it is to succeed, may require recognition of common purposes, leading to collaboration with individuals from allied fields and disciplines. As Westheimer notes, were music educators to form partnerships with other educators who conceive of education as a "profoundly human and liberatory endeavor," then music education might be "as threatening as some neoliberal reformers perceive it to be." John Dewey said almost the same thing eight decades ago when he enjoined teachers to ally

themselves with “social forces which promote educational aims” (1933, p. 48). This was to better defend public educational institutions from those who would undermine their democratic purpose of creating a critically informed and engaged citizenry that could protect the public interest from domination by economic elites. We ignore Dewey’s and Westheimer’s calls to action at our peril!

REFERENCES

- Dewey, J., & Childs, J. L. (1933). The social and economic situation and education. In W. H. Kilpatrick (Ed.), *The educational frontier* (pp. 32–72). New York and London: Century Co. Re-printed in Dewey, J. (1989). *The later works*, Vol. 8: 1933, *Essays and How we think* (Rev. ed.), Jo Ann Boydston (Ed.) (pp. 43–76). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Winner, E., Goldstein, T. R., & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2013). *Art for art’s sake? The impact of arts education*. Paris: Educational Research and Innovation, OECD Publishing.

CHAPTER 1

INTERSECTING SOCIAL JUSTICES AND MUSIC EDUCATION

ESTELLE R. JORGENSEN

THREE interrelated philosophical questions lie at the heart of this chapter: Why should music educators be interested in justice? What is meant by social justice and what are the types of social justice? How should music educators act on behalf of justice? Throughout this chapter, I make the case for a multifaceted view of social justice. I also meld theoretical and practical facets of social justice and sketch some implications for music education theory and practice. Thinking of justice in the plural complicates the analysis; outlining the practical implications of these ideas moves ideas closer to the phenomenal world in which music education transpires. Although I deal with each of these questions in conceptually independent ways, practically speaking, it becomes clear that they intersect.

WHY SHOULD MUSIC EDUCATORS BE INTERESTED IN JUSTICE?

Matters of justice constitute an imperative for music educators for at least four principal reasons. There may be other and more pressing considerations, and I do not claim that my list is exhaustive. Still, these reasons seem to be resilient in various communities and cultures and throughout history. Writing against the backdrop of a North American reality, in which music education has been a part of publicly supported education for the greater part of two centuries, it is natural to construe this problem in political and secular terms. In North America, at least, music education is conducted particularly within the aegis of the state and is manifested in its various political institutions. Viewed

within a pervasively secular framework, music education has also taken on a humanistic cast (e.g., Mursell, 1934). In the West, it has adopted a democratic and communitarian stance influenced by the ideas of such writers as John Dewey ([1916]1944). In parts of the world, religious, familial, commercial, and artistic institutions are some of the principal means for musical education writ large (Jorgensen, 1997). Even within North America, the private studio, conservatory, and church, as well as informal family and peer instruction in music, remain important ways through which people come to know music. Each of these institutions (and the musical communities that comprise and represent them) has its own value sets, some of which run counter to those of state-supported music education. Among state music educators, different values also obtain, exemplified in various curricula, instructional methods, administrative approaches, and means of teaching and learning. These realities complicate what might otherwise be a too simplistic or facile response to the question of why justice matters to and for music education. As the interests of state-supported music education remain paramount in the profession's consciousness, I begin by addressing the reasons that have the widest currency for music education. Some of the complications and dissonances—when the interests of other societal institutions in matters of justice and music education are taken into account—also become apparent.

First, from antiquity, justice underlies conceptions of humane and civil society. Its reference to conduct that is just, noble, and righteous is premised on particular conduct that is normative and prescribed by systems of rules that govern it. Rooted in mythic and theological ideas, justice is also spelled out in secular notions of how society should be organized and governed (e.g., Plato, 1993). The ancient Greek notion of *paideia* (Jaeger, 1943–1945), the ideal of an educated and cultured citizen, has been rearticulated and defended in our time by writers such as Martha Nussbaum (1997) and applied to educational thought and practice by Mortimer Adler (1982, 1983, 1984), among others. Justice is premised on the reality of pervasive evil-doing, inhumanity, and incivility, and the imperative to delimit and redress them insofar as possible. It both prompts right-doing and punishes evil-doing.

Practically speaking, what is considered to be “right” conduct is framed by those with the power to create and enforce the rules that define it. Societal institutions, whether political, religious, commercial, artistic, or familial, are characterized by different rule sets and power brokers from place to place and time to time. For music educators located within a pervasively political milieu, these rule sets are inscribed in laws and regulations that are enforced by courts (Heimonen, 2002). Each institution has rule sets that possibly conflict with those of other institutions, and these rule sets are contested in the public arena. Conduct valued as “just” or “right” by one institution may not be accepted as “just” or “right” by another. For example, justice conceived in terms of providing a gender-blind musical education in state-supported schools may not be acceptable in conservative Islamic, Jewish, or Christian-supported schools. Although they represent Abrahamic faiths, committed alike to broad principles of humanity and civility, their particular theologies give rise to differing conceptions of justice in taking into account gender in music education. All may seek to redress differing evils and point

toward various conceptions of righteousness, articulated by the governors of these faith communities and schools. Nevertheless, what one institution may view as just and right may represent for others what is unjust and wrong—this, notwithstanding that all may ascribe to the value of justice in the educational community or society. Music teachers may agree in general terms about the importance of justice as a value underlying humane and civil society, but the particular circumstances in which they do their work are likely to shape the specific ways in which their notions of justice are framed and realized in their musical instruction. While there may be widespread general agreement about the proposition of justice as a basis for humane and civil society, the closer one comes to the ground of music educational practice, the more fraught the problem of what is meant by justice and how it can be achieved practically.

Second, music education is centrally concerned with matters of justice because music education is a facet of cultural and public policy. It constitutes a means of developing dispositions of citizens within a particular society (Arnstine, 1995), recognizing and rectifying evil and wrongdoing and transforming society toward greater civility, humanity, and artistic expression (Jorgensen, 2003). Dewey ([1927]1954) makes the case that communities, institutions, and societies are predicated on the idea that the people who comprise them delegate authority (or it is delegated on their behalf) to those who perform tasks that cannot easily be accomplished by individuals acting alone. Such public actions especially benefit the very young and old, those who are vulnerable in society and may be physically or mentally unable to act on their own behalf, and those who do not possess the education, money, and power to act on their own behalf. This is especially the case in educational and artistic endeavors that often require decision-making on behalf of the collective good (Gingell, 2014). Whether under the aegis of the state, religion, commerce, family, or the music profession, music education lies within the realm of policies or general principles that guide action in regard to which particular musical beliefs and actions are valued as contributors to the well-being of the sponsoring group, community, institution, or society. Music education's value to a particular group is also adjudicated on the basis of its contribution not only to music but to the other beliefs, values, and mores by which this group lives. From the beginning of state-supported music education in the nineteenth century (Woodbridge, 1831), music education has been expected to develop the propensities to act in ways expected of citizens. This expectation has continued as a compelling argument during the twentieth (Mursell, 1934) and into the twenty-first centuries (Jorgensen, 2002, 2003). The same is true of religiously supported music education in the ancient world (Wellesz, 1969), and within the education of Cathedral choristers in the Christian church (Rainbow & Cox, 2006).

The notion of cultivating dispositions as the end of education admits that education cannot be wholly successful, and that some students may not develop the desirable character traits or ways of living for which educators might hope (Highet, [1950]1955). Being disposed to think and act in particular ways does not mean that one will always do what one wishes one might do or knows one should do. Kant's recognition of human frailty and imperfection aptly suits the human predicament (Berlin, 1990, foreword; Kant, [1784]1923, p. 23). Recognizing and rectifying evil and transforming education and

society toward more civility and humanity are contingent and problematic. Practically speaking, much depends on how evil and wrongdoing are defined within the sponsoring groups, communities, institutions, or societies, and the degree to which educators are empowered to solve often intractable problems. The notion of transforming music education is a complex one, depending on what one means by transformation and how it can take place (Jorgensen, 2003). Societally based notions of the particular good and right-doing toward which music education aspires are contested within and outside music education. Even if music educators agree on the particular ends they seek, there is the ever-present problem that they will not do what they believe they should. The notion that one could train music educators to act in particular ways is ultimately fraught and unsuccessful. Donald Arnstine's (1995) more modest project of seeking to develop dispositions to act in ways that improve the situation in education, as well as more broadly in society, is a more realistic plan. This approach admits that one might hope for music educators, as cultural workers (Giroux, [1992]1993), to seek justice. Ultimately, one cannot be assured of success in the project. Transformation from evil-doing to right-action, toward that which is just, is not only relative and contingent but far from assured, even if there is agreement and collective effort in the direction of the particular justice that is sought. My response to this dilemma is that even though this is the case, education remains a hopeful enterprise (Freire, 1994). Albeit an idealistic hope—hope in the face of the prospect of defeat—educational hope still represents a powerful incentive to improve the situation.

Third, justice emphasizes the worth, dignity, and preciousness of individual human beings (Gaita, 2000) and reinforces a sense of self-respect and self-worth in those who pursue and receive it. Thinking of justice in these humane and personal terms brings notions of justice closer to the beliefs and practices of music educators. Music teachers typically think of their work as having to do with valuing all of their students and developing their personal confidence, self-worth, and self-respect. Notwithstanding the different genders, ethnicities, colors, languages, ages, religious affiliations, social classes, and musical proclivities of their students, doing justice necessitates a commitment to all one's students, irrespective of their particular characteristics. Doing justice requires that one regards all people of worth with the same claims to honor, courtesy, and care.

This is more easily said than done because differences between people often prompt bias, suspicion, and hostility. When empathy falters, these biases are caricatured as stereotypes that harden into habits and mores. It then becomes easy to act dismissively, disrespectfully, critically, and thoughtlessly against different others. Carried to an extreme, this behavior may incite injustice and violence. Paulo Freire (1990) points to the tendency for those who once were oppressed, disempowered, and alienated but now come into power to act just as those who oppressed them, so ingrained is the "image of the oppressor" in their consciousness and unconsciousness. When people throw off the yoke of oppression, they may act like others did to them; they, in turn, can become oppressors of others who do not agree with them and are reluctant to give up the perquisites of power. Although overcoming these tendencies is a principal educational task, it may not suffice. As Seyla Benhabib (2002) notes, laws may also be needed to

settle disputes and enforce a measure of civility and humane conduct. One hopes, like Raymond Gaita (2000), to create the circumstances in which all people will be regarded as precious. Nevertheless, there is the ever present possibility that ingrained cultural and societal habits and norms, and an inability to empathize with different others and to imagine how things might be more humane and civil, stand in the way of realizing this principle.

Fourth, justice assists in negotiating the different perspectives, worldviews, and mindsets that compete for ascendancy, and it seeks to adjudicate conflicts and settle disputes through the exercise of reason, dialogue, and legal intervention (Benhabib, 2002; Morgan & Guilherme, 2014). Music education is centrally concerned with transmitting and transforming a plethora of musical traditions from one generation to the next. Negotiating today's globally interconnected world of musics poses significant challenges for music teachers and their students. The farther from the students' musical lives in time and space—the more disparate the musics studied from those they have experienced at home, in their place of worship, on the Internet, or in the live musical performances in which they have participated—the more difficult it is for them to grasp the claims of musics with which they are, as yet, unfamiliar. Musical values sometimes clash or rub up against each other, and each tradition is interested in its own survival. For this reason, the supporters of local musical traditions in the service of nationalistic movements may also resist efforts to introduce students to the musics of other cultures.

Justice, by its appeal to reason, hopes to negotiate the sometimes conflicting claims of this plethora of musical traditions. Paul Woodford (2005) posits that a reasoned approach to music education requires the exercise of critical thinking on the part of music educators and their students in unmasking taken-for-granted assumptions and practices and forging more humane and civil approaches. Such thoughtful approaches may fly in the face of educational and more broadly cultural realities. For example, a backlash against multiculturalism is already evident in some educational circles in the United States. As I write, the "Common Core" movement attempts to standardize certain elite knowledge as normative (Cardany, 2013; Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011). This approach represents a return to the thinking of writers such as E. D. Hirsch (1987), who sought to define what every American ought to know. Hirsch privileged certain masculine, esoteric, establishment, and Eurocentric knowledge over that which was feminine, popular, accessible, and emanated from the lower social classes and other parts of the world. Educators in some quarters are now lining up uncritically behind notions of the Common Core and are applying it to all aspects of the school curriculum. For music educators desirous of introducing their students to a world of diverse musical traditions, it is now necessary to critique notions of the Common Core while going beyond it. To do this effectively requires a reasoned approach to problems that may be difficult to surmount. Although thinking of music education in terms of justice offers an important means of carefully evaluating authorized knowledge (Apple, 2000), it cannot hope to be successful within the public sphere in circumstances where music educators are disempowered. In order to effect change, it is necessary for music educators to win

wide public support for their positions and act cohesively to insist that their views are heard and valued. Sometimes, it is necessary to ensure change through legal means.

WHAT IS MEANT BY SOCIAL JUSTICE AND WHAT ARE THE TYPES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE?

During the past decade, music educators have theorized aspects of social justice (Allsup, 2007, introducing a special issue of *Music Education Research*; Bowman, 2007, introducing an issue of *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*). Cathy Benedict and Patrick Schmidt (2007) are among those to grasp the problematic ways in which the claims of justice have been articulated and applied in the past. My own tack in this present writing is to unpack some of the lenses through which justice has been viewed in order to construe social justice conceptually and to reflect on implications for music education thought and practice.

Among these lenses, social justice can be thought of as a form of what is generally referred to as distributive justice (Allingham, 2014a, 2014b). That is, its focus is upon ensuring the “common good,” or fairly sharing the wealth and benefits of society among all its members. This view of justice has a decidedly economic ring, articulated especially in welfare economics, a field of economic theory concerned with taking account of and attending to the well-being of members of society. John Rawls (1999a) interprets distributive justice broadly to include educational, cultural, political, and legal benefits to which people in democratic societies are entitled. Distributive justice seeks reciprocity between individual and societal rights because of the tensions and conflicts between specific individual needs, wants, and interests and those of the communities of which they are a part. It also concerns matters of access to justice in every area of life. In education, distributive justice has been thought of in terms of rights to schooling (Levine & Bane, 1975). For example, in music education, distributive justice refers to the imperative of ensuring that music education is available equitably and that particular individuals or minorities are not disadvantaged or excluded from instruction. Such a position would require working with students who differ, often markedly, in language, ethnicity, family background, social class, musicality, and musical experience and forging music programs that ensure the benefits of music education irrespective of these differences.

The communitarian purpose of the “common good,” as “justice of the community” or “justice of common welfare,” is emphasized by educational writers such as Dewey ([1916]1944), Maxine Greene (1988), and Parker Palmer (1998). These writers embrace a democratic view of the community as a group of people united around particular beliefs and practices, responsible for their own governance, holding each other in esteem, and

acting humanely toward one another. The community is more than the sum of the individuals who comprise it. Individuals act not only in their own hedonistic interests but for the benefit of the good to the entire community. Welfare is understood not only to be individual, but collective or common to all those who comprise the community. Justice applies not only to individuals but also to their collective well-being and to the community as a whole. Viewed within this prism, as a music teacher, one would need to think not only of one's self or of each of the individuals who comprise one's class or ensemble, but of the well-being of the entire class or ensemble as a community. Social justice focuses on this collective, communitarian, or common welfare.

Commutative justice may also intersect with social justice. Thomas Aquinas (2013–2014) distinguished distributive and commutative justice in his *Summa theologiae* (question 61). By commutative, I mean contractual obligations that exist between individuals, groups, and the societies of which they are a part. For Dewey ([1927]1954), the public has entrusted the work of teaching the young to educational policymakers, administrators, and teachers. By virtue of accepting employment in school districts, teachers are contractually responsible to teach in ways that follow certain rules and regulations. Likewise, the public, politicians, and educational policymakers are responsible for fulfilling their contractual obligations by providing the conditions under which this educational work can be carried on successfully. Too often, these obligations are unmet. When this occurs, social justice insists on their being met. In the United States, for example, the conditions described by Jonathan Kozol (2005) of crumbling schools, unsanitary conditions, inadequate supplies, and unqualified teachers in some schools represent a failure of commutative justice on the part of the public and the school boards that represent them. Social justice can be understood in terms of these contractual matters and the need to ensure that contracts are honored by all the parties to them. Where public commitments are made to music education in schools, it is just as incumbent on the public and its policymakers to provide the resources to accomplish agreed-upon ends and means as it is for music teachers to offer programs that address the means and ends of music instruction for which they have been hired.

Social justice can also be viewed in terms of contributive justice. Contributive justice concerns what people are able to contribute to society, that is, their rights to give to others and the societies of which they are a part. Race remains an important factor in contributive justice in the workplace (Gomberg, 2007; Sayer, 2009). Whereas distributive justice concerns what is given to people, contributive justice focuses on what people give to each other and to their communities. For example, in economic terms, it concerns the rights of people to work; in artistic terms, it relates to the rights of people to create artistic products and engage in artistic activities; in social terms, it concerns the rights of people to marry and raise families. Social justice concerns the rights of women to vote and to contribute economically in ways that, in the past, may have been more stereotypically male. In music education, these gender roles may play out, among other ways, in the rights of females to play musical instruments or assume musical roles typically and historically played by males.

In terms of procedural justice, social justice focuses on the notion of the process and a sense of fair play whereby individuals and groups interact with each other, according each other rights and responsibilities (Rawls, 1971, 1999b). It concerns the means whereby justice is seen to be done in every aspect of life in ways that are transparent to all, and the procedures that are conducted in individual and collective life are understood by all in sharing the goods that society provides. This notion of justice emphasizes process rather than product and means rather than ends. For example, the process whereby music teachers select members of their ensembles is crucial in determining whether or not the teachers' conduct is perceived or understood to be just. Biases have historically been evident to people of differing cultural heritage in race-based admission to educational opportunities. Social justice may involve the effort to clarify the procedures whereby such admission decisions are made. When this is the case, social justice encompasses procedural justice that focuses on the means whereby particular educational ends are reached.

Social justice may sometimes include retributive justice. This view of justice has ancient roots in the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi (ca. 1750 BCE) and Jewish Mosaic Law. In the Law of Moses, for example, punishment is rendered to evil-doers so that they also suffer in an "eye for an eye" and "a tooth for a tooth" (Exodus 21:23; Deuteronomy 19:17–21). Notwithstanding Immanuel Kant's (1972) link between punishment and moral wrongdoing and his argument that those who have done evil to others deserve punishment that is measured and appropriate to the evil they have done, retributive justice may be harsh and vengeful. Penalties are exacted from evil-doers for the purpose of punishing them and causing them sorrow, suffering, and even death. Wishing to see people suffer in return for the evil that they have or are supposed to have done is a common human response. For those who have suffered persecution and oppression, it is difficult to see beyond a desire for their persecutors and oppressors to suffer as they have suffered. Their anger and outrage are understandable. Still, retaliating with hatred can consolidate and perpetuate an inhumane situation; instances of punishment and revenge can spiral, moving outward as they, in turn, consolidate and perpetuate themselves. Throughout history, religious dogma has often not only tolerated but encouraged this view of justice. Too often, education (and music education) has been conducted within an ethic of suffering and retribution. Some administrators, teachers, and students are mean and cruel; they delight in the suffering of others in the misguided belief that this is a necessary part of the educational process. In these and other ways, social justice may be retributive in its desire to punish evil-doers and see them suffer.

Restorative justice as a frame in which to construe social justice focuses on correcting past iniquities and inequities and, insofar as possible, putting right the evil that has been done. In recent decades, this notion has been explored in a variety of contexts, including criminal law, philosophy, and theology (Braithwaite, 1989; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1982; De Gruchy, 2002; and Govier, 2006). This transformational and redemptive notion of justice assumes that traditional thought and practice concerning individuals and groups may need to be rethought and reworked in order to restore what has been

lost to those who have been wronged. For example, Gaita (2000) writes of the need to restore to Aboriginal peoples of Australia the land, livelihood, and dignity that have been stolen or seized from them. Correcting past abuse, neglect, and ostracism seeks to create a more just reality in which those who have been marginalized or excluded from society are welcomed into it as fully participating and respected citizens. In education, such a view of justice requires the special effort of atonement in order to put things right. Here, since some individuals and groups have suffered injustice in the past, it is necessary to go beyond simply ensuring that all have a fair share of the benefits of society to give special attention to their needs and wants. One is not simply creating “a level playing field,” where all play by the same rules. Rather, realizing the burden of the sins of the past and the vulnerability of those who have not had the same access to education, wealth, security, respect, and love as their more privileged fellows requires “affirmative action.” Here, an effort is made to ensure that minorities and the more vulnerable in society have the support they need to succeed in a world where long-standing biases and stereotypes may make it difficult for them to succeed. For example, music teachers who, in the past, may have been biased toward their white middle-class students would need to reach out to meet the needs and interests of their minority, differently abled, and lower- and under-class students. These efforts may be perceived as privileging their minority students. Still, this is how it will likely be when restorative justice takes hold. Social justice can involve corrective justice when it seeks to put right the evils perpetrated by one group on another. From this perspective, social justice is transformational in seeking to right past wrongs and creating or restoring a more humane and civil society.

Social justice may also be seen as a form of poetic justice (Nussbaum, 1995). Such justice recognizes that doing evil causes harm to the evil-doer. Oppression harms the oppressor as much as the oppressed. Cruelty, violence, incivility, and lack of empathy for those less fortunate than oneself render people less moral, just, and good. In so doing, they are soul-destroying, isolating one from human friendship and love and even psychologically and physically debilitating. In myth and poem, such evil people often come to a bad end. Seen in this way, social justice recognizes the harm done to the perpetrators of evils such as slavery, patriarchy, xenophobia, racism, homophobia, cruelty to animals, and raping the earth. Within the realm of education, bullying and mean-spiritedness do harm to the bullies and the mean people as well as those whom they hurt. For this reason, social justice necessitates making the point that all will be better off in a civil and humane society in which everyone is regarded as precious, worthy of respect, and treated with dignity. When minorities are valued as part of the school community, all its members grow physically and spiritually, and the educational process is enhanced for teachers and students alike.

Instrumental justice as a way of construing social justice views justice as a means to other ends (Mill, [1863]2001; Plato, 1993). Among its purposes, it can promote happiness, facilitate democratic governance, foster peace and tranquility, and ensure the maintenance of societal structures that particularly benefit the society's establishment and powerful elites. This view of justice is parasitic on the notion of justice as a human

creation that, as Plato (1994, book I) has Thasymachus say, can also imply trickery. As such, justice is not always agreed upon by the powerful and powerless alike. It may appear to be done, without being actually done to all the people. For example, teachers may invoke justice as a tool to create the appearance of beneficence and care for their students, meanwhile conducting programs that are unjust in the treatment of those who are disadvantaged by this system. Social justice, viewed within this instrumental lens, can serve to create a more humane and collegial educational environment, as it may also perpetuate commitments to justice that are more apparent than real and that benefit some people more than, or to the detriment of, others.

Social justice construed as legal justice concerns the systems of laws, rules, and regulations that protect the individual and the collective rights of members of a society in which a particular legal system prevails. Aristotle (1994–2009, book 5) distinguishes this type of justice from natural justice that he regards as universal. Overlaying the differing legal systems in nation-states is a body of international law that governs relationships among nation-states. Nation-states may or may not agree to be bound by particular principles, treaties, and obligations articulated internationally. For example, the United States is not a signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations General Assembly, 1989), and does not regard itself legally bound by this Convention. Aside from precedent, professional and public pressure, or legal protections in the US Constitution, American children do not necessarily have the same legal right to know their own culture (including its music) as children living in other countries covered by this international Convention. If it is the right of every child to know the music of her or his own culture, social justice concerns contesting and possibly reworking the laws, regulations, and conventions that apply to music education in particular states and countries. Such a notion is inevitably fraught with legal and constitutional issues.

Thinking of divine justice in the Abrahamic faiths as a lens through which to view social justice envisages justice as vested ultimately in a deity who commands humans to think and act in particular ways that are considered to be just. In polytheistic religions, the gods share and sometimes contest responsibilities for justice, which is meted out to humans. Plato (1994) saw the gods as possessing the clearest and highest notion of the virtues, and human beings as grasping them less directly, less completely, and more imperfectly. Animistic religions ascribe power to particular beings with supernatural abilities that possess forces of retribution if not appeased. All these religions share the presumption that the divine beings that are worshipped will reward or punish those who follow or depart from particular religious prescriptions and proscriptions. Social justice, in these terms, is addressed within theologies of major faith traditions such as Islam, Hinduism, Christianity, Judaism, and Buddhism and in assumptions concerning the presence or otherwise of supernatural powers or deities in animistic, humanistic, and atheistic traditions. Systems of belief and practice that have built up around deities that are worshiped or repudiated are also interpreted differently, even within the faiths themselves. This ambiguity gives rise to factions, sects, and denominations that may be hostile to each other. Present denominational conflicts within Islam evoke similar and

often violent conflicts within Christianity. For example, in multicultural societies, questions relating to the musical education of Muslim boys and girls who constitute a minority in countries in which Christianity is established, or that of Christian boys and girls who constitute a minority in countries in which Islam is established, are matters that concern social justice. How social justice should be defined in theological terms, and the extent to which religious accommodations in education need to be made and how, are matters that go to the heart of music education. Believers in the various faith traditions begin their understanding of these matters within the frame of the divine commands or theological beliefs to which they assent.

Social justice is also interpreted in the frame of natural law, the assumption that the right to justice is a human right that is self-evident, and that all people ought to agree with this presumption (Aristotle, 1994–2009, book 5). The Enlightenment writers of the US Constitution could write in sweeping terms: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” (US Congress, 1776). In this view, human rights are universal, trump particular cultural rights, and arbitrate other rights. Where religious and other cultural rights run counter to natural law, they must accommodate to natural law. Viewed within the lens of natural law, music educators interpret social justice as applying universally, equally to musical and educational opportunities for females and males in spite of religious proscriptions and cultural stereotypes. For such music educators, the claims of natural law, envisaged in terms of human rights, transcend all other religious and cultural claims.

Seeing social justice through these various overlapping lenses provides a way of understanding a plethora of intersecting visions of social justice that relate to music education. The difficulties in describing social justice result from the ambiguity of these and other ways in which it can be construed. These types overlap, resonate with, and conflict with others. If one accepts that each frame contributes to the richness and ambiguity of the notion of social justice as it applies to music education, it becomes necessary to adjudicate the claims of these various perspectives. All have to do with aspects of human rights. The claim that human rights trump other cultural rights is a false dichotomy. One’s imagination is shot through with socially and culturally ingrained understandings that shape one’s perceptions of the possibilities of human rights. Just as the architects of the US Constitution could not see the injustice of slavery and the inferior treatment of women in the natural law they espoused in their own time, other blind spots may prevent us from seeing the injustice in ours. This fallibility suggests a more modest position of seeking to do the best one can in the particular situations in which one finds oneself. Such an approach necessitates considering which of these particular approaches to social justice most meet the claims of one’s particular situation and how they should be navigated. This is a situational approach to one’s ethical predicament, but I cannot see a humane way out of it that takes into account all of these nuances (and others besides) and the practical realities in which music teachers work. I caution that these differing perspectives on social justice suggest that one may talk past others without

hearing them. These differences may be the source of disagreements about what should be done about social justice in music education. So it is important to inquire how music educators should act on behalf of justice.

HOW SHOULD MUSIC EDUCATORS ACT ON BEHALF OF JUSTICE?

Thus far, I have unpacked some of the lenses through which social justice should be viewed. This analysis complicates the situation that music educators may face, but it may still not be a sufficiently broad view (Jorgensen, 2007). New frontiers of justice concerning such matters as disability, nationality, and species membership (Nussbaum, 2006) problematize our human and social relationships and advance the claims of the natural world and the plethora of other living things that share our planet. These complications lead me to prefer to think about justice more broadly, notwithstanding the importance of the social considerations to which social justice relates. I would prefer to focus, therefore, on the ways in which music educators may act on behalf of justice. Moving beyond my earlier writing (Jorgensen, 2007), I sketch implications of the various sorts of social justice for music education thought and practice.

Over the years, I have been concerned with the importance of dialogue within a fallibilist perspective as a means of articulating and negotiating differing perspectives (Jorgensen, 2003). When participants remain open to the possibility that they may be wrong, and they regard others' divergent and sometimes conflicting ideas with respect and empathy, it is possible to find common ground in which all may act together in the interest of certain shared interests and values and a humane and civil society. Drawing on Buber's ideas of human interrelationships, Morgan and Guilherme (2014) suggest that dialogue can serve as an important means of conflict resolution. This proposition assumes, like Greene (1995), that mutual respect and civility undergird social interaction, as one would hope they do in decent societies. Although this may be a somewhat idealistic and "improbable" hope (Benedict & Schmidt, 2007), dialogue may fail as a means of adjudicating different perspectives, and legal intervention may be needed (Benhabib, 2002), it can be a useful way in which music educators can think about and through the claims of justice in their particular situations in democratic societies.

In this present writing, I reflect on the implications of the various views on social justice and justice more generally for ways in which music educators ought to act. Among these perspectives, aspects of the distribution of music education across the population are a crucial consideration. Within the United States, for example, it is incumbent upon researchers to ascertain the state of this distribution. In recent decades, notwithstanding the importance for policy decision-making of understanding the specific situations in which music education is conducted, descriptive status studies have been eclipsed by scientific research in music education. The claims of distributive justice would necessitate

ascertaining the precise state of the distribution of all aspects of music education, not only within particular schools, local areas, regions, and nation-states, but comparatively and internationally. One would expect such data to include musical, teaching, learning, instruction, curricular, and administrative aspects (Jorgensen, 2011a). With the availability of such comprehensive and systematic data, it should be possible to identify and defend those particular areas and people most in need of various sorts of music education and devise, implement, and evaluate plans to remedy shortfalls, wherever they may be. Rescuing status studies from the margins of music education research is an important initiative in thinking distributively about justice for the field's research and practice.

Communitarian notions of social justice focus centrally on ways in which music education serves the common good. The preservation of democratic ideals, while not a perfect political solution, provides one of the most humane approaches to governance of which I am aware. Even totalitarian states understand the power, or even the illusion of power, to shape one's own society. Since democracies are vulnerable to the influence of money and the exercise of power by a few, Dewey ([1916]1944) and R. S. Peters (1966) are among those to emphasize the crucial role of education as a means of cultivating civility, powers of critical thought, and a populace with the capacities and skills to participate fully in their societies. In the United States, at least from the early nineteenth century, publicly supported schools have sought to fill this role. One of the principal aims of music education in this context must be a social one of preparing citizens of a democracy. To this end, David Elliott (2012), Woodford (2005, 2014) and Richard Colwell (2014) variously consider the importance of artistic citizenship as an end of music education. Focusing on citizenship as a music educational aim necessitates planning particular ways in which music education is conducted in order to express this objective. Randall Allsup, Heidi Westerlund, and Lauri Väkevä (Allsup & Westerlund, 2012; Väkevä & Westerlund, 2007; Westerlund, 2002) are among those to reflect critically on the implications of this aim for the practice of music education in publicly supported schools.

Commutative justice in music education concerns at least two different responsibilities: that of music teachers to fulfill their contractual obligations in serving their students and the wider public to which they are responsible; that of the public in providing the resources for teachers to be able to conduct their programs effectively. In the past, music educators have been more inclined to think in terms of their own obligations to their students and to the music profession and less apt to focus on the wider public policy questions concerning the context in which music education is conducted. Professional organizations in the United States such as the National Association for Music Education (along with its predecessors, the Music Supervisors National Conference and the Music Educators National Conference), informal think tanks such as the Mayday Group, and writers such as Charles Fowler (1996) have sought to articulate the responsibilities of public education to cultivate the arts. American music education professional organizations have engaged in political and policy action nationally, have published reports such as *Growing Up Complete: The Imperative for Music Education* (National Commission on Music Education, 1991) and the *National Standards for Arts Education* (Blakeslee, 1994),

and have lobbied for educational reforms (Aguilar, 2011). As Aguilar demonstrates, however, in notable instances, this policy decision-making has been uninformed by the extant educational policy decision-making literature. Music teachers in some states have successfully impacted policy changes by virtue of the personal connections established by music and art education leaders with policymakers and the public at large. For example, in Indiana, the Indiana Arts Coalition of stakeholders in the arts and general education (www.inartscoalition.org) is an important advocate for the arts and arts education. My sense is that these efforts are crucially important for commutative justice in music education, and policymaking research projects that document successful endeavors need to be emphasized. Research and policy action need to contribute to and reflect the educational policymaking literature, and strong links need to be forged between policymaking research and practice in music education. To some degree, doing this requires subverting the present scientific bias in what is considered “respectable” research in some quarters in music education and plowing the middle ground between research and practice.

Contributive aspects of social justice require that all men and women, boys and girls, of whatever ethnicity, color, language, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, and social class, among the many barriers that separate people, are able to contribute musically in the many ways in which they are interested and capable. Too often, music education has privileged males over females at all levels, from elementary to advanced instruction. Stereotypically gendered musical instruments often contribute to difficulties experienced by females who desire to be conductors, composers, and performers of instruments that are considered “masculine.” Throughout history, religious affiliation has prescribed and proscribed particular musical roles for the various genders and has limited the means by which females, those who are differently gendered, and various minority populations can participate musically. In our own time, the provision of gender-restricted musical education in some Cathedral choirs in Church of England, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox Christian traditions and the proscription of mixed-gender music education by some strains of Islam narrow the opportunities for all children to receive musical education. Notwithstanding the contributions of composers such as Hildegard of Bingen (belatedly, a Doctor of the Church) in women’s religious communities, the Western classical tradition still traces a largely masculine history throughout the Middle Ages, when religious music education was in the ascendancy (e.g., Burkholder, Grout, & Palisca, 2010). Papal restrictions on the musical education of girls by men other than immediate family members long limited the opportunities for girls to become professional musicians, and castrati were preferred to women as singers in the Baroque Italian opera. In our own time, the long-standing discomfort and silence of the music education profession on matters concerning differently gendered people and the important barriers in their way was only lately broken at a conference entitled “Establishing Identity: GLBT Studies and Music Education” (2010). Despite the presence of many teachers and students involved in music education who are gender-identified in other ways than heterosexuality, open discussions of these sometimes vexed issues have come only recently to music education. Rather than being

marginalized in the profession, as feminism too often has been (Gould, 2011), these and other frontiers of justice need to be at the core of the music education research enterprise and its policymaking practice.

The claims of procedural justice in music education require a careful and critical rethinking of the means and ends of music education. The various means of education, while well-intentioned, may in fact patronize, diminish, and dehumanize people. Carried out under the guise of other social ends, the procedures employed in the selection of musical repertoire, students for particular musical ensembles, instructional methods, and assessment methods may not be as procedurally transparent and even-handed as they need to be. I worry, particularly, about the appearance rather than the reality of democratic governance. Invoking allegiance to democratic principles without a corresponding spirit of inclusiveness, mutual respect, and civility can be an evil because it disguises a lack of democracy under the mantle of humane principles. Recent philosophical conversations concerning the operation of instrumental music education have focused on the evils that may be in evidence and the possible goods to which such ensembles may be put (e.g., Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Gould, 2005; Koza, 2005; Tan, 2012). This conversation is important in reminding music educators of the need to critically examine the methods and ends of instrumental music education as it is typically practiced. For me, the truth lies somewhere in the messy ground between the good that can be accomplished through the conduct of instrumental ensembles and the evil that may also lurk. The continuing challenge for instrumental music educators, as all music teachers, is to attempt to rescue the good while also avoiding the evil. It is incumbent on music teachers to decide for themselves where the truth lies in their particular situations. Glossing over the potential problems or viewing the possibilities with rose-tinted glasses are mistaken and simplistic positions. Instead, music education policymakers and teachers need to be comfortable with the problem of a two-edged sword that potentially benefits and harms the work of music education if procedural justice is to be served.

Retributive justice demands a response to evil-doing. It seeks punishment of the evil-doer as a curb on evil. In noting the vexed nature of this view of justice, I have suggested that vengeance is often counterproductive. Punishment may be defensible in some respects and indefensible in others (Jorgensen, 2003). It may be a deterrent to further evil, and it may also contribute to further evil. Music teachers need to weigh their actions in order to determine in their best light what should be the correct course of conduct in a particular situation. It is important for the young to learn the value of discipline and for those who are older to practice it. Still, my sense is that one's conduct needs to be humane and helpful to the student's subsequent growth insofar as possible. As a teacher, I confess to sometimes being at a loss as to what to do. My fallibility means that I do not understand all of the relevant aspects of the situation. I am cognizant of the fact that the aspects that I do not know may be the very ones that may make all of the difference in my interpretation of events. The times when one errs in retributive justice can stick like burrs. They are reminders of the wisdom of a restrained, thoughtful, and careful view of the situations in which one may be tempted to seek retribution as a means of

justice. For this reason alone, it is imperative to prepare music teachers as critical and constructive thinkers and doers.

Restorative justice is likewise problematic because of the unintended consequences of actions and changes in the distribution of power. In seeking to restore or ensure justice for those who have been beyond it or on its margins, it is possible to act in ways that have unforeseen effects. This is particularly the case for policymaking that seeks action on behalf of groups and populations. Such actions may also remove advantages from one group in order to bequeath them to another, resulting in shifts in the distribution of power among people. Losing one's privileged status can be painful, just as altering power relations can place unexpected burdens on those who have not been privileged in the past. School desegregation during the Civil Rights movement in the United States was intended to help people of color but, instead, placed the greater part of the burden on them. It not only resulted in eventual school re-segregation, but it also impacted the wider society geographically in ways that still disadvantage people of color. Affirmative action measures in university and college admissions became equally vexed as white people resisted real and apparent efforts to privilege people of color. Efforts to restore or ensure justice for all people by privileging those who have been disempowered and treated as of lesser worth need to be thoughtfully and critically undertaken. Importantly, policymakers need to understand that policies are inevitably shortsighted and inadequate; they will need to be revisited critically from time to time and reformulated when change is necessary. Although these decisions are fraught, I see no other alternative than that music educators act hopefully and humanely to improve their situations where they can. When unexpected consequences undoubtedly occur, they require the humility and courage to make the changes deemed necessary according to their best understanding of the circumstances.

Poetic justice relies on the imaginative powers of music teachers and their students. In other writing, I have urged the importance of developing imaginative thought and practice in music education (Jorgensen, 2008). As Greene (1988, 1995) observes, thinking imaginatively is a communal as well as an individual activity. So important is the artistic community to this enterprise that without being present to and within it, one may not imagine how things might be different. Seeing beyond the literal, prosaic, and ordinary to the figurative, artistic, and extraordinary are qualities that need to be emphasized in music education. Simply meeting or even surpassing literal standards, notwithstanding their value, cannot suffice. Rather, music teachers and their students need to experience those consummatory moments that Dewey ([1934]1979) describes as intensely satisfying and gripping, when one is caught up in undergoing the arts while at the same time actively creating them. Such experiences have a quality of what Abraham Maslow (1943, 1968) terms "peak experiences" and "self-actualization," or Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1990) describes as "flow," "optimal experience," and the sense of effortlessness and fluid and dynamic movement. Whether through literature, visual arts, music, drama, or other fine arts and crafts, as imagination grows, one is better able to imagine difference and divergence and embrace ambiguity. This reality may help to explain why Western philosophers since Plato (1993) have posited that the

arts may constitute a means toward moral development. If those involved in music education possess this capacity, even though flawed and certainly not sufficient when taken alone, they may play a role in expressing justice and may be helping others to move toward it.

Construed instrumentally, music teachers may think of social justice as parasitic on other aims. Viewed in this way, social justice does not constitute an end in itself so much as a means to other ends. This notion fits well within the *raison d'être* that music teachers often see for themselves as musicians and educators. As with notions of procedural justice, such a view focuses especially on ensuring congruence between one's beliefs and practices and embodying and living one's convictions about justice in all of one's dealings with others. One not only ascribes to justice, but one loves to live its principles. Although one's primary objective is helping others to come to know music, and through these experiences, helping them to better understand themselves and their responsibilities to others around them, thinking about social justice instrumentally becomes the "hidden curriculum" of music education, the substrata of all that is done, said, and not done or said. In teacher education, students may come to understand that their work is not only and primarily with the students for whom they have responsibility, or on behalf of musical knowledge as a part of culture, but that the wider impact of their actions is felt throughout the wider society and beyond. As in education more generally, living justice in all of one's life is far more important than mere assent to its principles. Practically speaking, this is problematic. For example, auditioning students for a jazz combo may seem to be a just way to select students for particular musical and educational experiences. Still, girls and women or those with little previous exposure to jazz may lack the confidence to improvise and can be disadvantaged by the audition process. On the other hand, creating opportunities for auditioned and open entry music ensembles may serve as a just means to accomplish high student morale and a range of educational experiences tailored to needs of a diverse student body.

Legal notions of social justice require music teachers to think of their work and the claims of the laws and regulations that guide their work as crucially important (Heimonen, 2002, 2006). For example, in the United States, the rights of children to know the music of their culture are delimited by a constitutional prohibition on the establishment of religion and legal interpretations of this prohibition. Even the performance of instrumental music with religious title but without religious text is subject to significant restriction in American state-supported schools (Perrine, 2013). The claims of social justice would suggest including and valuing minority religious perspectives in music education within the particular legal frameworks that obtain and seeking to change the laws in these countries where deemed necessary. Should these laws and regulations need to be altered in pursuit of justice, teachers require the skills to effectively forge better laws and regulations. The music profession is fortunate to have in its midst those with legal knowledge and skill. Still, it is tempting for music teachers to rely on others to do this work. Excusing one's avoidance of such necessarily legal and political policymaking on the grounds that one is primarily an artist and musician cannot suffice. Rather, music teachers are duty-bound to learn how to navigate this territory

successfully and to participate actively in the life of the profession in order to help create the kinds of laws and regulations that will best serve the interest of justice. Often, local school authorities and regional, national, and international bodies are reluctant to provide sufficient support for the arts in general education, and it is necessary to mount legal pressure on them to do what they should do or say they believe in doing. Thinking of justice in legal terms requires music teachers to be professionally committed to articulating and defending justice and helping to frame the policies that can best serve their particular situations.

Thinking of the divine role in justice inevitably requires reflecting critically on the role of the religions in music education. In other writing, and drawing on the work of Paul Tillich (1986) especially in regard to the visual arts, I have traced several types of religious experiences in music education, each of which is parasitic on particular theological notions (Jorgensen, 1993, 2011b). Contemporary secularized notions of music education largely bypass addressing the theological implications of justice. While music educators have recently explored aspects of spirituality and music education, the international and interdisciplinary conference entitled “Critical Perspectives on Music, Education, and Religion,” sponsored by the University of the Arts, Helsinki, Sibelius Academy Faculty of Music, in August 2014 was a welcome departure. Unpacking these issues as they apply particularly to justice in music education, undertaking research in these areas, and developing practical ways in which to address the religions and music education in the contemporary world lie ahead. This particular view of justice would insist on the importance of such initiatives for music education writ large.

The universal claims of natural law as they apply to music education have prompted music educators to espouse notions that everyone is musical and is entitled to participate actively in music education (Jorgensen, 2004). In recent decades, some philosophers of music education have been inclined to critique claims that music is a universal language and that its values are universal, preferring instead to emphasize the differing and specific practices that may be construed to be music (e.g., Elliott, 1995, 2013). Leonard Tan (2012) has argued, however, for a transnational approach to instrumental music education that grasps the commonalities in different musical traditions between East and West. I am attracted to this view because it explores the middle ground between the extremes of universalism, on the one hand, and extreme relativism, on the other. It suggests that while music teachers need to emphasize the particular and distinctive musics and musical practices, it is also important to mine some of the important commonalities and values that unite them. Recognizing the claims of justice as both universal in certain respects and relative in others puts music education thought and practice near the messy, sensual, and phenomenal world that it concerns while also pointing to widespread human aspirations to create with instruments, dance, song, visual arts, and drama, among a host of other ways, that have to do with the spiritual aspects of experience.

In sum, I have sketched four compelling reasons that music educators need to be concerned about social justice, or justice generally, have outlined various perspectives on or types of social justice as they might apply educationally, and have sketched some

implications for music education thought and practice. It is evident that these differing types of, or perspectives on, social justice potentially enrich music education while also challenging its thought and practice. None suffices when taken alone. These ambiguities, tensions, and dissonances complicate and trouble taken-for-granted assumptions of music education. It remains to music education policymakers and those committed to its work to navigate this terrain in ways that make sense in their particular situations. Together, these theoretical and practical initiatives can help secure more just practices of music education.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M. J. (1982). *The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York: Collier Books, Macmillan.
- Adler, M. J. (1983). *Paideia problems and possibilities: A consideration of questions raised by The paideia proposal*. New York: Collier Books, Macmillan.
- Adler, M. J. (1984). *The paideia program: An educational syllabus. Essays by the Paideia Group*. New York: Collier Books, Macmillan.
- Aguilar, C. (2011, April). *The development and application of a conceptual model for the analysis of policy recommendations for music education in the United States* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington).
- Allingham, M. (2014a). *Distributive justice*. London: Routledge.
- Allingham, M. (2014b). Distributive justice. *The internet encyclopedia of philosophy*, ISSN: 2161-0002. Retrieved from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/>.
- Allsup, R. E. (2007). Editorial. *Music Education Research*, 9(2), 167–168.
- Allsup, R. E., & Benedict, C. (2008). The problems of band: An inquiry into the future of instrumental music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 16(2), 156–173.
- Allsup, R. E., & Westerlund, H. (2012). Methods and situational ethics in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 11(1), 124–148.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Aquinas, T. (2013–2014). *Summa theologica: Selected questions on law and justice*. Lonang Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.lonang.com/exlibris/aquinas/sum22061.htm>.
- Aristotle. (2014). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). The internet classics archive. Retrieved from <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.5.v.html>.
- Arnstine, D. (1995). *Democracy and the arts of schooling*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Benedict, C., & Schmidt, P. K. (2007). From whence justice? Interrogating the improbable in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(4), 21–42.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Berlin, I. (1990). *The crooked timber of humanity: Chapters in the history of ideas*. (H. Hardy, Ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blakeslee, M. (Ed.). (1994). *National standards for arts education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Bowman, W. D. (2007). Who's asking? (Who's answering?): Theorizing social justice in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(4), 1–20.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Burkholder, J. P., Grout, D. J., & Palisca, C. V. (2010). *A history of Western music* (8th ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Cardany, A. B. (2013). General music and the common core: A brief discussion. *General Music Today*, 27(1), 35–39.
- Colwell, Richard. (2014). Response to David Elliott's "Music education as/for artistic citizenship." *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 22(1), 105–108.
- Czikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- De Gruchy, J. W. (2002). *Reconciliation: Restoring justice*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2002.
- Dewey, J. ([1916]1944). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. ([1934]1979). *Art as experience*. Reprinted, New York: Paragon Books.
- Dewey, J. ([1927]1954). *The public and its problems*. Reprinted, Denver, CO: Alan Swallow.
- Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elliott, D. J. (2012). Another perspective: Music education as/for artistic citizenship. *Music Educators Journal*, 99(1), 21–27.
- Elliott, David J. (2013). *Music matters: A praxial philosophy of music education* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Establishing identity: LGBT studies and music education*. (2010, May). University of Illinois, School of Music, Urbana, IL. Electronic conference proceedings. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*. Retrieved from http://bcrme.press.illinois.edu/proceedings/Establishing_Identity/.
- Fowler, C. (1996). *Strong arts, strong schools: The promising potential and shortsighted disregard of the arts in American schooling*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the oppressed* (R. R. Barr, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Gaita, R. (2000). *A common humanity: Thinking about love and truth and justice* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gingell, J. (2014). *Education and the common good: Essays in honor of Robin Barrow*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. ([1992]1993). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. Reprinted, New York: Routledge.
- Gomberg, P. (2007). *How to make opportunity equal: Race and contributive justice*. New York: Wiley.
- Gould, E. (2005). Nomadic turns: Epistemology, experience, and women university band directors. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 13(2), 147–164.
- Gould, E. (2011). Feminist imperative(s) in music and education: Philosophy, theory, or what matters most. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(2): 130–147. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00424.x.
- Govier, T. (2006). *Taking wrongs seriously*. Amherst, MA: Humanity Books.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Heimonen, M. (2002). *Music education and law: Regulation as an instrument*. Helsinki, Finland: Sibelius Academy, *Studia Musica*, 17.
- Heimonen, M. (2006). Justifying the right to music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 14(2), 119–141.
- Highet, G. ([1950]1955). *The art of teaching*. Reprinted, New York: Vintage Books.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jaeger, W. (1943–1945). *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture* (G. Highet, Trans.). 3 vols. (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (1993). Religious music in education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 1(2), 103–114.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (1997). *In search of music education*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2002). The aims of music education: A preliminary excursion. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 36(1), 31–49.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2003). *Transforming music education*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2004). *Pax Americana* and the world of music education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 3 (3), 1–18.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2007). Concerning justice and music education. *Music Education Research*, 9(2), 169–189. doi: 10.1080/14613800701411731.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2008). *The art of teaching music*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2011a). *Pictures of music education*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2011b). How can music education be religious? *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 19(2), 155–163.
- Kant, I. ([1784]1923). Idee zu einer allgemeinen geschichte in weltbürgerlicher absicht (1784). In *Kant's gesammelte schriften*, vol. 8. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kant, I. (1971). Justice and punishment (W. Hastie, Trans.). In G. Ezorsky (Ed.), *Philosophical perspectives on punishment* (pp. 102–106). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Koza, J. E. (2005). A response to Elizabeth Gould, Nomadic turns: Epistemology, experience, and women university band directors. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 13(2): 147–164.
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Levine, D. M., & Bane, M. J. (1975). *The “inequality” controversy: Schooling and distributive justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mill, J. S. ([1863]2001). *Utilitarianism*. Reprinted, London: Electric Book Co. Retrieved from www.elecbook.com.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. doi: 10.1037/h0054346.
- Maslow, A. H. (1968). Music, education, and peak experiences. In R. A. Choate (Ed.), *Documentary report of the Tanglewood Symposium* (pp. 70–73). Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.
- Morgan, W. J., & Guilherme, A. (2014). *Buber and education: Dialogue as conflict resolution*. New York: Routledge.
- Mursell, J. L. (1934). *Human values in music education*. New York: Silver Burdett.
- National Commission on Music Education. (1991). *Growing up complete: The imperative for music education: The report of the National Commission on Music Education*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

- Noddings, N. (1982). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1995). *Poetic justice: The literary imagination and public life*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *Courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Perrine, W. (2013). Religious music and free speech: Philosophical issues in *Nurre v. Whitehead*. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 21(2), 178–196.
- Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Plato. (1993). *Republic* (R. Waterfield, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011). Common core standards: The new U.S. intended curriculum. *Educational Researcher*, 40(3), 103–116.
- Rainbow, B., & Cox, G. (2006). *Music in educational thought and practice: A survey from 800 BC*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1999a). *A theory of justice* (rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1999b). *The law of peoples with "The idea of public reason revisited."* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sayer, A. (2009, January). Contributive justice and meaningful work. *Res Publica*, 15, 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s1158-008-9077.
- Tan, L. (2012). *Towards a transcultural philosophy of instrumental music education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Tillich P. (1986). Art and ultimate reality. In D. Apostolos-Cappadona (Ed.) *Art, creativity, and the sacred* (pp. 219–235). New York: Crossroad.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1989, 12 December). *Convention on the rights of the child*. Document A/RES/44/25. Retrieved from <http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/UN-convention/>.
- US Congress. (1776, July 4). *Declaration of independence*. Retrieved from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html.
- Väkevä, L., & Westerlund, H. (2007). The method of democracy in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(4), 96–108.
- Wellesz, E. (Ed.). (1969). *Ancient and oriental music*. *New Oxford history of music*, vol. 1. London: Oxford University Press.
- Westerlund, H. (2002). *Bridging experience, action, and culture in music education*. Helsinki, Finland: Sibelius Academy, *Studia Musica*, 16.
- Woodbridge, W. C. (1831). *A lecture on vocal music as a branch of common education. Delivered in the Representatives' Hall, Boston, August 24, 1830*. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, Little, and Wilkins.
- Woodford, P. (2005) *Democracy and music education: Liberalism, ethics, and the politics of practice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Woodford, P. (2014). The eclipse of the public: A response to David Elliott's "Music education as/for artistic citizenship." *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 22(1), 22–37.

CHAPTER 2

UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL JUSTICE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF MUSIC EDUCATION HISTORY

MARIE MCCARTHY

ISSUES of social justice in contemporary music education can be informed in important ways when examined from a historical perspective. Conversely, historians of music education can benefit from looking at the past, using social justice as a vantage point. A survey of the documented history of music in public education reveals who authored historical narratives and who is represented in such works. It also brings into relief those individuals and groups whose stories remain untold. Saltman (2008) points out that people have struggled over the representation and retelling of history, and these contests over the meanings of the past are inextricably tied to broader material and symbolic struggles, forces, and structures of power (p. 1). Insights gained from historical knowledge can contribute to ongoing discussions about professional history and can create more democratic, equitable, and emancipatory practices in music education, reflecting core values of social justice.

Music education history is created at the confluence of music, a sociocultural phenomenon, and public education, a foundational social institution. As a subject in the school curriculum, music education is powerfully positioned to reproduce values that seek to promote justice in the community and in society at large. Thus, music education history provides a particularly rich site for examining issues of social justice. If one of the tasks of music educators is to educate ourselves and to be concerned about matters of justice (Jorgensen, 2007, p. 173; Vagueois, 2009, p. 3), then history has an important place in that process, exposing the roots of social injustice and highlighting patterns of oppression over time.

Historical perspectives can provide new vantage points for looking differently at music education legacies, can give voice to people through oral history, and can disrupt

canonical narratives of the past. Thus, a more nuanced and complicated story of the past can be developed to expose the existence of multiple and often contradictory interpretations of historical data (Williamson, Rhodes, & Dunson, 2007). Woodford (2012) calls for more overtly political histories of music education that seek to tell us

not just the “who, what, and when” of educational reforms but also the “why” by identifying and critiquing the ideologies and social agendas of vested interests who would place their own needs above those of children, teachers and the public, or who would assume that they have a monopoly on truth. (p. 97)

Examining the past from such perspectives, and more broadly all perspectives that address issues of social justice, is facilitated by new approaches to historiography. The mainstream historical narrative is challenged by the possibility of multiple narratives created around the stories of those whose voices were not deemed important or worthy enough to be included in the grand narrative. At the same time, there is increased interest in revisiting and revisioning the past, using social and cultural perspectives to infer meaning and draw together threads of cause and effect. There is also a focus on the lives of ordinary citizens and their contributions to social and cultural development. In a sense, historiography is experiencing its own renewal that is in large part located in the realm of social justice.

Using new approaches to history can open up spaces of inquiry heretofore unexamined and can reveal roots of injustice and practices that were oppressive. At the same time, one must be cautious when using present values to critique actions of the past. The great advocate of emancipatory justice, Maxine Greene, expressed such caution about revisionist educational history, seeing “a doubleness” in it (1973, p. 5). On the one hand, she writes, without the new history “we might not have begun looking at the connections between schools and politics, education and social stratification, endemic racism” (p. 6). At the same time, she found questionable the oversimplification of social control where all individuals are perceived as malleable and passive, with little said about the different ways they internalize control, experience the influences of community, or order their life worlds.

Care must be taken when critiquing the past through the lens of social justice, taking into consideration Greene’s observations, among others. It is important to critique past events and actions in the context of what constituted public good at that time, and to avoid interpreting human motivation and actions in the name of labeling actions and events to fit contemporary discourse in social justice. For example, examining the content and viewpoint of E. B. Birge’s (1928) first history of public school music must be done considering the context of the 1920s. Rather than critiquing Birge for the many omissions—women in music education, music education in segregated schools, music education for the disabled—it is more instructive to ask: Who or what inspired him to document the history of public school music? What social and political ideologies and values framed his outlook? What sources

did he access? The goal is to bring a sensitive ear and empathetic eye to the words and actions of past generations of music educators and those who penned the story of music education through the decades.

The overall purpose of this chapter is twofold: first, to examine historical narratives of American music education from the perspective of social justice in its changing meanings and manifestations since music entered public education in the United States in the 1830s; and second, to offer recommendations for researching music education history and for teaching music and music education history. The chapter originates in these questions: How is social justice reflected in narratives of American music education history? What was the language used to advocate social justice in each era? In what ways did music educators respond to policies that sought to achieve equality and social justice in education? Did the profession offer an alternative narrative to contest injustice of any form? What journey has the profession taken to arrive at a lively discourse in social justice in contemporary times? How can historical research and the teaching of history advance the cause and nurture the practice of social justice in music education? The chapter is developed as follows: a conceptual framing of social justice is presented, followed by a narrative of American music education history through the lens of social justice. Implications for researching and teaching music education history from a social justice perspective are identified. The chapter closes with reflections on social justice from a historical perspective.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMING

The topic of social justice has a history within education. Ayers, Quinn, and Stovall (2008b) state that “education for social justice is the root of teaching and schooling in a democratic society, the rock upon which we build Democracy” (p. xiv). Classical ideals of social justice can be traced back to Plato’s *Republic*, the first in-depth treatment of justice and education (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008, p. 31). However, theorizing about justice is a distinctively modern enterprise (Miller, 1999) that emerged in the late eighteenth century as the child of the industrial and French revolutions (Jackson, 2005). The phrase “social justice” itself was introduced into political discourse from the late nineteenth century onward. As framed in contemporary discourse, the concept implies that schools and society are, and always have been, replete with injustice. Thus, public education is seen as a critical site for changing that reality and for engaging individuals as “agents for social change in a participatory democracy” (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008, p. 30).

Serving the good of the individual and the common good of society simultaneously creates a tension that is central to understanding social justice in public education. Greene (1973) saw this tension as irreducible since education takes place “at the intersection where the demands for social order and the demands for autonomy conflict,”

and thus it must proceed through and by means of the tension (p. 9). Ayers, Quinn, and Stovall (2008a) describe the contradictory nature of this tension:

The ideal of education as humanization—an enterprise in which opportunities and resources are organized to overcome embedded and historical injustices and to allow everyone to realize herself or himself in the full participation in political, social, cultural, and economic life—stands in direct contradiction to the demands of a system that objectifies everyone and enforces the acquiescence of each to the demands of the corporate body. (p. 727)

Historical narratives of music in public education shed light on the interaction between the needs of the individual and those of the common good. Schools, as state-sponsored institutions, are expected to inculcate and model the citizenship values of the state (Mantie, 2009, p. 97). Educational agendas focused on promoting national identity and citizenship are often couched in the language of social justice. Vaugeois (2009) states that looking critically at stories of nationhood is important for developing an understanding of social justice. Mantie (2009) goes so far as to suggest that how we evaluate justice in the sense of social justice is “a direct reflection of how we conceive of our political associations as a nation state” (p. 96).

Citizenship and nationhood are recurring themes in the history of music education internationally. Their meanings differ from one era to another, at times rationalized on the basis of social cohesion and social equilibrium, or patriotism in wartime, or national identity, or artistic citizenship as a right for all students (Elliott, 2012; McCarthy, 2011, 2014).

The ways in which social justice is framed theoretically can form the basis for examining it historically. For the purpose of this chapter, I draw on three contemporary approaches to explaining social justice in education contexts: distributive, cultural, and emancipatory justice. Distributive justice refers to the morally equitable distribution of goods in education, cultural justice to the absence of both cultural domination and marginalization of cultural groups, and emancipatory justice to that which seeks to free people from oppression and grant them the full participation in decisions that affect their lives (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008; Furman, 2012; Rizvi, 2008).

Distributive justice is fundamental to social justice because of the importance of the equitable distribution of resources and material goods in education. However, scholars have noted that, as a singular paradigm, it has limitations. Rizvi (2008) argues that it is inadequate in fully accounting for nonmaterial resources such as respect, recognition, rights, opportunities, and power, because injustice can also be rooted in social patterns of representations, interpretation, and communication (p. 92). When cultural and emancipatory forms of justice are implemented, they can account for these nonmaterial resources.

Similarly, Boyles, Carusi, and Attick (2008) note that distributive justice can emphasize the allocation of goods at the expense of less quantifiable qualities such as virtues, actions, and ideas, “each of which comprise in part the very ‘good’ social justice seeks to attain” (p. 38). Furthermore, the authors argue, the emancipatory emphasis found in social justice that seeks to free people from oppression can be absent from the egalitarian concept of distributive justice (p. 38). Rizvi (2008) also notes that the distributive

paradigm is no longer sufficient to capture the complexities of global interconnectivity and interdependence, on the one hand, and of contemporary identity politics, on the other. Thus, all forms of justice—distributive, cultural, and emancipatory—must operate in tandem when attempting to bring about social change by addressing social injustice in schools and the greater community (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008, p. 40).

The three forms of justice described above, aimed at nurturing practices of social justice, can be related to sociological theories of education, specifically functionalism and critical theory. Functionalist approaches operate using top-down approaches to education with a macro perspective in which social justice is explained using principles of equity involving access, equal outcomes, social cohesion, or citizenship. Approaches to social justice that draw on critical theories focus on challenging the effects of injustice and promoting emancipation in education. They are viewed from a more bottom-up micro perspective of actions that impact individuals' lives in time and place. The goal is to undo structures that "produce raced and gendered oppressions and systematic poverty" (Vaugeois, 2009, p. 3). For example, Ayers, Quinn, and Stovall (2008b) identify an aspect of social justice that is particularly relevant to historical study, that is, social literacy, where individuals become aware of their identities and how history is implicated in the ways those identities are formed and lives are negotiated (p. xiv).

While historical research cannot undo structures that produced raced and gendered oppressions and systematic poverty, it can expose the roots and impact of such structures in education, and explain how efforts to address injustice were framed and implemented in different eras. Historical work brings to the surface the sheer complexity of social justice in the context of music education. For example, one group can advocate a program of social justice that another group may experience as oppressive. In the nineteenth century, the white middle class who guided the course of music in Western and colonial education advocated music for its civilizing influence on all races and social classes; in retrospect, that same motivation can be interpreted as imperialist for the majority who were seen to benefit from it. Using principles of social justice in conjunction with social theories, I examine music education history developmentally from the following perspectives—music education as a sociocultural good, a national asset, a human right, a sociopolitical good, and a social responsibility.

A NARRATIVE OF AMERICAN MUSIC EDUCATION HISTORY THROUGH THE LENS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Music Education as a Sociocultural Good

Music entered a system of public education in the United States that was flawed in terms of its assumptions of social justice. Horace Mann (1848) marketed the common school by focusing on education as "the great equalizer of the conditions of men—the great

balance wheel of the social machinery” (p. 87, cited in Williamson, Rhodes, & Dunson, 2007, p. 215). Even in the mid-1800s, the idea of a “public” education system for all young people meant specifically all white young people, and the curriculum was rooted in the common experiences and values of nineteenth-century life (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008). These experiences and values were seen as an avenue toward social justice, as they would eventually eliminate inequity among socioeconomic classes.

When music was placed within this system, it was advocated as a subject that had physical, intellectual, and moral benefits. The rationale was based on a philosophy of social equality. All students would participate in singing, which would instill values for participation in a civilized society and elevate the tastes of working-class people. Music education, then, would contribute to the development of better citizens. There were at least two narratives of social justice at work in this philosophy—a salvationist narrative, and one of cultural imperialism.

A salvationist narrative, Vaugeois (2009) argues, is built on the notion of rescuing Others, in this case the poor and the illiterate who would be rescued by schooling to follow the pathway of upward social mobility. The narrative of cultural imperialism is related to the salvationist view of education in that the culture of the dominant group is established as the norm, and often without noticing it, the dominant group projects its culture as representative of humanity. In the process, the perspectives of other groups are rendered invisible and their identity perceived as the Other (Young, 2013). In the context of American music education in the nineteenth century, the salvationist narrative was visible in bringing music to the masses of white people, regardless of social class. The cultural imperialist approach was evident in the exclusive emphasis on European music and its pedagogical practices in the curriculum. The ways of music making popular among the poor or marginalized groups were not deemed as appropriate for inclusion in the school curriculum—for example, shape notes as a form of music literacy or the music that students learned informally as part of their everyday lives.

The nationalization of music education took root in an experiment at the Hawes School in Boston when Lowell Mason offered free vocal music instruction during the 1837–1838 school year. Its success led to the spread of school music programs. Such programs were documented in the official records of white schools, and the news media of their communities, facilitating the later writing of a historical narrative of music education for the period. By 1900, most black children continued to be educated in segregated schools that received little support from the education establishment (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008, p. 36). Stories of the transmission of music in black and other minority communities in that period are yet to find their place in the landscapes of music education history and to transform its canons.

Music Education as a National Asset

In the new twentieth century, progressive educators were vocal in their critique of the role of education in maintaining social injustices and the system’s lack of attention to

social justice (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008, pp. 34–35). The focus in some educational discourse shifted from top-down ideals of equity to a belief that “the creation of a just society requires the active participation of all society’s members in the democratic process” (Boyles, Carusi, & Attick, 2008, p. 35). According to John Dewey (1923), schools should be living, active communities that deliberated over issues relating to social inequality. They should serve as a means of developing a social consciousness and social ideals in children. The Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC), founded in 1907, made valiant efforts between 1914 and the end of the 1920s to reach out to school communities to develop a culture of singing and to foster school-community relationships. Such activity was aligned with Dewey’s philosophy of schooling and contained the seeds of cultural and emancipatory social justice. However, it was also connected with other prevailing narratives of social development and nationality, which came to dominate education.

In the same time period, the influx of new immigrants demanded that the school system accommodate ethnically diverse students in unprecedented ways. The assimilation of immigrants into mainstream culture, often articulated as the melting pot theory, emerged as a primary goal of schooling. Émile Durkheim, a founding figure in the field of sociology, wrote: “Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child, from the beginning, the essential similarities that social life demands (Durkheim, 1972, p. 203). Durkheim’s functionalist view of education was aligned with the social ideal of Americanization, in which all immigrants became nationalized through learning the language, participating in national holidays and celebrations, attending public schools, and learning the values of citizenship.

In public-school music education, as Volk (1998) points out, music was seen as an activity that could unite people of different ethnic backgrounds, social classes, and religious beliefs through singing and playing instruments together, thus instilling ideals of American nationality. Music teachers did their part to assimilate immigrants through singing patriotic songs and folk songs of various western European countries beyond the German canon, which had dominated school music up to that point (pp. 40–44). The use of international folk songs to achieve nationalist goals was well intentioned. However, it begs the question: Whose histories were represented in the folk songs transmitted? How were folk songs appropriated for use in public school? What connections were made between “music of foreign lands” and the realities of cultural pluralism in school communities? The focus was less on the identity of individual students in their communities and more on the achievement of cultural homogeneity and national citizenship through music education.

The underlying principles of functionalist social theory were evident in the way education was structured and implemented. This was not limited to the goals of American nationalism that focused on homogeneity and distributive justice alone. Other educational practices of the time were also questionable when set in the context of social justice. The science of individual and group differences in intelligence and ability that emerged in the early twentieth century bolstered racial rankings and provided

“scientific proof” of intellectual and moral variance between racial and ethnic groups (Williamson, Rhodes, & Dunson, 2007). The educational norms of intelligence testing and ranking and profiling influenced thinking in music education, evident in the publication of tests of music talent and ability.

In sum, the direction of music in education aligned with the dominant functionalist social theory. Two world wars intensified the functionalist approach to education and the need to unite peoples in time of war (McCarthy, 1993, 1995). The powerful metaphor of music as an international language served as a way to justify music in education, particularly in the early and middle decades of the twentieth century. The universal values of music were seen to unite peoples and nations in the name of international harmony, justice, and peace (McCarthy, 2004).

The climate of war and the educational goals of nationality and citizenship in the first four decades of the century influenced the direction of music and maintained the narrative of music education as a national asset.

Music Education as a Human Right

The goal of “Music for Every Child, Every Child for Music,” presented by MSNC in 1923, reflected the educational philosophy of child-centered education of the early twentieth century and the principles of democratic education. Thus, it can be interpreted as an effort to include all children in music instruction while advocating the value of music in education. The further development of a democratic approach to music in public education became visible again in post–World War II America when the rhetoric of war and nationalism shifted to one of freedom, justice, and peace. These principles were set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1948. In response, MENC (formerly MSNC) applied certain aspects of the Declaration to music education and issued a six-article document, “The Child’s Bill of Rights in Music,” in March 1950 (Morgan, 1955, pp. 298–299).

A focus on the individual’s right to a music education was also evident in other documents of the 1950s. When Lilla Belle Pitts wrote an open letter to music educators in 1957, she focused on the profession’s responsibility to individuals: “*We believe that we can make Music in American Life a living reality of the great American dream—the inalienable right of every human being to the pursuit of happiness*” (Pitts, 1957, p. 7). Again, in 1958, the report of the MENC Study Committee on Purposes and Goals of Music Education focused on the individual: “everyone is accorded the right and the obligation to improve American culture by improving himself or herself” (Pitts, 1958, p. 19). If the intention was to develop “American culture” in all its manifestations and contexts, however, then the curriculum did not reflect such intention. Whose cultures were represented? Whose cultures were to be developed through music education? The divisions between school music and music in the culture at large were clear, thus limiting the ways in which students could develop skills in school that would carry over

into the diverse musical practices that were alive in their communities and in popular culture. In sum, while the ideal of music as a human right entered the narrative of music education between the 1920s and 1960s, its implementation was limited to distributive justice. The right to a music education in public education was but a first step in developing each child's musical potential, framed in the context of personal and family history, identity, and values.

Music Education as a Sociopolitical Good

Metaphors that projected music as transcending cultural differences and as building international harmony began to fall out of favor with the rise of multiculturalism in the transformative and tumultuous decade of the 1960s. The notion that universal meanings were somehow embedded in music was rejected, and the cultural significances and contextual meanings of music took center stage. New metaphors such as mosaic, patchwork quilt, or kaleidoscope took the place of the "melting pot" to visualize the complex makeup of cultural groups and the dynamic nature of music cultures. Such metaphors captured the ever-evolving relationships between the identities of individuals, social and cultural groups, and nations in a globalized world.

The relationship between school, music, and society was to be reimaged in the 1960s, a time of profound social change. As the dominant social theory in education, functionalism was no longer adequate to accommodate the principles of a democratic system of education. Social conflict theory and critical theory provided alternatives to address the inequalities underpinning educational practices. Their introduction into the discourse of music education was gradual in the later decades of the century, reflecting a move from distributive and representative justice to cultural and, more recently, emancipatory justice. Efforts to expand curricular choices and repertoire selections to include diverse peoples and cultures were evident from the 1970s forward, framed in the context of multiculturalism.

A more lateral definition of music as a system of different but equally worthwhile traditions and practices began to transform views of and approaches to curricular music. However, the equal representation of peoples through their music was but a first step in understanding the meanings of music in the lives of diverse peoples. Moving from distributive justice to cultural justice demanded changes to pedagogy as well—finding ways to integrate voices of the Other into the curricular canon already in place, preparing teachers to teach from a place of cultural and musical diversity, and honoring the musical and social preferences of students through curricular experiences.

Some scholars question the limits of multiculturalism as an educational philosophy, and return to a more functionalist approach to education. Reports from European countries, Canada, and Australia indicate that educators are revisiting multiculturalism in the context of nationality and national identity. James Banks (2009b), the great proponent of multiculturalism, reported that citizenship education is being used in nations such as Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom to promote a new form

of assimilation called “social cohesion,” originating in concerns about the fracturing of national identity and the maintenance of national unity (p. 3). These concerns are in part a reaction to increasing diversity in nation-states, which is forcing nations to rethink how they can develop civic communities that incorporate the diversity of people and yet have an overarching set of values, ideas, and goals (Banks, 2009a, pp. 306–308). Entwistle ([1999]2000) argues that we should engage in “a detailed discussion of what a healthy, multicultural society needs in order to ensure both justice for the individual immigrant and the necessary social cohesion for citizens to feel connected to each other as contributors to the common good” (p. 14). Jacoby (2004) goes further when he writes that we may need a new understanding of assimilation:

... a definition that makes sense today, in an era of globalization, the internet, identity politics... Just what kind of assimilation is taking place today? What is possible? What is desirable? And how can we reframe the melting-pot vision to make it work for a cosmopolitan, twenty-first century America? (pp. 4–5)

In this century, awareness of the social responsibility of educators to the individual has competed for attention with the need to find a larger, shared narrative focused on social cohesion and the common good.

Music Education as a Social Responsibility

The period of representative justice in the late twentieth century was dominated by a politics of identity in education. The content of educational textbooks and repertoire lists changed to include the stories and music of marginalized groups; musical diversity was highlighted as a performance goal in school programs; and research publications reflected a new focus on the experiences and contributions of individuals from underrepresented groups. However, representation alone is not sufficient in achieving the vision of emancipatory social justice in which individuals have “a sense of their own agency as well as a sense of social responsibility toward and with others, their society, and the broader world in which we live” (Bell, 2013, p. 21).

Issues of social justice must also be embraced in pedagogical practices and the value systems that underlie such practices (Allsup & Shieh, 2012). Discourses in music education are beginning to approach deeper spaces of social justice beyond representation. A more humanistic view of music teaching and learning that emphasizes the experiences of individual students within groups is evident in both research and practice-based literature. For example, the June 2012 issue of the *Music Educators Journal* posed the question: “Music for All . . . ?” on its front cover. Authors responded with several articles on music and justice viewed through the lens of social class, culturally responsive pedagogy, access, and music in prisons. Related articles in other recent issues of the journal on gender and sexual orientation (Bergonzi, 2009; Taylor, 2011) and social class (Hoffman, 2013), as well as the September 2012 issue devoted to

disability, attest to a strong focus on the social and ethical responsibility of music educators to all students.

The MayDay Group, an international think tank in music education founded in 1993, has addressed issues of social justice in several forums, and specifically in the December 2007 issue of its online journal, *Action, Criticism and Theory*. Two organizations, Gender Research in Music Education and the Gender and Sexuality Special Research Interest Group of the National Association for Music Education, have served in notable ways to advocate for and to study issues related to gender and sexuality in music teaching and learning.

Embedded in efforts to advance the vision of emancipatory justice is a renewed focus on distributive justice aimed at underserved populations. Efforts to ameliorate the lives of socially disadvantaged students and to provide an opportunity for upward social mobility and cultural enrichment have been a hallmark of public education since its roots in the early nineteenth century. In Chapter 36 of this Handbook, Eric Shieh presents the reader with a critique of El Sistema, the Venezuelan youth orchestra program, as a social program. He exposes the various social agendas propelling the evolution of the program—social, economic, political, and cultural—and ends on a note of hope regarding its potential growth “as a force for valuable social, and simultaneously, musical transformation.” This case study illustrates how a social program focused on music must be rooted in a broad social policy, and how it must constantly re-evaluate the direction and impact of the program on its participants, their communities, and society at large.

Unlike the national political agenda underpinning El Sistema, there is a marked absence of reference to the nation and nationalism in contemporary music education discourse in the United States. Recent documents such as the *Strategic Plan 2011–2016* of the National Association for Music Education reflect values that emphasize well-being, both personal and collective. This is expressed in a focus on “the joy and power that music education brings in uplifting the human spirit and fostering the well-being of society,” and the strength that comes from “working together with stakeholders . . . to promote music, music education, and policies that build a better society for all” (National Association for Music Education, 2012, p. 4).

MUSIC EDUCATION HISTORY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

I have examined music education history since the introduction of music into US public education from the perspectives of music education as a sociocultural good, a national asset, a human right, a sociopolitical good, and a social responsibility. If issues of justice can be captured along the continuum from the good of the individual to the good of society or the common good, the music education profession has responded primarily to the call of the common good, evident in responses to sociopolitical ideologies

such as assimilation, social cohesion, patriotism, and nationalism. As such, music was viewed as a national asset, and a sociocultural and sociopolitical good. The very nature of its underlying pedagogical structures, focused primarily on ensemble culture at the secondary level, aligned well with the ideals of social ordering and social cohesion. Narratives of individual rights to a music education and the need to acknowledge the diversity of individuals' musical needs and interests were slowly integrated into the discourse of education in the latter half of the twentieth century. This movement coincided with the incorporation of critical theory into expanding paradigms of music education. And with this expansion of consciousness came an ethical and moral sense of responsibility to all students, regardless of social class, age, race, ability, or sexual orientation.

The historical evolution of music education viewed through the lens of social justice sheds light on the ways that music was advocated in the name of justice—from its power to provide a sociocultural good to maintain social control, to contribute to sociopolitical ordering, to build international harmony among nations, to represent the interests of marginalized groups, and to enrich the lives of youth from lower socioeconomic or underserved populations.

Researching and Teaching Music and Music Education History from a Social Justice Perspective

An examination of the history of music education in the public schools reveals a dominant narrative around the development of public school music as represented in the interests and values of the dominant social group. Several narratives of music education are not yet told, and others are constructed from narrow ideological foundations. In other words, a study of music education historiography problematizes professional history itself. Hegemonies are perpetuated through the appropriation of historical narratives. Thus, historians assume a critical role in opening a dialogue that challenges past practices and ultimately changes music educators' relationship to their past and, thus, their view of the present and hope for the future.

As early as 1980, Finkelstein (1980) addressed the need for a richer, more comprehensive, and sophisticated history of education, one that is

... attentive to the aspirations of all groups in American society. . . . a history that is also sensitive to public action when it undermines the capacity of individuals and groups to transmit their own values, create their own meanings, and define their own communities. (p. 122)

Hebert (2009) critiques historical research from the vantage point of documented musical traditions and practices. He argues that what is "sorely needed is an actual book-length history of American music education that is truly inclusive in terms of both culture and genre, especially popular music traditions associated with African-American heritage" (p. 177). Likewise, Woodford (2012) calls for "alternative

and radical histories” that challenge the roots of conventional music education policies and practices while presenting perspectives that cause teachers and students to examine their own assumptions. Only then can the profession confront and address issues of social justice.

In music education history, scholars have been slow to assume leadership in revisiting the past to uncover new meanings around issues of social justice, to examine canons and “truths” from multiple vantage points, to question whose voices have been included and whose remain silent, to evaluate what is remembered and how and why, and to complicate historical interpretations with competing and even contradictory narratives. Cox (2002) and McCarthy (2012, 2013) have identified an agenda to expand the scope and methodology of historical research. In relation to social justice, it includes histories of the transmission of music in the schools and communities of African Americans and other minority populations, histories of disability and gender in music education, critiques of the impact of colonialism on music pedagogy, exposition of the life histories of music teachers, and comparison of social justice issues in music education in different countries during the same historical period.

As stated earlier, the methods of the new history, as well as contemporary technologies used in oral history, contribute in significant ways to approaching historical topics from the perspective of social justice. For example, Vaugeois (2009) suggests that educators explore, together with their students, the life histories of different musical practices. By life histories, she means “the conditions of production of different musics such as available instruments, technologies, legal and institutional structures, as well as physical, social, and economic conditions.” In life histories, the researcher also asks “who is and is not present in different forms of music-making, where race, gender and class reside within musical expressions, how different musics are situated in relation to discourses of respectability, degeneracy, emancipation, and virtuosity” (pp. 3–4).¹ Approaching history in this way is not limited to scholars of music education history. It ought to permeate all instances of examining and teaching music and music education history, from elementary to higher education levels.

Findings from historical research need to be presented to the profession at large through teachers’ journals and included in textbooks and media produced for music education purposes. As the K–12 music curriculum expands to embrace a more comprehensive range of music-making practices across time and cultures, it behooves the profession to create sensitive and provocative curriculum materials that reflect a socially and morally conscious narrative of music history. Critical classroom discussions based on such materials contain the seeds of action for a socially just school and community, with carryover into lifelong engagement with issues of social justice through and with music.

Students can engage in oral history to gather personally the stories of musical lives. Furman and Gruenewald (2004) describe projects of cultural journalism that engage students in interviewing community members, gathering stories about local traditions, and producing knowledge about local cultural life by publishing articles, journals, and books. The authors continue to say that a critical pedagogy of place demands that local