

Comprehensive Education, Comprehensive Music Education: A New Vision

Bennett Reimer
Northwestern University



Introduction

As educators we struggle at this time in history to deal with the consequences of the currently mandated conception of education, one so narrow, so proscribed, so rigidly operationalized, as to transport us back at least a century into the past and perhaps several centuries. Those, apparently, were “the good old days,” when men were men, women were women, and teachers knew exactly what students needed to learn and how to get them to learn it, whether they wanted to or not. And, you’d better believe, how to test their students to be sure they *had* learned it, with dire consequences if they had not.

What happened since then? Well, John Dewey, for one thing. And, for another, a complete upheaval in our understandings of the human mind and of learning. That upheaval has been largely ignored in recent years in the hallways of power in which education policy is hatched, causing a regression to a species of

educational primitivism. We are forced, as a result, to consider, once more, the issue of comprehensiveness in education, its meaning and its promise.

Music Education and the Idea of Comprehensiveness

We in music education have an interesting history in regard to the notion of comprehensiveness. It is a history, I would argue, rife with good intentions, but inadequate, even puny, in their realization. Morphing out of the Young Composers Project begun in 1959, which placed composers in school residencies, followed by the Contemporary Music Project begun in 1963, which focused on persuading music teachers to include more contemporary music styles in their programs and to emphasize creativity conceived as composing, the Comprehensive Musicianship Project (CMP) took shape beginning around 1965. It aimed to invigorate our traditional curriculum, which was characterized by one of CMP’s proponents, David Ward-Steinman, as being “limiting, confining, dull, and ultimately self-defeating.” Comprehensive Musicianship, it was hoped, would correct these faults by stressing listening, composing, and improvising in addition to performing composed music; by going beyond Western classical literature to include both Western non-classical musics and non-Western musics; by relating music to the other arts, and by unifying musical learning by bringing together music theory and history into broadly-based foundations

courses for all music teachers in training and thereby the school programs in which they would apply their broadened backgrounds. (Mark & Gary, 2007).

Related to the CMP movement was another attempt, at around the same time, to view music education in a more comprehensive way. The textbook *Foundations and Principles of Music Education*, by Leonhard and House (1959, 1972) described “faulty music programs” as those “with undue emphasis on performance,” as “emphasizing music as an instrument for achieving unmusical ends such as health, citizenship, and so on,” in which “music loses its identity through specious integration with other subjects of the school,” and programs “aimed largely at receiving public approbation” by exploiting students in performing groups used excessively to gain popular approval (Leonhard & House, 1972, pp. 5-6). Envisioned, as an alternative, was a program in which students are enabled to participate fully in the musical life of their time (p. 74).

Comprehensiveness Unachieved

I want to argue that, some four decades since those attempts to fashion a more comprehensive posture for music education, we have accomplished few of their aspirations. Some, to be sure, but not all, and those few to only a small degree compared with the ambitions those aspirations exemplified. Our faulty programs persist, largely unabated, to this day. Not a happy picture, I’m afraid, at least for those in our profession for whom comprehensiveness remains a worthy, even necessary goal.

I am one of them. In fact I have argued for longer than I care to remember that because of our limited vision of what proper music education consists of we have become progressively more irrelevant to the actualities of the thriving, colorful, and

diverse musical culture in which we live, and particularly irrelevant to the musical lives of the large majority of students in schools. Our disconnection from the musical culture surrounding us, and our avoidance of substantive development toward real comprehensiveness, renders us dangerously unessential as a basic school subject. Sensing this danger, yet not being willing to address its root causes, we instead make endless attempts to convince any and all of the validity of those musical values that we insist are the only really important ones, values forged in the early history of our field and kept alive by the high level of inbreeding in generation after generation of those choosing to become music educators. So we advocate, endlessly, not for what could be if we had the courage to pursue a truly comprehensive program serving the needs of all students, but for what was and what is.

The Success We Have Achieved

Paradoxically, what then was and continues to be in music education is, in and of itself, worthy of a great deal of respect and admiration. What we have mostly done, and continue to do, we have done and continue to do extremely well, in my opinion, even remarkably well. I have the highest regard for the many music educators who offer performance programs of excellent quality, programs of which we deserve to be very proud. I know full well, having engaged myself in that enterprise for many years, how difficult, how complex, and how energy-draining and devotion-requiring the work of offering challenging performance programs is. I do not want to lose, or diminish, our extraordinary accomplishments in the endeavor on which we have focused most of our efforts. We need to retain it and to continue to improve it. Especially to improve it with programs that, while being what they are, nevertheless

take significant steps toward expanding the musical understandings they cultivate. This is accomplished by becoming more comprehensive in their inclusion of learnings that deepen the performance experience by situating it in broader musical and societal contexts, as the National Standards have called for.

Approaching a Vision of Comprehensiveness

How do we approach a concept of music education that embraces the needs, interests, and proclivities of all our students, as well as the full representation of all the many ways that music is conceived of and practiced in our multimusical world? That is, what would a genuinely comprehensive music program look like, and how would we enable ourselves to offer it?

These questions require attention to two dimensions of the task if they are to be answered convincingly. The first dimension is a grounding theory of what comprehensive education in its totality might consist of. The second is a set of guidelines as to how we in music education can carry out that theory in our practices. Neither theory by itself nor practice by itself will be adequate to the task facing us, because, as we have all no doubt heard many times, theory without practice is empty, and practice without theory is blind. (By the way, that maxim has been attributed to a bewildering array of people, so I am not able to cite it authoritatively.) In this paper I will propose answers to both dimensions, answers I have pursued for most of my career and which I have continued to refine and extend to the present day. I hope that as other such proposals are advanced we will be enabled to create a concept of comprehensive education and of comprehensive music education, along with their necessary practices, that will elevate both education and music education to the

level of relevancy that our culture and our students deserve from us.

Each Child Fulfilled

My answer to the question of what a comprehensive education consists of is based on a philosophical objective; that is, a hoped-for value, that goes directly counter to the presently operative objective of education, known as No Child Left Behind. I have already characterized its deficiencies, so I will not continue to beat this dead horse, except to relate that one of its critics, dismayed by the relentless regimen of testing that it puts students through, proposes that we change its name to “No Child’s Behind *Left*” (A reasonable proposal, I would say).

I have stated my alternative proposal to No Child Left Behind in three words: Each Child Fulfilled. This value, I argue, grounds education in a fundamental goal that is at once deeply humane and powerfully practicable. It focuses on the individual as the essential unit of worth and of nurturance, and it provides endless implications for what an effective, meaningful education will consist of and how it can be carried out in all the myriad practices that a functional education program requires.

Fulfilled individuals, persons whose education has helped them become as completely self-developed as possible *at every stage of that development*, are the basic components for secure and mature cultures to which they are contributors and from which they are beneficiaries. Fulfilled lives, as those lives are being lived day by day, year by year, are lives most worth living, I would propose. People who are living such lives participate fully in wholeness, in optimum realization of each human’s potentials for satisfaction, growth, success, challenge, and joy.

The purpose of education, in this conceptualization, is to provide every possible opportunity for individual potentials to be realized, as those potentials interact with those that the person's culture makes available. Human individuals require a culture that gives shape to their potentials. Cultures require individuals who shape it so as to offer optimal opportunities for potentials to be achieved. This reciprocal need, this interdependence of individual and culture for the benefit of both, is a universal characteristic of the kind of creatures humans are, with our mutually shared bodies, brains, and mindful potentials. That universal human characteristic is played out as each culture enables it to be achieved. Education is a primary means, probably *the* primary means, for individuals to both become fully who they might be within the parameters of their culture's opportunities, and to act as agents for expanding and improving such opportunities.

Cultural Empowerment and the Role of Roles

This universally required interaction of individual with culture, advancing the welfare of both, can be conceived as "cultural empowerment." It is a basic outcome, I believe, of effective education. I have proposed a comprehensive conception of education in which individuals are introduced to all the important knowings and doings of their culture, and of other cultures, by being immersed in each of those knowings and doings as they are actually pursued in their culture and others (Reimer, 2003). Those knowings and doings are powerfully captured and made apparent, in both their theory and their practice, in the various roles people play in their culture.

So basic are these roles that they in fact define what a culture essentially is and how it works. A culture is usefully understood to be the sum total of all the

roles it makes available and how those roles are characteristically played. Simple cultures are ones that have relatively few roles available to be played beyond those that are common to the survival of all cultures; that is, various family roles, food production roles, safety-keeping roles, simple governance roles, and so on. Complex cultures, such as that of modern nation-states, require so many roles to be played in order for the culture to be viable as to require professionalized and prolonged systems of education that prepare their members to be able to function successfully in the culture and thereby to sustain the culture in its many facets. Each culture's system of education reflects its values as to the important roles that require nurturance through the special kinds of efforts that educational institutions are designed to make. Successful education enables a successful culture. A successful culture enables successful education. Both depend, at base, on cultivating all the necessary roles that must be played if individual lives, and, thereby, the needs of the culture, are to be fulfilled. Hence, each child fulfilled becomes the basis for successful education, empowering both individuals and their culture.

Roles as Intelligences

Further, each role available to be played in a culture is, I have argued, a way to be intelligent. The conception of roles as intelligences is basic to the theoretical foundation I offer for a conception of comprehensive education. In the general field of education we have been influenced, for the past twenty years or so, by the idea that intelligence is not a single entity capable of being measured by a single test (the IQ test). Instead, we have been persuaded, intelligence is a multiple phenomenon, evidenced in several different domains. The most influential argument in

this regard has been made, as we are all aware, by Howard Gardner, in his theory that there are seven, or perhaps eight, or perhaps eight and a half, or perhaps eight and two halves (the existential and the moral, which have turned out to be too hazy to be given full status) (Gardner, 1983, 1999).

Luckily for us, one of them, on the original list of seven, no less, is the musical intelligence. Why music happened to be singled out as an intelligence domain, unlike any of the other arts, each of which was buried within other domains, seemed to me, when I first studied Gardner's theory, to be puzzling, even disturbing. But in my pleasure that we were on the side of the good guys, and were able to play that for all it was worth, basking in the theory's glory, I put aside my qualms and went blissfully on my way. As time passed, other aspects of his theory began to seem to me to be less and less well founded. For example, how a domain was identified in the first place. Why some domains got added and not others seemingly equally as worthy. What intelligence actually consists of absent a clear definition or description of it by Gardner, actually absent any definition of intelligence at all to help establish its parameters. The edifice I had at first left unexamined began, as I looked at it more closely, to crumble before my eyes.

Also, as his theory became more widely applied in education, I witnessed the confusions it was causing as to how and when to apply it, and the absurdities that were appearing in the attempts being made to put it into practice. For an example relevant to us, singing a counting song in an arithmetic lesson as satisfying the presence in arithmetic of the musical intelligence. Or, worse, counting up the beats in three measures of four beats each to introduce the idea of multiplication, again assuming that the musical intelligence had made its

appearance. This sort of thinking, easily found in attempts to apply MI (Multiple Intelligence) theory, simply stripped the veil from my eyes as to the validity or practicality of the theory. I am sorry to say that Gardner has never, to my knowledge, convincingly explained away or corrected the weaknesses in either the theoretical foundation or the application of his theory. I am also happy to say that despite my criticisms of it (he has read my material on the subject and has listened to me lecture on it), he and I remain on the most cordial and respectful terms. I have boundless admiration for him, both as a person who I have come to know quite well and as a major scholar who has made magnificent contributions in a wide variety of fields. I just think that in this particular regard a more persuasive alternative is greatly needed, which is why I've engaged myself so intensely in trying to provide one.

I want to make, now, only a few points about this new view of intelligence, those that relate directly to the topic of comprehensiveness. First, here is my definition, or description, of intelligence. (Description is a less restrictive term than definition but both serve pretty much the same purpose.)

Intelligence consists of the ability to make increasingly acute discriminations, as related to increasingly wide connections, in contexts provided by culturally devised role expectations.

Clarifying the Definition

I'm going to make five points about my theory of intelligence here, from among the many more that could be made.

1. Intelligence is not a matter of pure reason, or pure cogitation, as it is often thought to be. That old idea, most famously propounded by René Descartes when he

said “I think therefore I am,” has fallen by the wayside in philosophy and psychology and, strikingly, in the cognitive sciences including neurology, most dramatically in brain science. Conceptual and mathematical reasoning, which is what Descartes meant by “think,” certainly has its place in intelligence, primarily in the making of meaningful connections when such connections happen to call on such reasoning in order to be made. But reason is never disconnected from the body, the bodied brain, the emotions and feelings, and personality. All play equal, interactive parts in the ways that human intelligence functions. Everything that makes us human; everything we are capable of as humans, is implicated in human intelligence, in my view.

2. Each culture provides the matrix for *what* intelligences are able to be manifested and for *how* they are manifested, as I’ve already mentioned. Our culture allows us to live a fulfilled life within the potentialities it provides and within the ways those potentialities are appropriately played out. That includes, of course, our *critiquing* our culture’s ways of being and doing.
3. Within each culture each individual plays out its potentialities in her/his distinctive ways. Those individualities of intelligences, different in degrees and kinds from person to person, are precious resources for both individual wholeness and for cultural wholeness.
4. Opportunity plays a crucial role in what intelligences can get developed, how they get developed, and the degree to which they can be developed. No opportunity equals no manifestation of an intelligence. And intelligences always exist *to some degree*; that is, they are not static entities but dynamic states of being constantly in flux. Deeper opportunities in any one of them will deepen a person’s intelligence in

that particular one as interactive with that person’s capacities in it.

5. Every role that humans can play – not only the ones usually taught in schools and colleges – requires, in order for it to be played successfully, the development of the particular distinctions, discriminations, perceptions, or differentiations, that each role calls upon, and of the connections made of them – the meanings, significances, or sense-making of them that adds meaning and significance to our lives – that makes *sense* of our lives. Each and every role requires its ways to be intelligent in it, and deserves the respect that this fact calls to our attention. The conception of intelligence I am proposing has the great virtue, for me, of democratizing our understanding of intelligence, recognizing it, valuing it, and admiring it in all the countless ways that humans demonstrate it.

Applying the Theory

The breadth of roles that are played by people in today’s world cultures gives a sense of the breadth of my conception of intelligence, one that goes far beyond anything that can be encompassed in seven or eight (or so) intelligences. Each of the five points I’ve made about intelligence provides a foundation for further development, both of the theory and for educational practices based on it. I want to concentrate here on the latter—the uses of the theory for education rather than on the theory itself, and on education considered in the comprehensive sense as all the teaching and learning that goes on in schools and related institutions.

Being clearer about what that entails if it is to be comprehensive is what we most need if we are to make significant progress toward a vision that goes beyond the superficial, beyond the assumption that what we do now in education, and in music

education, is somehow sacrosanct, and that “reform” is largely a matter of tinkering with what now exists. That attitude, so prevalent in education and in music education, is often expressed in the lament that we hardly have enough opportunity to do what we want to do now, and to do it as expertly as we would wish. So how can we do new things, think differently, aim in different directions, when we haven’t entirely succeeded in doing optimally what we try to do at present?

That position, unfortunately, gets us nowhere, dooming us to the status quo forever, dooming us to all the existing irrelevancies in education and in music education from which both of them suffer. We are ready, more than ready, to move ahead boldly to new challenges, new opportunities, and new hopes for what we can be and how we can contribute to human welfare in fundamentally better ways.

So here is that vision as I presently conceive it, at the level of practice. I must state at the outset that I am well aware that I am not capable of imagining all the ways that the theory can be applied, let alone all the ways that it can be developed over time to be as functional, as successful, as I believe it can be. No one person can do that. This is too big, too inclusive of every dimension of learning and teaching, to be fully comprehended beforehand and applied in all its dimensions by any individual. So my suggestions are humbly offered, as being my inklings of what might occur if this direction is taken, a journey that will require both time and a lot of effort by a wide variety of thoughtful, skilled people.

The Dimension of General Education

First, we must recognize that we need a major overhaul of the concept of general education, that aspect of education in which all students are expected to be engaged if they are to be functional in their

culture and in the world. Our tendency in this regard, around the world, is to identify the subject matters (or fields, or domains, or disciplines) that we consider most important for all educated citizens of each culture to be acquainted with, to as high a degree as each culture’s educational system can reasonably be expected to achieve. These subject matters, constituting the core curriculum, vary somewhat from culture to culture, of course, but as the world has become more homogeneous the core has also become more so. We can generally expect primary attention to language studies both domestic and foreign, social studies, mathematics, and sciences, with lesser attention, if any at all, to physical education (or, as it is called in some areas of the United States, “kinetic wellness”), the arts, and various configurations of what used to be called vocational education but which has now graduated to being conceived as career and technical education.

With the exception of that last area, career and technical education, which has always aligned itself with the world outside of schools (although sometimes far behind what is going on outside of schools), the core and auxiliary subjects have dominantly been studied as coherent disciplines, to be learned in and of themselves as bodies of knowledge that are contained within their characteristic ways of thinking and doing. That is, they are largely studied, in and of themselves, as school subjects.

It is true, I believe, that each subject is indeed one way to explore and understand our world, and that each has its characteristic ways to be learned if it is to be understood and practiced genuinely. But the problem with conceiving them as subjects to be learned is that it tends to isolate them from the lived world outside of school. A great deal of schooling, for a great many students—perhaps most schooling for most students—is regarded by them as being

largely or entirely unrelated to the realities of their lives outside the school. Their learning, therefore, is saturated with a sense that it consists of hoops to be jumped through, expectations to be met, disconnected from everything else in their lives that matters to them. This syndrome is especially prevalent at the high school level although it tends to come to consciousness for many students at the middle school level and even earlier. For just one example, algebra seems to be a barrier subject that must be broken through at all costs, despite that there seems to be little if any clarity as to what it has to do with anything that might be of interest or of use.

That particular example is relevant, in various degrees, to the attitudes many have about all the other subjects they are required to learn. As a result the “will this be on the test?” mentality thrives, caused by test results being the major criterion of successful learning. Absent, here, is genuine absorption in and enjoyment of what is being learned as being meaningful to lives being lived. The test-result criterion diminishes education seriously, as it does the humanity of all who become infected with it. This is not a trivial matter: it goes to the heart of what we hope education will accomplish in the lives of all our students—lives more fulfilled than can otherwise be attained.

Here the power of focusing on roles becomes immediately felt, for two fundamental reasons.

First, each of the many roles that people play within fields, requires, as I have suggested, its particular ways to be intelligent. In language studies, for example, it’s one thing to think and do in expository prose, as in journalism. It’s quite another to create poetry. Two different intelligences because they are two very different roles. It’s one thing, in social studies, to think and do as a sociologist. It’s a very different thing

to be an economist. Those two roles can be coordinated (not integrated), each adding its intelligence to the benefit of the other by making meaningful connections among the two. Each has to be clear about its particular contribution. In mathematics, it’s one thing to think and do as an astronomer, but another as an architect. In science, an atomic fusion researcher is intelligent in one particular way; a cancer cell researcher in another. Within each of the fields I have mentioned, and all the others that I have not, there are many sub-roles, each with its particular intelligence that it makes available for our common welfare.

A focus on roles reveals the manifold ways that humans can be intelligent. That multiplicity of human potentials accounts, in large part, for the success of the human species. That focus, as well, insures the genuineness of what is actually learned and experienced in each domain being studied. The level of the domain, the broad, all-inclusive category of a field of thought and action, is useful to demarcate it from other domains. When it is applied to education, however, it is, simply too indeterminate, by itself, to be able to made operative in the ways requiring its many intelligences to be encountered and lived through in order to be learned.

The same is true of music, of course. To be genuine to each subject its many roles must be encountered, because the subject is, in a real sense, the sum total of all the operative roles within it. And, at the macro level, as I have explained, each culture is the sum total of all the roles in all its areas of endeavor. Focusing on roles within domains reveals the genuineness, the particularity, of the many ways in which intelligence can be manifested within the broad category each domain identifies.

General education, therefore, will consist, in this vision, of the development of each student’s intelligences in the identified

roles, as each of those intelligences are exemplified in the real world of people who are devoted to them as their particular identification both in their culture and to themselves.

The second contribution of focusing on roles in general education, in addition to their basis for how humans act intelligently, is that this connection of school learning with the realities of actual people doing actual things in the world makes general education real, vital, and authentic, both to what is being learned and to how particular humans exemplify those learnings in their life engagements. In the field of multicultural education people who play distinctive and important roles have been given the name “culture bearers.” In my conception, all people who participate in their culture by playing one or several or many of its important roles, are culture bearers. All such people are potential models for students to get to know and to understand, both inside the school and outside the school in the many places where those roles are being played. The trick here, of course, is for educators to choose such role models skillfully and insightfully, and to help prepare them for taking on the teaching role as assistants to those who are playing that role professionally. As we know very well, not all successful role players can also be successful in the role of teachers, or, in this case, as auxiliary resources for teachers, especially in regard to children of various school ages and competencies. Professional teachers must be the careful and wise arbiters of such arrangements.

The vision of general education I am proposing links students to the roles people play in their culture by immersing them, as appropriate for their age, in the realities of how life is actually being lived in their culture, with close connections to the people living those lives and playing those important roles. Of all the many ways that

educators have attempted to align what happens in schools with what happens in the world, this one seems to me to be most respectful of genuine, developmental learning such as schools should be responsible for providing; that is, for curriculum, and as affording the most powerful reality base for those learnings in how people practice their particular roles in the world. I would go so far as to say that this conception of education represents a mature form of praxialism. I don't usually use that term because I struggle to avoid jargon, with somewhat better success as the years go by. But I do want to make the point that a focus on practice, or praxis, can be narrowly construed as being related only to particular roles, such as, in music, performance, or it can be understood comprehensively as when practices are regarded to be intelligences in action in all the countless ways that humans play out their lives. This liberates praxis from the constraints that have, unfortunately, been associated with the term.

The Dimension of Specialization

In addition to their obligations in general education, schools are usually expected to offer some level of opportunity for specialized studies. Here, too, the theory of comprehensiveness I am proposing offers clear guidance for practice.

As students progress through the school years their understandings grow of what their culture offers, and of the lives of people who are successful participants in it, and of the contents of thinking and doing that each of the various roles entails. At certain points in the program students are likely to discover that a particular role seems to resonate with unusual excitement. “Hey. This is great stuff. This really reaches me. I kind of come alive in this role.”

When that magic occurs, that “finding oneself” in relation to some

endeavor, education should be able to leap at that golden opportunity by meeting the needs of the child who senses fulfillment awaiting. In addition to what is being learned in the inclusive studies of general education, the moment for specialization has occurred, for deeper immersion into a particular role than the general program can be expected to provide. Ideally, the school, by itself or in tandem with various community enterprises, will be prepared to seize the moment and to arrange for appropriately specialized learnings. Appropriate means both relevant to the student's developmental stage and to his or her propensities. If there is no such appropriate opportunity available it is highly likely that the student's potential fulfillment will disappear into the void of missed chances, a void every one of us must live with as being the "what ifs" in our life. We must, if we are to be humane, if we are to be just, if we are to be equitable, do everything we can to be comprehensive in the special opportunities we offer in addition to the inclusiveness of general education, so that we can meet the needs of all children to become absorbed in a role that makes potential sense for their lives, for their own sakes and for the sake of their culture.

Applying the Vision to Music Education

Everything I have proposed here applies immediately and fully to music education. In fact, my home base in music education, and my attempt to conceive it comprehensively, is what led me to a clearer view of what education as a whole needs to accomplish if it is to be comprehensive. We have not had many, or even any, music education-based conceptions of the total education enterprise, to my knowledge. Perhaps I simply don't know about them. My playing out of this conception of comprehensive education within the domain of music has already been achieved, at least

in its broad outlines (Reimer, 2003). We only need, here, a few reminders to make crystal clear what we need to do to become as comprehensive as we have always claimed we *want* to be but which we have not defined well enough to be *able* to be.

So, first of all, we need to be very clear about the great variety of roles that exist in the real world of music in our culture. Here's my attempt to give some form to the issue of musical roles, using the National Standards as the basis (see Figure 1).

This conceptualization of the diverse nature of musical roles as related to the National Standards is particularly useful in highlighting the roles we have emphasized and those we have neglected. But it is not something written in stone. It has to adjust itself to what actually develops in music as new roles are created and as old ones drop by the wayside. The point of delineating the many roles in music in our culture is to recognize that in American music education, both in its general music dimension and in its specialized music dimension, we have so poorly represented the many musical roles in our culture as to have unconscionably limited the opportunities available for each child to discover which might be fulfilling, and to be able to pursue that discovery. So we have settled on serving something like nine to twelve percent of the students in schools with performance opportunities, very few of those students remaining active in the performance role beyond their introduction to it in our programs. And then we wonder why we're not considered a basic subject.

This reality of music education betrays, so clearly, how limited, how unjust, we have been by serving the needs of a small segment of students so well, yet ignoring the many other musical needs that we have equal obligations to help fulfill. Our only comfort about that, cold as it may be, is

Figure 1. U. S. National Content Standards For Music Education (Restructured).

A. MUSICIANSHIP ROLES (INTELLIGENCES/CREATIVITIES)

- | | |
|---------------------|------------|
| 1. Singing, Playing | Performer |
| 2. Improvising | Improviser |
| 3. Composing | Composer |
| 4. Arranging | Arranger |

↑
(Reading and notating music)



B. LISTENERSHIP ROLES (INTELLIGENCES/CREATIVITIES)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 5. Listening | Listener |
| 6. Analyzing, Describing | Theorist |
| 7. Evaluating | Critic |
| 8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts | Psychologist, Philosopher, Neuroscientist, Education Theorist, etc. |
| 9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture | Historian, Sociologist, Ethnomusicologist, Anthropologist, Cultural Critic, etc. |

C. MUSIC EDUCATION ROLES (INTELLIGENCES/CREATIVITIES)

Those responsible for teaching all the above, and those who support that teaching, such as Music Teacher Educators, Philosophers, Historians, Researchers, Administrators, etc.

that we are not alone. All of education suffers from the limitations under which it now labors. We need a liberating vision of education and of music education; one that is both an advancement into new horizons of possibility and that is also capable of being attained. I believe that the conception I offer does indeed open the gates to expanded potentials for satisfaction of fundamental human needs that go beyond what present and past ideals have offered, while also being in consonance with the best traditions of progressive education.

But is such a vision really achievable? I am heartened about its potentials by the steps now being taken in the direction of fulfilling each child musically, in performance by a more comprehensive view of what has traditionally been too narrowly conceived, with our budding attempts to install composition to its rightful place in our programs, with the addition of musics beyond the Western classical tradition, and

with deeper examinations of a variety of issues relating to the concept of comprehensiveness. That is cause for celebration and for hope.

But a great deal of challenge awaits us if we pursue the full implications of a comprehensive conception of education and of music education. An ideal such as I have sketched calls upon a great deal of courage, of imagination, and of wisdom if it is to be sought genuinely. Of course any ideal, if it is worthy of the name, is completely achievable only in theory. We are not ideal creatures and we do not live in an ideal world. Any vision easily achievable, after all, is not much of a vision. Our task in this world, I would suggest, is to strive toward improving our lives and our work, guided by hopes perhaps not entirely to be realized. Without such hopes, such guiding values that give coherence and direction to our lives, we can only wander aimlessly and therefore ineffectually. In our professional case the value of each child fulfilled

musically provides a goal toward which we can strive with the dedication of a full heart, knowing that, to the degree we can help each child achieve it, we are contributing

powerfully toward the inevitable consequence of doing so, that of *each adult fulfilled*.

REFERENCES

- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leonhard, C., & House, R. W. (1959, 1972). *Foundations and principles of music education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mark, M., & Gary, C. (2007). *A history of American music education*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.