

Abstract

A conceptual framework for the description of the decision-making process in music education is sketched with reference to extant formulations in education, management, marketing and economics. A list of decision-making phases in music education is proposed, each of which exhibits the characteristics of a social system and an historical example of each phase is described.

Estelle R. Jorgensen *

ON THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN MUSIC EDUCATION

My purpose is to sketch a conceptual framework for the systematic description of the *decision-making* process in music education illustrated by means of historical examples. Decision-making is one of 22 social processes identified by Henry Zentner as applicable to all social systems; the process by which members of a social system determine their collective actions in the face of alternative, possibly competing courses of action.¹

The analysis forms part of a line of research in the conceptualization of social processes in music education.² It is formulated at a high level of generality and thereby provides perspective for empirical research in decision-making in music education at a variety of integrative levels of analysis (or causal complexity).³ Also, it exemplifies a processual or dynamic approach based on assumptions consistent with conditions of imperfect knowledge and uncertainty among others that typify the "real world."

Three assumptions undergird the analysis. First, the actors (individuals or groups participating in the decision-making process in music education) must make decisions on the basis of imperfect information under varying degrees of uncertainty. Actors are not omniscient. They do not have perfect knowledge and they do not possess all the facts relevant for a particular decision.⁴ Typically, they must settle for a certain degree of imperfect information and weigh the "cost" in time, effort, money and anxiety, among other factors, in securing the information they deem relevant against the importance of that decision.

Uncertainty is particularly evident in change-oriented social systems in which there is a lack of agreement on what constitute the appropriate goals, procedures and bases for decisions.⁵ Where change is evident, actors are uncertain of the utility of past experience and of their information base in predicting possible future consequences that will flow from their actions. They are also unable to readily obtain the information they need in order to make decisions. As the rate of change increases, the effective information base shrinks and the costs of obtaining relevant information burgeon. This fuels actor uncertainty and results in a spiral of progressively more imperfect information and uncertainty. On the other hand, in tradition-oriented social systems there is a relative consensus on the decision-making process. Actors are able to predict future consequences on the basis of past experience with comparative certainty. Relevant information at lower cost may also be more accessible to them. As the rate of change decreases, the effective information base grows and the costs of obtaining relevant information decrease. This results in greater actor certainty and a spiral of progressively less imperfect information and uncertainty.

* Faculty of Music, McGill University

Second, actors make decisions on the basis of subjectively perceived expectations of events and their significance, i.e., on the basis of an expectation set or an "assumptive frame of reference."⁶ A variety of historical, cultural, social, psychological and physiological factors contribute to the development of these expectation sets.⁷ In consequence, the view of each actor is an essentially unique one and is reflected in a variety of individual motives, beliefs, attitudes and intentions. Further, the expectation set of a given actor is potentially more-or-less similar to that of other actors having similar assumptive sets, e.g., those having similar roles in the educational process as parents, teachers, students or administrators.

Expectations may not always be realised and from time to time it will be necessary for actors to reevaluate their expectations in the light of experience. Some actors may have more realistic expectations than others, reflecting such differences as their positions in the social system *vis-a-vis* the power structure, their past experience and the degree of change in the system. Nevertheless, all actors find a greater or lesser disparity between their expectations and the events that actually occur. This results in an ongoing process of change in their expectations.

Third, actors are variably constrained by social expectations of them.⁸ Not only are they members of various competing social systems (e.g., groups, institutions and societies) in which their membership is contingent on an acceptance of social rules, norms, or mores but their decisions also affect other actors. This results in interconnecting chains of decisions that may spread in varying degree through the system to other systems as well. The outcome of a particular decision-making process may involve either a change in actor expectation sets or an alteration of the social system and a change in the external constraints on actors, or both.

These external constraints may be manifested in various ways such as institutional affiliations, professional association rules, administrative policies and directives, curriculum syllabi or guides, public or common examinations, reference group expectations (such as those of family, friends or valued "others"), and personal interests and commitments outside music.

Actors have varying perceptions of the degree to which they are constrained in their decision-making and varying reactions to perceived constraints on their choice. Their reactions to these constraints are reflected in their subsequent participation in the social system.⁹

There are various prominent theoretical descriptions of the decision-making process extant, representing such fields as education, management, marketing and economics. I will examine five examples in chronological order, showing that all represent the decision-making process in the dimension of time and in the order in which events transpire as a series of stages or phases, each of which constitutes a process at a lower level of generality.

John Dewey depicts five 'phases or aspects of reflective thought': suggestion, intellectualization, hypothesis, reasoning and testing hypothesis by action. He also suggests a sixth phase — reference to the future and to the past.¹⁰ Reflective thought, for Dewey, commences with a suggestion "in which the mind leaps forward to a possible solution" to a dilemma that is faced. This suggestion is more clearly articulated in the intellectualization phase as "a *problem* to be solved." One suggestion after another serves as the hypothesis initiating and guiding an individual's search for evidence. Reasoning (both inductive and deductive) follows as the individual prepares to test the hypothesis by overt or imaginative action and subsequently, to evaluate it in the light of past experience and expectations of the future. Dewey envisages that the order of the

phases may vary and each may incorporate distinct sub-phases. His view of individual reflective thought has been especially influential in the development of conceptual models of consumer behaviour in contemporary marketing theory.¹¹

Herbert Simon depicts three phases of decision-making in management: finding occasions for making decisions; finding possible courses of action; and choosing among courses of action.¹² The implementation of choice constitutes, for Simon, another series of decisions in turn, following the three phases above. His definition of decision-making as the process of making up one's mind or reaching a conclusion on a given issue is more limited than a broader concept of the decision-making process as one that also encompasses implementation or the translation of thought into action and the evaluation of that action. Notwithstanding the narrowness of his definition of decision-making, Simon's classification has been incorporated within subsequent analyses of individual and group decision-making that include implementation and evaluation as well.

Brian Loasby describes a decision cycle of five stages, the first three of which follow Simon's analysis: intelligence; search; choice; implementation, or the translation of choice into action; and control, implying the accountant's concept of an evaluation with a view to ascertaining if future decisions will be warranted and leading, in turn, to intelligence, and to yet another decision cycle.¹³ Loasby sees each phase of the decision cycle as potentially containing "one or more decision cycles at a lower level of complexity." Also, he suggests that a partial definition of the problem presupposes "a series of redefinitions or partial solutions as new difficulties are discovered" sometimes short-circuiting the cycle. He makes two important contributions: first, in explicitly recognizing the decision process as a cyclical phenomenon — a notion that is implicit in Dewey's analysis; and second, in recognizing the distinction between choice and implementation — a distinction important not only in social organizations where policy must be translated into practice but also in psychological events where intentions must be translated into action.¹⁴

In his model of the buying process Gordon Foxall envisages four stages: development and perception of want or need; pre-purchase planning and decision-making; the purchase act; and post-purchase reactions and evaluation (with possible repeat buying).¹⁵ Foxall like Dewey and Loasby envisages decisions as necessarily involving action and evaluation. A consumer buys a good or service, subsequently evaluates the purchase and decides whether or not to repeat the purchase. Unlike Loasby, however, Foxall does not distinguish choice and implementation. Rather, he views a consumer's choice as being synonymous with the act of purchase.

The EKB model is an acronym for the three original proponents: Engel, Kollat and Blackwell.¹⁶ Drawing on a variety of extant models of consumer behaviour including the Howard and Sheth model as revised by Howard,¹⁷ the EKB model is an elaborate flow diagram in which hypothetical relationships between variables are reduced to a set of equations that spell functional relationships.¹⁸ The model is predicated on the assumption of information processing, taking the analogy of the computer as a representation for the cognitive process. The EKB model depicts five phases in consumer decision-making: problem recognition, or "What happens to initiate the process?"; search, or "What sources of information are used to help arrive at a decision and what is the relative influence of each?"; alternative evaluation, or "What criteria are used by the consumer to assess alternatives? What are the resulting beliefs and attitudes about the alternative? What is the status of purchase intention?"; choice, or "What selection is made from among the available alternatives?"; and outcomes, or "Is choice followed by satisfaction or by doubt that a correct decision was made?"¹⁹ In the EKB model as with Foxall's model, choice is synonymous with the purchase act but unlike Foxall's model, there is a discrimination between alternative evaluation

and choice somewhat paralleling Loasby's choice and implementation phases, respectively. Further, the decision-making process is rather more open-ended than Loasby's decision cycle would imply with the outcomes phase being more-or-less similar to Foxall's post-purchase reactions and evaluation phase.

I am proposing a list of decision-making phases in music education, as follows: problem, search, choice, implementation and evaluation. This list is similar to Loasby's stages in the decision cycle with the first and last relabelled. The problem phase involves actor perception of a discrepancy between existing characteristics of music education and their expectations of what these would be, i.e., a difference between actor expectations of "some *existing situation and desire situation*." ²⁰ The label avoids the restrictiveness of the term 'problem recognition' in the EKB model and the lack of focus in Loasby's term 'intelligence' while still providing a sufficiently broad label to encompass both problem recognition and formulation (incorporating Dewey's 'suggestion' and 'intellectualization' phases).

Problems may have varying importance for the actors and are of two types, alpha and beta; polarities on a continuum giving rise to different decisional characteristics. ²¹ Alpha problems occur relatively infrequently and are therefore relatively few in number whereas beta problems occur more frequently and are relatively numerous; alpha problems necessitate widespread search efforts whereas beta searches are more localized; alpha problems typically involve many variables and are relatively complex whereas beta problems involve few variables and are relatively simple; actors have a relatively low degree of certainty in approaching alpha problems and a relatively high degree of certainty in beta problems; solutions to alpha problems are typically creative while those to beta problems are typically routine; and alpha problems involve relatively high solution costs whereas beta problems involve relatively low solution costs.

The search phase involves actors in the formulation and elaboration of suppositions and in an active search for information, i.e., both an *internal* search (or "memory scan") and an *external* search (or a "motivated and completely voluntary decision to seek new information") with the purpose of deriving possible alternative courses of action in order to solve a problem. ²²

The choice phase involves the evaluation of alternative courses of action and the selection of a particular alternative, resulting in a decision or *intention* to follow a certain course of action. By definition, it stops short of the implementation implied in Foxall's concept of the purchase act, Dewey's notion of testing hypothesis by action, and Engel and Blackwell's choice phase where choice and implementation are more-or-less synonymous, although in practice, it may be immediately expressed in action.

Ivan Steiner has suggested three types of choice that may operate at the psychological level: 'evaluative', where actors compare the best available option with their standard of comparison; 'discriminative', where actors compare two or more options, both of which are at least equivalent to their standard of comparison; and 'autonomous' choice where actors compare the characteristics of two options, each complex and different one from the other on several dimensions. ²³

The implementation phase involves the translation of intentions into actions and is distinguished from choice on the assumption that there may be a delay between the time a choice is made and that at which it is implemented. There may also be a variable ability or willingness on the part of the actors to translate their intentions into actions. This implementation of choice varies both quantitatively and qualitatively depending on the particular choice and its perceived importance for the actors.

The evaluation phase involves actor assessment of implementation with a view to determining if further decisions will be required, suggestive of a cyclical decision-making process.

Each of these phases represents a process that exhibits the characteristic dimension described by Henry Zentner as applicable to all social systems, namely, time, space, number, causation, ethic and aesthetic.²⁴ It is now possible to systematically describe each of the decision-making phases not only in terms of the dimension of time but also with respect to all the other aforementioned characteristic dimensions. Such a matrix provides the framework for a rich theoretical description of the decision-making process.

The questions raised in connection with each of the characteristic dimensions are similar for all the decision-making phases, as follows:

Time refers to the historical context and particular time in which a decision-making phase is manifested, the duration of the phase and the specific changes in the phase over time.

Space refers to the spatial context and the particular place in which a decision-making phase occurs at a given time, the area over which the phase is spread (e.g., localized or international in scope) and the difference evident in the phase over space at any given time.

Number refers to the measurement and quantitative aspects of a decision-making phase and empirical evidence of its characteristics (e.g., the number of actors involved, the amount of time taken, the number of particular instances cited).

Causation refers to the causal aspects of a decision-making phase, for example, the particular dimension of music education involved, the specific characteristics of a decision-making phase at a particular time and place, the relationship of that phase to other decision-making phases, the effects of actor characteristics on the operation of the phase and the impact of that phase on subsequent actor attitudes, motivation and effort.

Ethic and aesthetic refer to the specific ethical and aesthetic values or standards at a given time and place, the history of these values (including their longevity and the manner of their formulation), the specificity of their formulation, the agreement among actors about them, their variance in time and place, the 'zone of tolerance' or range of disparity from these standards that is tolerated and the sanctions that are imposed on actors for non-compliance.

Each of the phases represents a theoretical type ordered for purposes of conceptual distinction.²⁵ In practice, the decision-making process may be short-circuited, resulting in the omission of phases. Also, a number of decision-making processes at lower levels of complexity may be subsumed within the decision-making process each of which may be analyzed at a lower level of complexity. Not only may the order of the phases change but the actual boundaries of each of the phases may be blurred as one phase merges into the next.

I will now describe an historical example of each decision-making phase in turn, illustrating the temporal, spatial, numerical, causal, ethical and aesthetic aspects of each phase. Examples have been selected on the basis of available documentary evidence representing a variety of sponsoring institutions, historical periods, geographic locations and aspects of music education.

Problem

As an example of an alpha problem in music education, I cite the problem underlying the British musical appreciation movement; a curriculum reform movement in the first three decades of the

twentieth century emphasizing the importance of educating music listeners. This example is based on evidence provided by Percy A. Scholes, one of the protagonists of the movement, thereby reflecting his perspective on the problem.²⁶

Scholes saw the problem as having been recognized by isolated individuals as early as 1789 and formulated by the editor of the *Musical Times* in 1896. Yet it was not until 1908 that it was recognized and formulated more widely, and the Music Teachers' Association was founded, one of its expressed purposes being "to stimulate and maintain among teachers, a recognition of the important and often overlooked fact that music is a literature, and should be taught and studied from that point of view."²⁷ Other influential individuals spearheaded the movement including Stewart Macpherson, Ernest Read, Mrs. J. Spencer Curwen and E.M.G. Reed. By about 1925, musical appreciation had begun to be included in the course offerings of leading British conservatories (e.g., Royal Academy of Music, Royal College of Music, Guildhall School of Music, Trinity College of Music) and it later spread to wider school use. Indeed, Scholes' evidence suggests that the British musical appreciation movement was a political process involving the recognition and formulation of the problem by a widening circle of actors and an increasing momentum as events transpired with increasing rapidity.²⁸

Scholes saw the problem in two phases: the establishment of the principle that musical appreciation is desirable and should be included in general musical instruction; and the subsequent debate on the methods that should be employed to implement this principle. While the need to educate music listeners was recognized in Britain, North America and on the Continent, there was more agreement on the general purpose of musical appreciation than on the procedures whereby this should be accomplished (i.e., the specific formulation of the problem). These methodological differences of opinion are illustrated in the debate between Stewart Macpherson and Percy Scholes over the appropriate qualifications for teachers of musical appreciation. Macpherson believed that specialist training in music was a necessary prerequisite for school teachers of musical appreciation. Scholes thought Macpherson's insistence on music specialists for the teaching of musical appreciation to be "entirely wrong". He believed that generalist classroom teachers could safely be entrusted with the teaching of musical appreciation. Indeed, not to do so would deprive millions of school children of musical appreciation classes.²⁹

The specific formulation of the problem, especially in the method of its solution, was also affected by the available technology of the time — the player-piano and the gramophone. The invention of the 'Pianola' Roll and the 'Duo-Art' Roll, for example, was followed by the formation of an Advisory Committee on the Educational Use of the Piano-Player Roll and Scholes was contracted to prepare a musical appreciation course using piano-player rolls. While the planned course had subsequently to be shelved for economic reasons it nevertheless represents an important example of the impact of technology on problem formulation in music education; an illustration of the fact that a problem must be viewed within the particular context of the time and place in which it is manifested.³⁰

The problem was first recognized and formulated, in the main, by people outside the state school system; by such writers as E.F. Jacques, the editor of the *Musical Times* and London music critic; H.G. Wells, writer and philosopher; Stewart Macpherson, Professor of Harmony and Composition at the Royal Academy of Music; and Percy Scholes, writer, music critic, broadcaster and lecturer. In consequence, these individuals had to rely on support they could muster from within the school systems. They did this by means of lectures and publications directed at musicians, educators (especially administrators) and the public-at-large. Their efforts were also

complemented by other developments outside the state schools such as Gwynne Kimpton's London "Concerts for Children" beginning in 1911.³¹

Also, the problem arose as a result of comparisons with historical, external and imagined standards: from the recollection of past efforts to educate listeners of music (e.g., those of Hans Georg Nägeli and Francois-Joseph Fétis);³² the observation of situations elsewhere (e.g., Miss A. Langdale's observation of music education in the United States and her subsequent influence on Stewart Macpherson to become a protagonist of the British musical appreciation movement);³³ and the imagined ways of educating listeners (e.g., musical appreciation courses developed variously by Stewart Macpherson, Percy Scholes, and Thomas Whitney Surette and Daniel Gregory Mason).³⁴ Educators have historically attached particular importance to external standards and the British musical appreciation movement appears to have been no exception. Witness Scholes' citation of the various first-hand accounts of experiments and experiences with the implementation of musical appreciation in various types of schools as a means of providing external standards for comparison by teachers and administrators.³⁵

At the time the British musical appreciation movement was underway, progressive ideas in education were spreading on both sides of the Atlantic and ethical ideals of universalism rather than elitism were being popularized. Yet notwithstanding the efforts by the protagonists of musical appreciation there appears to have been considerable disagreement among musicians and teachers about the merits of mass music education and the methods by which this might best be accomplished.³⁶ Musical expectations of teachers apparently varied widely although the presence of a music supervisor in some districts reduced this variation by limiting the freedom of teachers to set their own curricula. While different points of view were tolerated among British schools in general, evidenced by the co-existence of elitist musical programmes and generalist musical appreciation courses, a much narrower tolerance for divergence from institutional standards appears to have existed within any given school.³⁷

Search

As an example of the search process, I cite Carl Orff's search for an instrumentarium, or instrumental ensemble as part of his approach to music education, based on his account of what happened.³⁸ Over approximately eight years (1924-32) while associated with the Guntherschule in Munich, he gradually assembled an instrumentarium that reflected the gradual refinement of his ideas. Figure 1 illustrates the development of this instrumentarium.

Orff's external search was more-or-less restricted to consultation with people he knew in Germany, such as: Dorothee Gunther, movement educator and colleague at the Guntherschule in Munich; Gunild Keetman, music educator and colleague, who provided invaluable assistance in the development of the instrumentarium and the Schulwerk; Oskar Lang, friend, art historian and writer on music; Karl Maendler, harpsichord maker; and Curt Sachs, musicologist and Curator of the Staatlichen Musikinstrumenten Sammlung (State Collection of Musical Instruments) in Berlin.³⁹

The specific direction of Orff's search changed over time as his ideas crystallized and broadened. At first, in 1924, he was preoccupied with exploring the possibilities of primitive and exotic percussion instruments, e.g., jingles, rattles, tambours, tambourines and double-sided drums. When Spangenberg brought out his "Heine Tanzpauke" (tunable drums or "dance timpani") in 1925 Orff added these instruments to his ensemble. The arrival of an African marimba from the Cameroons in 1926, sent by two Swedish sisters who had been introduced to him by Oskar Lang,

sparked a new search. He wrote: ⁴⁰

At one stroke I had found what I needed for the further extension of my educational ideas and for the dance orchestra, an instrument that would supply those resonances that had previously been missing and upon which melodies and ostinati of all kinds could be built. As I looked back at the earlier percussion experiments they seemed to me like incomplete, skeletal sketches that could only now be meaningfully performed.

As well, Orff recalled the ancient roots of the xylophone; its primitive development in South-East Asia and Melanesia culminating in the Gamelan orchestra of Indonesia, its development in Africa and subsequent incorporation into the indigenous folk music of Latin America and its use in Slavic and Germanic countries since the Middle Ages. ⁴¹

In his search, Orff was helped by colleagues and by unexpected events. The search for a prototype xylophone for the instrumentarium led him to consult with Curt Sachs who advised against the reproduction of African models and suggested, instead, the inclusion of recorders. A consort of recorders was then ordered from Peter Harlan a friend of Curt Sachs. In the meantime, a "Kaffir piano" arrived from Hamburg. It had been sent by a student of the Güntherschule who had purchased it from a sailor recently returned from the Cameroons. This instrument provided the prototype for the soprano and alto xylophones made by Karl Maendler in 1928. ⁴² As a result, the range of keyboard percussion instruments was subsequently increased to include those listed under the Instrumentarium circa 1932 in Figure 1. Later, other early instruments such as the portable, spinet, fidels and viols were added to complement the ensemble.

Orff pursued the search for an instrumentarium with purpose. While his search was directed toward specific ends for evidence that tended to support his ideas rather than to contradict them (i.e., toward verification rather than refutation), his collaborators and he wished to test their work, to "submit it to proof, and to make it more widely known." To that end, they held numerous public demonstrations. ⁴³

Orff had a high degree of control in his experiments at the Güntherschule. He wanted to develop a new approach to music his way, from an artistic rather than an educational starting point and his position at the Guntherschule enabled him to develop his ideas relatively free of interference. ⁴⁴ He came from outside the state school system; from the world of composition, conducting and musical theatre. By dint of his influence and stature as a musician he was free to develop an instrumentarium of his choice and more generally, his own approach to music education.

Orff won the support of Eberhard Preussner, Director of the Music Department of the Central Institute for Education and Training in Berlin, for his approach to music education. This led to an invitation in 1932 by Leo Kestenberg, Minister of Culture, for Orff to introduce the Schulwerk into the Berlin schools. His work also received the approbation of musicians and public alike. In particular, the performances of the various instrumental ensembles of the Güntherschule, especially the dance group and dance orchestra led by Gunild Keetman and Maja Lex received international critical acclaim. ⁴⁵

Choice

As an example of the choice phase in music education outside the milieu of state school systems, I cite the case of the Orpheus Choir of Glasgow, an amateur choir that achieved an international reputation over its fifty-year life (1901-51). This analysis is based on accounts of events by its sole conductor, Hugh Robertson. ⁴⁶

An important instance of choice occurred at the time the Orpheus Choir was formed as an independent organization. Until 1906, it was known as the Toynbee House Musical Association, a part of the Toynbee Men's Social Club. Robertson sketches the events that led to this change.⁴⁷ There was growing agitation among the members, especially the women, that the choir needed to be independent of the club. Its freedom of action was challenged on various occasions especially as the choir became an economic asset to the parent association and where financial decisions were to be made. While the men were constrained by social ties to the Toynbee Club, the women gave their entire loyalty to the choir. Strife resulted. The women made up their minds that something needed to be done. The choir needed another home. Without consulting the conductor, Elsie Hall, a member of the soprano section, independently enlisted the aid of her employer and secured the Collins' Institute as a rehearsal venue. The final choice to leave Toynbee House was expressed by the members during a choir rehearsal one evening in January, 1906. By then the options were clear. The members had to make a choice between remaining as the Toynbee House Musical Association with constraints on their freedom of choice or forming a new choir that would give them autonomy. Four-fifths of the eighty members of the Toynbee House Musical Association chose the latter alternative and formed the Orpheus Choir. Choice appears to have followed soon after Elsie Hall's successful search for a rehearsal venue and to have been of relatively short duration in comparison with the problem phase that had previously extended over several years.

The expression of choice and the sense of freedom to make their own decisions had a positive impact on the morale of the members. Robertson describes the euphoria that gripped the members the night they left Toynbee House and became the Orpheus Choir.⁴⁸

The choice to break with Toynbee House was an informal grass roots movement and it may be contrasted with the much more formally organized choice made just before the Orpheus Choir ceased to exist.⁴⁹ At a choir meeting in June, 1950, the choir president (in the chair) upon receiving Robertson's resignation moved to dissolve the choir at the end of the fiftieth season — a motion unanimously endorsed by the members. At that point there were two options: continue the choir with a new conductor, or disband. When confronted with these alternatives, the members chose to disband.

The fact that the conductor and choir chose to continue a partnership for fifty years illustrates a compatibility between the characteristics the singers desired in a conductor and those the conductor desired in the singers. The choir members, for their part, were obviously enamoured of Hugh Stevenson Robertson.⁵⁰ They wanted a dynamic leader; a musician who demanded their respect, believed in them, expected them to achieve a high standard of musical performance and inspired them to work toward this ideal. The conductor, for his part, wanted people who would follow him, who could become the choir he envisaged, who were willing to work hard and to learn, who were willing to take the time to rehearse and perform and who were loyal and supportive members of the choir.⁵¹

Amateur choirs have historically had a written constitution or an unwritten understanding of the power and prerogatives of the conductor, officers and members, more-or-less restricting their freedom of choice. Choirs have differed in the specificity of their rules and regulations and in the relative concentration of power with the conductor. In some choirs, a democratic process has prevailed and the conductor's role has been more limited while the members have assumed greater responsibility. In others, the conductor has assumed the prominent role. The Orpheus Choir represents the latter case. Robertson's prerogatives had been established and consolidated over a

fifty-year period, reflecting his belief that a great choir is formed around "the personality of some inspiring leader."⁵²

Prior to 1901, before Robertson became the conductor, the choir, as the Toynbee House Musical Association, had been constrained by the values and rules of the Toynbee Men's Social Club. At that time, musical values were an adjunct to the predominant social values. Under Robertson's leadership, however, musical values came to assume greater importance for the members especially for the women whose only affiliation with the club was through the choir. Eventually, the values of the parent organization and its musical progeny collided. For a time, the disparity of values was within the zone of tolerance of the choir and the club. By 1906, it exceeded the zone of tolerance of the choir women, necessitating a complete break between the two organizations and provoking a choice.

The Orpheus Choir became progressively more elitist over the course of its fifty-year life. As it grew in prestige more singers sought admission and auditions became necessary. Later, the standard was such that by 1945 singers were re-examined every year whether or not they had sung before.⁵³ This meant that Robertson had increasing choice not only of singers but of choral repertoire, concert venues, and broadcasts and recordings, among others.

Not only was the progressive elitism of the Orpheus Choir accompanied by increasing musical standards but the survival of both the Orpheus Choir and the Choral Union in Glasgow over the same period, indicates that there was room for the musical contributions of both choirs: the performance of major choral-orchestral works by the resident Glasgow Choral Union; and the performance of national songs and shorter choral works by the touring Orpheus Choir.⁵⁴

Implementation

An example of the implementation phase I consider the case of the introduction of vocal music into the Boston grammar and writing schools over the period, 1838-50.⁵⁵ It took about nine years from November, 1829, when William Channing Woodbridge returned from extended travel in Europe to settle in Boston, having chosen to ensure that vocal music was introduced into American common schools, until August 28, 1838, when the School Committee of the city of Boston voted to introduce music into its "grammar and writing" schools. During that period, Woodbridge was the catalyst for a political process whereby his choice came to be shared by sufficient numbers of musicians, educators and the public-at-large to bring about partial implementation of his ideas — a strategy in several stages involving widening circles of actors and events occurring with increasing rapidity.⁵⁶ Implementation commenced in September, 1838, shortly after the School Committee's resolution to that effect.

Implementation involved successive stages reflecting a broadening scope and it was still incomplete by 1850. For example, not all the fifteen eligible schools received musical instruction at the outset. The resolution of the School Committee left the timing for the introduction of vocal music to the sub-committees of the individual schools involved. By 1841 while thirteen of the schools were apparently receiving musical instruction two were not included until 1871. Further, not all the pupils in each of the schools in which vocal music was offered were included at the outset. It was not until 1848 along with administrative reforms in the schools, that the principle of providing vocal music for all the students in each school was established.⁵⁷

Over the period, 1838-50, there were also various changes in specific aspects of implementation, e.g., the administration, curriculum and teaching staff in vocal music that reflected a growing administrative decentralization. At the outset, through his assumption of the designation

Master of Music (a dual role of teacher and superintendent of music), Lowell Mason exercised considerable power. During his initial superintendency the administration of vocal music was centralized. Mason was relatively free to hire teachers at fees he determined, dismiss them when necessary and select textbooks. In February, 1846, however, when Benjamin Baker and Lowell Mason were appointed dual superintendents of music, each responsible for vocal music in half of the schools, Mason's powers were curtailed and the administration of vocal music was more decentralized. This tendency toward increasing decentralization was extended in October, 1850, when the superintendency of music was abolished and each school was made responsible for hiring its own teacher of music.⁵⁸

These administrative changes were also reflected in the curriculum, teaching staff and scheduling of music classes. For example, Mason and his assistants used *The Juvenile Singing School* as their textbook until 1841 when it was replaced by the *Boston School Song Book*.⁵⁹ From 1846, however, Baker and his assistants used *Baker's Elementary Music Book*.⁶⁰ Thus, while all schools initially used Mason's system and textbook, by 1850 half the schools were using his book and half were using Baker's. Also, Mason and Baker each hired assistants of variable competence who more-or-less shared their respective points of view about goals and methods of vocal music instruction.⁶¹

The implementation phase was more specific than the choice phase. For example, the choice expressed in the School Committee's resolution of August 28, 1838, specified: the music committee's responsibility to "contract with a teacher of vocal music in the several public schools of the City"; the cost ceiling for each school; the time at which vocal music would be introduced into each school; the schedule for musical instruction; and the school masters' responsibilities. Left aside, were the specific issues of exactly how this was to be accomplished. For example, the ambiguity in the resolution left it possible for Lowell Mason to assume a superintendency as Master of Music, in charge of teaching assistants hired independently of the School Committee.⁶²

Lowell Mason played a central role in the implementation of the School Committee resolution of August 28, 1838. The administration, curriculum, teaching method and textbooks in the vocal music programme bore the stamp of his ideas.⁶³ He also became the focus of much controversy as his power was challenged by colleagues and local politicians in the Press and on the School Committee. The introduction of a dual superintendency of music in 1846 was a political compromise in a difficult situation. Yet Mason continued in the school system notwithstanding the connivances of his detractors.⁶⁴ His experience illustrates the political nature of the implementation phase; the relative distribution of power among the actors that affects musical instruction, actor perceptions of others and external constraints on their freedom of action.

The implementation of vocal music instruction in the City of Boston Schools during 1838-50 constituted an innovation. Standards were neither well-established nor precisely articulated. While there was essential agreement on some issues (e.g., the appropriate inclusion of vocal music within the school curriculum and the necessity for competent teachers to provide musical instruction), there was disagreement on other more specific issues. For example, Mason treated his responsibility as a teacher of music in much the same way as an educational contractor would do today: he provided his own teachers, curriculum, textbooks and pianos and he guaranteed quality vocal music instruction in return for specified fees.⁶⁵ His critics saw things differently. Some wanted to ensure that musical instruction was controlled by the School Committee. Others wanted to have a variety of approaches to musical instruction within the school system. It was doubtless the lack of agreement on these issues that led to controversy over Mason's superintendency of

music and later, in 1850, to the School Committee's resolution to abolish the superintendency in music and to decentralize control within the sub-committee of each school. Yet despite differences of opinion there was sufficient agreement to ensure the survival of music in the City of Boston schools over the period in question.

Evaluation

As an example of the evaluation phase in private musical instruction I cite Amy Fay's evaluation of her teachers, based on her account of her studies with Karl Tausig in Berlin (February, 1870 to August, 1870), Theodore Kullak in Berlin (August, 1870 to April, 1873, and three or four lessons during October and November, 1873), Franz Liszt in Weimar (May, 1873 to October, 1873), and Ludwig Deppe in Berlin (December, 1873 to April, 1875).⁶⁶

As with all her teachers, Fay's evaluation of Tausig began even before she had her first lesson with him and continued throughout the duration of instruction and after she had ceased to study with him. Her subsequent experiences modified her assessment of each of her teachers. After she had worked with Kullak she evaluated Tausig differently; after she had studied with Liszt she was dissatisfied with Kullak; and after she had studied with Deppe she believed him to be better than Kullak and she saw Liszt in a different light.⁶⁷

With the exception of a summer in Weimar with Liszt, Fay took most of her lessons in Berlin and her evaluation was based on what she saw, heard and experienced there as well as in her travels in Germany.⁶⁸ She also referred to her previous studies in North America.

Fay's evaluations of her teachers were quite subjective and consisted mainly of character sketches of them. For example, she believed that Kullak was not as "terrible" as Tausig because he was gentler and better tempered. Yet later, she commented that Kullak was a more "discouraging" teacher than Tausig because while Tausig rarely played the piano in her lessons, Kullak constantly played to her. She thought that Liszt was a "delightful" teacher with a charismatic personality who gave her "freedom" to interpret the music in her own way — a marked difference between Kullak and Liszt. Fay felt that Deppe had an analytical ability that Liszt did not have and that her progress was greatest under him.⁶⁹

Fay was not entirely satisfied with Kullak while studying with him, yet it was not until she experienced lessons with Liszt that her dissatisfaction with Kullak reached a point where her studies with him became unbearable. She then sought out another teacher and found Deppe. Although she had been free to leave Kullak when she wished and he might also have dismissed her if he had wished, Fay had been constrained by her lack of awareness of other options. For example, she later commented that had she known of Deppe she might have studied with him much earlier.⁷⁰

Fay's choice of her teachers was made on the basis of their reputations yet her evaluation was mainly based on their personal and musical qualities. She enjoyed a teacher who was kind, personable (even charismatic), intense, and analytical; who encouraged different interpretations of the music and who was willing to devote time to leisurely lessons. She felt that no individual teacher could satisfy *all* the student's musical desires and needs. Each teacher emphasized a different musical aspect and it was therefore essential for a student to study with several teachers. With the benefit of hindsight she later wished that she might have studied three years with Deppe followed by one year with Kullak and two seasons with Liszt.⁷¹

Fay described the musical instruction she received from each of her teachers in considerable detail. She had private lessons (one or two a week) and participated in master classes (numbering up to 20 students with Liszt). The length of her lessons ranged from one hour per week (with Kullak) to three hours per week (with Deppe) and a marathon master class of four hours with Liszt that left her feeling "more dead than alive."⁷² Her repertoire varied and included studies, solo piano works, piano concertos and chamber music.⁷³ She practised five or six hours a day, regarding it as a holiday to reduce her practice time to three hours a day. Before going to a lesson with Liszt she practised four hours in the morning.⁷⁴ Her experience indicates the variety of teaching methods employed by Tausig, Kullak, Liszt and Deppe. For example, when Fay went to study with Deppe, he assigned her Czerny's "*Schule der Gelagfigkeit* (School of Velocity)" to be studied very slowly, hands separately. Having previously studied what she considered to be more advanced material, she regarded this assignment as "rather a come down". Further, each teacher required her to learn his system, a process that in Fay's observation took "fully a year".⁷⁵ Yet while there were apparent differences in the musical and instructional standards by which teachers were evaluated, their instructional methods, the amount of time they were absent on concert tours, and their contractual agreements with their students,⁷⁶ there were evident similarities as between them, notably a master-disciple relationship between teacher and students with the students in a subordinate role. This is exemplified in most extreme form by Fay's depiction of Liszt's relationship to his students as that of a monarch to his subjects.⁷⁷

Fay referred to external musical and ethical standards in her evaluation of other teachers: in comparisons of concert performances by internationally acclaimed artists of her day; in comparisons of her teachers with one another and of herself with her fellow students. As her knowledge and experience broadened, her basis of evaluation shifted from an external source (e.g. what others said of a teacher) toward an internal source (e.g., which teacher gave her personal satisfaction). Citing the example of four students beside herself who had left Kullak to study with Deppe, Fay pointed to the sanctions on teachers who did not give satisfaction to their students, where students were free to opt out. She was also aware of the sanctions on students who did not give satisfaction to their teachers, where teachers might dismiss them, an experience that on more than one occasion she feared might happen to her.⁷⁸

I have sketched a conceptual framework for the description of the decision-making process in music education with an historical example of each phase. This analysis has implications for the directions of future research. First, a systematic description of examples of decision-making in music education is needed, representing various sponsoring institutions (e.g., churches, state and independent schools, music conservatories, private music studios, community music schools, and amateur performing ensembles), aspects of music education (e.g., administration, curriculum, instruction, teaching and learning), historical periods and geographic areas, among other factors that might be included in a comprehensive paradigm of decision-making in music education. Second, the examples cited above represent situations where actors regard decisions as important (alpha decisions). It is also necessary to amass evidence of decision-making under conditions where decisions are of low priority (beta decisions). Third, the conceptual framework as outlined may have a wider application beyond music education, necessitating research in other areas of education as well.

The analysis also has implications for the *methods* of future empirical research. The examples cited provide evidence of interdependent phases in the decision-making process, indicating that

Figure 1
The growth of the Orff Instrumentarium

Instrumentarium ca. 1925	Instrumentarium ca. 1932
2 timpani	Soprano and alto glockenspiels
4 dance timpani	Chromatic glockenspiels
1 bass drum	Soprano, alto and bass xylophones
some tenor drums	Soprano, alto and bass metallophone
4 Chinese tom-toms in various sizes	
1 Chinese barrel-shaped drum	Sopranino, soprano, alto, tenor and bass recorders
1 double-skinned cylindrical drum	
1 tambourine	Musical glasses
several wood blocks	Triangle
castanets	Small cymbals
triangle	Antique cymbals
glockenspiel	Dance cymbals
4 large cymbals	Large cymbals
1 large tam-tam and several smaller ones	Small and large gongs
	Small and large tam-tams
	Bells
	Castanets
	Wood blocks
	Cylindrical wood blocks
	Wooden bells
	Slit drums
	Rattles and strung rattles
	Jingles and strung jingles
	Claves (wood or bamboo)
	Tambours in various sizes
	Tambourines
	Chinese tom-tom
	Double-skinned drum
	Dance timpani
	Timpani
	Tenor drums
	Side drum
	Bass drum
	Portative*
	Spinet*
	Fidels*
	Viols*
	Double bass

Source: Carl Orff, *The Schulwerk*, Vol. III of *Carl Orff/Documentation, His Life and Works*, trans. Margaret Murray (N.Y.: Schott, 1978), pp. 70, 135, 136.

*First used in the dance orchestra after 1934.

rather than just gathering evidence of each phase as if it were independent of the others, researchers might also select strategies that enable them to study the decision-making process holistically.

Résumé

Sur la base de formulats courantes en éducation, en management, en marketing et en économique, l'auteur esquisse un cadre conceptuel pour décrire le processus de prise de décision en formation musicale. Il propose une liste des étapes de ce processus dans le domaine précité, dont chacune présente les caractéristiques d'un système social et illustre chacune à l'aide d'un exemple tiré de l'histoire.

NOTES

¹ Henry Zentner, *Prelude to Administrative Theory* (Calgary: Strayer 1973), pp. 154-256.

² See Estelle R. Jorgensen, *A Critical Analysis of Selected Aspects of Music Education* (Calgary: Department of Education Administration, University of Calgary, 1977); "On Resource Allocation in School Music," *Proceedings of the McGill Symposium in School Music Administration and Supervision, 1979* (Montreal: Faculty of Music, McGill University, 1980), pp. 20-41; "On the Recruitment Process in Amateur Ensembles," Canadian University Music Review, In Press, 1985. Unpublished paper available from the author, Faculty of Music, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

³ See Alastair Taylor, "Systems Approach to the Political Organization of Space," *Social Science Information*, International Social Science Council, 14 (1975), 7-40.

⁴ Brian J. Loasby *Choice, Complexity and Ignorance: An Enquiry Into Economic Theory and the Practice of Decision-Making* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) has coined the term 'partial ignorance' to describe this state-of-affairs. His analysis of the economic system flies in the face of assumptions underlying neo-classical economic theory (e.g., as outlined in H.A. John Green, *Consumer Theory*, rev. ed., London: Macmillan, 1976). While Mark Blaug (*The Methodology of Economics: or How Economists Explain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980, pp. 184, 185) is critical of Loasby's approach as a basis of economic theory, arguing that it does not offer a coherent system of refutable propositions and that it challenges the very basis of economics viewed as a precise and predictive science. Loasby's work offers an approach in the present context that is compatible with dynamic processual analyses of social systems and consistent with extant theoretical models in the marketing literature, e.g., see Gordon R. Foxall, *Consumer Behaviour: A Practical Guide* (London: Croom Helm, 1980), and James F. Engel and Roger D. Blackwell, *Consumer Behavior*, 4th ed. (Chicago: Dryden Press, 1982).

⁵ See Henry Zentner, "Sorokin's Analysis of Time and Space," *Sorokin and Sociology: Essays in Honour of Professor Pitirim Sorokin*, ed. G.C. Hallen and R. Prasad (Moti Katra, Agra-3, India: Sataish, 1972), for an analysis of Sorokin's view of two polarities in social history; the sensate or change-oriented society contrasted with the ideational or tradition-oriented society.

⁶ See Edward A. Tiryakian, "Sociology and Existential Phenomenology," in *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences*, I (Evanston: Northwestern University, 1973), pp. 199-201. The importance of expectations in decision-making is evident in extant educational and psychological research. See: Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen, *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975); A. Morrison and D. McIntyre, eds., *Social Psychology of Teaching: Selected Readings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), pp. 324-343; Roy Nash, *Classrooms Observed: The Teacher's Perception and the Pupil's Performance* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973); Roy Nash, *Teacher Expectations and Pupil Learning* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976); Lawrence C. Perlmutter and Richard A. Monty, eds., *Choice and Perceived Control* (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1979).

⁷ Studies of the variety of factors contributing to the formation of expectation sets span several fields including education, management, marketing and consumer behaviour, and social psychology. Useful sources include: Michael Argyle, ed., *Social Encounters: Readings in Social Interaction* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973); Michael Argyle, *The Psychology of Interpersonal Behaviour*, 3rd ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978); Peter M. Chisnall, *Marketing: A Behavioural Analysis* (London: McGraw-Hill, 1975); John Eggleston, ed., *Teacher Decision-Making in the Classroom: A Collection of Papers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); Engel and Blackwell, pp. 44, 189, 687; Foxall, p. 19; Morrison and McIntyre, pts. 3, 4; Victor H. Vroom and Edward L. Deci, eds., *Management and Motivation: Selected Readings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970); and Neil Warren and Marie Jahoda, eds., *Attitudes: Selected Readings*, 2nd ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973). Also, Loasby (p. 96) lists four types of standards on which actor expectations are based: "historical, the record or recollection of some past situation believed to be relevant"; "external, the apparent situation somewhere else"; "planning the situation that was anticipated or intended"; and "imaginative, some notion of what does not exist but might be created."

⁸ The social expectations of actors are explicitly recognized in expectancy-value theory (see Fishbein and Ajzen), and in Harvey Leibenstein's analysis of the factors that influence the different levels of effort that individuals are willing to expend in the economic system and the organizational pressures on them. See Harvey Leibenstein, *Beyond Economic Man: A New Foundation for Microeconomics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980).

⁹ See Perlmutter and Monty, sect. 5. Abraham H. Maslow (*Religions, Values and Peak-Experiences*, 1964; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976, pp. 97-101) has distinguished "good" and "bad" environments on the following basis: "good" environments permit free choice and enable an individual to make "growth" decisions that satisfy higher needs such as self-esteem and self-fulfillment; and "bad" environments preclude free choice and therefore growth decisions, and necessitate "regression" to lower-need gratification, such as safety needs.

¹⁰ John Dewey, *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*, rev. ed. (Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933), ch. 7.

¹¹ See Engel and Blackwell, p. 23.

¹² Herbert A. Simon, *The Shape of Automation for Men and Management* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 54.

¹³ See Loasby, ch. 5.

¹⁴ The case for the cyclical character of the decision-making process is supported by Leon Festinger *The Human Legacy*, (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1983), who argues that the solution of one problem normally creates another.

¹⁵ See Foxall, pp. 22-24.

¹⁶ Originally published in 1968 (see James F. Engel, David T. Kollat, and Roger D. Blackwell, *Consumer Behavior*, (N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), the EKB model has gone through several revisions until its 1982 version (see Engel and Blackwell, pp. 686-688).

¹⁷ See John A. Howard and Jagdish Sheth, *The Theory of Buyer Behavior* (N.Y.: Wiley, 1969); John A. Howard, *Consumer Behavior: Application of Theory* (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1977).

¹⁸ Other earlier models of consumer behaviour have attained a considerable following. For example, F.M. Nicosia *Consumer Decision Processes*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966) attempted to develop a set of equations that would express beliefs about consumer behaviour and the relationships between variables in a manner that could be modelled by the computer. Mary Tuck (*How Do We Choose? A Study in Consumer Behaviour*, London: Methuen, 1976) is critical of the variety of flow-approaches evident in the EKB, Howard and Sheth, and Nicosia models on the basis that these theories have not been translated into refutable propositions.

¹⁹ See Engel and Blackwell, p. 23.

²⁰ W.F. Pounds, "The Process of Problem Finding," *Industrial Management Review*, 11 (1969), p. 5, quoted in Loasby, p. 96.

²¹ This analysis follows Loasby, ch. 5, and Engel and Blackwell, ch. 2. Loasby has distinguished innovative and operating decisions on the basis of three criteria: width of agenda, set of control variables, and degree of programming necessary. Innovative decisions characteristically require expensive decision-making as efforts must be spread more widely in order to find a solution, there are many variable elements and a great deal of uncertainty is evident. Operating decisions, however, require low-cost decision-making as efforts are localised, there are few variable elements and routines have been established. Similarly, Engel and Blackwell have contrasted "high involvement" and "low involvement" decisions; high involvement decisions being those that are complex, high risk and important, and low involvement decisions being those that are simple, low risk and of low importance.

²² Engel and Blackwell, p. 323.

²³ See Ivan D. Steiner, "Three Kinds of Reported Choice," in Perlmutter and Monty, pp. 17-27. Kevin J. Lancaster (*Consumer Demand: A New Approach*, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1971) has proposed that consumers evaluate goods and services on the basis of certain objective characteristics possessed by those goods and services. These characteristics have valency (the quality of attraction or repulsion) and potency (the strength of attraction or repulsion) in generating consumer purchases. Lancaster's work has been complemented by extensive research into product characteristics, on the assumption that a knowledge of those characteristics that are attractive to individual or groups of buyers will assist marketers to improve their sales (see Engel and Blackwell, pp. 394-396). These studies suggest the possible importance of isolating characteristics in music education and determining their valency and potency for different actors in the educational process.

²⁴ See Henry Zentner, "Curricular Planning for Sociological Change and Development: A Critique," *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 13 (1979), 170-196.

²⁵ See Henry Zentner, "The Construction of Types and Standards in Sociology: A Critical Reassessment," *The International Journal of Critical Sociology*, 3, (1979), 49-59.

²⁶ See Percy A. Scholes, *Music: The Child and the Masterpiece; A Comprehensive Handbook of Aims and Methods in All That Is Usually Called 'Musical Appreciation'* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 3-28; "Appreciation of Music," *Oxford Companion to Music*, 10th ed., 1983, pp. 46-48. Biographical sketches of Scholes may be found in: John Own Ward, "Scholes Percy (Alfred)," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980, XVI, 725-726; and a tribute by J. Raymond Tobin in a pamphlet entitled, *Percy Scholes Eightieth Birthday 24 July 1957* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, n.d.)

²⁷ Scholes, *Music*, p. 18.

²⁸ This is a similar conclusion to that in Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Engineering Change in Music Education: A Model of the Political Process Underlying the Boston School Music Movement (1829-1838)," *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 31 (1983), 67-75.

²⁹ See Scholes, *Music*, pp. 20, 65-70, 203-207. Also, see Stewart Macpherson, *The Music Teacher's Part in a General Educational Scheme*. An address delivered at the Conference of Educational Associations, University College, Gower Street, W.C. 1, on Saturday, January 5th, 1924. (London: Joseph Williams, 1924), pp. 4, 8.

³⁰ See Percy A. Scholes, *The Appreciation of Music by Means of the 'Pianola' and 'Duo-Art': A Course of Lectures Delivered at Aeolian Hall*, London (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), p. 4; *Music*, p. 19.

³¹ See Macpherson, *Music Teacher's Part*. Also, see Percy A. Scholes, *The Mirror of Music, 1844-1944: A Century of Musical Life in Britain as Reflected in the Pages of the Musical Times*, II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 622; "Musical Appreciation" in *Schools, Why — and How?* (1920; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1957); *Music*, pp. 10-14, 17-19.

³² See Hans Georg Nägeli, *Vorlesungen über Musik, mit Berücksichtigung der Dilettanten* (Stuttgart and Tübingen: J.G. Cotta, 1826); François Joseph Fétis, *La musique mise à la portée de tout le monde, exposé succinct de tout ce qui est nécessaire pour juger de cet art, et pour en parler sans l'avoir étudié* (Paris: A. Mesnier, 1830).

³³ See Scholes, *Music*, p. 17.

³⁴ See Stewart Macpherson, *Music and Its Appreciation: or, The Foundations of True Listening* (London: Joseph Williams, pref. 1910); *The Appreciative Aspect of Music-Study: Some Thoughts and Suggestions* (London: Joseph Williams, 1910); *Aural Culture Based Upon Musical Appreciation* (with Ernest Read), 3 vols. (London: Joseph Williams, 1912); *The Musical Education of the Child: Some Thoughts and Suggestions for Teachers, Parents and Schools* (London: Joseph Williams, 1916); *The Appreciation Class (A Guide for the Music-Teacher and the Student)* (London: Joseph Williams, 1923). Also, see Percy A. Scholes, *The Listener's History of Music: A Book for Any Concert-Goer, Gramophonist or Radio Listener; Providing Also a Course of Study for Adult Classes in the Appreciation of Music*, 3 vols. (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1923-29); *The Complete Book of the Great Musicians: A Course in Appreciation for Young Readers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920). Further, see Thomas Whitney Surette and Daniel Gregory Mason, *The Appreciation of Music* (N.Y.: H.W. Gray, 1907).

³⁵ See Scholes, *Music*, pt. 5.

³⁶ Scholes (*Music*, pt. 2) rebuts several arguments brought against the musical appreciation movement, including the idea that "class teaching of musical appreciation" is "largely wasted" because some students do not have a "musical sense", and the notion that music education should be for an "elect". He also notes (*Mirror of Music*, II, p. 622) that Macpherson "was strongly opposed by many conservatively-minded professional musicians, but to a large extent he triumphed."

³⁷ Scholes (*Music*, pp. 20, 21) quotes a published letter by Oscar Browning, Master at Eton (1860-75), who partly attributed his dismissal to the fact that he provided concerts of "first rate chamber music played by artists from London" that were attended by the older boys, and some of his colleagues, especially the Head Master, thought this practice to be "effeminate and demoralizing".

³⁸ This example is based on Carl Orff, *The Schulwerk*, Vol. III of *Carl Orff/ Documentation, His Life and Works*, trans. Margaret Murray (N.Y.: Schott, 1978); "Orff-Schulwerk: Past and Future", in *Perspectives in Music Education, Source Book III*, ed. Bonnie C. Kowall (Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1966), pp. 386-394. For biographical information see: Andreas Liess, *Carl Orff: His Life and His Music*, trans. A. and H. Parkin (London: Calder and Boyars, 1966); Hanspeter Krellman and John Horton, "Orff, Carl" *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980, XIII, pp. 707-710.

³⁹ See Orff, *The Schulwerk*, pp. 10-14, 67, 73, 87, 88, 102-104, 135, 283. Orff (*The Schulwerk*, p. 150) acknowledged Gunild Keetman to be "the leading personality concerned with the building up of our orchestra."

⁴⁰ Orff, *The Schulwerk*, p. 89.

⁴¹ See Orff, *The Schulwerk*, pp. 89-95.

⁴² See Orff, *The Schulwerk*, pp. 102, 103. Karl Maendler subsequently built a bass xylophone, and soprano, alto and bass metallophones, ca. 1932.

⁴³ Orff, *The Schulwerk*, p. 63. Blaug (chs. 3,4) provides a succinct review of significant literature exemplifying two different philosophies of science; verification and falsification (or refutation), with particular reference to economics.

⁴⁴ See Orff, *The Schulwerk*, p. 13; "Orff-Schulwerk", p. 387.

⁴⁵ See Orff, *The Schulwerk*, pp. 198, 199, 202, 203. Kestenberg was subsequently removed from office and Orff-Schulwerk, by association, was suppressed. Later the Güntherschule was confiscated in July, 1944, when Günther resisted a political decree and it was eventually bombed and burned out in January, 1945.

⁴⁶ See Hugh Robertson, *Prelude to the Orpheus* (Glasgow, Edinburgh, London: William Hodge, 1946); Hugh Robertson and Kenneth Robertson, eds., *Orpheus and His Lute: A Glasgow Orpheus Choir Anthology* (Oxford, London, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1963).

⁴⁷ See Robertson, pp. 40-43.

⁴⁸ See Robertson, p. 44.

⁴⁹ Robertson (p. 39) comments that for many years the Orpheus Choir was "highly organised on the musical side and with little or no organisation on the business side."

⁵⁰ For a brief character sketch of Hugh Stevenson Robertson by F.H. Bissett, President of the Orpheus Choir for 34 years from 1912, see Robertson, p. 7.

⁵¹ See Robertson, pp. 30-32; Robertson and Robertson, pp. 32, 33.

⁵² Robertson and Robertson, p. 30.

⁵³ See Robertson and Robertson, pp. 6, 228.

⁵⁴ See Robert Craig, comp., *A Short History of the Glasgow Choral Union* (Glasgow: Robert Maclehose, The University Press, pref. 1944). Compare the repertoire of the Orpheus Choir (see Robertson and Robertson, pp. 305-320) with that of the Glasgow Choral Union (works performed since 1919 in Craig, pp. 13, 14).

⁵⁵ This example is documented in Bruce Dunbar Wilson, "A Documentary History of Music in the Public Schools of the city of Boston, 1830-1850," 2 vols., Diss., U. of Michigan 1973.

⁵⁶ See Jorgensen, "Engineering Change," p. 73; "William Channing Woodbridge's Lecture, 'On Vocal Music as a Branch of Common Education,' Revisited," *Studies in Music* (University of Western Australia) No. 18 (1984), 1-32.

⁵⁷ See Wilson I, pp. 79 n. 2, 106; II, pp. 139, 140, 142-145, 155, 237-248, 176, 177.

⁵⁸ See Wilson, II, p. 206. The decline of Mason's power also implicated the Boston Academy of Music which until 1845 enjoyed indirect influence on music in the City of Boston schools through its professor, Lowell Mason.

⁵⁹ See Wilson, II, pp. 153-155. Also, see Lowell Mason and George J. Webb, *The Juvenile Singing School* (Boston: J.H. Wilkins and R.B. Carter, 1837); Lowell Mason, *The Boston School Song Book* (Boston: J.H. Wilkins and R.B., Carter, 1841).

⁶⁰ See Benjamin F. Baker, *Baker's American School Song Book: Containing a Thorough Elementary System, with Songs, Chants and Hymns; Adapted to the Use of Common Schools* (Boston: Otis, Broaders and Co., 1845).

⁶¹ Mason used teaching assistants more than did Baker (see Wilson, II, p. 181) and while he hired at least one teacher who proved to be unsatisfactory (see Wilson, II, p. 155), the impression left by the teachers under Mason's superintendency appears to have been an overwhelmingly positive one (see Wilson, II, pp. 240-248). For a discussion of the assistants who taught over the period, 1838-50, see Wilson, I, pp. 99-108.

⁶² Wilson (I, pp. 78-83; II, pp. 139, 140, 143) notes the change from the status "teacher of music" to "Master of Music, to provide teachers of Singing and superintend the same."

⁶³ For a biography of Lowell Mason, see Carol Ann Pemberton, "Lowell Mason: His Life and Work," Diss., U. of Minnesota 1971. Wilson (I, p. 144) has gone so far as to suggest that in spite of the dual superintendency of Baker and Mason from 1846, the only real changes were the "faces and textbooks in some schools."

⁶⁴ See Wilson, I, pp. 127-133, and supporting documentation in II, pp. 162-168.

⁶⁵ See City Document No. 7, City of Boston, Report on Music, February 2, 1848 (Wilson, II, p. 181), in which the arrangements for superintendency of the schools are described. Mason received \$130 per annum for each of the ten schools he superintended. He taught in two of these and hired assistants at \$80 per annum each to man the other eight schools. He rented pianos to the schools at \$30 per annum each, and received \$100 per annum for his services at each of the two schools in which he taught and \$20 per annum as his administrative fee for each of the eight schools in which his assistants taught.

⁶⁶ This case is based on home letters from 1869-75, in *Music-Study in Germany: From the Home Correspondence of Amy Fay* (1880; rpt. N.Y.: Dover, 1965).

⁶⁷ See *Music-Study*, pp. 37-42, 82, 83, 103-105, 123, 272-274, 287, 288, 291, 297, 298, 302.

⁶⁸ See *Music-Study*, pp. 264-267.

⁶⁹ See *Music-Study*, pp. 103-105, 213, 272-274, 287, 291, 316-320.

⁷⁰ Fay was concerned to justify her choice of Deppe whose reputation as a teacher was not as established as Kullak's (see *Music-Study*, p. 301). She was influenced in her choice of Deppe by the personal recommendation of a fellow student as well as by hearing one of Deppe's students play (see *Music-Study*, pp. 284, 294, 295).

⁷¹ See *Music-Study*, pp. 213-217, 222, 223, 225, 227, 231-233, 318-320, 340, 341.

⁷² See *Music-Study*, pp. 21, 39-42, 63, 100, 231, 232, 248, 1304, 314.

⁷³ Details of her repertoire include the following: studies (*Music-Study*, pp. 264, 265, 299); solos and concertos (*Music-Study*, pp. 123, 183, 211, 216, 220, 232, 351); and chamber music (*Music-Study*, pp. 328, 337, 338).

⁷⁴ See *Music-Study*, pp. 79, 231.

⁷⁵ See *Music-Study*, pp. 63, 105, 159, 175, 219, 273, 299, 302, 318-320, 331, 332.

⁷⁶ Early in August, 1870, Tausig suddenly announced that he would close his conservatory on the first of October, 1870, and there was nothing his students could do except find other teachers. (See *Music-Study*, pp. 83, 84.)

⁷⁷ See *Music-Study*, pp. 219, 220.

⁷⁸ See *Music-Study:R*, pp. 21, 211, 274-280, 301.