Music education for the improvement of coexistence in and beyond the classroom: a study based on the consultation of experts
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This study examines theoretical principles and models of music education to promote interpersonal and social relations. It focuses on the primary and secondary stages of education in Spain. To this end, relevant national and international figures in education, music or critical thinking were consulted. Their responses to the consultation were treated qualitatively. The results highlight the need to promote participatory activity and to design alternative proposals for music learning that invite the student to gain positive musical experiences. This will help to recognise different musical identities, promote intercultural musical diversity and encourage positive coexistence in and beyond the music classroom.
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1. Introduction

The present study is built on an interrogative proposal aimed to promote reflection and debate on music education in students’ general education. The research is grounded on the premise that, although the main purpose of the music classroom should be to encourage the development of students’ musical ability, it can also be an optimal space for developing skills focused on learning to live and to live together. This research therefore views music education as an aid to individuals’ integral training. It addresses questions regarding the implications of learning and musical practice for improving dialogue between people and recognising cultural diversity.

The different methods and proposals for music education have centred on these issues over the years, so that music education adapts to the social and geographical contexts that each society requires. Today, in a context of rising cultural and musical pluralism, musical tastes are generally becoming increasingly eclectic (Campbell et al., 2005). On the other hand, social and technological developments have opened up a multitude of new ways to create, interpret and be actively involved with music (Partti & Karlsen, 2010). Today’s education should aim to integrate and recognise the musical identities that have traditionally fallen outside the formal system (Oliveira, 2004). It is important that the theoretical principles underlying this system of music teaching in general education also focus interest on developing
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interpersonal skills, so that music serves as a tool for improving coexistence among individuals and societies.

Education is a powerful tool through which we learn to relate to the reality that surrounds us. The formal educational framework offers, ultimately, an optimal space for learning to coexist. Coexisting does not only involve a tolerant attitude based on a passive and restrictive view of diversity. Previous studies have emphasised that genuine coexistence starts with full recognition amongst people, which unquestionably involves dialogue, interrelation and justice (Cortina Orts, 2002, p. 41; Nussbaum, 2007, p. 110). A society characterised by cultural diversity cannot guarantee peaceful coexistence if it does not resolve its multiculturalism from an ethical perspective. The interrelation referred to here is necessarily difficult and therefore the problems that may emerge from coexistence should be addressed from the perspective of transcultural ethics (Marina, 2002, p. 227). In many cases, openness to diversity is accompanied by self-reflection and a commitment to social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010). A solid educational effort can provide the basis on which to promote the transformation of our multicultural reality into intercultural spaces of positive coexistence.

Music education can be an excellent vehicle for developing these interpersonal skills and the dialogue on diversity (Bradley, 2006; Giráldez Hayes, 2007; Joseph & Southcott, 2009), firstly, because music is not only part of our aesthetic dimension; musical expression is an important channel of communication and also a cultural manifestation that exists in all societies. In this sense, music is a constituent part of individual and collective identity and, as such, has the capacity to unite, but also to separate or divide people. The music classroom can create a suitable environment for cultural exchange between students, but in order for this to happen it is important to ensure that the school culture does not exclusively become the culture of the dominant groups in society (Fernández Enguita, 2001). Strategies to promote positive attitudes towards other cultural groups are needed if coexistence is to be achieved. In this vein, participation and interrelations must be encouraged between the different cultural entities that share a given educational space.

We believe that guaranteeing a focused approach to integrating musical practices in the guidelines of music education can develop the strictly musical training of our students. Furthermore, as Eisner (1996) notes, we are aware that educational practices and curricula that define classroom lives depend very much on the beliefs and values of teachers. In the music education literature, some research has analysed music teachers’ beliefs and values with regard to their practices in teaching musical instruments (Schmidt, 1998) and in music classes in elementary schools (Wong, 2005).

But at the same time, the music classroom could become a space where relationships between individuals can be enhanced, by cooperating through musical practice and encouraging students to make use of their musical experiences beyond the classroom. Gaining positive musical experiences, in which an intersubjective connection between participants is achieved, encourages the creation of new links to interrelations, which in turn enhance the coexistence between people. Numerous projects have shown how music and music education help to generate new links to coexistence, improve participation, encourage the transformation of conflicts, explore reconciliation processes in depth or promote social development (Abreu, 2001; Díaz-Gómez, 2011; Lederach & Lederach, 2010; Urbain, 2008).
The present study of the opinions, values and experiences of music educators and experts in the field of education in relation to this topic helps to fill the gap in the literature of music education research and opens up an important dialogue for music teachers and music teaching in primary and secondary schools.

2. Music education and coexistence: proposals and guidelines

Music education has been evolving and changing to focus its key interests on the function of the social reality surrounding each educational context. Without losing sight of musical training for society, the 1950s and 1960s brought a change in the accessibility of music education. Active and instrumental methods (Hemsy de Gainza, 2004), with teachers and educators such as Dalcroze, Martenot, Orff or Kodály, opened up space for musical training for everyone, and abandoned the elitist notion that music could only be understood and practised by a few. The 1970s witnessed the awakening of creativity; musical educators of this period, like Self, Paynter or Schafer, drove forward what are now known as creative methods for the teaching and learning of music.

In recent years, one of the issues associated with new approaches towards inclusive models of music education is the deconstruction of the notion of musical autonomy of social contexts as a hallmark of good art. The ideology of the value of music has been constructed by attributing certain characteristics to certain styles of music, with the results that some styles have fewer of these characteristics or lack them all together. In this way, the worth of certain music styles is legitimised and reproduced in educational contexts. These characteristics include, among others, universality, eternality, complexity and originality (Green, 2003). Giving musical autonomy to social contexts impacts directly on the increase in the value attributed to a certain musical style. The inclusion of this new body of musical literature in the formal landscape calls for a rethinking of these issues (Clarke, 2003; McClary, 1987; Wolff, 1987).

The current trend towards intercultural music education is challenging. Nowadays the plurality in the understanding of the musical experience is so marked that musicians, philosophers and theorists of music education cannot integrate all diversity in the educational field, and this task is even more challenging for professional educators (Green, 2005, p. 77). While music education had previously centred its interest on recognising diversity, in recent years it has focused on integrating cultural diversity in the formal space of the classroom. Musical diversity now goes beyond cultural pluralism, so that musical identities and cultural identities are not necessarily related. In this context, various proposals have emerged that aim to accommodate this plurality of views towards musical preference in the formal music education system.

Drawing on the theories of Dillon (2007), the necessary development of musicality among our students should start by analysing what role music plays in the lives of the students, teachers and perhaps even the school or education centre itself. From this basic principle, the teacher must assume the role of cultural manager in developing young people’s musical lives (Dillon, 2005). This management of musical diversity has aspects in common with Campbell’s (2004) proposal to promote teaching music globally.

Praxial philosophy in learning music is an academic stream that has studied this idea in more depth in recent years. From this educational perspective,
Regelski (2009, p. 67) advocates understanding music as an inherently social characteristic, the value and meaning of which should be seen in relation to the use that people make of it. Hence, a musical experience can have different values and meanings depending on the social context, the perspective of the participant and the specific moment. Musical praxis has the capacity to create a change – make a difference (Regelski, 2005) – in individuals’ lives only when the value of music is analysed in terms of its use; when the use of music brings a pragmatic and tangible difference to individuals and societies at a particular time. The praxial concept of musical appreciation inevitably disassociates itself from the notion that aims to legitimise musical autonomy in social contexts as a mark of artistic and aesthetic worth.

Recovering the knowledge of music in society and putting it into practice in music education can, from this point of view, encourage a change in the lives of the people who share these musical realities. From a transcultural ethics perspective, which, as Marina (2002) argues, helps to reduce unrest in interrelations between individuals, these musical experiences can encourage moments of positive coexistence within the educational framework. In the same way, they help to encourage meaningful learning that takes into account the previous knowledge of those participating in the educational process. In recent years, numerous efforts have been made in music education to incorporate social habits and uses of music in action. Outstanding among these efforts, focused on groups of young people in primary and secondary schools, are experiences that promote the integration of informal practice and music learning in the classroom (Feichas, 2010; Folkestad, 2006; Fulbró & Malbrán, 2000; Green, 2008; Oliveira, 2004; Wright & Kanellopoulos, 2010).

In Spain, despite multiple recent efforts in the field of music education to promote intercultural musical learning in primary and secondary stages, there is still a long way to go towards models of music teaching and learning that centre on the social problems demanded by the context. The increase in cultural diversity that took place in the 1990s spawned educational approaches centred on the peaceful management of multiculturalism. In music, hundreds of experiences followed this trend (Giráldez Hayes, 1998; Giráldez Hayes & Pelegrín Sandoval, 1996; Nadal Pedrero, 2007; Siankope & Villa, 2004). In recent years, new forms of conflict are emerging in our societies as a direct repercussion of the current acute economic and social crisis. In this context, a necessary task in the field of education is to work towards improving coexistence, encouraging the initiation and consolidation of intersubjective links between individuals. And in this task, there is no question that music has an important role to play.

3. Methods

Renowned professionals from different areas of educational work participated in this study. The main purpose of the investigation was to collect opinions and experiences of authors from the field of music education, education theory and critical thinking. The participants were all national and international figures of authority in their fields. The study drew on experienced researchers with a range of profiles from different countries in order to enrich and offer varied perspectives on the question of whether music education has the potential to facilitate integration and positive coexistence.
3.1. Participants

The study did not analyse a large number of responses as this approach would have led to difficulties in managing a significant quantitative analysis. Initially, an intentional sampling process (Cohen & Manion, 1990, p. 139) was carried out with 25 participants. The selection criteria were thoroughly debated by a committee of experts and consensus on them was reached. The sample aimed to gather participants with extensive knowledge of the educational panorama in each country who had also made relevant contributions to the literature on the social impacts of music and education. All the authors selected were researchers working in higher education institutions, universities or research centres. In many cases, moreover, the authors selected had previously worked in primary and secondary schools. Furthermore, most of these experts have published relevant books and teaching materials on the didactics of music for primary and secondary schools in their own countries, and currently work training future primary and secondary teachers who carry out their teaching practice in these settings. They often create and participate in learning networks with primary and secondary teachers. Our aim to build a multi-voice dialogue led us to select participants from different geographical and social contexts, and who currently conduct research in the field of music and/or education from diverse perspectives – social, philosophical and psychological. The response of the participants was highly gratifying as a result of their willingness to take part in the survey for the study. Similarly, respondents’ permission to use their names in the study was requested, because of their positions as authoritative figures in their subjects.

The fact that the selected authors have in some way enriched the state of the issue addressed by this study is particularly notable. In this task, the literature published by each one of the authors was previously studied and analysed with utmost rigour and detail. In the analysed texts, complementary views were set out regarding concepts relating to music education, the theory of education, cultural and musical diversity or studies for peace and coexistence.

A total of 19 responses were obtained from the initial sample, all containing interesting information on the research topic. The wealth of the data lie primarily in (1) the extensive academic experience of the participants; (2) the variety in their professional profiles and (3) the content of the responses nourished by the educational reality in diverse contexts of music education. Although the selected participants came from mainly European and American backgrounds, the initial sample included a greater national or geographical diversity. The responses received came from different geographical areas, although we acknowledge that the absence of other regions may entail certain partiality in the discourses. Specifically, we received responses from authors in twelve different countries, thus reflecting the context and traditions of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States. The information reflects the experiences of the role of music education in different realities in some way, all of which is conducive to obtaining comprehensive, deep and rigorous responses.

3.2. Procedures

The selected participants were contacted via email with information about the purposes and objectives of the research, prior to presenting the questions. The respondents were asked to respond without any indication on length – some of the replies
were long whereas others were more concise – or discursive in relation to perspective. They were invited, if they wished, to include experiences or perspectives from their particular contexts. Further connections were established with some of the participants regarding the study, either to clarify issues in relation to the interview or the research, or on the initiative of some of them to collaborate by providing bibliography or other materials that could be useful to the study.

The question put to the participants for them to respond to in writing was as follows: Which is the best theoretical approach to offer a music education that enhances integration and peaceful coexistence? In one particular case, the response was given in the form of a telephone interview, at the request of the respondent. To guarantee equity in the method of data collection, this interview was not directed at any point. In fact, the respondent was limited to answering only the question raised to avoid bringing in related issues. The transcribed text was then sent to the respondent for her to reconsider her responses or modify possible misinterpretations or confusions, where necessary.

3.3. Data analysis

The data collected were qualitatively analysed, reflected upon and contrasted. According to the guidelines for qualitative research in music education (Bresler & Stake, 1992), the analysis allowed us to categorise the responses based on the thematic nature of the information. The texts containing these results are unpublished and not all of them were collected in English. The translation into English of these fragments was carried out by the authors of this paper.

Throughout this study, we have been able to confirm preconceived ideas in some cases, and in others, to expand the body of knowledge on the subject of music education. Finally, the study led us to reflect on the theories of music education, which offer interesting alternatives to ensure an education model in which shared musical practice can drive the principal guidelines. This practice opens up a great number of possibilities for music as a tool that encourages coexistence between people and cultures.

4. Results

The analysed data revealed multiple issues of interest for music education as well as important questions for the critical analysis of the mechanisms involved in the learning and teaching of music in different realities. This analysis takes as its reference a prior review of the concept of musical and cultural diversity in the process of music teaching and learning in these educational stages, and takes the study of the participants’ testimonies into account (Cabedo-Mas & Díaz-Gómez, 2012, 2013).

It proposes a mechanism to systemise the information which classifies the ideas emerging from the results into five basic categories that arise as a result of the thematic nature of the responses. The experts referred to some of these issues in one way or another throughout their texts. The analysis therefore aims to collect information based on how each one of the thematic categories was reflected in the responses. Given that, as noted above, the participants are regarded as figures of authority in the study, the information from each participant is provided along with their names.

Table 1 lists the frequency with which each one of the categories emerges in the participants’ responses, referring to the authors of the account considered in this selection.
| Category | Thematic nature                                                                 | No. of responses | Authors referring to this category in some way                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Cat. 1** | There is no single valid theoretical approach                                    | 5               | Wilfred Gruhn (University of Music, Freiburg, Germany)  
Silvia Malbrán (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina)  
Alda Oiveira (Universidade Federal da Bahía, Brazil)  
Keith Swanwick (Institute of Education, University of London, United Kingdom)  
António Ângelo Vasconcelos (Escola Superior de Educação do Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal, Portugal) |
| **Cat. 2** | Open and flexible pedagogical approaches to abilities and levels of learning      | 7               | Pep Alsina i Masmitjà (Universidad de Barcelona, Spain)  
Liora Bresler (College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA)  
Marcelo Giglio (Haute Ecole Pédagogique BEJUNE, Bienne, Switzerland)  
Andrea Giráldez Hayes (Universidad de Valladolid, Spain)  
David Hargreaves (Roehampton University, London, United Kingdom)  
Silvia Malbrán (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina)  
Nicolás Oriol de Alarcón (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain) |
| **Cat. 3** | Concern about students’ social context and musical diversity                     | 11              | Wolfgang Dietrich (University of Innsbruck, Austria)  
Steve Dillon (Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia)  
Andrea Giráldez Hayes (Universidad de Valladolid, Spain)  
Lucy Green (Institute of Education, University of London, United Kingdom)  
David Hargreaves (Roehampton University, London, United Kingdom)  
Federico Mayor Zaragoza (Ex-director General de la UNESCO, Presidente de la Fundación Cultura de Paz de Madrid, Spain)  
John O’Flynn (University of Limerick, Ireland) |
Each of the emerging categories is summarised in the following subsections, along with a selection of references that illustrate the key ideas that stand out in this investigation.

4.1. **Category 1: there is no single valid theoretical approach**

Many of the experts agree that it is difficult to offer a valid theoretical model which responds to the particularities of every educational context and every individual person. These responses emphasise the need to centre each particular educational proposal on the specific characteristics of the students, as well as on the social contexts surrounding the educational circumstances.
Some of the responses that demonstrate this need are highlighted here:

Silvia Malbrán (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina): I do not think it is possible to choose one single theoretical approach exclusively. [...] a reductionist selection would see that Social Psychology and Cultural Psychology give answers to such claims. However, the component that acts as the best social integrator and model of coexistence is the action of learning from one another. This is a socio-cognitive approach, where ultimately different disciplines come to our aid when it comes to supporting our practices.

Alda Oiveira (Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brazil): I do not believe there is one best theoretical approach.

António Ângelo Vasconcelos (Escola Superior de Educação do Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal, Portugal): From my point of view [...] the best approach, as a fundamental principle, breaks away from the idea of the ‘model’ and is open to possibilities of the arts and its worlds opening up, encouraging and promoting what is known as ‘differently articulated singularities’.

4.2. Category 2: open and flexible pedagogical approaches to abilities and levels of learning

This category gathers the proposals that emphasise the need to adapt each educational action to the needs of the students. Heterogeneity is perhaps one of the factors that the educational framework should take into account more vigorously. The people who deal with educational realities are not the same and, therefore, neither should the pedagogical approaches be the same. The proposals emphasising the need to take into account the different levels of learning, motivation and abilities of our students are gathered here. Similarly, proposals are included that defend diversity in group music practice, bringing music practice in school closer to what may resemble real music practice, in which each member develops a certain activity. The selection of fragments presented here responds to these thematic principals.

Pep Alsina i Masmitjà (Universidad de Barcelona, Spain): Any theoretical approach that is not rigid or closed, but flexible and open. One that allows suitable application to each context and each student and that facilitates building of musical knowledge together (teacher-learner), constantly modifying learning and teaching objectives (as well as content, evaluation, etc.) according to achievements, skills, abilities and joint interests.

Marcelo Giglio (Haute Ecole Pédagogique BEJUNE, Bienne, Switzerland): I think that theoretical approaches of heterogeneity are necessary in school.

Andrea Giráldez Hayes (Universidad de Valladolid, Spain): I think that the first thing that music educators should do is set out a pedagogical model, inspired by what is ‘real’ music practice, in the sense that not everyone does the same thing, but each person brings something different. [...] Making music together is very different from singing, playing or dancing ‘in unison’. It may be that initially everyone learns and knows the others’ parts, but in the end, each one has a different role.

Silvia Malbrán (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina): Every time people share a task, the skills and abilities are different, meaning each of the members has to carry them out more efficiently. [...] To respond to diversity in school groups is to teach the diversity that the world presents and everyday life in the relating environment. In order to overcome diversity, the first requirement of the teacher is to be an effective observer of each student in the group; the second is to note how many difficulty levels a task involves to accurately assign to each student; the third is to expect of each student...
what they are really capable of achieving, rather than imposing expectations based on maturity standards and norms for the age group, which are sometimes not reliable indicators; the fourth is to break down old stigmas of what makes a successful class.

Nicolás Oriol de Alarcón (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain): The students must be given the chance to find their own learning paths.

4.3. Category 3: concern about students’ social context and musical diversity

The idea that arose most frequently in the analysis of the responses was the importance of not losing sight of the students’ social context in every educational approach. In this vein, all educational action is urged to encompass cultural diversity by promoting the positive integration of the participants’ cultural identities. From a musical point of view, the dialogue with different musical identities is based on recognition of and group participation in the individuals’ musical diversity.

Some of the notable fragments in this category are highlighted here:

Wolfgang Dietrich (University of Innsbruck, Austria): Allow people to express themselves with their vernacular music, respect and celebrate it and use this energy for conflict work.

Andrea Giráldez Hayes (Universidad de Valladolid, Spain): It is important to address the students’ diversity of interests. Music plays a very important role in their lives, but nevertheless, the school seems to ignore their musical worlds, offering a single point of view and a single repertoire deemed ‘worthy’ of being worked on in school. Currently, an immensely diverse range of styles coexist that should be incorporated into the classroom. Otherwise, the student learns that ‘their’ music cannot form part of the classroom repertoire.

Federico Mayor Zaragoza (Ex-director General de la UNESCO, Presidente de la Fundación Cultura de Paz de Madrid, Spain): Peaceful coexistence and the exchange of experiences and points of view is achieved through integration – that is to say, to co-live [co-exist] as each one is – and not, in any case, through assimilation, which is equivalent to forcing the other to ‘make themselves similar’.

John O’Flynn (University of Limerick, Ireland): While the music educator may not necessarily wish to or may not be in a position to oppose dominant trends, she or he may help students negotiate their way through established music curricula and their attendant cultural values (whatever shape or hue those curricula might take), by periodically introducing students to musicians, genres and perspectives that are ‘other’ to the mainstream, and through building on their capacity for self-awareness and reflection.

Sylvia Szhwarzenbach (Musikschule und Konservatorium Bern; Hochschule fur Musik und Theater, Bern; Switzerland): I think through music education we can help to enhance integration and peaceful existence as music is a common language understood by everybody. The repertoire has to be broad and international but in teaching there must be also information around the different cultures. Using a more open pedagogical system allows pupils and children from other musical cultures to integrate and if possible involve their parents. Organising school events where all these cultures come together and where they can share their music cultures with their instruments and food, dancing together, with their costumes, traditions.

Keith Swanwick (Institute of Education, University of London, United Kingdom): An attitude that respects this principle is most likely to meet these aims: care for the music of students.
4.4. Category 4: educational perspectives focusing on practical approaches and participatory music

This category contains the responses that mention the need for music education to centre mainly on the practice of music. These perspectives, which, to a greater or lesser degree, coincide with praxial philosophies in relation to music education, consider the idea of music education constructed from the experience that comes from *music making*. In addition, it stresses the need to make music in a participatory way, through joint construction of the musical event. This participatory music is, essentially, according to the authors, what will most efficiently encourage the creation of intersubjective links between students, promoting better coexistence. Among the authors mentioned in this educational perspective, a contribution by Professor Thomas Regelski is included, through which he produces, in a clear and insightful way, a description of the guidelines that should be seriously considered by music educators as a group. Among other things, it refers to the guidelines that allude to the concept of *musicking*, developed by Small (1998) and later, with some different connotations, by Elliott (1995).

*Lucy Green (Institute of Education, University of London, UK):* I would say the best theoretical approach is to regard music-making as being the heart of music education and to regard the musical taste and identity of the student as also being at the heart of music education, and to build from both music-making and the musical tastes and identities of the students from there outwards and beyond that, so that having gained the trust of the students, teachers can then take them into new realms of music that they haven’t previously come across; and through that, give them musical insight into other cultures and religions and geographical areas and historical eras as well, that they might not be able to encounter in quite the same way otherwise.

*Steve Dillon (Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia):* I think the main shift in thinking that music education needs to consider is precisely about the qualities of music making that can promote health and well being, not about measuring knowledge outcomes. Whilst attention to quality is important, expressiveness in any creative activity has a self-actuated predisposition to refine and develop musical product and processes. The re-integration of art and life is a worthy quest but needs to always concern itself with the relational pedagogies – the ethics of the transaction in dynamic ways because context is ever changing.

*Thomas Regelski (University SUNY, Fredonia, USE; Helsinki University, Finland):* [...] If ‘[social] integration and peaceful coexistence’ are meant, presentational music needs to be downplayed in favour of participatory musicking of various kinds. At the very least, a large dose of the latter is needed to compensate for the social segregation (in-groups, taste, publics, etc.) and hierarchies created by the former (especially ‘classical’ music). In my experience, students who, for whatever reason, are interested in presentational performance seem to get their needs addressed by community (community music schools or private lessons) or school based (public or voluntary) instruction or ensembles. The vast majority of students who don’t want to play standard orchestral instruments, but who often would eagerly study other instruments (everything from guitar to locally popular ethnic instruments) are typically ignored in schools. Schools, instead, should be meeting the needs of such students and thereby advancing the quantity and quality of musicking in a society and the contributory role of musicking to sociality and integration.

Similarly, forms of musicking that do not focus on the usual conditions of presentational performing (e.g. most music apps for iPhone, iPads, etc.), are also ignored (e.g. various composition and other software), as are the ample forms of musicking already taking place in the community (drumming circles, steel drum bands, karaoke, sing-alongs, etc.). These, too, should be promoted by schools.
In general, viewing music as a levelling force in society, not as a hierarchical ‘us vs. other’ force that separates insiders (or people who are ‘good at’) from outsiders (who are not ‘good at’ but may still like a music), is the best principle. Unfortunately, much in the music world, including commercial music and conservatory training, is premised on competition of some kind or degree; of being advanced (e.g. auditioned seating in an orchestra), of seeking accolades and recognition. But the larger part of any local music world consists of people engaged in various participatory musicking and musical practices simply of like-minded and more equally proficient people sharing a collective intentionality (or in the privacy of their own homes – though, remember, Einstein wouldn’t play his violin if anyone, including family, might hear him).

The principle at stake, then, is to identify and locate (situate) the prevalent musical practices in a nation, region, or local society. Then, determine what skills and knowledge are needed to participate at an entry level. Then, where possible (even if it means connecting with community resources, promoting growth and transfer of learning by providing (or informing students of the local availability of) more authentic and advanced praxis. These stages are all assisted when, in fact, the community of musicians and of music teachers (private and school-based) work together cooperatively. That will enhance integration and peaceful coexistence.

4.5. Category 5: recommendations of specific proposals

We should not forget that although Spain did not play an active part in international discussion forums until recent times (Díaz-Gómez, 2012), in other contexts research on music education is not a new topic and there is therefore a large body of literature on the subject. Knowing the theoretical foundations of classical authors on music education and discovering innovative proposals for the teaching and learning of music is a task that is both necessary and fascinating in the work of a music teacher (Malbrán, 2007). A good music teacher brings originality and participates in the creation of specific musical and educational proposals; but the teacher also knows and values the work that other teachers share, and work that contributes to research. For this reason, the experts make some recommendations for particular proposals and approaches in music education.

Wolfgang Dietrich (University of Innsbruck, Austria): Start from the idea of elicitive conflict transformation.

Steve Dillon (Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia): Whilst there are philosophies of music education and ‘methods’ for music education that are useful to explore, they are all culturally located and reflect the music and practices of the culture. Perhaps the best philosophy comes from the Pragmatist John Dewey’s Art as Experience (2005) which simply recognises the nature of the experience as phenomenological. Whilst the Western world seems to argue Reimer’s aesthetic and Elliot’s praxis approach, both these philosophies are firmly placed within a US band and orchestral approach to music making and transfer of the philosophies requires significant cultural reframing. The methods such as Kodaly, Orff and Dalcroze also must be considered in their holistic context of being rooted in the nationalism of the late 19th early twentieth century. While they hold important traditional values and practices they too are limited in a twenty-first century digital and multicultural classroom.

Marcelo Giglio (Haute Ecole Pédagogique BEJUNE, Bienne, Switzerland): In terms of integration, I think that theoretical approaches of heterogeneity are necessary in school. On the other hand, the praxial philosophy of David Elliot can contribute to the relationship between the musician and the listener in different cultural contexts.

Wilfred Gruhn (University of Music, Freiburg, Germany): From my experience, the basic principles of Gordon’s Music Learning Theory are very appropriate and
applicable to students’ music learning. However, it should not be seen as ‘the’ (only right) method or not as a ‘method’ at all, but as a basic general idea which has to be adapted to the particular demands of each social and cultural context.

Alda Oliveira (Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brazil): I think that the music teacher has to develop (practically and theoretically) to use the method he or she has been educated with and combine it with the recommendations of the PONTES Approach.

5. Discussion

The main objective of this study was to publish authoritative arguments on whether music education could be a potential tool to facilitate integration and positive coexistence. The analysis of the results, combined with some existing theories and proposals in the music education literature, provides evidence on the research topic and leads to interesting considerations that we wish to highlight. This analysis emphasises the fact that, although each social context gives rise to a different educational situation with different potentials and needs, the experts interviewed mentioned many of the same issues in their responses, regardless of their geographical and social situation.

5.1. Revision of the concept of integration in music education

The first point here is the revision of the concept of integration, which in inclusive and intercultural music education should govern the guidelines for action. Poorly understood and managed integration could lead to proposals based on the perspective of assimilation and multiculturalism (Mayor Zaragoza, 2008). In this case, any educational action should introduce rules that include showing respect and recognition towards all musical manifestation. Musical identity is built up from a combination of individual – personal and collective – musical experiences, and participation in a social group, at both a micro and a macro level, which encompass musical tastes, values, practice, skills and knowledge (Green, 2011). These identities are constructed through the transmission and acquisition of learning, which come from each person’s cultural environment, and from all forms of teaching, from the informal to the strictly formal. Establishing the dialogue on constructing personal musical identities and recognising different musical manifestations is one of the challenges for the music teacher. This dialogue provides the grounding on which to establish a music education based on interaction among individuals, guaranteeing enhanced coexistence. In the same way, music could start to be considered as one of the tools necessary to resolve and transform possible conflicts derived from negative coexistence in the educational space (Gázquez, Pérez, & Carrión, 2011). One of the ideas to emerge from the responses suggests starting from the idea of elicitive conflict transformation (Dietrich, 2013). Elicitive conflict transformation theories, in contrast to prescriptive methods, state that as there are many ways to understand peace and coexistence, each conflict is unique and needs to find new emerging ways of understanding to transform it into positive opportunities for learning. This transformation should come from the participants, and depends on their social contexts. Playing music together, understood as an elicitive dialogue, can foster understanding, although musical experiences have to be respected and celebrated; in this case it is possible, as stated, to use energy for conflict work. Within educational settings, as suggested, teachers must show care for the music of students. Responding to
students’ musical diversity must necessarily result in incorporating into teaching the musical diversity that the world presents in their everyday life. In turn, there will be a need to observe and recognise students’ musical identities and adapt educational practices to their musical lives. Only in this way can teachers avoid the aforementioned assimilation that musical curricula can sometimes promote.

5.2. Adaptation of educational practice

Another challenge facing the music teacher is to respond to the recommendations to contextualise every educational proposal to the specific situation it needs to adapt to. A theoretical approach can offer valid guidelines for action, but if it is not applied to a specific context, it may lack effectiveness. In this sense, there will be as many theoretical approaches as educational contexts.

The need to promote coexistence is a key challenge on every country’s educational agenda. Spain has witnessed a reduction in the resources available for the effective integration of all members of the community. Music teachers, regardless of the conditions, strive to creatively accommodate the complex educational reality that surrounds them. Specifically, music teachers find themselves having to protect access to music education for a large number of students, having to ensure the acquisition of knowledge, as well as awakening musical taste, encouraging active participation in the musical life of the communities and integrating more and more musical identities into the formal framework of education. And they have to do all of this in a context of few teaching hours for music, the rise in the student–teacher ratio in classrooms and reduced resources with which to acquire and maintain musical and school equipment.

In this complex system, music teachers make great efforts to identify diversity among their students, assuming that the variety of musical identities go beyond cultural origin. A useful guideline for music teachers is Dillon’s (2007) proposal, which urges them to discover the place of music in the lives of their students, assuming that adapting musical practice in educational environments also involves addressing diversity in the access to and assimilation of musical knowledge. According to the suggestions made by the study participants, guaranteeing the heterogeneity that can help to promote coexistence within the educational realm involves encouraging the act of learning from one another. Peer learning in music education, if it is based on parameters of recognition and justice, enhances the dialogue and interrelations among participants. This socio-cognitive approach leads teachers to recognise and integrate each student’s different articulated singularities, enabling their own learning paths, but fostering the building of music learning together, according to students’ achievements, skills, abilities and joint interests.

5.3. Participate and experience music

The proposal to maintain an active tendency in the learning of music is probably the most significant point. Nowadays, there are new challenges that music education should address. In this vein, opting for musical learning focused on the musicking of individuals could encourage and promote an experiential music education, centred mainly on acquiring positive musical experiences. Through these experiences, as a result of the affirmative responses to their musical and extra musical meanings, we can guarantee students a strictly musical training. In this context, it does not focus
exclusively on obtaining results, but also on the need to make music in school, which has an impact on both the promotion of positive attitudes towards music and increased motivation for the phenomenon of education (Madariaga Orbea & Arriaga Sanz, 2011). Positive musicking arises from understanding the music that is being practised. The incorporation of elements of informal music learning in the formal framework (Green, 2008), based on our students’ music knowledge and taking into account the musical tastes and identities of all those participating in the educational event, leads to a plethora of new possibilities that should be kept in mind. This integration of informal musical elements into formal realms can help to encourage musical experiences in the classroom that, as the participants note, match with the students’ real music practices. In this sense, it can be useful to merge the use of educational methods that enable students to successfully learn music in academic paradigms, with training to critically approach the different musical lives they experience outside school. As Giráldez states, music plays an important role in students’ lives and, sometimes, school seems to ignore their musical worlds. Critically incorporating, practising and valuing these musical worlds in educational settings will enhance students’ engagement with different music and promote the use of common musical practices. Consequently, promoting participatory music (Turino, 2008) – as opposed to the Western paradigm of the value of presentational music as distinctive of a select education – could give rise to new links of interrelation between participants, making it possible to change extra-musical connotation that could emerge in music practice. In this case, a positive musical experience is built on an understanding of the phenomenon of music as well as on the enjoyment of shared practice and exchange, ensuring integration and recognition of different musical identities. It is precisely on this point that music education has the potential to improve coexistence between people and cultures.

6. Conclusions

In certain circumstances, group music practice creates intersubjective communication links, which help to improve understanding between individuals and groups of people. Communities have made use of music to the extent that, on many occasions, it goes beyond enjoyment and aesthetic pleasure (Higgins, 2012).

In an increasingly diverse society, in addition to learning about music, the classroom should be a space to integrate cultural knowledge through group music practice. Sharing positive music experiences contributes to generating spaces of understanding where different knowledge, values and tastes are recognised. This recognition helps to improve the classroom atmosphere, enhancing interaction and possibly leading to better learning outcomes (Braxton, Bray, & Berger, 2000).

Much of our students’ musical knowledge is generally excluded from the formal system. The methods of music learning outside the traditional music teaching methodologies are frequently omitted from the classroom. In this scenario, learning music becomes an alien process for our students; this can be a barrier to the construction of an educational space where music practice is a tool for gaining positive shared experiences.

Finally, we are contributing to a change in musical pedagogy in which the music teacher should know how to be responsive in the face of essentially expository models from previous years. Music teachers cannot set themselves up as the exclusive source for constructing musical knowledge because they cannot be experts on every
style that forms part of their students’ musical background. Incorporating music and models for music learning into the formal environment involves having a dialogue with different musical identities and opening up to new ways of learning.

Teachers need to be aware of the different proposals and guidelines in music education. We firmly believe in the idea that there is not only one educational model, but many, and that they contribute to students’ training. The world of education now acknowledges three realms for learning: formal, non-formal and informal. This gives rise to the need for coordination between formal and non-formal educational settings, without forgetting that music education must consider the knowledge and experience students acquire in informal contexts (Berbel Gómez & Díaz Gómez, 2014). The methods of music teaching identified by the experts, together with the different approaches and philosophies referred to – Dalcroze, Kodaly, Orff, Gordon, Elliott, etc. – can be excellent models and guides to ensure the acquisition of musical knowledge from this active practice. However, the challenge for teachers who aim to adapt this knowledge to the classroom is linked to the ability to transform the educational ideas on heterogeneous approaches that respond to students’ musical interests, in order to foster compositional, interpretative and creative processes. The participants interviewed agree on the importance of the didactic approach to the design of music education programmes, both in auditory education and instrumental, vocal and/or body performance and composition.

The music that we currently listen to and perform is the result of many years of experimentation in sound all over the world. Musical styles such as rock, jazz, rap and many others help us to understand the fusions and hybridisations produced by intercultural marriages. They also help teachers to stimulate students’ interest towards music and music education and to create their own musical ideas. Inviting students to think with sounds, to express through music what they cannot say with words, can result in musical practices that foster motivational, social and emotional processes and that facilitate learning.

Promoting classroom practices that enable students to acquire positive musical experiences leads to the growth in the musical lives of the students outside the classroom; if these experiences are, additionally, shared and based on recognition, they can help to improve the atmosphere and coexistence both within and outside the school.
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Note
1. An entry level is a beginning level that is sufficient to provide musical satisfaction of the kind likely to motivate the desire and intention of developing more advanced techniques that promote increased satisfactions.

References
Abreu, J. A. (2001). Venezuela, Sistema Nacional de las Orquestas Juveniles [Venezuela, National Network of Youth Orchestras]. In El contrato global. I Encuentro Internacional sobre Cultura de Paz [The global contract: First International Encounter on Culture of Peace] (pp. 113–114). Madrid: Fundación Cultura de Paz.
Berbel Gómez, N., & Díaz Gómez, M. (2014). Educación formal y no formal. Un punto de encuentro en educación musical [Formal and non-formal education. A meeting point in music education]. Aula Abierta, 42, 47–52.

Bradley, D. (2006). Music education, multiculturalism and anti-racism: Can we talk? Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 5, 1–30.

Braxton, J. M., Bray, N. J., & Berger, J. B. (2000). Faculty teaching skills and their influence on the college student departure process. Journal of college student development, 41, 215–224.

Bresler, L., & Stake, R. (1992). Qualitative research methodology in music education. In R. Colwell (Ed.), Handbook of research on music teaching and learning (pp. 75–90). Beverly, MA: Wadsworth.

Cabedo-Mas, A., & Díaz-Gómez, M. (2012). Music making: A bridge joint of students’ cultural and musical diversity. Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences, 46, 2215–2219.

Cabedo-Mas, A., & Díaz-Gómez, M. (2013). Positive musical experiences in education: Music as a social praxis. Music Education Research, 15, 455–470.

Campbell, P. S. (2004). Teaching music globally: Experiencing music, expressing culture. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, P. S., Drummond, J., Dunbar-Hall, P., Howard, K., Schippers, H., & Wiggins, T. (2005). Cultural diversity in music education: Directions and challenges for the 21st century. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.

Clarke, D. (2003). Musical autonomy revisited. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert, & R. Middleton (Eds.), The cultural study of music (pp. 159–170). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1990). Métodos de investigación educativa [Research methods in education]. Madrid: La Muralla.

Cortina Orts, A. (2002). Ciudadanía intercultural. In J. Conill (Ed.), Glosario para una sociedad intercultural [Glossary for an intercultural society] (pp. 35–42). Valencia: Bancaja.

Dewey, J. (2005). Art as experience. New York, NY: The Berkley Publishing Group.

Díaz-Gómez, M. (2011). Una educación musical por la diversidad y para la integración cultural [Music education for diversity and cultural integration]. In J. Vallès Villanueva, D. Álvarez Rodríguez, & R. Rickenmann del Castillo (Eds.), L’activitat docent. Intervenció, innovació, investigació [The teaching activity. Intervention, innovation and investigation] (pp. 297–305). Girona: Documenta Universitaria.

Díaz-Gómez, M. (2012). Educación musical: Investigamos, luego avanzamos [Music education: We investigate, therefore we progress]. Revista electrónica de investigación e innovación educativa i socioeducativa, 3, 67–76.

Dietrich, W. (2013). Elicitive conflict transformation and the transrational shift in peace politics. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dillon, S. (2005). El profesor de música como gestor cultural [The music teacher as cultural manager]. Revista Electrónica Complutense de Investigación en Educación Musical, 2, 1–10.

Dillon, S. (2007). Music, meaning and transformation. Meaningful music making for life. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Eisner, E. W. (1996). Qualitative research in music education: Past, present, perils, promise. Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 130, 8–16.

Elliott, D. J. (1995). Music matters: A new philosophy of music education. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feichas, H. (2010). Bridging the gap: Informal learning practices as a pedagogy of integration. British Journal of Music Education, 27, 47–58.

Fernández Enguita, M. (2001). Educar en tiempos inciertos [Educating in uncertain times]. Madrid: Morata.

Folkestad, G. (2006). Formal and informal learning situations or practices vs formal and informal ways of learning. British Journal of Music Education, 23, 135–145.

Fulbró, S., & Malbrán, S. (2000). ¿Hola!...¿Qué tal? Repertorio para jugar con la música, jugar con el cuerpo, jugar con la escena [Hello!. How are you? Repertoire to play with the music, play with the body, play with the scene]. Buenos Aires: Sonerías.

Gázquez, J. J., Pérez, M. C., & Carrión, J. J. (2011). Clima escolar y resolución de conflictos según el alumnado: Un estudio europeo [School climate and conflict resolution according to the students: A European study]. Revista de Psicodidáctica, 16, 39–58.
Giráldez Hayes, A. (1998). Educación musical desde una perspectiva multicultural: Diversas aproximaciones [Music education from a multicultural perspective: Different approaches]. *Revista Transcultural de Música, TRANS Iberia*, 1, 219–230.

Giráldez Hayes, A. (2007). La educación musical en un mundo digital [Musical education in the digital world]. *Eufonia*, 8.

Giráldez Hayes, A., & Pelegrín Sandoval, G. (1996). Otros pueblos, otras culturas. Música y juegos del mundo [Other peoples, other cultures. Music and games in the world]. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.

Green, L. (2003). Why ‘ideology’ is still relevant for critical thinking in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2, 2–20.

Green, L. (2005). Musical meaning and social reproduction: A case for retrieving autonomy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37, 77–92.

Green, L. (2008). *Music, informal learning and the school: A new classroom pedagogy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Green, L. (2011). Introduction: The globalization and localization of learning, teaching, and musical identity. In L. Green (Ed.), *Learning, teaching, and musical identity. Voices across cultures* (pp. 1–19). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hemsy de Gainza, V. (2004). La educación musical en el siglo XX [Music education in the 20th century]. *Revista musical chilena*, 58, 74–81.

Higgins, L. (2012). *Community music*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Joseph, D., & Southcott, J. (2009). ‘Opening the doors to multiculturalism’: Australian pre-service music teacher education students’ understandings of cultural diversity. *Music Education Research*, 11, 457–472.

Lederach, J. P., & Lederach, A. J. (2010). *When blood and bones cry out: Journeys through the soundscape of healing and reconciliation*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Madariaga Orbea, J. M., & Arriaga Sanz, C. (2011). Análisis de la práctica educativa del profesorado de música y su relación con la motivación del alumnado [Analysis of the educational practice of music teachers and their relationship with student motivation]. *Cultura y Educación*, 23, 463–476.

Malbrán, S. (2007). *El oído de la mente* [The ear of the mind] (Vol. 8). Madrid: Akal Ediciones.

Marina, J. A. (2002). Interculturalidad. In J. Conill (Ed.), *Glosario para una sociedad intercultural* [Glossary for an intercultural society] (pp. 222–228). Valencia: Bancaja.

Mayor Zaragoza, F. (2008). Educación, desarrollo, integración: es tiempo de acción [Education, development, integration: It is time for action]. *Eikasia: Revista de Filosofía*, 18, 93–106.

McClary, S. (1987). The blasphemy of talking politics during Bach Year. In R. Leppert & S. McClary (Eds.), *Music and society. The politics of composition, performance, and reception* (pp. 13–62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers’ dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 447–454.

Nadal Pedrero, N. (2007). *Músicas del mundo. Una propuesta intercultural de educación musical* [World music. An intercultural music education proposal]. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona. ICE.

Nussbaum, M. (2007). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Oliveira, A. (2004). Contextos de formación musical: educación musical entre lo formal y lo informal: músicos consagrados de Bahía (Brasil) [Contexts of music training: Music education between the formal and informal: Renowned musicians from Bahía (Brazil)]. In A. Giráldez Hayes (Ed.), *Mundos sonoros por descubrir. Selección de comunicaciones ISME 2004* [Sound worlds to discover: Proceedings ISME 2004] (pp. 8–15). Tenerife: Sociedad para la Educación Musical del Estado Español (SEM-EE).

Partti, H., & Karlsen, S. (2010). Reconceptualising musical learning: New media, identity and community in music education. *Music Education Research*, 12, 369–382.

Regelski, T. A. (2005). Music and music education: Theory and praxis for ‘making a difference’. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37, 7–27.
Regelski, T. A. (2009). Curriculum reform: Reclaiming “music” as social praxis. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 8*, 66–84.

Schmidt, M. (1998). Defining “good” music teaching: Four student teachers’ beliefs and practices. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 138*, 19–46.

Siankope, J., & Villa, O. (2004). *Música e interculturalidad* [Music and interculturalism]. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, Los Libros de la Catarata.

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking. The meanings of performing and listening*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Turino, T. (2008). *Music as social life: The politics of participation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Urbain, O. (2008). *Music and conflict transformation: Harmonies and dissonances in geopolitics*. New York, NY: I.B.Tauris.

Wolff, J. (1987). The ideology of autonomous art. In R. Leppert & S. McClary (Eds.), *Music and society. The politics of composition, performance and reception* (pp. 1–12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wong, M. (2005). A cross-cultural comparison of teachers’ expressed beliefs about music education and their observed practices in classroom music teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 11*, 397–418.

Wright, R., & Kanellopoulos, P. (2010). Informal music learning, improvisation and teacher education. *British Journal of Music Education, 27*, 71–87.