<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Philosophy of Music Education Review*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Georgii-Hemming, E., Lilliedahl, J. (2014)

Why "What" Matters: On the Content Dimension of Music Didactics.

Philosophy of Music Education Review, 22(2): 132-155

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2979/philmusieducrevi.22.2.132>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hj:diva-24095>

Why *What* Matters: On the Content Dimension of Music Didactics

Philosophy of Music Education Review, vol 22, No. 2, Fall 2014, pp. 132–155

Authors:

Eva Georgii-Hemming, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden

eva.georgii-hemming@oru.se

Jonathan Lilliedahl, Jönköping University, Jönköping, Sweden

jonathan.lilliedahl@hjk.hj.se

Abstract

Is the most important function of education to provide students with basic skills and useful knowledge in order to eventually become employable? In many parts of the world knowledge league tables and policy documents inform us this is the case. As the question of what should form the educational content seems to be answered, teachers can concentrate on how they should teach, and researchers can concentrate on what method is the most effective. In the current rhetoric, however, many vital pedagogical issues have been placed in the background and the aesthetic subjects are downgraded. These tendencies worried Frede V. Nielsen who stated that didactic studies and philosophical inquiries yet again are needed to explore and give substance to the content dimension. Nielsen's writings on didactics form the basis for this essay, where we highlight which perspectives and dilemmas could be placed on a critical, philosophical didactic study agenda. The starting point is the field of tension between the what and the why of education.

Frede V. Nielsen's authorship is extensive. His ideas have had a significant impact on the development of subject didactics and music pedagogy as an academic field. The impact has been seen mainly in the Nordic region, but also further afield directly as well as indirectly through the international networks in which he was involved. Through these networks, he met education scholars from many parts of the world. His critical and philosophical reflections on music and music education have also influenced generations of music education researchers and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

During the whole of his professional life, Nielsen was occupied with aesthetic expressions and aesthetic experiences, and how people are shaped through interactions with the arts, nature, and languages. He fought for the existence of the music subject and against its instrumentalization. Prior to his retirement, in June 2012 he gave a final lecture during which he emphasized that it is time to remind ourselves about the "timeliness of the subject didactics as well as the necessity of the arts."

It seems that politicians in many parts of the world believe that the most important function of education is to teach students to read, count, and write; that is, to give students necessary and useful knowledge in order to eventually become employable.¹ Thus, the didactic question about *what* should form the educational content appears to have been answered. For teachers, the pedagogical main problems can be reduced to one simple method issue—*how* should I teach? For researchers, the question becomes: what method is the most effective for students' learning processes?

Consequently, several vital pedagogical issues have been placed in the background. In his speech, Nielsen highlighted the importance of "what students are reading, what is important to calculate, and what is worth writing about." There are clear indications that pedagogical content

today is understood in terms of tools and skills, but without ideas about what they should be used for viewed from a cultural and existential life perspective. The continental idea and thinking of *Bildung*, which has characterized the mission of schools during the last 200 years, seems to have disappeared.² Perhaps the criterion to define content as something that, through its effects on the individual, leads towards *Bildung* seems too complex in a pluralistic world. Perhaps a relativistic view dominates, which makes it difficult to discuss what is of greater importance. There are several possible explanations, but Nielsen stated that didactics yet again needs to explore the issue of content. He therefore called for systematic, analytical, and empirical studies that give substance to the content dimension and issues of criteria within didactics. In other words: *who* are learning *what*, for what reasons (for *what*) and, especially, *who* or *what* shapes the answers to these questions.

Inspired by these words, we would like to contribute to the study of these didactic aspects of teaching and learning music. We will not defend, challenge, nor develop didactic theory. The theory is a scholarly position, argued by many teacher educators and researchers. Instead, we would like to use it as a legitimate starting point in order to explore its potential for philosophical music pedagogical inquiry.

Teachers' choices of content to teach are based on many factors; for example, their personal experiences, their view on student learning, and the music subject, but also the character and activities of the subject, as well as contextual and historical dimensions. Nielsen speaks of four didactical approaches that can constitute a basis for choice of educational content. When these basic positions are combined in various ways with personal, pedagogical, subject specific, and contextual aspects, a theory begins to emerge that is much more complex than we can review here. Below we briefly present the four paradigms. Existential matters are discussed by Øivind

Varkøy elsewhere in this issue of *PMER*, so we focus our illustrations and discussion on the first three. The starting point is the field of tension between the *what* and the *why* of education, that is, the relationship between educational content and its aims. Particular aims will call for particular educational content. In this essay, we highlight issues of which aims are today seen as legitimate and which ones claim these didactic choices, but above all which perspectives and dilemmas could be placed on the philosophy of music education agenda.

Some notes on terminology: we use the terms music pedagogy and general pedagogy as the science of (music) education and (music) education for the practice of teaching and learning (music). Music didactics is the scientific study of all the factors that affect music education and its content.

Didactics as a Research Field

All education is dependent on decisions about *what* education should contain and *how* it should be organized. To pose questions about educational content—*why* this content is relevant and how it should be transferred to the student—according to a continental-European understanding can be summarized in the German term *Didaktik*.

Using a slightly wider definition, however, *Didaktik* includes far more questions than merely that of what education should contain, why, and how. Other relevant didactic issues are *who* should learn, *with whom* one should learn, *through what* as well as *where* and *when*. But *Didaktik* does not only cover the teachers' choices in relation to education. The term also includes the *conditions for these choices* and the *fundamental conditions* in education, such as from where education content originates as well as pedagogical-philosophical starting points for the essence of education. Taken together, the idea of *Didaktik* opens up to a number of questions

about education as a phenomenon and all the considerations to which it can be connected.

Therefore, *Didaktik* can also be understood as a term in the intersection between theory and practice.

The Anglo-Saxon equivalent to didactics is not so easily defined. Didactics is often understood as method study or, with a starting point in pedagogical psychology, as synonymous with learning theory. But the continental-European definition instead involves bringing together what in the Anglo-Saxon world is called curriculum and instruction. Therefore, the terms pedagogy and pedagogics are what could be viewed as most closely related to didactics.³

There are of course shifting emphases across the didactic research field. Following Nielsen's definition, didactics will in this essay highlight a content-oriented didactics. The meaning of such approach is that didactic issues are primarily centered on content; what content should be chosen, and also from where content originates in a natural and/or social sense, as well as how this content should be used.⁴

In didactics as an academic discipline, there is often a distinction between general didactics and subject didactics (*fachdidaktik* and *fagdidaktik*). In the former approach, didactic research questions are viewed as principal and so fundamental that they permeate reflections of education, regardless of subject. The latter approach poses the same type of questions, but deals with them within a framework for a particular subject. As such, the meaning of music didactics is different from mathematic didactics, for example.

A central question is how subject didactic studies can be understood. Can they be understood as subject areas investigating people's understanding of the structures, the concepts, and the theories of academic disciplines? Or can they chiefly be viewed as studies highlighting how students in pre-school and school understand subject content and terminology from a more

strictly applied subject perspective? In contrast to this polarizing question, several education researchers argue that there are risks in describing subject didactics from a too tension-filled, narrow, or selective perspective.

Subject didactics can favorably be compared with what Lee S. Shulman called pedagogical content knowledge (PCK),⁵ a combination of pedagogy and theoretical knowledge of a subject, defined as “knowledge to make a subject comprehensible to others.”⁶ Viewed from this perspective, PCK and subject didactics are closely related. Shulman integrates subject and pedagogical knowledge, and in Pamela Lynn Grossman’s⁷ further development, the subject, general pedagogical knowledge, and knowledge of content are described as three forms of knowledge that are tied together by PCK. PCK does include questions about the aims of teaching, but not, according to our interpretation, the “why-questions” of didactics, in the sense of motives or reasons for the possible values of music education (the goods of music). These appear instead as a philosophically-based definition of knowledge.

Nielsen’s research and positioning of the didactic term can be captured using four definitions. First, he had a relatively traditional understanding of the didactic concept, where didactics is the same as the theory of teaching, contrary to didactics as the theory of learning. Second, his theory primarily rests on a narrow concept of didactics where the basis for teaching and the matter of content are prioritized. Method issues and learning theories are not irrelevant, but he argued that the methodological questions are dependent on critical and thorough examinations of the content, in order to attempt to get beyond ideas about educational content, which are taken for granted. In other words, he posed didactic questions about the basis of content, principles for selection of content as well as how content can be organized. He expressed a clear unwillingness toward defining normatively and prescriptively what music

education should be like. His didactic theory-forming approach is rather like empirical tools for research and models for the teachers' own didactic choices. Thus, his didactic theory should primarily be read as an analysis of the conditions for and the potential of music education. The central question—for researchers as well as for teachers and teacher students—is reflection on what music education is and may mean.

This leads us in to Nielsen's third definition, which consists of understanding the content mainly as content of, that is, content for learning. Yet again, the issue of content is viewed as intimately connected to the purpose of education because the selection and organization of content is understood as choices of what type of meaning and *Bildung* can occupy a place in education. In this sense, he connected with a *Bildung*-centered didactics [*Bildungstheoretische Didaktik*] with roots in German hermeneutics and general didactics, and in particular Wolfgang Klafki's later works.⁸⁹ Lastly, Nielsen made progress in subject didactic definitions. He developed music didactic theory through interaction between the general didactic perspective and subject-didactic questions. The glue in this union consists of content matter being viewed as both general-didactic and music specific.

Subject Didactic Starting Points: Four Paradigms

Different aspects influence the ways in which music teachers think about educational content: general pedagogical theories as well as musicological, artistic, music pedagogical theoretical, and/or crafts-related ideas.¹⁰ In addition, education exists in a given historical, social, and political context. This wider context becomes significant when looking at the schools' mission and students' learning.

Many teachers, not just music teachers themselves, have a propensity to perceive the music subject as unique and different from other subject areas. With such ideas, there is the risk that the subject becomes excluded from participation opportunities in general, as well as from pedagogical and didactic discussion. Nielsen discusses four basic positions, in order to see whether there are general criteria for education that could also be useful in music didactic contexts. His intention is to create a didactic basis for reflection, which in turn could lead to an improved understanding of a teacher's own subject. Even though these positions are not completely comparable, they can on a higher level help to specify matters in several subject didactics. The four positions do not exclude one another, but in curriculum planning can instead complement each other. Nielsen defines these as subject didactics rooted in the core subject (basic subject didactics); subject didactics rooted in everyday experience (ethno-didactics); subject didactics rooted in societal issues (challenge didactics); and subject didactics on philosophical, anthropological grounds (existential didactics).¹¹

Basic subject didactics imply that content, principles, and terminology of education is being drawn from one or several underlying core areas. Nielsen illuminates these relationships through the example of physics, where the basic subject is the academic subject of physics. Scientific knowledge of physics terminology and its order and descriptions all aid the school subject physics, without dominating it completely. An equivalent scientifically-oriented position applied to music teaching would mean a strong relationship with structures and theories in musicology. It is obvious that this is not a given, nor that it is the only foundation upon which music didactics rest. The criteria for music education are also shaped according to other basic positions, such as music as art and craftsmanship.

Ethno-didactics developed during the 1980s and 1990s as a criticism of overly science-centered conceptions of education. It strongly emphasized intellectual aspects of education and it was argued that greater importance must be placed on non-verbal knowledge and students' everyday experiences. This position can be described as micro-culturally oriented, since regard for local traditions and subcultures is seen as important. The overall idea of ethno-didactics can be described as democratic, since advocates argue that all students from different cultures and subcultures should be able to acquire knowledge on their own terms. Thus, a level of action-competency is created, which facilitates active participation in a democratic society. Since the experiences of students are to be qualified on their own terms, this view generates didactic terms such as "differentiation" and "action orientation." An interest in everyday experiences has meant that activities and subjects that are not directly related to a scientific subject tradition have been emphasized, for example subjects with an aesthetic and practical content. To summarize, ethno-didactics is socio-culturally oriented and is centered on everyday experience and expressions of such. Therefore, action, competency, and interaction between teacher and student and between student and other students inform education.

In challenge didactics, educational content is shaped by the ecologic, economic, and democratic crises of the modern world. Students are educated to be able to cope with the challenges that face humankind, and specific subjects become a means to handle these major themes. The position includes a moral and ethical quality, given that the general pedagogical endeavor is built on the idea of shared global responsibility. This paradigm can therefore be described as "macro-didactic." This does not mean that the position constitutes an opposite to micro-didactic ethno-didactics, since the approach can generate similar teaching strategies. Both orientations are critical, socially-oriented, and engaged in the development of democracy.

Existential didactics starts with the basic conditions for human existence and how these relate to didactic choices. Music and musical expressions can often be connected to existentially significant experiences and emotions. Being human is to feel and to be creative, which is why artistic and musical expressions are seen as fundamental expressions of life, according to this position.¹² Supporting evidence for this position is the fact that, as far as we know, no societies without music have ever been discovered. To ask what it is to be human means that no answers are forever valid. In a pedagogical context, it leads to a continuous renewal of questions around educational content. The theoretical base can be found in philosophical anthropology, which emerged in the 1930s as a reaction against an increasingly fragmented view of human beings. Different approaches—for example sociological, psychological, and biological—contributed with various (partial) explanations of what it means to be human. Philosophical anthropology aimed to bring together and integrate these aspects to create a comprehensive understanding. Through studying human life expressions as they appear and manifest themselves through symbols, it is thought that we can discover what is general and human. An anthropological position can thus contribute to a shared view of the aim of educational content. One philosophical area, for example, is that of research into the relationship between emotion and logic.

Viewed in light of these four basic positions, music didactic choices deal with how subjects can contribute to realizing the overall mission of school education. The issue is about what kind of knowledge and basic views we wish to allow the shaping of our society.

Challenges in Education and Didactic Research

In large parts of the world, education is often caught between several, often contradictory, demands. There is rhetoric, influenced by economic logic, where education is expected to be effective and deliver pre-defined “goods.” Education should, in other words, deliver what is relevant for society.

The lack of importance of critical and public examination of what constitutes knowledge and who defines the criteria is notable, particularly when it comes to the pervasive reforms that are currently taking place. There are constant negotiations and rephrasing of definitions by policy actors, more or less public, of what should be understood as valid and relevant knowledge. These discourses should not be viewed as merely empty rhetoric on a political level. They contribute language, action norms, and premises for pedagogical work and research. When change is seen, generally, as necessary and urgent, there are few voices discussing the directions, content, and consequences of changes, not least the pedagogical ones.

Market orienting, coupled with an increasingly fragmented and culturally pluralist world, thus challenge the democratic and normative dimensions of education. Some forms of knowledge are being questioned; norms and values are becoming increasingly blurred and conventional distinctions (for example between the ethical and the technical) more difficult to separate.¹³

When international knowledge league tables and economic demands of profitability inform thinking, it is easy to reduce a teacher’s task to what can be measured, gives quick results, and relates to global market demands. The pedagogical mission, however, involves more than simply providing limited basic skills and knowledge.

Also research has been affected by these education tendencies. During the past decade, we have seen a growing body of standardized measurement of teacher competence development¹⁴ and studies related to the requirements of successful teaching.¹⁵ Many subject didactic researchers do study education and learning from a cultural perspective, where different subject conditions meet social interactive dimensions, yet several pedagogical researchers warn of subject didactic research becoming increasingly reduced to matters of student learning and how this could be supported in a context related to school subjects.¹⁶

Educational matters are not simple, nor one-dimensional or uncomplicated. The challenges for education and pedagogical research that we describe here, in a summarized fashion, should not be perceived as populist or idealist. An instrumental way of thinking cannot simply be met by viewing education as a project for democracy, tolerance, or solidarity. Conversely, idealist prospects about the pedagogical mission cannot be solved by better methods based on scientific evidence.

We argue that these developments have led to a shrunken arena for critical engagement. They increase the need for reflection among actors and participants in different arenas and organizational levels. The challenge lies in locating deliberate educational content according to its possibilities. As philosophically interested music-pedagogical researchers, we need to ask ourselves what music, art, and artistic activities have to offer from an educational perspective. We need to critically explore the dimensions and perspective that the music subject can have, for whom, and for what reasons. The major question is, as Nielsen formulated it; "What do we want with ourselves and each other?"

Basic Subject Didactics and Its Challenges

Basic subject didactics means taking a didactic approach within a subject. When content is based on the fundamentals of a subject (understood as an academic discipline), education and didactics become a matter of “pedagogizing” this content. Put more simply, the school subject physics is built on content and structures found in the academic subject physics. As opposed to didactic researchers focusing on the connection between a subject and its academic discipline, Nielsen argued that music education has to be understood as a cross-disciplinary subject. Music rests on a three-dimensional foundation; art, craftsmanship, and everyday culture, as well as musicology. These sources together form the foundation for nourishing the educational subject music, and thus music didactics. When considering these three sources, Nielsen also distinguished between two polarizing dimensions: *ars* versus *scientia*. The *ars*-dimension consists of music as art and skill, where music is knowledge practice. However, this dimension also contains everyday experiences that people obtain via sounding music. Taken altogether, the *ars*-dimension includes the artistic as well as the crafts-related and everyday cultural aspects. The *scientia*-dimension, on the other hand, highlights knowledge areas resting on scientific principles. These principles, for example, are to define, systematize, and abstract music. This knowledge dimension is not primarily expressed in a sounding form, but rather through verbal and intellectual activities. Despite Nielsen’s general non-normative approach, it is possible to argue that he may have questioned the *scientia*-dimension. At least, he portrayed *scientia* as a secondary dimension in relation to *ars*, which he painted as more natural or real. He argued that defining music is a second step, and that the first step involves direct experience. Thus, he was not completely neutral to the tension between *ars* and *scientia*, but instead adopted an almost idealized approach to *ars* as being the music subject’s most pristine form and the aspect that most deeply motivates music

education and learning.¹⁷ There is always something in art that comes before distinct thoughts, verbal language, and other modes of expression. Yet, at the same time, there does not have to be a distinction between art and intellect in aesthetic processes in general nor in the area of music in particular.¹⁸

Also included in Nielsen's theory is the idea of describing the music subject as an aesthetic subject. The main reason for doing so was not the fact that music education should convey aesthetic norms, but rather the fact that the subject should have aesthetic qualities. This means that the immediate experience has, or can have, stronger status in music than in several other (non-aesthetic) subjects. Highlighting experience should probably be understood in relation to Nielsen's phenomenological approach.

Nielsen's model of the foundations of the music subject points to the complex nature of this subject. From a didactic perspective, this image can function as a starting point for teachers' didactic choices in so far as it encourages reflection on educational practice. Nielsen's theoretical formation of the music subject structure can thus provide perspectives on the origins of selection for educational content. In other words, it can give perspective to the potential for meaning that can be assigned to the music subject. This theory, therefore, can lay a foundation for teachers' reflective practice as well as for researchers' philosophical and structural illustration of the music subject as a phenomenon. Depending on how a teacher and a researcher position themselves in the tension of *ars* and *scientia*, certain didactic and research-based questions will be asked, but above all, different answers will be offered to these questions.

If basic subject didactics were to be designed as a focus of study, research questions would be asked regarding the foundations for the music subject and music education. Such research can attempt to examine relatively generic relationships, such as Nielsen's idea of the three-

dimensional foundation of the music subject. It can also try to illuminate how relationships between different foundations shift, depending on the context, or how they may have changed over time. In this type of research, it becomes relevant to look at relationships between music as an academic subject, as a research subject, as an everyday conversation topic, and as a school subject. Research can handle matters such as whether the school music is only a mirroring of other already existing expressions of knowledge, or to what extent it can be viewed as a relatively unique tradition or discipline.

If basic subject didactics would instead be used as a theory of educators' teaching methods, thoughts would arise about whether a teacher can balance different starting points; whether and how a teacher can take a didactic approach to curriculum design, educational traditions, local situations, current events, and so on. Teachers' relationship to the three-dimensional foundation of the music subject can be understood as three music-didactic starting points.¹⁹ Music teachers can, on a personal-professional level, focus on the *ars*-dimension with skills in practice-based music teaching and an understanding of music as a practicing and creating subject. Teachers who are instead deeply rooted in the *scientia*-dimension and therefore view music as science will have a more theoretical approach to music education and view music knowledge as knowledge about music. A third alternative can also be distinguished, which is based on music teachers whose focus is primarily general education and where music merely constitutes a part of the subject-didactic skills, and possibly also only a part of the didactic orientation.

Regardless of whether basic subject didactics is used as a starting point for researchers or teachers, we would like to highlight perhaps the most important thing in this basic position. By using basic subject didactics, we realize that education always means teaching *something*. The

didactic theory can in this sense go beyond creating understanding for what (we as) teachers educate in/about and from where this content comes. We can, from this position, also understand that education, per definition, is dependent of content. This is arguably the foundation upon which content-oriented didactics rests.

Nielsen highlighted in his final lecture that it is time to remind ourselves of the “necessity of arts.” The way we see it, this is one of the more urgent philosophical challenges and it could start within this position. Basic subject didactics can highlight the legitimacy in the different knowledge forms of the music subject.

In transnational documents, there are several notions of the fact that an aesthetic orientation can be understood as a key skill in our current and future knowledge society.²⁰ However, the expression of what roles cultural and aesthetic skills should have is weak and inconsistent. It seems as though the culturally “key-skilled” would be a greedy consumer culture as well as an active practitioner one; creative as well as knowledgeable both when it comes to cultural heritage and popular culture, open toward multi-culture all around the world but also with a sense of the role of aesthetics in everyday life. The school missions appear so all-encompassing that it seems at the same time that nothing is important. Without being too conspiratorial, it hardly looks like a lot of cognitive energy has been spent on the aesthetic mission of education. Sven-Erik Liedman’s analysis of these policy documents is that “the entrepreneurs shall possess the world. In their spare time they can spend time painting pottery or go to the theatre, or at least watch some TV.”

Changing the current market economic rhetoric where the aesthetic forms of expression are officially downgraded by educational policy can be a difficult task for researchers as well as teachers. However, the marginalization of aesthetic subjects may correlate with a difficulty and a

reluctance to verbally describe the essence of music and thus specify the value of music education. This is a potential and urgent mission for philosophical music pedagogy.

An important aspect of basic subject didactics is the ambition to balance thought and action. Herein lies also an obvious pedagogical risk. Through using the above-described basic position as a starting point, the development, learning, and meaning creation among students can be pushed into the background of a prescribed subject. If the subject is being made into a primary source for educational content, students' own everyday experiences could (at least theoretically) become a secondary matter. This could be described as an implicit reason for the didactic position discussed in the next section.

Ethno-didactics and Its Challenges

The ethno-didactic position rests on democratic and culturally oriented ideals. It has its basis in students' interests, their musical everyday experiences and local culture, but on a general level it is an ambition to give equal access to cultural values. People have, through music education, an opportunity to realize their musical ideas, shape personal and cultural identities, as well as obtain action competence to actively participate in (music) culture.

In order to strengthen students in a personal and critical socialization, the culture-oriented paradigm is tied to music activity as a cultural phenomenon. It is not mainly education *through* music, but education *toward* music. The basis for music education is verbal and sounding dialogues based on different music cultural values, and ethnic and musical expressions, coupled with a long-term ambition to change society toward a greater level of cultural tolerance.

We live in a society that is becoming more fragmented into various subcultures. The population of a country consists of groups with different senses of belonging, depending on age, gender/sex, occupation, ethnicity, and material standards. Groupings like these constitute important social attributes that tell us who we are, who we could and would like to become, as well as what we can and cannot do. Yet, at the same time there are those within the groups who have different views of what a good life looks like, how society should be, and how music should be valued.

It is easy at this point to identify some potential areas of conflict. The micro-cultural level alone as a basis for all content selections evokes questions: such as: what music culture constitutes students' everyday experiences, who should decide what is relevant, and by what criteria? The paradigm has macro-cultural ambitions, but these are not primarily the shapers of educational content, since the main goal is to respect individual students' conditions. However, the overall democratic ambition within this position raises questions about what music culture students should be socialized into, and how acceptance for (and meetings with) diverse subcultures can be achieved.

In didactic research, there has been much interest in the idea of students' everyday experiences and their individualization, in particular when it comes to questions concerning learning and motivation. From the perspective of more superordinate matters of democracy, Nordic music pedagogy research during the past few years has widened the research questions to include those about the relationship between didactic starting points in student local culture and the potential in education to develop tolerance and understanding between different groups and cultures. This is, not least, about the social and cultural diversity in society and how schools can contribute to people's possibilities of living together as democratically equal and culturally

different.²¹ To what extent does micro-cultural content close to students lead to meetings of different experiences and perspectives? To what extent, and in what pedagogical contexts, could this didactic strategy create segregating tendencies instead? This critical discussion builds on students' personal and music experiences as the primary starting point for educational content. The ambition to generate inclusion becomes problematic when music pedagogical studies from countries where this is the case show how repertoires in different schools are very local in nature. When certain genres, pre-knowledge, and interests, but also ways of working musically, are being excluded, it leads to issues about ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic class. To be clear, we can in a very simplified and generalized way describe the problem as follows: music education in white middle-class areas is dominated by white, male, and guitar-based rock, whereas hip hop is given a larger space in immigrant-dense areas. The ethno-didactic paradigm criticizes ethno-centrism and a Western canon, but one wonders if micro-cultural and student-centered methods are as narrow musically, albeit with more popular culture content. In countries where Western music heritage and music theory knowledge is the focus of music education, didactic and philosophical research questions about democracy, inclusion, culture, and sub-culture become both different and similar.

We ask ourselves for example if it is even possible—in any educational context, let alone in music education with ethno-didactic ambitions—to limit “culture” to musical culture and artistic expressions or to what people create to give meaning and context in social life. Is it, in other words, possible to refer to “cultural tolerance” only as respect for shifting musical identities, without ideas about how this relates to boundaries between and within different groups of people, or groups like young and old, men and women, rich and poor? Culture meetings can lead to conflicts and tensions, and today's pluralist society thus evokes a number of (music-didactic)

questions that demand socially sustainable answers. The demographic development (the intercultural ambitions of society and school) is one reason why multi-culturalism is so intensely discussed in our current society, but it is also a reason why it has made its way into the didactic research agenda.

Questions also connect to the education-political discourse of “usefulness.” Schools can be a meeting ground where young people can create connections and meaning and where questions can be asked from a new angle through a combination of aesthetic, ethical, and empirical perspectives. When much points toward an overriding of aesthetic perspectives, philosophical and music-pedagogical reflections are called for that can systematically examine the commonalities and differences in music education around the world. We need to address philosophically “multiplicities and pluralities,”²² or commonalities and differences in music education internationally. As philosophers, we can discuss and critique ideas and practices within various linguistic and cultural traditions but also seek to exceed these traditions in a common discourse.

The Challenge Didactic Position and Its Challenges

In the challenge didactic paradigm, questions are focused on what are the next generation needs in order to deal with the challenges that society faces. Both ethno-didactics and challenge didactics are society-oriented and interested in conditions for and development of democracy. Both positions take into account local traditions and subcultures, but the educational content choice according to challenge didactics starts out with the large themes of ideology and morality. The intent is to strengthen students’ future opportunities to lead a good life and to take part in general improvement of the world. The thematized societal challenges—ecological, economic, ethical philosophical—are complicated and complex. As a starting point, the paradigm is not

subject specific, but it accommodates opportunities for specific subjects to qualify the thematic work in relation to music, for example. As such, the perspective can indeed be anchored in a core subject didactic way of thinking.

When a complex theme such as democracy is being used to examine the relationship between individuals and society based on a music perspective, discussions may involve culture politics, the conditions, use, and functions of music, or power-relations in music industry and music culture. There is a risk that educational content called for in an area only becomes intellectually articulated, whereas the critical aspect is not expressed in the actual music-making. We argue that also the ways of working with music can, and have to, be understood as didactic content matter.

A starting point for our argument is that education always takes place in a historical and cultural context. People develop knowledge and understanding through obtaining and interpreting existing impressions in a society. We, as individuals, are born in a particular place and grow up in a particular social environment. It is in this context that we learn to speak, think, and understand. Our expectations in life and our view of other people, groups, and cultures begin to form. Didactics therefore highlight the fact that most educational processes often involve *more* than simply *learning of knowledge*.

A historical and cultural context means that some political and moral meaning is attached to educational content. School is a place for socialization and the transfer of norms and values. It contributes towards the construction of collective identities, social interactions, and roles. Children, young people, teachers—people of all ages—filter their impressions through their own experiences and often in a way that confirms what we already think we know about the world. In many ways, we have not achieved increased social and cultural diversity despite increased

geographical movement and media-related opportunities in our everyday life to meet other people, countries, and musical influences.

These socializing processes, however, do not mean that we have to remain stuck in taken-for-granted ideas about our world, or with our associations between certain music and a certain social group, life-style, geographical place, political ideas, or anything else. On the contrary, it means that schools and ethical philosophical research has an important task to identify, raise awareness, question, and counteract such ideas.

Music education is a part of students' music cultural socialization where repertoires and ways of working are important for challenging and preserving different power structures relating to gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic class. A hidden, or rather, tacit curriculum as well as music conventions are therefore factors that one needs to consider when deciding, discussing, and studying perceptions of what an education built on a critical foundation could contain, and why.

From a critical, socially oriented perspective, music education work and philosophical as well as empirical music pedagogy studies can question ways of working and relationships such as educational content and repertoires based on matters of equality. A critical examination of, for example, how gender power structures take shape within music education and music industry is thus not only about their discursive constructions or about discussing them in education. It can also include studying and raising awareness of the problematic relationships between musical practices and culturally colored associations about masculine and feminine.

So far, we have presented and closely examined three basic positions respectively. In the following section, we will relate them to each other, mainly through focusing on questions about time and context. In this next section, we aim to show how rich and fruitful Nielsen's *Bildung*-

theoretical didactics is, according to our understanding, but also how it can be a progressive perspective for challenge didactic reflection.

Critical-Constructive Didactics

Bildung-theoretical didactics exist in a dialectic field of tension between more or less common values and the self-reflection of free agents, that is, individual growth and the *Bildung* process. As such, it is possible to see how *Bildung*-theoretical didactics searches for content, based on two interacting aspects: *Bildung* as role model and goal, and *Bildung* as a free, infinite process.²³ Viewed from this perspective, we can understand basic subject didactics and challenge didactics as colored by cultivating mutual aims, whereas ethno-didactics is colored by the idea of the learners, their everyday experiences, and personal life. Existential didactics, which we have not explained further in this text, is based on the idea of people as beings and art as a symbolic form of cultural life expressions. In this way, the basic foundation can be described as influenced by what is cultivating, deeply human, ahistorical, and the things we have in common. At the same time, there is music in our lives with a potential to contribute to the shaping of individual and cultural identities. Music as a route to articulate subjective and existential emotions can therefore in pedagogical action lead to a paradigm domination by individual self-expression and the personal, local life. We are using this as an example so as to remind us of what we mentioned in the beginning: that didactic questions about educational content cannot easily be analyzed from the basic positions *alone*. Pedagogical action and its motivations is complex and the paradigm is combined with aspects such as views on the subject, views on music as a phenomenon, current discourses, and context.

Nielsen is clear about the fact that the dialectic position should not contain competing elements or any aspects that are treated as separate. The didactic basic positions are not suggestions of separate routes for teaching and learning. On the contrary, they are perspectives that taken together give a tension-filled didactic teaching situation. The issue of content in this sense is particularly interesting, since content according to *Bildung*-theoretical didactics should be selected and treated in a way that encourages the idea of *Bildung*. Thus, the teacher should be starting with the aim of *Bildung* in order to relate to the basic positions. In the long term, music education then becomes a means for the overall goal of *Bildung*. At the same time, Nielsen made no particular distinction between music and *Bildung*. “Musical *Bildung*” can be understood as a *Bildung*-theoretical position, yet at the same time a dialectic, where music and *Bildung* are inseparable aspects for music didactic work.

Nielsen’s didactic approach is however not only a *Bildung*-theoretical position, it is also critical on at least two levels. Among the didactic basic positions, a socio-challenge didactics is clearly influenced by critical theory, such as that defined by the Frankfurt school of thought, and later integrated in didactic theory forming. Music is viewed in light of this position as a phenomenon in society and music education as a possible arena for criticizing features in society. At the same time as pointing out the relevance of a critical theoretical aspect of music education, Nielsen also warned about the risk of letting intellectual activities be conducted at the expense of the view of the music subject as an aesthetic subject for aesthetic activities. The music subject should not be reduced to knowledge about music based on explanatory “beyond music” models. Regardless of this approach, Nielsen took a very limited, yet still normative positioning toward didactic positions. One could say that his critical approach included being skeptical (on a meta-level) toward normative ideas and didactic, descriptive theories. Instead, Nielsen chose an

analytical approach where theory mainly consisted of models of the conditions in music education.

Both characteristics (the *Bildung*-theoretical and the critical approach), however, are also related to a third one: the fact that Nielsen's didactics are not only *Bildung*-theoretical but all-in-all critical-constructive. Nielsen's didactic theory is influenced by a *Bildung*-theoretical perspective with critical elements which does not stop at research questions. It also gives a set of conceptions, which in a constructive way, seeks to bridge the gap between theory and practice.²⁴ As such, Nielsen may well be in line with what Klafki has defined as the main points in critical-constructive didactics, namely to unite the *Bildung*-concepts, the socio-critical perspective, and the creation of a didactic theory that includes theory and practice. Taken altogether, Nielsen's didactics can thus be interpreted as an expression of critical-constructive didactics.

Philosophical Didactics

Nielsen's didactics may be understood as critical-constructive in their approach, but his deed can also be viewed as pointing toward philosophical didactics. The crucial point is the content issue of *what*. Already in the early 1800s, the *what* question that states the goal of *Bildung* in practical philosophy (ethics) is marked differently in empirical works in didactics,²⁵ compared with psychology, which was associated with the issue of *how* and the methods of teaching. The inclusion of philosophical questions is also reflected in later didactic models²⁶ where the aim of education is included within the framework of didactics as well as within pedagogical philosophy. A common feature between philosophy and didactics is thus the intimate relationship between the content of education and its aims. Therefore, the potential

contribution of philosophy in philosophical didactic research is to highlight meaning-related aspects within the area of didactics.

Nielsen argued that philosophical music didactics should rest on two empirical pillars: musicology (and its study object, music) and the direction within pedagogy toward *Bildung* and the education of people. Neither one can be excluded if music pedagogical philosophy is to emerge, remain, and develop. It is through this blend that we can understand the actual meaning of “musical *Bildung*,” but it is also through this that we can understand Nielsen’s philosophical starting point for how the didactic basic positions can be defined. Basic subject didactics, ethno-didactics, challenge didactics, and philosophical anthropological didactics are all resting on two pillars: one that sees music as a natural and/or social phenomenon, and the other that has its basis in *Bildung* and education. For example, core subject didactic questions are doubly philosophical in the sense that the concept of music needs to be examined from a music philosophical or an aesthetic perspective, united with questions on basic pedagogical views.²⁷

Another aspect of philosophical didactics is research that shows how didactic approaches relate to philosophical routes and routes within the history of ideas.²⁸ Many ideas that influence current music didactics can be connected to historical perspectives on music and music education. Through these historical perspectives, we can obtain a wider and deeper understanding of the current discussions surrounding music education. Current music pedagogical ideas, however, can also become the object for reflection in relation to future approaches. It is the role of philosophy, not least critically oriented philosophy, to also mirror what is current from the perspective of a possible future. In this sense, we would like to connect with Nielsen’s description of three types of reality: intended reality, actually occurring or realized reality, and possible reality.²⁹ There is a music pedagogical reality existing here and now

in our classrooms, which is often being empirically researched. This actually occurring reality does constitute a basis for philosophical studies, but perhaps it is still the intended as well as the possible reality that mainly deals with philosophical issues.

First, based on a didactic understanding, the actually occurring reality is preceded by an intended reality. This reality contains plans for teaching and learning and is as such a matter of curriculum. Curriculum, widely speaking, also contains an element of underlying philosophy. A curriculum, as a text, rests on a pedagogical discourse with historical roots. In order to understand the current curriculum and its underlying meaning, we should thus seek a historical-philosophical explanation. We can also, through Nielsen, combine studies in the history of ideas with the aim of understanding today's society, and connect them with studies in a grey area between two contexts; the intended and the realized.

Second, philosophy can also reflect on what is actually occurring in relation to a possible reality. Philosophical didactics can pose questions of what music education could be like, instead of lingering around issues of what music education is currently like or the intentions that are influencing what education should contain. This perspective raises the question of the *why* of teaching. When adopting a philosophical approach, we do not need to limit ourselves to issues of what is possible in terms of content and aims. We can instead aspire to think the un-thinkable. The un-thinkable means here the potential, which exists beyond operative ideologies and claims of legitimacy and which is really only possible when thinking freely. With this argument, we do not wish to extol an elitist standpoint, but rather illustrate the existing need to strive for a critical-emancipatory approach. "[I]t will always be possible from philosophical perspectives to ask new critical and critical-constructive questions about the past, current reality, and future possibilities."³⁰

Bildung-Theoretical Didactics in the Field of Tension between the Individual and the Communal

As described above, we view Nielsen's *Bildung*-theoretical didactics as critical-constructive on the one hand, since *Bildung* and a socio-critical perspective are united. On the other hand, music didactics' philosophical dimensions unite the empirical fields of musicology (with the music phenomenon as the object of study) and pedagogy. Nielsen pointed to the value of critical-theoretical aspects in music pedagogical activities, but also emphasized that the subject of music must not be reduced to explanatory models where music is necessarily viewed as conceptually and verbally defined. He gave this field of tension a great deal of attention and the main issue can be described as the relation between *ars* and *didactica*, between the spirit of art and linguistic articulations, between music practice and analytic descriptions. The perspectives interact, but teachers' understanding and accentuation of these aspects have consequences for how the music subject is profiled. To develop these issues further would move us too far away from the basic positions that we are focusing on here, and we must therefore leave the issues open to readers and their own considerations, but it is essential to highlight the fact that the most central issue for Nielsen was the issue of how didactic reflection can contribute to understanding and experience of what is aesthetically or musically relevant.

However, we would like to spend some time on a closely related issue. Many of the challenges described in relation to the didactic basic positions may seem to point toward pedagogical theory or social science theory, rather than toward humanistic understanding and philosophical questioning. The question, then, is how philosophical and humanistic perspectives can be united with critical questions regarding current issues that include ideology. Put differently; we argue that *Bildung*-theoretical didactics do not only involve *Bildung* theory, nor

only pedagogical or didactic theory, but that these relate to each other in a theory of science, and how they do so.

The idea of *Bildung* has an immensely important place within didactic theory in order to avoid seeing learning as only an internal, psychological matter or something that can be solved through rational organizing processes of teaching and learning neatly systematized content. This could mean that we also speak of content as having a particular and allocated meaning. Learning viewed as a process of *Bildung* can instead be understood as a subject-oriented and contextually bound process, influenced by unexpected moments, sharp turns, departures, and this radical new orientation.

From this perspective, it would be easy to imagine that the subjective dimension of *Bildung* limits the *Bildung*-theoretical didactics in time and space—also as a perspective for philosophical pedagogical research. That is not what we claim. Not least, Nielsen himself pointed to this, by highlighting the combination of didactics and *Bildung*; connecting pedagogical theoretical and philosophical reflection. We also argue that there is a space in the field of tension between the subjective *Bildung* process, more or less local contexts, and the common aspects in a more limited context, as well as in a wider one.

There are several interpretations of *Bildung*, which throughout the centuries have been expressed in European education; the classical German approach that has taken its ideas from Kant and Humboldt: “liberal education” where German ideas of *Bildung* have been transformed within the Anglo-Saxon world, and the hermeneutic ideas of learning that have mainly been influenced by Gadamer and Ricoeur. The main thread in the latter is the relation between the familiar and the unfamiliar, the fact that we as humans interpret and understand what is different from the perspective of our life worlds. Expressed in the ideas of Hegel, we see ourselves in the

foreign and see the foreign in ourselves. In this *Bildung* concept lies a metaphor of the *Bildung* process as a journey³¹: “We depart from home, travel the world to meet the unknown and come back home again, still the same yet changed.”³²

A main idea in classical *Bildung* is that a single person becomes educated through experiencing the collective experiences of all human beings, but this is often limited to a Western cultural heritage. *Bildung* is often associated with the past, to general education, to a set of classical works, and as something elitist. The individual person is changed in a process that takes place through the meeting between now and then, but also through thoughts about the future. By using hermeneutic *Bildung* concepts, this can be expressed as meetings between different experiences or horizons of meaning. This means that meetings between experiences as a challenge didactic *Bildung* concept do not only deal with then, now, and later, but can also be formulated as a meeting between different (sub)cultures, in a geographical and spatial, artistic and human sense. The *Bildung* concept can thus be widened in such a way that it is not limited to the past, Western culture, or male hegemony. Herein lies also an opportunity to cross dualist perspectives like “us and them,” the individual and the common, the particular and the universal, or art and intellect.

We argue that didactic *Bildung* theory can deal with the more societal and shared challenges outlined above through the basic positions, especially when it takes into account the humanistic and democratic dimensions that *Bildung* does involve. In such a critical philosophical perspective, the subjective dimension of learning can meet a socially oriented perspective and explore what happens in the meeting between different musical, social or cultural experiences; between artistic expressions from different places and times; between various notions and ideas, or between different forms of knowledge.

This should not be understood as idealistic. Education takes place in a historical and cultural context. Cultures—musical as well as social—are always particular in some sense as they develop and give local meaning. At the same time, we must also be aware of the criticism that has been directed towards a speech on these differences as diversity—and “multiculture as dialogical meetings”—as it can create stereotyped perceptions about different groups.

In other words; in order to cross the individual and the common, or the local and the general, it is of course not enough to vaguely speak of meetings between experiences or meetings between art and language. We need philosophical and theoretical didactic knowledge as well as tools for critical societal analysis. Therefore, we see opportunities in the *Bildung*-theoretical didactics to first, explore what happens in the gaps between the familiar and unfamiliar, for example in students’ meetings between different types of micro and macro cultures, between the individual person and others, between critical reflection of musical experiences and for example equality issues that can come to be expressed in musical practices. Second, we also see how meetings between pedagogical theory forming and humanistic *Bildung* ideas become productive in such studies, at the same time as this combination has the potential for further development. With such approaches, questions about the role of music for development of people’s humanistic features can be studied from the phenomenon itself, and also be related to, for example, issues of democracy, multiculturalism, and a globalized society undergoing change.

We argue, not least, that such perspectives are crucial when aesthetic education and *Bildung* are being challenged in the current climate in education politics. When for example issues of education quality are connected to quantitative quality control, assessment issues can appear as a particularly pressing research perspective. Using Nielsen’s own words, it is “common that threatened subjects tend to justify their existence with something that has higher

status than the subject itself and its content.”³³ Assessment matters are not unimportant, but the questions and approaches that are being chosen by researchers have also—in themselves—the potential to challenge dominating thought structures. As philosophers, we can critique ideas and practices and sustain the work of philosophical reflection in music education.

Alongside Nielsen, we argue for the timeliness of the didactics, and at the same time we do not wish to reduce the potential of music and art in education and *Bildung*. However, didactic questions and reflecting insights into the value of art may “perhaps also contribute to new opportunities for expression within the area of art.”³⁴

Notes

¹ Eva Georgii-Hemming, “Meeting the Challenges in Music Teacher Education,” in *Professional Knowledge in Music Teacher Education*, edited by Eva Georgii-Hemming, Pamela Burnard, and Sven-Erik Holgersen (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 203–213.

² See also Marja Heimonen, in this issue of *PMER*, and Sven-Erik Nordenbo, “*Bildung* and the Thinking of *Bildung*,” *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36, no. 3 (2002): 342–352.

³ Ian Westbury, Stefan Hopmann, and Kurt Riquarts, eds., *Teaching as a Reflective Practice: the German Didaktik Tradition* (Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2000).

⁴ Ibid., 2000

⁵ Nordenbo, “*Bildung*,” 342–352.

⁶ Lee S. Shulman, “Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New reform,” *Harvard Educational Research* 57 (1987): 1–22; Lee S. Shulman, “Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching,” *Educational Researcher*, 15: 2 (1986): 4–14.

⁷ Pamela Lynn Grossman, *The Making of a Teacher: Teacher Knowledge and Teacher Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1990).

⁸ Wolfgang Klafki, *Dannelsessteori og didaktik: nye studier*. 2nd ed. (Århus: Klim, 2002).

⁹ Westbury, Hopmann, and Riquarts.

¹⁰ Frede V. Nielsen, *Almen Musikdidaktik* [General didactics] (1998), 31.

¹¹ Ibid., 36.

¹² Ibid., 31.

¹³ See also Monika Nerland, “Civic and Professional Responsibility in New Landscapes of Knowledge,” *Utbildning & Demokrati* 17, no. 2 (2008): 123–130.

¹⁴ For example: *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, edited by Lorin W. Anderson and David R. Kratwohl, (New York, NY: Longman, 2001); Jürgen Baumert, Mareike Kunter, Werner Blum, Martin Brunner, Thamar Voss, Alexander Jordan, Uta Klusmann, Stefan Krauss, Michael Neubrand, Yi-Miau Tsai, “Teachers’ Mathematical Knowledge, Cognitive Activation in the Classroom, and Student Progress,” *American Educational Research Journal* 47, no. 1, (2010): 133–180; Donald Boyd, Pamela L. Grossman, Hamilton Lankford, Susanna Loeb, and James Wyckoff, “Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 31, no. 4 (2009): 416–440.

¹⁵ See for example Richard Shavelson, “On the Measurement of Competency,” *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training* 2, no. 1 (2010): 82–103; Lee S. Shulman, “Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New reform,” *Harvard Educational Research* 57 (1987): 1–22; Franz E. Weinert, “A Concept of Competence: A Conceptual Clarification,” in

Defining and Selecting Key Competences, eds. Dominique Simone Rychen and Laura Hersh Salganik (Göttinge, Germany: Hogrefe, 2001), 45–65.

¹⁶ See for example Anders Jakobsson, Åsa Mäkitalo, and Roger Säljö, “Learning to Reason in the Context of Socioscientific Problems: Exploring the Demands on Students in ‘New’ Classroom,” in eds. Kristiina Kumpulainen, Cindy Hmelo-Silver, and Margarida César, *Investigating Classroom Interaction: Methodologies in Action* (Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 2009).

¹⁷ See also Heimonen, “Response to Frede V. Nielsen, Didactology as a Field of Theory and Research in Music Education,” *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13, no. 1 (2005): 98-102.

¹⁸ Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1942) and *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art Developed from Philosophy in a New Key* (London and Henley, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953).

¹⁹ See also Geir Johansson, “Fagdidaktikk som basis- og undervisningsfag. Bidrag til et teoretisk grunnlag for studier av utdanningskvalitet,” *Nordic Research in Music Education Yearbook* 8 (2006): 115–135; Ingrid Hanken, and Geir Johansen, *Musikkundervisningens didaktikk*, 2nd ed. (Oslo: Cappelen Damm akademisk, 2013).

²⁰ E.g. *Recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council of 18 December 2006 on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning*; UNESCO (2005). *Towards Knowledge Societies*, <http://www.unesco.org/publications>.

²¹ See Eva Georgii-Hemming and Maria Westvall, “Music Education—A Personal Matter? Examining the Current Discourses of Music Education in Sweden,” *British Journal of Music Education* 27, Special Issue 01 (2010): 21–33.

²² Maxine Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

²³ Bernt Gustavsson, ed., *Bildningens förvandlingar* (Göteborg: Daidalos, 2007).

²⁴ Nielsen's *Almen musikdidaktik* (1998) is possibly the best example of this.

²⁵ Through the German philosopher and educator Johann Freidrich Herbart (1776-1841) and his two works *Allgemeine Pädagogik* (1806) and *Umriss pädagogischer Vorelesungen* (1835). One of the most developed early books on didactics is arguably *Didactica magna*, which was created 1628–30 by Johan Amos Comenius in his mother tongue, and was made public in 1657 for a Latin-speaking audience. The book became significant for Rousseau and Pestalozzi and thus also for the modern pedagogy.

²⁶ E.g., in a didactic model from 1969 by Carl Aage Larsen, cf. Gundem 2011, Klafki 1998.

²⁷ Ellen Krogh and Nielsen, eds., "Sammenlignende fagdidaktik 2," *CURSIV* 9 (Aarhus Universitet: Institut for Uddannelse og Pedagogik, 2012).

²⁸ See e.g., Tomas Kroksmark and Thorbjörn Johansson, "Teachers' intuition-in-action: How teachers experience action," *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives* 5:3 (2004): 357–381; Øivind Varkøy, *Hvorfor musikk?: en musikkpedagogisk idéhistorie* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1993).

²⁹ Frede V. Nielsen, "Den musikpædagogiske forskningens territorium: Hovedbegreber og distinktioner i genstandsfeltet," ["The territory of musico-pedagogical research: Principal concepts and distinctions in the object area"] *Nordic Research in Music Education Yearbook* 2 (1997): 155–176; Frede V. Nielsen 2006, "A View on the Future of an International Philosophy of Music Education: A Plea for a Comparative Strategy," *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, volume 14, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 7–14.

³⁰ Nielsen 2006, 14.

³¹ Such as for example in Peter Kemp, *Världsmédborgaren: politisk och pedagogisk filosofi för det 21 århundradet* (Göteborg: Daidalos, 2005).

³² Gustavsson, *Bildningens förvandlingar*.

³³ Nielsen, final lecture June 2012. Authors' free translation. In original: "Det er en almindelig tendens, (...) at skolefag, som føler sig truet på sin eksistens, har tilbøjelighed til at begrunde sig med noget andet end selve faget og dets indhold. Nemlig med noget, som har højere aktuel status i den almene bevidsthed." <http://vimeo.com/44644835>

³⁴ Ibid. Authors' translation

Pre-print version