

Andreas Lehmann-Wermser

Markus Csovljecsek, Madelaine Zulauf (eds.) (2018): *Integrated Music Education. Challenges of Teaching and Teacher Training*. Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang. 418 pp., 29 fig. b/w, 2 tables

The Swizz scholars Madelaine Zulauf and Markus Csovljecsek have edited a book documenting a conference in 2008 of music educators from a variety of fields. They focus on the attempt to encompass various subjects and their specific ways to work and think along with music. Hence, “Integrated Music Education” (abbreviated *ime* from now on) refers more to the everyday teaching of music than to a scholarly discourse. *ime* is the work of a decade. It presents 17 chapters by 18 authors from 7 countries most of whom are internationally known for their deep and lasting engagement for improvements in practical teaching of music though this may not necessarily have been in a school context. One important question that rises from the very title is whether “integrated” is meant as concept for teaching in classrooms, i.e. as a philosophy of music or “didactical” concept, or rather as concept for the academic discipline, i.e. as a scholarly perspective. We will return to this later on. Reviewing an edited volume one is forced to shed spotlights on some chapters, neglecting or omitting others.

Thus, while we skip the introduction by Swizz educational scholar Künzli to focus on Cslovjecsek’s and Zulauf’s ground laying chapter. While there are other approaches that attempt to find communalities between the arts in school (Clark, 1985; Kindler, 1987; more elaborated but in German Dethlefs-Forsbach, 2008) the authors follow a more encompassing approach. *ime* is considered to be an alternative to the old division of learning in and through the arts. By formulating fundamental principles common to all arts the boundaries are not only transgressed but rather become meaningless. They are no longer borders that need to be overcome but mere conventions that dissolve if one follows *ime*. School then, needs reorganize to “allow students (...) to set up their own integrated learning processes” (p. 56). But not only asks *ime* for a rather radical change in the school system but also calls for reconsidering the concepts of music as we teach it. If for instance, periodicity constitutes a basic principle of music (as well as of math and physics) then the content of lessons needs to be reformulated. Curricula and material have to follow (p. 63). Maybe this is the true challenge of the book to reconsider music lessons in a more encompassing way,

The well known dichotomy of music education “in” and “through” music is discussed both in a historical perspective and in systematic considerations. To them a synthesis is feasible by a “reciprocal relationship between these two”. They demonstrate this by giving an overview over various countries but the questions remain how this goal can be achieved. Therefore, the next steps and chapters need to demonstrate that. Frits Evelein’s chapter on “Cooperative Learning in Music: Music Education and the Psychology of Integration” (p. 137ff.) is such a step ahead. Indeed, it seems very convincing that the new approach to teaching in general also asks for new form of organizing lessons and new methods. Frits Evelein has given many workshops in different music lessons throughout Europe. His ideas may not be specific only to Cslovjecsek’s and Zulauf’s conception but they fit in very well and contribute to *ime*’s relevance.

While the chapter of Zulauf and Cslovjecsek is enlightening and clear all chapters following have to stand up to that standard – and not all do. Jane Russell’s may well be a fascinating art project but it is hardly about *ime* although different arts are involved. There is actually very

little music in it. And some passages on Brazilian culture neither take respect to more complex race and gender relations (p. 80f.) nor do they recognize regional folk traditions ("Bumba meu boi"). Pesch's chapter on Indian music (p. 91ff.) seems not really new, Richardsen's is not student centered which is declared to be a core intention if *ime*.

It is a strength of the book to link theory and practice. Step 3 and 4 are therefore designed to help teachers actually try out and conduct *ime*. Some examples go as far as to present ready-to-use material (pp.264ff.) which is helpful to teachers. These sections also document the troubles of transposing sophisticated concepts into the classroom. Reacting personally to Varèse, meaningful as it may be, does not automatically lead to an "understanding of the arts of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century" (p. 270). It appears that the editors had their experiences and doubts, too, so they comment on the difficulties (p. 278). That indeed helps and shows their experience and a clear sense of what they can expect from teachers and what obstacles these will face. The book is certainly an interesting approach. The "steps" can bridge the gap between scholars and teachers. Many will read it as an interesting new way of teaching by its broad approach and its rich variety that can well be integrated into national frameworks or individual school's practice.

We asked about the nature of the *ime* whether it could best be understood as a new philosophy of music and as a method or a scholarly concept. The editors lean toward the former. Following this, we need to ask what is new compared to, for instance, Austrian Wolfgang Roscher's "Polyästhetische Erziehung" (1976) or Dethlefs-Forsbach (2008)? It appears that the focus is much broader. Embedded in schools and the school system *ime* offers a new perspective by the inclusion of the school's perspective. Teacher's may find the book too ambitious and may not be able to follow the basic approach. Language barriers may keep them away but also their desire for ready-to-use examples including audio and visual material which is presented but scarce. Also, the fact that systemic constraints are only touched (and cannot be covered solidly in an international publication) may impede implementation. Professionalization has come a long way since 2008; therefore, some of the approaches no longer appear that new. But the book may serve to inject new topics to enrich the music curriculum.

Although the authors clearly point at the difficulties to place *ime* in a neo-liberal world (which would even more be true in the English-speaking or Southeast Asian countries) a major question remains unanswered, that is how subject specific techniques and elements of knowledge find room and appreciation within newly conceived school structures, especially at a time when the playing and singing gains ground in many countries. Thus, the book calls out loud for a follow up how implement its approach and how to transpose its ideas into everyday teaching. The development of digital learning platforms that has taken place since would offer rich possibilities. Maybe there is more to hear from *ime* in the future.

## References

Dethlefs-Forsbach, B. C. (2008): Fächerübergreifender Musikunterricht. Konzeption und Modelle für die Unterrichtspraxis. Augsburg: Wißner

Kindler, A. M. (1987). A Review of Rationales for Integrated Arts Programs". *Studies in Art Education*. **29**: 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1320456> [2020-10-25]

Clark, G. (1985). "Integrated Art Education". *Art Education*. **38**: 4. Online available <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3192867> [2020-10-31]

Roscher, Wolfgang (Hg.) (1976): Polyästhetische Erziehung: Klänge - Texte - Bilder - Szenen. Theorien und Modelle zur pädagogischen Praxis. Köln: DuMont Schauberg (DuMont Aktuell).

*Andreas Lehmann-Wermser*