MEMT 813: HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF MUSIC EDUCATION  
Spring 2014  
(Wed. 6 - 8:50 PM)

PROFESSOR: James F. Daugherty  
(email: jdaugher@ku.edu)  
Office: 448 Murphy Hall  
Office Hrs: Mon Noon-1:00 p.m., Thurs 2:00-3:00 p.m., or by appointment

GRADUATE ASSISTANT: Melissa L. Grady  
576 Murphy Hall  
(email: melissalgrady@gmail.com)

COURSE WEBSITE: http://people.ku.edu/~jdaugher (user name and password are both "dinky" for protected materials)

PURPOSE: The purposes of this course are (a) to introduce ideas, people, and events that inform the history and philosophy of Western music education, particularly in the North American context, and (b) to acquaint students with tools of philosophical and historical inquiry appropriate for their ongoing engagement with music education as reflective practitioners and as graduate student researchers.

TEXTS: Required:


Other readings as distributed or assigned from the course web site.

**Recommended:**


**HEADS UP:** This graduate course requires considerable reading, along with discriminating reflection, writing, and discussion. Students who know themselves to be averse to such work should not enroll.

**NOTE:** The Academic Achievement and Access Center (AAAC) coordinates academic accommodations and services for all eligible KU students with disabilities. If you have a disability for which you wish to request accommodations and have not contacted the AAAC, please do so as soon as possible. They are located in 22 Strong Hall and can be reached at 785-864-4064 (V/TTY). Information about their services can be found at [http://www.disability.ku.edu](http://www.disability.ku.edu). Please contact me privately in regard to your
needs in this course. Please also contact Dr. Daugherty privately in regard to your needs in this course.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

1. **Logic Assignment**
   Complete given exercises on ingredients of logical arguments.

2. **Written Evaluation Handouts**
   Complete two evaluation handouts (Possession/Arnold & Gould book).

3. **Article or Book Review**
   
   Master's level students will select, read, analyze/review, and do a 15 minute class presentation on one article from either *The Journal of Historical Research in Music Education*, *The Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, or *Philosophy of Education*; or a philosophical or historical study from *The Journal of Research in Music Education* or the *Bulletin of the Council of Research in Music Education*. Permission of the instructor is needed to use an article from any journal not here mentioned.

   The topic of your article should be one that complements the structure of the course by introducing material or aspects of material not fully covered in the texts of the course, or by enlarging upon the materials of the course. The wise student will select an article that can also be used to some extent in the historical or philosophical projects of the course.

   Your in-class presentation will follow this format: Presentation of information (5-7 minutes); An analysis of methodology (How well did this author do history or do philosophy?) (4-5 minutes); Discussion of the overall context and meaning of this material in the history and/or philosophy of music education (3-5 minutes). You should provide hand-outs for the class. Be sure to include author, title, and publication data. You may wish to employ audio, visual, and/or technological aids.

   Doctoral students will select, analyze/critically review, and do a 20 minute class presentation on one of the suggested books related to philosophy/history of music education.

   Articles and books should be selected as soon as possible, but not later than the third class meeting. First come, first served. Emailing the instructor the title, author, and publication data (journal, publisher, year, etc.) of the article or book you wish to present reserves that work for you. Presentation times will be assigned, as much as possible, to relate the subject matter of your article/book to the topics of particular class meetings. Provide a handout to class colleagues. Leave some time at the end of your presentation for questions/discussion.

4. **Small-Scale Historical Research Paper**
   
   This paper is a small-scale historical investigation. You might consider using a document or artifact from the Spencer Research Library Shull Collection. You may negotiate with
the instructor use of other primary sources, if you have in mind already another kind of historical project. For doctoral students whose final paper in this course will be an historical investigation, this small paper may be an initial step toward the larger term paper. Full details for this paper are discussed in the appendix to this syllabus.

5. **Weekly Discussion Postings**

**REFLECTIONS:** For roughly the second half of the course, all students will post weekly one observation, question, discussion starter, or pertinent comment related to EACH of the assigned readings for that week. For several weeks, your reflections should be divided into these major categories: Elliott, Reimer, Other. For the two weeks when we consider only one book (Small, Laine), post according to first half of book and second half of book. These postings must be made prior to 4 P.M. each Wednesday, and will be used as starting points for each week’s in-class discussions.

6. **N=4 Short Critical Analysis Papers**

Rather than do one philosophy paper, class members will write four 2-page critical reflection papers. Full details for these short papers are discussed in the appendix to this syllabus.

7. **Competency Quiz**

All students will pass with a score of 85 or above a competency quiz on identification and chronology of major events, people, and key concepts relative to the development of music education in the United States. This quiz will be drawn primarily, though not exclusively, from the “Key Terms” identified for each reading assignment from the Mark text.

8. **Final Exam or Term Paper**

Doctoral students will write a term paper of approximately 15-20 pages, reflecting historical and/or philosophical research. If it best meets the student’s goals, this paper, with permission of the instructor, may take the form of an historiographic essay or review of literature.

Doctoral students who may wish to use the term paper as the basis of a doctoral competency project are advised that requirements for the term paper and the competency project differ. It is possible, for instance, to write a fine term paper that satisfies the requirements of this course, yet is not quite up to par for a publishable doctoral project. While the term paper can indeed be used as a draft of the doctoral project, typically the competency project requires further consultation, work, and revision beyond this course. At the same time, however, doctoral students should note that with careful selection of topic and planning, the term paper for this course can advance them considerably toward completion of the doctoral project.
Paper proposals are due by the date specified on the course calendar. The proposal should consist of a purpose statement, specific research questions, and a working bibliography (divided into two parts: primary sources, secondary sources).

Students writing the term paper are invited to consult periodically with the instructor on their progress. If it can be accomplished in timely fashion, i.e. sufficient turn-around time, the instructor is willing to read and offer suggestions on the first draft.

Master's students may elect to do the term paper in lieu of the final exam.

The final exam is an opportunity to synthesize and reflect broadly on the work of the course. It consists of four discussion questions, two of which will be completed “open book” and “open notes” prior to the exam day. The other two questions will be taken from a longer list of questions provided to students during the final weeks of the course.

**ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION:**

Final course grades will be determined by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation (Attendance, Contributions to class discussions/activities)</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic Assignment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Evaluation Handouts (N=2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Research Paper</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=4 Critical Reflection Papers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Quiz</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Review/Presentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review/Presentation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Discussion Board Postings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>---*</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Master's students may elect to do a term paper instead of the final exam (the paper will still be worth 20 points); Doctoral students must do the term paper.

**GRADING SCALE:**

A = 93-100 points; B = 85-92 points; C = 77-84 points; D = 69-76 points; F = 68 points or below.

**COURSE CALENDAR & ASSIGNMENTS:** A tentative course calendar is appended to this syllabus. Also available for download from the course web site.
HISTORY RESEARCH PAPER:

This paper reports a small-scale historical project using primary sources. The Shull Collection at the Spencer Research Library is one possibility for such sources. Students may negotiate with the instructor another focus, as long as primary source materials are available for such.

Choose and examine primary source document(s): correspondence, book, song collection, minutes of a meeting, diary, speech, concert programs, photograph(s), etc. Place your documents in the context of major socio-cultural and/or musical events of their time, do an analysis of them, assess their value, and share your conclusions.

The written report should be eight to ten pages long (not counting appendices and the like). But, as a general rule of thumb, the number of pages per se is not as important as whether you adequately addressed your particular argument and analysis. Depending on the project, some papers may be longer, some shorter.

Papers must be typewritten and double-spaced throughout. The style should follow Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 7th ed., revised by John Grossman and Alice Bennett (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), and use footnotes rather than parenthetical references. For purposes of this class, do not use a title page or include a separate bibliography.

You must use primary sources to construct your argument. You may use other sources (secondary or primary) as needed to advance the thesis/argument and construct your narrative. You will want to review the Storey book, the writing samples distributed in class, and other readings from the class as you plan and write this paper.

Students with defined research goals may negotiate a different focus, e.g., a historiographic essay or another type of focus, for this project if desired. Consult with the instructor as soon as possible.

Because this paper is a small-scale historical research project, avoid a grand thesis/argument. Indeed, your argument might well be in the form of a reasoned/critical proposal for future research.

A sample outline for the paper might look like this:

I. Introduction (partial page, or 1-2 pages)
   Capture your readers’ attention. Set the stage. Begin your narrative. Your main thesis/argument should be succinctly included either as part of the introduction, or soon thereafter.

II. Context (1-3 pages)
Briefly place your document/artifact in the context of some major socio-cultural, musical, and/or music education events and/or personalities of its times. Verify authenticity, etc. (2-3 pages)

III. Analysis and/or Assessment (4-5 pages)
    Advance your thesis/prove your argument by critical use of primary sources. Relate to corroborating evidence, as possible.

IV. Conclusion (1-3 pages)
    Relevance of your findings for music education or music education historiography, etc. Answer the “So what?” question.

Although you will want an introduction and conclusion to your narrative, precise construction of the other parts of your paper will depend to large degree upon the nature of your primary source and the type of argument you wish to advance.

Some sources for main sociocultural events:


Some sources for main musical events:


Metronome (1885-1961)
The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular
The Musical Quarterly (1915-present)
The Musician (1896-1948)

Some sources for main music education events:

Music Educators Journal (1934-present)
MENC Proceedings (1935-52)
Music Supervisors Journal (1914-34)
MSNC Proceedings (1910-24)
MTNA Proceedings (1876-1950)
NEA Proceedings (Music Education Department) (1884-present)
School Music (1900-36)
MEMT 813 Historical Project/Term Paper Grading Rubric:

MEMT 813
History & Philosophy of Music Education

NAME: _______________________

MEMT 813 Historical Project/Term Paper Evaluation Form

I. CONTENT-RELATED:

1. Content
   Utilizes primary sources
   Conveys a “true story about the past,” attending to
   “truth” via critical use of primary sources and
   attending to narrative or “story” via making an
   argument based on those sources
   Addresses material culture and historiography, as appropriate
   Thoughtful
   Interesting
   Significant
   Original
   Logically organized
   Relevant
   Strength of Argument
   Avoidance of logical fallacies

2. Clear statement of your purpose (main idea or thesis, argument
to be advanced)

3. Supporting information
   Appropriate primary sources for your topic
   Quality (sources, not volume of references)
   Quantity (sufficient to corroborate main points)

4. Introduction, transitions, and conclusion
   Introduction (sets the stage, articulates main thesis)
   Transitions (effective bridges from one main area to next)
   Conclusion (summarizes, brings to fitting end)

II. STYLE

5. Sentences
   Clarity (concrete nouns, strong action verbs)
   Varied in length
   Few passive voice constructions
   No one sentence paragraphs

6. Usage, punctuation, spelling
   Word usage (no contractions, no exclusive language, avoid
   first person plural, etc., etc.)
   Punctuation (two spaces after periods, commas and periods
   inside quotation marks, proper use of commas and
7. Citations 0 1 2 3 4 5
Use where needed (ends of paragraphs, except for direct quotes)
In proper form per Turabian manual (footnotes/endnotes, not APA)

8. Typography 0 1 2 3 4 5
Title page (no cover sheet, binders, folders, etc.). Simply begin the paper
or report on page with the title (all in caps, centered) and your name (upper and lower
case, centered), followed by the text. Staple the paper in the upper left-hand corner.
Margins (1.5” left, 1.25” all the rest, except 2” top margin on title page)
Pagination (bottom center on title page; top right on all the rest)
Underline or italicize
Underline or italicize all foreign language words
Spell out all numbers from one to ninety-nine
No widows (singer lines at tops of pages) or orphans (single lines at the
bottoms of pages)

9. Timeliness 0 1 2 3 4 5
Paper project turned in on time
Proposal submitted (if applicable) on time
Outline submitted (if applicable) on time
N.B. Five points per day will be deducted from the final grade for
each day the project/paper is late.

Total Points: ________

Grade:

Comments:
N=4 SHORT CRITICAL ANALYSIS PAPERS

The purpose of this series of two-page papers is to focus on an argument or proposition therein from one of the class readings each week in order to either refute or strengthen it. These papers afford you an opportunity to increase your skill in logical reasoning and analysis, i.e., to “think about the thinking” of the philosophers we read.

Here are some guidelines:

Guidelines for Critical Reflection/Analysis Paper

1. Your paper must be typed/word-processed.
2. Your paper may not exceed two pages. Whether you double-space or single-space, and where you set margins, are entirely up to you. If you single-space, please skip a line between paragraphs.
3. Use a 12-point font size.
4. Follow this format:
   Write your name in the upper right hand corner. Skip two lines.
   Write (left justified or centered) a citation of the primary passage or passages on which you are focusing. For example: Elliott, pp 73-74.
   Skip two lines, then begin the body of your paper.
   For purposes of this paper, acknowledge any quotations from the readings simply by using quotation marks followed by the page or section number in parentheses.
   Ordinarily, you will not quote secondary sources, as the purpose of this paper is to present your own thinking. However, should the need arise, use Turabian style in referencing other works.
5. Use “lean and mean” writing.
   Do not take up space telling us about the author, that thoughtful human beings have wrestled with this idea for centuries, that you had chili peppers for lunch, etc. Assume we have read the material well, and are familiar with the task of these analyses. Get right to the point.
   Write simply and directly. Avoid word splurge. My grandmother should be able to understand you. On the other hand, do not insult grandmother’s intelligence.
   No misspellings, grammatical errors, punctuation errors. This is graduate school. Proof read what you write. If feasible, also allow someone else to read your paper before submitting it.
Some common errors to avoid: Incomplete sentences. Verb/subject disagreements. Demonstratives standing alone (can lead to ambiguity in philosophical writing). Use of contractions. One-sentence paragraphs (a paragraph must contain at least two complete sentences). Over-use of passive voice. Use of exclusive language when referring in some sense to “all people” (We are in the 21st century; all major style books have ruled on this issue; in this class we will abide by those rulings). Remember also: Dr. Daugherty finds particularly annoying incorrect uses of “that” and “which” <G>. Refer to the Writing Guide PowerPoint and writing resources in the External Links to this course.

6. Ordinarily, you will use no more than one succinct paragraph to grab the reader’s attention and to present/recap the particular argument or set of arguments you are addressing. Be sure you restate/introduce this material fairly and accurately. No straw men. No logical sleights of hand.

7. Then write an unambiguous thesis or purpose statement, or perhaps a short paragraph, which states what you intend to demonstrate or do in your paper. You have two choices, and only two choices, in this respect: You may (a) refute/defeat the stated argument or a proposition therein, or (b) logically strengthen the stated argument or a proposition therein. N.B. this second choice can be the more difficult of the two (see description below).

Primary ways to refute a presented argument:
1. Demonstrate/prove that no argument has been made, i.e., that what the author wrote constitutes an explanation, point of view, opinion, simple belief, preference, etc. In other words, what the author presents does not meet the basic criterion of an argument: at least one premise leading to at least one conclusion in a valid (not necessarily sound) fashion.
2. Take issue with the conclusion by demonstrating that the conclusion does not necessarily follow from the premise(s), and/or it is not the only logical conclusion that could be drawn from the stated premise(s).
3. Demonstrate/prove that at least one of the propositions that serve as a premise is false.

Primary ways to strengthen a presented argument:
1. First, demonstrate that a proposition in the argument (either premise or conclusion) requires strengthening. The easiest way to do so is to provide a counter-argument or counter-example, which demonstrates that, although the basic argument is valid, when applied to this particular case, context, or instance it could be refuted unless there is some modification to the argument/proposition as presently stated.
2. Second, proceed to strengthen a proposition or the argument as a whole by such steps as (a) modifying existing language, (b) adding additional language (e.g., modifiers, phrase, etc.), (c) making explicit an implicit assumption, etc.

You do not, for purposes of these analyses, have the choices of (a) simply elaborating on or explaining the author’s argument without either refuting or
strenthening it, (b) writing the paper as a “book review” that simply shares in
a non-argumentative way what you liked or did not like about it, (c) sharing
simple opinions, preferences, beliefs, or gripes.

8. Thereafter, you will concentrate on your critical analyses of the argument.
   Some food for thought in this respect:

   Choose a “manageable” argument or proposition from the readings to address.
   Arguments and propositions come in all sizes and on all levels.
   There is, for example, the overall, grand argument of the book as a
   whole, the overall argument presented by each chapter, the overall
   argument presented by each section of a chapter, the argument
   potentially presented in one paragraph of a chapter, the argument
   potentially presented in one sentence, as well as any one
   proposition offered at any of these levels.

   Choose an argument or proposition from the assigned reading that you can
   zero in on and handle in the two pages allotted. Remember, (a) the
   smallest unit of argument is one premise and one conclu-
   sion (should you decide to tackle an argument), and (b) you have the
   choice of addressing only one proposition (either a premise or a
   conclusion) for your critical analysis.

   Refer to the information in #7 above on primary ways to refute or strengthen
   arguments.

   For an inductive argument, the same concerns apply, but are couched in terms
   of the “inductive force” or probability of the argument, rather than
   its soundness per se.

   You may also address the (sometimes implicit) epistemology (the “theory of
   knowledge”) of the author or his/her argument: How does the
   author know what s/he knows, or thinks s/he knows? Traditional
   epistemology (ways of knowing) holds that knowledge = belief
   that is both (a) true and (b) justified. In other words, beliefs that
   are “accidentally” true do not constitute knowledge. To count as
   knowledge, beliefs must be arrived at in some reasoned manner
   that considers and tests the evidence. (N.B. There are various
   schools of thought on how precisely “truth” and “justification”
   relate, and some philosophers, e.g., Gettier, have taken issue with
   the whole traditional formulation. For our purposes now, however,
   such matters need not unduly concern us.)

   Supply the best counter-argument possible to the argument you have made in
   the paper. For example, if you took issue with a Small argument
   or proposition therein (a premise, the conclusion), how might
   Small best respond to your argument? Supply the best counter-
   argument possible and then succinctly address it/respond to it. Do
   not omit this step.
Next, address succinctly the “So what?” question. Why does/should this particular argument matter? For the author. Or for you. Or for others. Or for real life music education?. Ideas/concepts have consequences. What are the consequences of the particular propositions advanced in your paper?

9. Include an interesting conclusion (sentence or short paragraph) that summarizes what you have done and why it correlates to what you said you would do.

Here is one possible outline you might follow (N.B. This outline is not the only one possible):

Paragraph 1: Short, introductory sentence that grabs the reader’s attention, followed by a succinct, fair, accurate summary of the argument or proposition therein you will be addressing.

Paragraph 2. Begin with a thesis/purpose statement (you are either going to refute or strengthen the argument or proposition stated in the first paragraph), followed by a sentence or two that states or previews the argument you will present, i.e., precisely how you will go about your purpose.

Succeeding Paragraphs. Depending on your purpose, supply in some logical order, each of the premises and the conclusion of your argument, supporting each with appropriate evidence and/or logic.

Counter-Argument. In a paragraph or two, supply the best possible counter-argument to the argument you have just presented, and address the objections raised by that counter-argument.

So what? In a brief paragraph, address the “So what?” Question.

Conclusion. In a well-constructed sentence or brief paragraph, summarize for the reader how you have done what you said you would do. Depending on your purpose and preferences, you may wish to make the “So what?” question a part of your conclusion, rather than addressing it just prior to your conclusion. You get to decide.

You may well want to diagram your proposed argument, either prior to writing your paper or following your first draft. You do not need to submit your diagram.

Xerox sufficient copies of your first paper (one for each class member, including instructor) and bring them with you to class on the evening the first analysis is due. Thereafter, attach (.doc) your papers each week in an email to Dr. Daugherty prior to Noon each Wednesday.

For MEMT 813, your first critical analysis paper serves as an individual baseline. Your subsequent papers will be assessed against that baseline. In other words, your progress in critical analysis is measured by how much you improve from paper to paper, not according to how you compare with the achievement of the class as a whole.

Grading: Critical analysis papers will be graded either EC (Expected Competency) or NY (Not Yet expected competency). If you earn a grade of EC on a paper, you have earned the maximum
points possible for that paper (i.e., an A). The yardstick for earning an EC becomes more
exacting with each succeeding paper. If you earn a grade of NY, you will have one opportunity
to re-do and re-submit that particular paper, without penalty, to receive a grade of EC. In this
competency-based schema, you basically have the choice of earning an A or earning an F on
each paper.

Because the first paper serves as a baseline, just about the only way to earn an NY on that
particular paper is not to write it according to the guidelines above; for example, you offer an
opinion or point of view rather than an argument, or you choose to pursue a purpose that does
not entail either refuting or strengthening an argument or proposition.

**SOME BOOKS FOR REVIEW**

(Simply Examples. Other choices may be negotiated.)

Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994. This volume is a reprint, with
an updated bibliography, of the 1987 book published by Haven Publications, Inc.
1967.
Bevir, Mark. *The Logic of the History of Ideas.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press,
1999.
Oliver Ditson, 1937; new and augmented edition, Reston, VA: Music Educators National
Boethius. *Fundamentals of Music.* Translated by Calvin M. Bower. Edited by Claude V.
Brand, Manny, ed. *Philosophy in Music Education: Debating the Issues.* This collection of
texts is Volume II, Number 3 of *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and
Learning* (Fall, 1991).


Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*.


