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Abstract

Two premises guide this paper: first, music education, like all educational enterprises, is shaped by its grounding metaphors which affect its aims, pedagogies, curriculum, and administration. Second, music education, like all educational endeavors, is increasingly encouraged to address issues of social justice and contribute in real ways to the benefit of the community through positive social change. In this conversation, the authors, each of whom have written about metaphors and social change, build on these two premises to explore ways of bringing together the two lines of inquiry in search of metaphors that would guide an education for social change. In their dialogue they propose four metaphors but acknowledge that these alone do not address the full array of meanings a metaphor for social change would need to capture.

*Keywords*: metaphors; social change; music education; master-apprentice; steward, ripple effect; rabbit-becomes-a-cat
Metaphors for a Change: A Conversation about Music Education and Social Change

Two common themes emerge in our writings over the past several decades. Estelle Jorgensen has focused in part and significantly on models and metaphors that undergird music education. Iris Yob has examined the role of higher education generally and music education specifically in creating positive social change. At times, and against the backdrop of recent writing on music education, social change, and social justice, we each have explored topics in the other’s area of interest. Neither of us has systematically brought together the two themes: building practices on grounding metaphors for developing music education as a means for promoting the common good. In this paper, our conversation explores some metaphors that might assist music educators’ understanding and practice as agents of social change.

On Models and Metaphors in Music Education (Estelle)

Heuristic models provide a means of more systematically understanding and critiquing music education and constitute a scaffolding for research and practice. They define concepts, articulate the relationships of one concept to another, and provide a basis on which empirical research can be validly undertaken. Such models might be abstractions at a remove from the multiple realities that they address. Nevertheless, they are ways of understanding the salient features of the practicalities they are intended to represent and express. They form useful frameworks for grasping otherwise elusive and complex phenomena. Philosophy constitutes a means whereby this work can be forwarded and a corrective to an excessive focus on empiricism. It offers a basis for rigorous empirical investigation and thoughtful critique of practice. Notwithstanding its importance in scholarship and practice broadly construed, philosophy has too often been regarded as peripheral to research in music education, and its
theoretical importance to the field’s research and practice has not always been recognized. During recent decades, Bennett Reimer confessed his discomfort as a philosopher among American music education researchers and Patrice Madura Ward-Steinman and I urged researchers to include philosophy as a vital part of music educational scholarship. The intractability of music education’s under-conceptualization in the United States probably kept me focused on the claims of models far longer than might have been the case if a turn toward increased theoretical rigor in the field had been evident. In Europe, theoretical modeling was emphasized more than in the United States and philosophical discourse was more tightly integrated into the research community in music education. One thinks, for example, of the work of Hermann Kaiser and Jürgen Vogt in Germany, Frede Nielsen and Frederik Pio in Denmark, Keith Swanwick and June Boyce-Tillman in the United Kingdom, Øivind Varkøy in Norway, and Heidi Westerlund in Finland.

Focusing on the middle ground between metaphor and model offers an approach that appeals to the imaginative thought crucial in music education. My interest in this middle ground as a rich source of inspiration for music education was sparked especially as I was writing *Transforming Music Education*. Later, as I was reflecting on imagination and its role in music education in *The Art of Teaching Music* and other essays, my interest increasingly shifted towards metaphor and its possibilities for music education. This interest was extended especially as I mined Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy in its literary and cinematic forms with the possibility of the interrelationship between myth and music education. It blossomed in *Pictures of Music Education* in which I examined metaphorical models of music education, models predicated on metaphors that I experienced in a lifetime of music teaching. Subsequently, Randall Allsup explored the practical possibilities for prefacing music education on metaphor in
his *Remixing the Classroom: Toward an Open Philosophy of Music Education* in which he critiqued the master-apprentice model of musical instruction that had persisted from antiquity—offering, instead, what he termed an “open philosophy” for the field’s practitioners.  

Thought of comparatively, metaphors and models offer different possibilities for music education. By juxtaposing things that are distinctively different, metaphors surprise and prompt imagination in carrying the associations from one field into a disparate field to which they do not ordinarily belong. Their reliance on imagination, holistic thought, and immediacy of intuition grounded in ordinary experience differs from the reasoning through induction, deduction, and analogy, and relating theoretical propositions to a body of systematic thought and empirical evidence upon which models rely. In contrast to the ambiguity, richness of possibility, and passion of metaphor, models are inevitably more limited, prosaic, and definitive. My analysis of metaphoric models or modular metaphors in the middle ground between metaphor and model revealed that I could only tease out one of a variety of possible models implicit in a metaphor if I was to show the possibilities of thinking in terms of metaphors as well as models. Each metaphor encapsulated a variety of possible models and differed depending on the picture it evoked. As I examined metaphor-model pairs, I discovered what I already knew as a music teacher, that ambiguity is at the heart of music and education and metaphors can bring alive the features of music education in ways that models might systematize but cannot quite capture in entirety. Neither metaphor nor model suffices and both offer important insights.

Writing *Pictures of Music Education* seemed to probe at an even deeper question of the ethical imperatives of music teaching and learning. I realized that although I had written concerning the values that ought to undergird the work of music instruction, I had not thought through systematically and sufficiently the values that are at the basis of what music education
should be about and for and the common goods to which music education should be directed—a task in which I am presently engaged. It seemed important to connect metaphor to the claims not only of social justice, the subject of some of my recent writing and that of other music education writers, but to broader questions relating to the nature of the societal change that needs to take place (now being taken up by the National Association for Music Education in the United States). These tasks required thinking about how the themes I have been investigating might be directly related to those that have preoccupied Yob in general education.

Social Change in Education (Iris)

Teachers are agents of social change by profession. Teaching others to read, write, compute, think creatively and critically, perform research, use the tools of a trade, or make music is to transform learners. This will in turn make a difference in their relationships to the environment, to others, to the power structures in which they are embedded, to the community in which they live, and probably to future generations as they build their lives and contribute their new understandings and artifacts and attitudes to those around them. The documentary record at the time of Martin Luther during the Protestant Reformation, of Comenius during the Enlightenment, of Horace Mann at the founding of the new country that would become the US, and of Paulo Freire at the rise of Brazil and other countries against grinding military rule, to name a few examples, connects education with the social change movement of the time and attributes to education in large part the success of those movements. Of course, some teaching/learning practices were considered to be more a productive means of social change than others. In Luther’s view, an education in the liberal arts and languages was essential for understanding the Bible; Comenius argued for an “inductive approach” as the best preparation
for ongoing scientific understanding; in a battle of minds and politics, Mann moved education away from Puritan perceptions of religious instruction to secular education free of creed and doctrine; Freire focused on a liberating education approach that would build critical consciousness and self-worth, replacing a “banking system” of education where the teacher dispenses preformed knowledge with a real-world problem-solving approach. These examples simply illustrate that education has been an important partner in major cultural and social shifts over time and has embodied not only the hopes of a new movement but also its principles and premises in how teaching has been carried out and what kind of learning has been promoted.

We live now in another time of significant cultural and social change brought about by increasing technology, globalization, and threats to our very existence as a species. The industrial world gave birth to a spirit of innovation and exploration that resulted in advances in almost every field we can imagine: medicine, communications, energy production, information gathering and storage, business and commerce, international relations, and so on, while at the same time creating an ongoing legacy that is becoming more and more challenging: climate change, mass unemployment, global tensions, new weapons of mass destruction, depletion of natural resources, exploitation of the poor by the rich on local, national, and international levels, to name a few. Again, in these changing times, education is called on to play a part in shaping the future. The emphasis on strengthening programs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (the STEM subjects) for developing and employing the skills and knowledge to take advantage of current advances is one evidence of this.

Education at all levels, higher education in particular, is also being challenged to bring its energy, resources, and research skills to address the perils of our age. Writing a quarter century ago, Ernest Boyer urged academics to broaden their perspective to include the “scholarship of
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application” which encourages engagement with the real world. He asks, “How can knowledge
be responsibly applied to consequential problems?” and “Can social problems themselves define
an agenda for scholarly investigation?” He answered these kinds of questions in the affirmative
and stressed the importance of doing so. At about that same time, service learning, in which
students apply what they are learning in class in some kind of service setting in the local and
sometimes foreign community and bring back to the classroom what they have learned from that
activity, was spreading across campuses in the US and elsewhere. Based on principles laid out
almost a century earlier by John Dewey, the value of experiential learning combined with
serving the community and addressing its needs is having an impact on both learners and the
communities they serve.

With encouragement from the Obama administration and funding from the US
Department of Education, a national taskforce produced a “call to action” entitled, A Crucible
Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future. The civic and democratic responsibility of
education at all levels, the recommendations of the study state, is carried out in part by
“expand[ing] the number of robust, generative civic partnerships and alliances, locally,
nationally, and globally to address common problems, empower people to act, strengthen
communities and nations, and generate new frontiers of knowledge.” Since the early days of
service learning, the vision of universities and colleges working in partnership with communities
to address current needs is becoming increasingly globalized. Even more recently, the United
Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has published its own
response to current developments and the role education can and should play in addressing them.
Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good? identifies the challenges of the present
day and urges us to view the social contract between higher education with a larger, global
perspective, envisioning not only a transformative education for all peoples everywhere but an education that is responsive to solving the tensions, threats, and challenges that would dehumanize any person or make the future less secure.17

A perusal of their home pages reveals how universities have been infusing a sense of serving their communities into their mission statements and finding ways to demonstrate how that mission is being fulfilled. At Walden University, an online graduate institution in a variety of professional fields, the concept of “creating positive social change” was central to its mission from its founding in 1970, even before there was so much focus on mission statements and before there was an internet. With an accreditation visit imminent in 2012, the University leadership revisited that mission and began exploring ways that it could be practiced and demonstrated. A faculty task force addressed the question of how “positive social change” could be woven through the curriculum. “Social change” had been commonly spoken of, but what did it actually mean when it came to preparing students to take their part in it? The task force identified eight interrelated features that make up the concept and should be taught: in the knowledge domain, the ability to think systemically, to reflect on ideas and actions, and to connect scholarship to social problems; in the skills domain, the ability to plan and execute a practical project, to collaborate, to advocate for a cause, and to engage politically; and in the attitudes domain, to explore and practice defined ethics. These eight features are now being inserted in all programs of study, along with appropriately worded learning outcomes, student learning activities, and assessments of their learning.18

While this step moved the university community away from the vague although highly motivating expression “positive social change,” for a university such as an online university like Walden with its world-wide reach, the Walden community discovered “social change” does not
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carry the same intent and purpose universally. In an interview study conducted by Yob with faculty and students in colleges and universities around the world, that became very apparent. In English-speaking countries, such as the US, the UK, Australia, and New Zealand, “social change” covers any activity from working a shift at a food pantry to the civil rights leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr. for African Americans and of Gloria Steinem for women’s rights, even though some activities at one end of this continuum actually do not purport to create much in the way of actual long-term, far-reaching change. In some countries, “social change” is a risky expression to use (China, for example) or an expression with a negative history (Germany, for example). Some prefer to use the expression, “social responsibility,” which may be less provocative but possibly less proactive and less robust. “Social justice” is frequently used and certainly many of the problems and challenges of the present day have an injustice of one kind of another at their root, but there is more to creating the common good than righting wrongs; social change also invokes capitalizing on present opportunities and possibilities. Even the writers of the UNESCO document had difficulty with being definitive about the common good in a global setting, choosing to end their title with a question mark: Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good? There is no end to finding definitions of “social change” or “the common good” that can satisfy everyone. While breaking down the meaning of “social change” to teachable and particular knowledge, skills, and attitudes helped Walden University move forward practically, there is another promising approach to developing a shared understanding around this concept. This other approach can provide some direction not only to prepare students for their chosen careers or personal development but also to help meet the challenges from Dewey, Boyer, the members of the US National Task Force, the writers of the UNESCO document, and many others. If we were to find some grounding metaphors to supplement and
guide our practical responses to the challenges of the day, we might have some framing tools that carry inspiration as well as understanding and guidance and that would be flexible enough to perform well in a variety of cultural settings.

Metaphors for Social Change

We have variously noted our predicaments in conceptualizing music education and defining what is meant by social justice and social change. The inevitable ambiguity of the work of music education devoted to humane ends suggests that metaphors may offer productive possibilities for thinking about educational change. Linking our differing work on metaphors and social change allows us to try on this idea and see where these connections lead. We each sketch two contrasting metaphors with a view to showing what they suggest for music education engaged in social change, and we respond in counterpoint to each other’s analysis.

The Master/Apprentice (Estelle)

From antiquity, the notion of a skilled master musician who gradually brings along a devoted disciple has been pervasive in East and West. Little by little, the master shares with his student the wisdom to which he is heir as he judges the student is ready to receive it. Gradually, the apprentice becomes more accomplished as he acquires the skills and understandings of a tradition in the hope of eventually becoming a competent if not always exemplary exponent. This metaphor depends on cultivating a knowledge of classical traditions around the world, particularly, their performative, improvisatory, and compositional elements, and it has also been relied upon in school music education especially since the nineteenth century, particularly in choral, orchestral, and wind ensembles. It is so pervasive that I took this conservative and quite
sexist interpretation of the metaphor as a basis for my analysis of the “Artist and Apprenticeship” pictures of music education. Of late, this master/apprentice approach to music teaching has been roundly criticized in music education philosophy for, among other things, its asymmetrical power relationships, undemocratic instructional approaches, excessive conservatism, and formality. More recently, Allsup critiques this metaphor for its closed-mindedness and offers, in counterpoint, an open philosophy of music education that values open-endedness, democratic values, dialogue, inclusivity, and informality.

The enthusiasm for casting aside the old master/apprentice metaphor sets one worrying about what might be lost in the process. Is it possible that the very ways in which this metaphor has been construed within the industrial and post-industrial milieu in which we live have been wrong-headed? Could it be that if one were to rethink and revitalize this old metaphor, one might capture the very qualities of social change one may seek by repudiating it? Let us begin with an argument Leonard Tan offers in his essay, “Towards a Transcultural Theory of Democracy for Instrumental Music Education.” In combining aspects of Confucian and Deweyan thought, Tan draws on Xunxi’s metaphor of “the boat and the water.” Rather than thinking of an instrumental ensemble as a conductor directing a subservient ensemble, Tan suggests a very different interpretation of the ensemble members as the water that supports and sustains the boat floating upon it. Although his interpretation of the situation flies in the face of a more paternalistic and authoritarian view, in the way in which our students can become our teachers, this worry persists. What if our earlier depictions of the master/disciple metaphor are too small and fail to see its possibilities? What if one turned the metaphor of the master/apprentice on its head, in a radical reconstruction, to think of the master as the boat able to float only because of the cooperation, support, encouragement, and affection of the apprentice? What if one were to re-construe
mastery as the ultimate repudiation of “power over” another and see it instead as “power with” the other? What if all depends and centers on the apprentice whose empowerment is the instructional center of music-making and taking? What if the top-down constructions of the master’s instruction were reconceived as her or his responses to student needs, interests, impulses, and desires? What if notions of master and apprentice were fundamentally re-conceptualized in the diversities of genders from femininity to masculinity, in which embracing difference becomes a driver towards disparate ends that encompass and welcome the polyglot of humanity? What if this metaphor was not limited to exclusive or esoteric musical traditions but might be practiced across the world’s oral and literate, vernacular and classical musics? What if its embrace of a life infused with music were to recapture ancient notions of education as a holistic way of living and being? What if this metaphor were to be thought about and through education for humane means and ends? Could this reconfigured or “remixed” metaphor (to borrow Allsup’s word) constitute a way forward not only for music education but for all education?

Now, a critic wants to trouble these possibilities. For example, even if it were to be reconfigured, there is an inherent closed quality to the master/disciple metaphor. Musical mastery suggests that there is a finite body of knowledge or skill that can be acquired and demonstrated at a level of competence evident to those “in the know” regarding this music. There is certainly a closure of some sort. This closure need not necessitate closed-mindedness because a musician may acknowledge, respect, and admire other traditions that she or he may or may not be able to master. Still, a musical tradition is more-or-less bounded and the skills to make it are finite.

It is tempting to see openness, the prospect of never-ending growth, as a good, in contrast to closure as an evil that needs to be repudiated. Resisting this temptation, closure can also be a
good and a necessity for mastery of any field of study or skill. Life provides us with a limited
time in which to gather knowledge, wisdom, and skill, and this fallibility makes it quite
impossible to do everything we might wish to do, learn all that we might wish to learn, and
pursue every impulse that beckons. Ultimately, if Erik Eriksson is correct, the arc of our lives
tends towards a sense of closure, even if that end is unfinished. Music-making, as a part of life,
also embraces both openings and closings, beginnings and ends. Alfred North Whitehead
recognizes this possibility in his notion of wisdom as a form of closure, albeit dynamic, that
constitutes “generalization”—a romantic and intuitive grasp of the subject combined with an
understanding of how that subject is articulated such that the many aspects of the system
constitute a unity albeit provisional. In the best sense, masters and their apprentices are after a
sense of closure and closing before moving on, in turn, to another opening. And so, while one
might espouse openings and open-endedness, it is important not to relinquish the closings and
closure evoked within the master/disciple metaphor re-construed in some of the sorts of humane
ways the earlier questions suggest.

Allowing that the metaphor of the master/apprentice might be revitalized and even
transformed, and notwithstanding the possibility that it might still be lacking in one sense or
another, what are its implications for social change? Rethinking the asymmetrical power
relations in music instruction might lead to inculcating values that disrupt the systemic
patriarchy, xenophobia, homophobia, classism, racism, religious intolerance, color-
consciousness, inequality, and injustice that are all too pervasive in decent societies. The
anonymity of the Internet has unleashed what some reporters have called a “culture of hate.”
Grounding music education in personal relationships that honor human dignity and what
Raymond Gaita has called “preciousness” in ways that a transformative vision of the
master/apprentice relationship based on mutual respect and love might suggest counters this culture of hate-filled discourse; it offers a powerful alternative to the dehumanization exemplified by this culture of hate. Thinking of this metaphor in terms of empowerment of teachers and their students within a caring community devoted to one other and hopeful for their success directly meets the disempowerment of the many and oppression by a powerful few. In education, this cellular approach is modeled in the conversations between masters and those desirous of achieving mastery in the literacy that Freire suggests is vital to empowering the oppressed. If carried into music education, such a dialogical approach constitutes a means of challenging and even unseating the small-mindedness and closed-mindedness all too evident throughout society. Once having tasted of freedom, one wants more of it. So, individual experiences meld to generate communitarian experience that begins to change society.

The Steward (Iris)

One of the oldest metaphors in Western thought about our relationship with the rest of the world—its people, the other creatures, indeed all living and non-living things—and one that may complement the positive power of the master-apprentice metaphor while ameliorating some of its more negative connotations is that of the steward. The steward metaphor comes to us by way of what we interpret of Native American beliefs and practices but primarily it is part of our Jewish, Christian, and Muslim legacy. While we may have moved into a secular era and mostly abandoned religious beliefs and practices, there are occasions when something from the past becomes relevant again. This is essentially the argument made by Douglas John Hall in his book, *The Steward: A Biblical Symbol Come of Age.*
The concept of the steward appears throughout the Bible, from the beginning, in the creation myth, where God is pictured putting the newly created Adam in the Garden of Eden with the mandate “to till and keep it” through to the announcement that Jesus was giving to the apostle Peter “the keys to the kingdom,” employing one of the primary images of a steward to describe his new calling at the founding of Christianity. The metaphor has suggested a particular role for human beings in relationship to the earth and all that it contains. Hall argues that it reminds us that “the basic resources of the earth belong neither to individuals, nor corporations, nor nations, but are global treasures, given perpetually … for the use of all the families of the earth.” Stewardship is an appointed role; the steward is accountable to something or someone else. It suggests management, not ownership; caretaking, not exploitation; responsibility, not self-aggrandizement. The metaphor is apropos to capturing our relationship to the environment, both animate and inanimate, and has particular resonance for those concerned about the plundering of resources both natural and human by rich individuals and wealthy nations at the expense of the poor. It is also appropriate for describing the role of the teacher in relationship to her students as in loco parentis: parents entrust their young to their teachers with all the rights and responsibilities that entails. Older students volunteer themselves into this relationship.

Hall identifies several features of stewardship that can contribute to its usefulness in conceptualizing social change and that can be rephrased and restated a quarter century after his first formulation of them to meet the challenges of today. Stewardship can envision action beyond the local and provincial and national to the global level because we live in a connected world and feel the results locally where our immediate charge begins. It strikes at the extreme individualism that has promoted personal needs and wants above the common good and supports a sense of community instead because the steward is caretaker of and for others’ welfare. It is a
corrective to the rampant “technologization” of our lives that has recognized no moral limits or ethical boundaries because it does not have a built-in accountability. It is also a corrective to the market economy which has been allowed to become the final authority in how societies are structured and relationships between people are determined because it is a direct challenge that takes in the welfare as well as the prosperity of the enterprise. And it encourages a futuristic vision which looks beyond our present wants and needs and takes into account those of generations to follow.33

There are however some limitations, perhaps even a dark side, to the stewardship metaphor in the social change context. In the same creation myth that introduces the stewardship role, God is described as also saying to Adam and Eve, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.”34 Theologians of the present day have been at pains to explain in this context the idea of “subdue” and “dominion” where in the original the former has consistently meant “enslave,” or even “molest” and “rape,” and the latter has meant “rule over.”35 These words have given past generations a mandate to exploit earth’s natural and human resources, but are today becoming understood in a more nuanced way as empowering the steward in the caretaker role in ways that parallel Tan’s metaphor of the boat and the water mentioned earlier.

Nevertheless, the stewardship model implies a hierarchy. It draws on a picture of a wealthy landowner who delegates authority to a steward who in turn manages the affairs of the estate including the welfare of the land itself, the animals and wildlife on it, and the other workers whose duties lie in the farm, the woods, and the household. This makes the steward a powerful individual, especially if the landlord is absent or largely uninvolved and invisible. Two
significant principles of social change are not captured by this picture. First, one of the primary considerations of social change agents is that they do not see themselves simply as “the helper” and the other as “the helped.” Charity may be a necessary first step to build trust between giver and receiver and to lay the ground for significant change to come (for example, one cannot address the root cause of hunger if those who are most affected are too hungry to think beyond their immediate need). But charity itself is seldom change, for real change involves empowerment. Freire understood this: teach the peasants to read and they will become informed, self-respecting, and self-determined. Needy people are not necessarily helped if they become dependent on the helper and cannot become self-sustaining and self-sufficient. Stewards are not primarily concerned with making those he or she oversees more independent and self-directive.

Second, real change is a community undertaking, a partnership. Some are poor because others are rich; some suffer discrimination because others discriminate; some anguish at the hands of violence because others are violent, even indirectly through elected officials and tax-supported policies; some die young because others profit from their labors. In other words, real change implies change throughout the system and implicates and involves everyone. The steward model has the privileged ones standing somewhat above the fray of change because they have oversight and do not see themselves as necessarily implicated.

A corrective to both of these limitations in the steward metaphor, the empowerment of the other and dealing with one’s own implication in and contribution to the problem, can be addressed to some extent by judicious watchfulness in enacting the steward role. However, it is not essentially guaranteed by the metaphor itself which assumes a hierarchy which can privilege the steward.
Langer’s Rabbit becomes a Cat (Estelle)

In her *Philosophy in a New Key*, Susanne Langer gives us a picture of a rabbit and a cat side by side, and in the metaphor of a rabbit becoming a cat we might find a corrective to the problem of apartness from change that the master or steward might be tempted into.\(^{36}\) Let us use Langer’s picture in a different way than she intended and think, instead, of a dynamic image of a rabbit morphing into a cat. While both mammals, each of these animals belongs to a different genus with specific physical characteristics and personalities. This is a dynamic ecological image of becoming something different from what one once was. Today’s software shows the process of morphing from one thing to another much more compellingly than Langer could have imagined. This is a transformative metaphor of change from the outside in and the inside out. We think not only of the rabbit’s physiognomy and physiology, of its food preferences, gait, and habits becoming the cat’s—differences that may be both subtle and profound. How does one make a vegetarian into a carnivore, a hopping critter into a creature capable of running with great speed, the hunted into a hunter? Now for the many cat lovers, I do not intend a sinister development, but rather, the acquisition of difference. Some of our writers in music education such as Patricia Shehan Campbell, David Elliott, and Lucy Green have advocated for cultivating the many musical traditions in the world and the various ways in which these musics are learned.\(^{37}\) Others such as Elizabeth Gould and Petter Dyndahl have explored post-modern ideas of *différence* that address the tensions engendered by inclusion within music education, the imperative of unmasking oppression and resisting and subverting the taken-for-granted sexism, homophobia, xenophobia, ethnocentrism, and musical elitism that has too often prevailed in music education.\(^{38}\) Charlene Morton and Patrick Schmidt have reminded music educators of the imperative of cosmopolitanism and hospitality as values that need to undergird music education.
in our time.\textsuperscript{39} Langer’s rabbit becoming a cat focuses on the nature and importance of becoming, and the unfinished business of music education that extends a lifetime.

Now, critics will quibble with this metaphor. They will challenge the possibility of overemphasizing the international over the local and national, the impossibility of coming to know the entirety of the world’s musics in the ordinary compass of a general education, and the danger of knowing a little about a lot of things rather than being an exponent of one or a few musics. They may criticize the danger of overemphasizing difference and neglecting the threads of commonality that unite the world’s music-making practices. They may wonder whether difference is an unmitigated good, or whether it is conditional and based on the ethical directions in which differences point. They may worry with the emphasis on endless becoming without commensurate attention to arriving, on process rather than on product or educational end. While this metaphor seems apropos to a time of technological and musical change, they may also point to the long periods in musical history in which change was not rampant but traditions held sway. How else, one might wonder, could one explain the longevity of a Boethius’s musical text, \textit{De Institutione Musica}, read by students for a thousand years?\textsuperscript{40} The status quo is sticky, and it persists because it delights in continuity rather than change. Indeed, society is only possible because change is limited and at some point fixed. So, this metaphor, while it offers so much is also shortsighted. It cannot suffice alone.

Nevertheless, it offers much for a music education directed to positive social change, towards improving the lives of people, and enriching and civilizing the situation in which people find themselves. I want to emphasize the power of this metaphor in directing efforts towards social change. How so? I might have drawn upon my picture of the revolutionary as change maker as a metaphor for music education for social change. This is the easier course and the
more politically fraught because of its potentially incendiary character. Revolutions have a destructive character that can consume those who make and engage in them. Notwithstanding these possibilities for evil and danger, revolutionaries are needed in music education and this is not an argument against revolutionaries. Rather, thinking of the rabbit morphing into a cat is a different approach that may have appeal to those not inclined or with the stomach to engage in revolution. This metaphor reminds us of the power of incremental and organic change in improving society, and of the ecological possibilities of music education.\(^41\) Instead of overthrowing the social order, one seeks to change it bit by bit until inexorably it improves.

Such an approach may seem to some educational observers to be mere “tinkering toward utopia.”\(^42\) And it may sometimes be this. However, thinking about music education in the United States since it was first introduced into publicly supported schools in the early nineteenth century, over the better part of 200 years, we recall that although change has been sometimes achingly slow, and there have sometimes been reversals toward a less humane approach, many educators are now more sensitive to the claims of inclusiveness, humanity, and equality. One can point to music teachers who are beloved by their colleagues and students, even at a time when they are frustrated with a lack of political support for their work. In my examination of the dossiers of music teachers nominated for Grammy Awards for their work, I was struck by the devotion of these teachers to their students and the communities in which they taught. One may fault their work and those who represent them, but one cannot deny the force for good that music education has been in the lives of many Americans. Mary Cohen and Eric Shieh are among those who think about the transformative possibilities of music education for prisoners.\(^43\) In a multitude of choirs, informal singing groups, and rappers, we see music giving voice to oppression, and resisting it. Singing the anthem, “We Shall Overcome,” by black, white, and
brown alike has often been a beacon at racially-charged times such as this when justice cries out to be done. Little by little, piece by piece, over a lifetime, change can be wrought in society toward greater humanity. Notwithstanding the lack of drama in these changes, they nevertheless take place. Over the long term, we can be grateful for any greater vision of inclusion and equality that has been achieved.

The Ripple Effect (Iris)

Since Walden University espouses a mission of preparing students to be scholar-practitioners able to “create positive social change,” as part of the university’s self-study, a small team of researchers conducted an interview study with faculty, current students, and alumni to discover something of their perspectives on the meaning of social change in thought and practice. One metaphor cropped up in their responses more often than any other: the idea of a ripple effect. A ripple effect comes about when one event leads to a succession of other events. The interviewees were telling us that real social change can begin with an individual but through a kind of ripple effect would spread to ever-increasingly wider groups of people until their combined efforts would really make a difference. An alumnus used a similar metaphor borrowed from physics when he spoke in terms of a “gravitational wave” that can ultimately carry the impact of a single person’s activity to “the farthest reaches of the universe” and an alumna used the expression of “paying it forward” to capture a similar idea. One alumnus took an expression familiar in environmental activism and turned it around to capture the same idea: “act globally, think locally.”

There is something very hopeful about the ripple effect metaphor in the face of almost overwhelming, world-wide concerns like poverty, conflict, discrimination, climate change, and
exploitation, for instance. A single individual with a good idea and some energy can start
something that can grow into something much bigger, and that is what many of these problems
will need. Some interviewees understood that significant social change does not come about
through the efforts of a single individual and went so far as to add that real change required what
one student identified as a “critical mass” and another student bravely asserted to be “about thirty
percent of the population” to bring it about. Many teachers at all levels of education believe they
can make a difference by impacting a single learner who in turn will impact others, each of
whom can impact still others, and so on.

Magali Kleber, a music education professor in Londrino, Brazil I was able to interview in
person through an interpreter, takes her students into the slum district around the city. Her
classically trained musicians work with local young people on making music together. At first,
their practice space and instruments were vandalized, they were taunted and ridiculed as the
locals looked on them with suspicion, but over time, as this music educator and her students
listened to the people, encouraged them to make and even compose their kind of music, and
eventually to stage concerts of their efforts right there in the favela, a major shift occurred.
Working cooperatively together and actually accomplishing something they could be proud of
for the first time in their lives is building a sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy and a taste for
success that is transforming their lives, and its transformative impact seems to know no
boundaries. It is also transforming the graduates from the music education program as well with
new skills and a vision to address similar situations wherever they take up their teaching
appointments. The ripple effect metaphor is empowering in the sense that it does not require one
to take on the problem writ large, but rather writ small, at a local and manageable size.
Just as the ripple effect metaphor can be empowering, it can also unfortunately be limiting. It can encourage us to think small and trust the waves of ripples to carry forward the impact of our efforts. This occurred at Walden University as the researchers read through the interview manuscripts. All the programs are graduate level; one would hope that the graduates leave with a level of expertise, research skills, new knowledge, the ability to ask the penetrating questions and challenge the status quo, and with improved models of thinking and doing to bring to their professions. How can the university encourage them to think beyond the little pebble that is tossed into the pond of social problems creating ripples across its surface? In other words, is the ripple metaphor the right metaphor for someone who could step into a leadership role?

The ripple effect also suggests humanity and every other living thing is connected to each other and to the inanimate world in such a way that what one element in the system does can have an effect that flows through the whole. The metaphor then comes with a mandate to do what is good for the whole. Even with this in mind, this metaphor of the four we are looking at here in many ways it is the most ambiguous of all. On the one hand, the ripple effect metaphor has one simple moral imperative: do something, however small it may be, to make a difference for the better and there is the possibility that the impact of your effort will expand and spread. There is, however, nothing like an ethical principle to guide the spreading; ripples simply form and move at the direction of forces beyond our control. Their effects may be good or erosive like the wake of a boat on a fragile shoreline. While we might talk of ameliorating or directing the impact of our activity, the ripples or the context in which they occur in this particular metaphor do not necessarily reflect the qualities of the pebble that set them in motion in the first place. In the end, this metaphor which suggests at first glance that little deeds are sufficient for bringing about social change, those little deeds become highly weighted with ethical considerations.
because once enacted their results are beyond our control. Complicating this problem, even though the pebble itself may be completely immersed, it remains impervious, unaffected, and even unrepentant even though it is causative. On the one hand, the ripples are more or less empowered to roll on subject only to the forces of nature; on the other hand, the pebble instigator remains unchanged. It is part of the system, if you may, but is the strange element in that system that can be unaffected by what else is happening in the system, and therefore, beyond reproach and change itself.

Conclusion

We have briefly explored four powerful grounding metaphors that can shape an education for social change. In the master-apprentice metaphor, we see the power of radically reworking our taken-for-granted beliefs in more humane and inclusive ways. In the steward metaphor, we can trace the high responsibilities and perils of the steward. In the Langer’s cat-becomes-a-rabbit metaphor, we grasp the possibilities of organicism as a means of fundamental changes in social systems over the long term. And in the ripple effect metaphor, we are reminded of the potential significance radiating out from even small actions toward social change but are left wondering if this is sufficient for real change to take place. There remain, however, several important aspects of an education for social change that are not captured by these metaphors. Perhaps the most daunting of all challenges in the sphere of creating social change is enunciating the goals of action. If we have the common good in our sights, we must ask ourselves, “Who determines what that good is?” Even when we talk of initiating “positive” social change, the question of “positive for whom” still hovers. The UNESCO document which espouses a global view hesitates to define the universal good and in fact adds a question mark to its subtitle, Towards a
Common Good? It must be “defined with regard to the diversity of contexts and conceptions of well-being and common life,” the writers acknowledge. At the heart of the solution to the dilemma of wanting to make a difference but being unsure what that difference should be, the UNESCO document also suggests a way forward: “sustaining and enhancing the dignity, capacity and welfare of the human person, in relation to others and to nature.” And at the heart of such an education is “a humanistic vision.” In the metaphors already at hand or possibly in new metaphors yet to be discovered, humanistic and humanitarian principles need to be uncovered because they can encounter and absorb the individualistic and particularistic impediments otherwise encumbering our action toward the common good.
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