Orff and the 'ivory tower': fostering critique as a mode of legitimation

TERRY LOCKE
University of Waikato, New Zealand

Abstract
This article begins by recounting the development and implementation of a unique, mutual agreement between the School of Education at the University of Waikato and Orff New Zealand Aotearoa (ONZA) to develop three master's-level courses in Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice. The rationale for this project is detailed and related to changing conceptions of postgraduate study and debates about continuing 'professional learning' for teachers. It is argued that at the heart of the exercise is a problematic around theorization. How can an approach to pedagogy such as Orff Schulwerk be incorporated into a programme that demands critical reflexivity? A number of 'solutions' to this problematic are provided. A case is made that involves teachers (as practitioners and prospective researchers) in addressing this problematic and will have positive consequences for Orff Schulwerk in New Zealand (and beyond), and for debates about classroom pedagogy in general.

Key words
music education, music pedagogy, Orff Schulwerk, professional learning

Introduction

The Orff-Schulwerk approach to music education was guided into existence by Carl Orff and Gunild Keetman in Central Europe in the mid-20th century. Since that time it has spread to many parts of the globe, including New Zealand, where it put out its first tender shoot in the 1960s. In 2009, however, there is a growing national movement of music educators whose practice has been influenced by the approach. It has its own national organization, Orff New Zealand Aotearoa (ONZA) and a university (Waikato) offering postgraduate papers on Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice.

What happens when an 'approach' such as Orff Schulwerk is transplanted into a new sociocultural setting, in this case, New Zealand? New Zealand is old geologically, new in terms of human habitation, has unique flora and fauna, has a robustly assertive indigenous population or *tangata whenua*, was colonized at times aggressively by people from the UK in the 19th century, has three national languages, has at times been a social laboratory for all sorts of experiments and is becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MUSIC EDUCATION Copyright © 2009 International Society for Music Education
Vol 27(4) 314–325 [(200911)27:4] 10.1177/0255761409345446 **http://ijm.sagepub.com**

In many ways, the problematics of transplantation are unique to the New Zealand setting. However, it is likely that the issues raised here will resonate with other settings.

In this article I do three things. First, I detail a particular university's rationale for offering a postgraduate programme in Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice. Second, I identify some of the 'rhetorical conversation spaces' that have been deliberately opened up within the context of this programme – what kinds of conversation become generated when Orff Schulwerk is held up for critical scrutiny through a series of discursive lenses which are *not* rooted in the Schulwerk? Third, I discuss how the programme initiative has an 'activist professional' (Sachs, 1999) potential in the New Zealand educational context.

Orff Schulwerk in the New Zealand postgraduate setting

The opportunity to embed Orff Schulwerk in a postgraduate setting was realized in 2006, when a memorandum of agreement was signed between the University of Waikato and ONZA. The latter was an indigenous association of teachers with a committed interest in the Schulwerk, which was established and incorporated in New Zealand in 2005. It was the first time the university had entered into a formal, collaborative agreement with a professional association of teachers. In terms of this agreement, the university agreed to develop three papers on Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice at postgraduate level and to work collaboratively with ONZA in developing each paper around a six-day block course, supplemented by an online component. For its part, ONZA endorsed the University of Waikato as its preferred provider of master's-level papers in Orff theory and practice. In addition to its collaborative role in helping design courses and recommend presenters, the organization, through its regular workshops for teachers, agreed to help provide potential participants with the skills required at the postgraduate level.

As foreshadowed in 2006, the three papers offered in Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice would invite participants to develop an in-depth, experience-based knowledge of both the musical content and the pedagogical ideas embedded within the Schulwerk. Students would critically examine these ideas and practices in a way that was informed by other music education discourses as well as by historical perspectives, educational philosophy and learning theory. Students would explore issues such as multiculturalism, creativity and the role of language, and engage in self-reflexive action research.

The marriage reflected certain identifiable interests on either side. The university's Arts and Language Education Department had been reflecting on its identity as a provider of postgraduate study and rethinking its construction of postgraduate study vis-à-vis the needs of classroom practitioners. Were courses too abstract and theoretical? Were they too driven by staff research agendas unrelated to the practicalities of classrooms? What Orff Schulwerk offered the university was a continually evolving, context-specific and deeply philosophized set of classroom practices, which challenged the university's traditional view of theory as underpinning practice rather than practice as generating theory via deep reflection on practice effects.

University education faculties are invariably spaces where a range of disciplines rub shoulders but often talk past each other – not just disciplines related to professional disciplinary knowledge (music theory, literary theory, linguistics, and so on), but disciplines related to teaching and learning (developmental psychology, theories of cognition, social constructivism). In all sorts of complex ways, the two groups meet and coalesce in theories of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), which tend to be lumped together as 'approaches'.

Orff Schulwerk offered the university an opportunity to enter into dialogue (in Bakhtin's [1986] sense of the word) with a highly developed system of pedagogical content knowledge.

Like other 'approaches', the Schulwerk put the teacher at the centre of classroom musical education programme development. In many settings, teachers have in varying degrees attempted to schematize the Schulwerk into specific practices and even ladders of competencies. Nevertheless, these attempts have been professionally based and teacher-directed and have often had an uneasy relationship with the dicta of official curriculum. Even when Orff associations have engaged in attempts at the schematization of professional content knowledge, individual Orff practitioners have developed and owned their own forms of practice. What is less clear, nevertheless, is the extent to which these schematizations engender a non-reflective conformism. All methods, once codified, have the potential to marginalize dissonance.

What did ONZA gain from the arrangement? In the first instance, it enjoyed material benefits such as training spaces, resources, administrative support and ICT provision. More importantly, however, by positioning Orff Schulwerk as a substantial focus for postgraduate study, a message was being broadcast that the body of knowledge represented by the Schulwerk was worthy of note. I am not being patronizing here. If anything, I am drawing attention to the *politics of legitimation* that operate in all social contexts and that work to privilege some discourses and marginalize others (Fairclough, 1992; Foucault, 1991; Locke, 2004). Discourses are socially constructed 'stories' about things, such as 'creativity' or 'music education'. The Schulwerk, of course, tells 'stories' about both of these. By taking the Schulwerk into the academy, we were moving it from the margin to the centre of New Zealand debates about what constitutes effective music education. Thus positioned, the Schulwerk became a basis for contesting the legitimacy of 'other' competing stories about music education. In addition, as a player in the game of interdiscursive dialogue, it opened up possibilities for its own premises and practices to be challenged and to undergo transformation.

Orff Schulwerk as a player in a rhetorical conversational space

What *is* Orff Schulwerk? One answer is that it is a concept awaiting content – an empty vessel waiting to be filled. Every time the question is asked, as Bahktin (1986) suggests, the questioner is poised at the threshold of a dialogue with other voices. Shamrock (1995) defines Orff Schulwerk as a 'framework for designing learning experiences in music and movement' (p. 1). She then proceeds to elucidate this framework, but in doing so, enters into dialogue with the voices of Orff himself (who clearly did *not* see himself as the last word on the matter), Keetman, Regner and others. I would assert two things: that a concept is not owned until it is interrogated in dialogue with other voices and that the outcomes of this dialogue are always provisional. At their best, universities foster a climate where these acts of interrogation are viewed as core academic business.

Waikato students of Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice One were asked to answer this question by first completing a bibliographical task analyzing seminal readings (pre-1970) related to Orff pedagogy, and second by establishing their own set of core principles through dialogue with the authors of these texts and sharing these online with other members of the class. One of the students, Robyn Trinick, offered the following PowerPoint slide as *her* reading of core principles:

– based on the inter-relationship of music, movement and speech;

- media, pedagogy and theory are interwoven;
- leads from imitation to improvisation to musical literacy;
- fosters creativity and musical discovery;
- allows for inquiry, innovation and active participation;
- moves from simple to complex, from experience to concept, from unison to orchestra;
- respects individual differences – readiness, skill level, activity preference;
- uses the rhythms inherent in the child's native language as an important resource;
- based on the concept of communal dance and music-making; aesthetic in its content and process.

Illustrated here is the professional work that occurs when a teacher (in this case an experienced one) revisits the assumptions that underpin his/her practice. The focus is primarily on the articulation of a set of principles that can then be owned. Such principles are always provisional and never watertight.[1] However, they constitute a set of practice ideals and can become reference-points for the evaluation of the specifics of classroom practice and activity.

Students were further asked to identify connections and disjunctions between their practical experience of Level 1 training and the principles they subsequently identified. In a sense, Orff Schulwerk was being added here as a 'player' in a dialogue between students and their workshop tutors. The following online posting was written by Robyn McQueen, a music specialist from a poor, multicultural school in Auckland:

> One of the Key Principles we have been examining in earlier forums was improvisation.
>
> In this post, I would like to consider aspects of improvisation and composition as I experienced them in the workshop and in relation to the reading. There is no question that both improvisation and composition are integral to elemental music. Both are present in the descriptions of the early work of the Güntherschule and the development of the Schulwerk. I would like to explore the *relationship* between these two processes in the workshop and in the readings.
>
> In the workshop we certainly had plenty of opportunities to improvise with rhythm and movement and playing instruments (recorders and barred percussion). Vocally, we improvised by offering suggestions for words for ostinati (but I don't recall any improvisation in singing). This is consonant with Keetman's recommendations, outlined by Solomon 'that children: 1) create accompaniments, 2) create melodies, and 3) improvise in many different forms' (Solomon, 2006, p. 16).
>
> What about the composition exercises we had to do? I had thought the main point of those tasks was to familiarize us with aspects of instrumentation/notation/form. I had been thinking about why we had to do those tasks, and why they were the part of the course that was marked. I now see that (for me anyway) they provided a chance to experience 'crossing over' from improvisation to composition. I don't consider myself a composer, but, like everyone else, I had to tackle those composition exercises, relying on my long-past study of theory. I felt much happier writing notes down after I had played with them on an instrument. Perhaps that is why I was so drawn to the description of Keetman 'composing' at the xylophone – more of a practical than an academic exercise (Murray, 2004, p. 80). However, the guidelines Christoph [Maubach] gave us for each task were enough to keep me 'safe' and on the right track.
>
> I was wondering if it is ok to think of Improvisation–Composition as a continuum …

Such responses illustrate the process whereby teachers develop professional content knowledge, anchored in a set of principles and embodied in classroom practices. One could argue, though, that thus far the reflective lens that has been made available to these participants is a pair of rose-tinted Orff spectacles. To balance this, students needed to be exposed to other pertinent discourses – ones with the potential to expose the Schulwerk to varying kinds of critique.[2]

In bringing Orff into the Academy, course developers saw it as a fundamental task to determine 'theoretical perspectives' deemed productive for Orff Schulwerk (as understood by students and teachers) to enter into dialogue with. Our assumption was that these discursive encounters would both generate and deepen understanding of all perspectives involved. We were also confident that these encounters would be personally transformative of the thinking and practices of course participants, while having the potential to contribute to a dynamic for change in Orff Schulwerk as practised in the New Zealand setting. In the remainder of this section, I indicate some of the 'dialogic encounters' that were set up.

One such encounter was with the writings of Thomas Regelski (1998, 2000, 2002), one of the co-founders in 1993 of the MayDay Group,[3] which describes itself as an 'international think tank … concerned to identify, critique, and change taken-for-granted patterns of professional activity, polemical approaches to method, and social, musical and educational philosophies, educational politics and public pressures that have threatened effective practice and stifled critical and open communication among music educators', with the dual purpose of applying 'critical theory and critical thinking to the purposes and practices of music education' and affirming 'the central importance of musical participation in human life and, thus, the value of music in the general education of all people'.

Regelski's polemic was in part driven by a neo-Aristotelian, tri-partite philosophy of knowledge, which framed a 'praxial philosophy' of music and music education. Regelski articulated a relationship between three kinds of knowledge (*episteme*) connected with thinking (*dianoia*):

- *Theoria*: 'speculative knowledge studied, arranged, and contemplated for its own sake', and so, 'abstract, autonomous, universal, pure, and absolute, and thus timeless and unchanging' (1998, p. 23);
- *Techne*: 'knowledge needed for "making", "producing", or "creating" certain objects or other overt results – a process Aristotle called *poiesis*' (1998, p. 25). The salient feature of techne is its relationship with standardized forms of output, and utility separated from ethical considerations;
- *Praxis*: 'Praxis is governed by the kind of "doing" called *phronesis*, an ethical [and situated] knowledge of and for achieving "right results" judged in terms of actual benefits for one's self or for others' (1998, p. 28).

In educational settings, Regelski argued, the determination of what constitutes 'right results' manifests itself ideally in the 'form of the *curriculum* that guides "right action" and that is used to judge "right results"' (1998, p. 29):

> Action ideals, ideals directing praxis, then, are *regulative ideals* by which professional praxis in any field is conducted and recognized. Thus, a rationally and ethnically conceived curriculum of action ideals that clearly point to tangible and concrete benefits for students is the underlying condition of music education as praxis.

Waikato students were asked to develop a set of 'action ideals' consonant with their understanding of the Schulwerk. One of the students, Chris Archer, wrote:

1. Engages and focuses the creative, artistic, sensual and musical self within a playful participatory socially constructed context, allowing students to individually and collectively create, play and shape music. In addition to developing instrumental skills in meaningful musical contexts, they develop listening skills with increasing sensitivity by participating in and reflecting on scaffolded musical experiences. Here, the 'mind is "at play" reflectively enjoying its own activity of engagement … transforming such activity into "good time"' (Regelski, 1998, pp. 33–35). Creativity is valued for what students bring with them and develops students' 'general musicianship [techne, theoria] … mentally and physically' (Regelski, 2000, p. 81).

2. Employs a process-orientated pedagogy that is individuated and works from and builds personal knowledge in, through, and about music. A scaffolded approach ensures 'learning is effective [and] results directly … in noticeable progress that benefits students' (Regelski, 2002, p. 115). Learning success motivates students to continue learning outside/after leaving school, as amateurs or professionals. High standards are expected and address 'the kinds of excellence that are entirely innovative, even against the grain of … taken for granted paradigms' (Regelski, 2000, p. 82).

3. Challenges students to 'think as musicians' as they actively and playfully make music. Personal music making creates a '"good time" that may or may not be equally valued by those within hearing distance' is of key importance (Regelski, 1998, p. 39). Playing provides the practice. Technical knowledge – instrumental technique, processes, musical features that support musicianship – is embedded in learning processes: not taught in isolation. Orff practices serve the purpose of creating music as a group of 'playful' musicians. This 'good music … serves the "good" purpose that is its raison d'être on a particular occasion' (Regelski, 1998, p. 40).

There are other resonating and challenging concepts that postgraduate students of the Schulwerk are going to encounter in Regelski's work. For example, the latter's claim that 'the "right action" of praxis is not susceptible to standardized, formulaic, prescriptive, recipe-like methods or systems' resonates with Keetman's (1974) claim that 'classification of material according to age or grade, subject matter and curricula, as is so frequently attempted, is … as impossible as it is absurd' (p. 11).[4]

A second kind of dialogue addressed Orff Schulwerk as a globally dispersed phenomenon. How should the Schulwerk interface with the musics and music educational practices in the various social settings where it takes root? As Shamrock argues, neither Orff nor Keetman ever contemplated 'developing a music pedagogy that would be applicable on a global scale' (1995, p. 24), and, in later life, Orff noted that Schulwerk principles were not yoked to a European model and might develop in a way that no one foresaw (Regner, 1984, cited in Shamrock, 1995, p. 24).

The 'challenge of adaptation is that the goals of the European model are to be maintained while the materials for development should be formulated according to the indigenous tradition' (Shamrock, 1995, p. 29). Shamrock proved an ideal conversant for teachers reflecting on this challenge in the New Zealand setting, with its robust, indigenous music traditions (in this case, Maori). A discourse outside the Orff ambit is critical multiculturalism, explained by May (2003) as a response to essentializing tendencies in multicultural discourses and a failure in these discourses to address power-grounded relationships in respect of identity formation, social inequality and cultural representation itself. A student or teacher assuming such a discursive vantage point will identify a range of issues and solutions in relation to the implementation of Orff Schulwerk in New Zealand as a bicultural nation that is becoming increasingly characterized by cultural and linguistic difference.

Robyn McQueen, the teacher mentioned previously who works in an underprivileged, ethnically diverse school, wrote the following in an essay exploring the place of Orff Schulwerk in the New Zealand setting:

> Many features of Orff Schulwerk sit comfortably with the approaches to music, movement, and learning seen in Pacific and Maori cultures … Maori children are more comfortable with a focus on group, rather than individual, success. There is no conflict here. On the contrary, an Orff-based approach supports group participation and group outcomes. And these groups need not necessarily be differentiated by age or ability. One of the strengths of the Schulwerk is the flexibility to include participants at various levels of ability in the same work. This resonates strongly with the emphasis on Whanau; including old and young, in Maori culture. Within these heterogeneous groups, models of mentoring and apprenticeship can be seen. These patterns of interaction have been acknowledged and utilized in schools in Whanau groups and Buddy Reading (Teina/Tungane) for example. Such supportive ways of interacting can only enhance outcomes in music classes and should be actively encouraged.

What is at work here (despite the essentialist tendency) is a consideration of how learning styles are discursively constructed and an identification of similarities between Orff pedagogy and widespread New Zealand indigenous learning styles.[5]

Third, postgraduate study of Orff Schulwerk inevitably involves participants in ongoing dialogue with conversants concerned with approaches to integrated learning and inter-disciplinarity. However, integration in relation to learning can *mean* many things to many people. For some, it implies the deployment of particular kinds of mediating technologies in the learning process. For others, it suggests a product that requires skills and knowledge drawn from a range of disciplines. For others it means the design of programmes where students approach topics, problems or tasks using the knowledge-producing methods of a range of subjects or disciplines. The latter meaning comes under the broad umbrella of 'curriculum integration', currently a hot topic in New Zealand, where a number of schools are experimenting with ways of 'integrating' various curriculum areas.

What kind of dialogue might occur between Orff practitioners and an integration advocate such as James Beane (1995, 1997, 2002)? According to Beane:

> Curriculum integration centres the curriculum on life itself rather than on the mastery of fragmented information within the boundaries of subject areas. It is rooted in a view of learning as the continuous integration of new knowledge and experience so as to deepen and broaden our understanding of ourselves and our world. Its focus is on life as it is lived now rather than on preparation for some later life or later level of schooling. It serves the young people for whom the curriculum is intended rather than the specialized interests of adults. It concerns the active construction of meanings rather than the passive assimilation of other's meanings. (1995, p. 622)

It is interesting to juxtapose this definition with Orff's description of 'elemental':

> What is elemental? The Latin term 'elementarius' means 'belong to the elements, to the origins, the beginnings, appropriate to first principles'. Further, what is elemental music? Elemental music is never music alone: it is bound together with movement, dance and speech; it is a music that one must make himself, into which one is drawn in not as listener but as participant. It is unsophisticated, knows no large forms or grand structures; instead it consists of small series forms, ostinatos, and small rondo forms. Elemental music is near the earth, natural, physical, to be learned and experienced by everyone, suitable to the child. (Orff, 1963, cited in Shamrock, 1995, p. 8)

At first glance, the statements appear to have little in common. However, there are salient points of overlap: a concern with the 'organic' as opposed to the 'artificial' (Beane, 1995, p. 616); a focus on the here and now of meaning-making, on relevance; an emphasis on active (democratic) participation; a focus on the creative co-construction of new forms of knowledge/form. The following extract shows how one student, Rose Alexander, entered this conversation:

> However, when considering Orff-Schulwerk and the so-called 'integrated domains' of speech, movement and music (Maubach, 2006), is it more a case of seeing a reversal of the fragmentation of knowledge and understanding? It is not so much an issue of planning to integrate these domains – they already have an aspect of integration; rather, it is allowing the overlap between the domains to be part of the fabric of learning. Indeed, this appears to be what Orff had in mind when he chose to use elemental music as the means for developing creativity and musical expression. 'Elementary music is never music alone but forms a unity with movement, dance and speech' (Orff, 1963), as we see in childhood expressions where the elements are intertwined. Integration is a natural part of knowing and understanding, because knowledge is not fragmented and isolated from other knowledge.

The emphasis in Orff Schulwerk on media integration opens up another kind of dialogue, this time with social semioticians interested in the relationship between meaning-making and multimodality (the interplay of human meaning-making resources). 'If, in a multimodal text, all the modes make a contribution to meaning, then each mode makes a partial contribution to the total meaning, and that includes the spoken or written part of that multimodal ensemble' (Kress & Burn, 2005, p. 77). Such a sentence raises the key issue of the contribution each 'resource' does/should play in the Orff ensemble.

Orff Schulwerk and the music teacher as professional

A focus on discrete, decontextualized competencies – a kind of 'outcomes' fetishism – has characterized much educational practice in New Zealand since the National Government's 'Achievement Initiative' of 1991. This policy demanded 'the establishing of clear achievement standards for all levels of compulsory schooling' (Ministry of Education, 1991, p. 1), thus signalling a massive shift from a curriculum oriented to the needs of individual learners to a system describing student learning as measurable against pre-established 'clear objective standards' and state-dictated educational priorities. The shift was accompanied by words such as 'clarity' and 'transparency'. With the clear identification of outcomes, it was believed, the progress of individual students could be monitored, and schools (and teachers) effectively evaluated. Non-coincidentally, the behavioural shift to measurable outcomes has been accompanied by a shift from intrinsic to extrinsic accountability (Locke, Vulliamy, Webb & Hill, 2005). At the same time, the neoliberal, market-driven reforms characteristic of New Zealand and other countries was tending to foster a technocratic-reductionist as opposed to a professional-contextualist view of teaching (Codd, 1997, p. 140):

> In the technocratic view, good practice can be reduced to a set of predefined skills or competences, with little or no acknowledgement given of the moral dimensions of teaching. In the professional view, on the other hand, the good practitioner is a well-rounded person who can integrate all aspects of their prior knowledge and act in a teaching situation with moral integrity.

An insistence on the identification of clear learning intentions as a crucial ingredient of lesson planning fosters a reductivist view of learning in at least two ways: valuable learning is always larger than what is intended and not always commensurate with verbal articulation; valuable learning may not manifest itself in the short term. It also lends itself to a reductivist view of teaching as a mechanistic cycle of learning intention identification, teaching/drilling and assessment. Moreover, it lends itself to extrinsic accountability measures such as 'spot checks' on individual teachers' classroom routines and other surveillance technologies.

The introduction of Orff Schulwerk into a postgraduate university setting helps legitimize it as a locus of resistance to such paradigms of teaching and learning, and teacher professionalism and identity. There are a number of ways in which the Schulwerk operates as a locus of resistance. Keetman's (1974, p. 11) assertion that classifying curriculum material according to age is impossible and absurd challenges the determination of policy makers in New Zealand to couch learning in all curriculum areas in terms of discrete, age/stage-related, decontextualized achievement objectives. In contrast, the Schulwerk as pedagogy is premised on the notion of carefully designed learning sequences, from simple to sophisticated, based around the activities of exploration, imitation, improvisation and creation (Shamrock, 1995, pp. 18–19). In the latter case, the structure is something that evolves in context rather than imposed from without.

Central to the Schulwerk also are metaphors of the teacher (and student) as improviser and creator, currently in refreshing contradistinction to the tedious iteration of the student as 'learner'. Such an emphasis tilts teaching in the direction of artistry, and allows for (and indeed encourages) the unpredictable, the unforeseen and the unforeseeable. Indeed, in the widest epistemological sense, Orff Schulwerk poses a challenge to the view of meaning-making underlying behavioural approaches to teaching and learning. It does this by suggesting that the emergence of meaning (as form) is not something stamped on minds as per factory models of education, but rather as something that emerges, uncalled for, when minds in consort and with the right conditions are engaged attentively in the moment with the things (materials, problems) at hand.

In the New Zealand context, and probably elsewhere, teacher professional content knowledge in respect of music practice clearly occupies a continuum from low ability/limited skill and knowledge range to high ability/developed skill and knowledge range. The New Zealand curriculum, however, is premised on a generalist teacher with a musical ability level and skill/knowledge range at the lower end of this continuum. Because of this, the construction of worthwhile music education practice in schools (particularly primary schools) is being determined, not by the total range of musical experiences a child is capable of learning at a particular age, but rather by the sorts of learning experiences a teacher of limited musical capability is capable of providing. In contradistinction to all of this, Orff-Schulwerk teachers emphasize the lifelong development of both musical knowledge and music pedagogical knowledge and, for this reason, have a high ability to ascertain what a child at a particular age is capable of learning to do musically. In this respect also, it constitutes a challenge to the widespread way in which music teaching happens in New Zealand schools.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following students who participated in the 'Orff Music Education: Theory and Practice' paper of 2008 for allowing me to quote from their wonderful online dialogue and assignment work: Chris Archer, Robyn McQueen, Rose Alexander and Robyn Trinick.

Notes

1. There are concepts here, such as 'creativity', 'innovation' and 'aesthetic' that allow for widely divergent constructions.
2. According to the university's own guidelines, a graduate student is expected to: 'Systematically review a range of literature, sustain a theoretically justified position, report and analyse material critically and accept criticism [and] critically appraise and inter-relate different theoretical perspectives and apply these to educational issues.'
3. See MayDay Group (2009).
4. There are a number of grounds for a critique of the Schulwerk in Regelski's writings, of course. For example, an argument can be made that the traditional Orff instrumentarium creates an unhelpful disjunction between music-making in the school setting and music-making in the 'real' world outside of school, with its increased emphasis on digitization.
5. What is not explored is the tension that is set up when a teacher wants to both 'honour' the form and spirit of a traditional 'waiata' (song) – assuming that permission was obtained to incorporate it into one's programme – and the improvisational principle identified as at the heart of the Schulwerk.

References

Bakhtin, M. (1986). The problem with speech genres. In C. Emerson (Ed.), *Speech genres and other late essays: M. M. Bakhtin* (Trans. V. McGee) (pp. 60–102). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Beane, J. (1995). Curriculum integration and the disciplines of knowledge. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(8), 616–622.

Beane, J. (1997). *Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic education*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Beane, J. (2002). Beyond self-interest: A democratic core curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(7), 25–28.

Codd, J. (1997). Knowledge, qualifications and higher education: A critical view. In M. Olssen & K. Morris Matthews (Eds.), *Education policy in New Zealand: The 1990s and beyond* (pp. 130–144). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1991). Politics and the study of discourse. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 53–72). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Keetman, G. (1974). *Elementaria: First acquaintance with Orff-Schulwerk* (M. Murray, Trans.). London: Schott.

Kress, G., & Burn, A. (2005). Pictures from a rocket: English and the semiotic take. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *4*(1), 95–105.

Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.

Locke, T., Vulliamy, G., Webb, R., & Hill, M. (2005). Being a 'professional' primary school teacher at the beginning of the 21st Century: A comparative analysis of primary teacher professionalism in New Zealand and England. *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*(5), 555–580.

Maubach, C. (2006). *Introduction to the Orff Schulwerk approach* (VOSA training guidelines). Melbourne: ACU.

May, S. (2003). Critical multiculturalism. In M. Peters, C. Lankshear, M. Olssen, & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical theory and the human condition: Founders and praxis* (pp. 199–212). New York: Peter Lang.

MayDay Group. (2009). *Action for change in music education: … a brief history [about us]*. Retrieved 22 July 2009, from http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/aboutus.php

Ministry of Education. (1991). Achievement initiative. *Education Gazette*, *70*(7).

Murray, M. (2004). Gunild Keetman – The essence of the Schulwerk. In *Gunild Keetman: A life given to music and movement* (pp. 78–80). Mainz: Schott.

Orff, C. (1963, October). Orff-Schulwerk: Past and future. Speech given by Professor Dr Carl Orff at the opening of the Orff Institute in Salzburg (M. Murray, Trans). Retrieved 14 December 2006, from http://www.vosa.org/aboutorff/?pageID=17

Regner, H. (1984). Music for children: Observations on the reception and adaptatin of Orff-Schulwerk in other countries. *Musik und Bildung: Zeitschrift für Musikerziehung*, *16*, 784–791.

Regelski, T. (1998). The Aristotelian bases of praxis for music and music education as praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *1* (Spring), 22–59.

Regelski T. (2000). Accounting for all praxis: An essay critique of David Elliot's *Music Matters*. In *Bulletin – Council for Research in Music Education* (pp. 61–87). Urbana-Champaign, IL: Council for Research in Music Education, School of Music, University of Illinois.

Regelski, T. (2002). On 'methodolatry' and music teaching as critical and reflective praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *10*(2), 102–123.

Sachs, J. (1999, November). Towards an activist view of teacher professionalism. Paper presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Adelaide.

Shamrock, M. (1995). *Orff Schulwerk: Brief history, description and issues in international dispersal*. Cleveland, OH: American Orff-Schulwerk Association.

Solomon, M. (2006). Paths to improvisation: Using Keetman's *Elementaria*. *The Orff Echo* (Summer), 16–19.

Terry Locke is Chair of the Arts and Language Education Department in the School of Education at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. His research interests include teacher professionalism, constructions of curriculum (with an emphasis on the English language arts) and the teaching of literature, argumentation and writing, especially in multicultural settings. Recent publications include: *Critical Discourse Analysis* (Continuum, 2004) and *Resisting Qualifications Reforms in New Zealand: The English Study Design as Constructive Dissent*. He is a strong advocate for the arts both as discpline-based subjects and as integral to aesthetic pedagogy. He is coordinating editor of the journal *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*.

Address: School of Education, University of Waikato, PB 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand. [email: t.locke@waikato.ac.nz]

Abstracts

Orff et la 'tour d'ivoire: Stimulation de la critique comme mode de légitimation

Cet article expose le développement et l'exécution d'un unique et mutuel accord entre L'École d'Éducation à l'université du kiwi et l'Orff New Zealand Aotearoa (ONZA) pour développer trois cours de niveau de Master en Éducation Musical Orff: Théorie et Pratique. Le déploiement de ce projet est détaillé et connexe aux conceptions changeantes des études supérieures diplômantes et aux discussions au sujet de 'l´apprentissage professionnel' continue pour des professeurs. On explique qu'au cœur de l'apprentissage, est une problématique autour de la théorisation. Comment une approche pédagogique telle que la méthode Orff peut-elle être intégrée à un programme qui exige de la réflexion critique? Un certain nombre de 'solutions' à cette problématique est fourni. Un cas est présenté faisant participer les professeurs (comme praticiens et futurs chercheurs) et en adressant cette problématique peut-être obtenu des conséquences positives pour la pédagogie Orff en Nouvelle Zélande (et au-dehors) et pour des débats sur la pédagogie en classe de façon globale.

Orff und der 'Elfenbeinturm': Fördernde Kritik als berechtigte Methode

Dieser Bericht beginnt mit einer Erzählung über die Entwicklung und Einführung eines einmaligen, gegenseitigen Einvernehmens, zwischen der School of Education an der Universität von Kiwi und Orff Neuseeland Aotearoa (ONZA) um drei Master Niveau Kurse in Orff Musikerziehung in Theorie und Praxis zu entwickeln.Die Gründe für dieses Projekt sind klar und verbunden mit sich ändernden Konzepten der Post Graduated Studien und Diskussionen über ständige „professionelle Weiterbildung" für Lehrer. Es wird argumentiert, dass im Kern der Übungen das Problem der Theoretisierung liegt. Wie kann der Zugang

zur Pädagogik, wie derjenige des Orff Schulwerkes,in ein Programm eingegliedert werden, das kritisches Reflektieren verlangt? Eine Anzahl „Lösungen" zu diesem Problem werden gegeben. Ein Beispiel wird vorgestellt, worin Lehrer als Praktiker und mögliche Forscher im Angehen dieser Problematik positive Auswirkungen auf das Orff Schulwerk in Neuseeland und darüber hinaus, wie auch für Diskussionen über Pädagogik in der Schule im allgemeinen haben werden.

Orff y la 'torre de marfil': Promover la crítica como modo de legitimación

Este artículo comienza contando el desarrollo e implementación de un acuerdo mutuo entre la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad de Kiwi y la Asociación Orff de Nueva Zelandia (ONZA) para desarrollar tres estudios de máster en 'Educación Musical Orff: Teoría y Práctica'. Se detallan los fundamentos del proyecto, relacionándolos con los debates sobre los estudios de postgrado y la formación permanente del profesorado. Se sostiene que en el centro de estos debates está el problema de la teorización: ¿cómo puede un enfoque pedagógico como el Orff Schulwerk incorporarse a un programa que exige reflexividad crítica? Se brindan algunas 'soluciones' a esta problemática. Se argumenta que implicar a los profesores (como profesionales de la educación y futuros investigadores) en el abordaje de esta problemática tendrá consecuencias positivas para el Orff Schulwerk en Nueva Zelandia (y más allá), así como para los debates sobre la pedagogía escolar en general.