

Forum

Jack A. Taylor, editor
Journal of Research in Music Education

Professor Clifford K. Madsen needs no introduction to the music community. The quality and quantity of his research is well known, and his work serves as an inspiration to music teachers and researchers across the country. Not only has he provided us with unique musical models that we can use for our own research, but the results of his carefully controlled research have given practicing music educators solutions to both musical and behavioral problems.

The application of results to the classroom is the ultimate goal of research, and Madsen's success in this area reveals both his ability to "ask the right questions" and his persistence in pursuing those questions using carefully designed research. In these things he succeeds admirably. Thus, it was fitting for MENC to recognize Professor Madsen's contributions of the past twenty years by bestowing him with a special honor: the MENC Senior Researcher Award.

Madsen's acceptance speech, given at the April 1988 MENC conference in Indianapolis, presents considerable food for thought. Madsen describes three research priorities he believes music educators need to address. These priorities are not abstractions: They are concrete ideas that any college music education department could put into practice.

In addition to these priorities, a major theme is present—but perhaps not obvious—in Madsen's address: He believes that research and teaching skills are complimentary, that they should be learned in parallel, and that college music education graduates with these two skills are both better teachers and better researchers. We cannot argue; Madsen has demonstrated the truth of his belief by personal example and by the contributions his own graduate students have made to music teaching and research.

Note: This is the last issue of *JRME* edited by Jack A. Taylor, who has completed his six-year term. Rudolf E. Radocy of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, has been appointed as the new *JRME* editor and will begin his tenure with the winter issue.

Clifford K. Madsen is the first recipient of MENC's Senior Researcher Award. This article is an adaptation of a speech he presented to the Society for Research in Music Education at the MENC national biennial in-service conference, Indianapolis, April 22, 1988.

Clifford K. Madsen, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Senior Researcher Award Acceptance Address

I wish to thank very much those people who have made this award possible. First, the Music Education Research Council and the National Executive Board of MENC. Second, my colleagues at Florida State University (FSU)—I think that those people with whom one works most closely know one best. I would also like to thank all those involved in the Center for Music Research at FSU who help make my research possible. Third, I would especially like to thank the students whom I have had the privilege of teaching over the years and with whom I have interacted and addressed research issues.

It has been said that there is no better job than to be a tenured professor at a major university. This is especially true if the subject matter one deals with is music. Although music teachers at all levels have the privilege of interacting with people and music, there are only a few who have been given the time, within the requirements of their job, to add a little to the sum total of knowledge. It seems obvious to me as I interact with K-12 teachers that it is they who not only make the most difference with students but who also work the hardest. For those of us who may have forgotten how difficult it sometimes is even to schedule a rest room break, the relative luxury of university teaching should carry an added responsibility.

The responsibility for me is to be a researcher, to work carefully in both basic and applied models and to find and test those aspects that contribute either to greater understanding or to a better application of the information found. I find the research process to be exciting and

For copies of this speech, contact Clifford K. Madsen, Center for Music Research, School of Music, Florida State University, Tallahassee 32306.

personally rewarding. Indeed, I am one of those individuals who gets to do what I love best: research combined with teaching.

I am somewhat distressed, however, with aspects that seem to inhibit research in music education within institutions of higher learning. It is often said that a heavy teaching assignment reduces research productivity. This is often the case, but it seems to me that the primary enemy is not teaching but unnecessary meetings. Disregard for faculty time has no parallel when it comes to scheduling meetings. While faculty participation in the running of a university is both important and necessary, it seems that quality time is far more important than total time, and every attempt should be made to limit meetings. As one might suspect, I have collected data on this aspect as well as other issues dealing with use of time, and I would suggest that a great deal of research could be accomplished during the time devoted to committee meetings. This might seem obvious, but it needs to be stated.

Some time ago I was asked to help the National Association of Schools of Music develop a research agenda for music. I spent considerable time thinking through many issues relating to research that seemed to be perennial and finally decided that several basic aspects were especially important because of their potential influence within our profession. Much of the following is taken from that original work (Madsen, 1985a).

It seems that there are three basic areas that need to be analyzed and developed in much greater detail before we can expect research to have the influence it deserves. These are (1) investigating attitudes toward all issues relating to applied music study; (2) examining those aspects that pertain to transfer of knowledge, including research dissemination; and (3) developing and supporting researchers within schools of music.

The first aspect concerns applied music study. It seems that issues relating to applied study are both extremely important and complex. Music is basically an applied art, and if the making of music is to progress (outside of professional performing ensembles), we need a good deal of research that is much more comprehensive and sophisticated than that attempted at present. It would be wise to consider current practices of musicians in this regard, for it seems that the way musicians pass on their applied art has not substantially changed in hundreds of years. Young Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was instructed by his father Leopold in much the same manner as applied music is taught today—one-on-one—in an apprenticeship model. The essence of this model seems to rely on individual musicianship (craftsmanship) and the ability of the student to learn from the master. Furthermore, it is tremendously expensive, especially in institutions of higher education. The tremendous faculty required for professional performance demands optimal efficiency, but much time is wasted when conflicting opinions, which could be tested experimentally, are argued and debated. This does not imply that Leopold Mozart was not a good instructor for young Wolfgang; he obviously was. It does seem unfortunate, however, that some applied musicians still do not recognize anything outside of "apprenticeship" in the study of applied music or that most aspiring musicians are not Mozarts (Madsen & Madsen, 1978).

Until we start to unravel the philosophical complexities of why people pursue this difficult task, the sociological issues concerning status, and the psychological issues relating to self-concept and personal motivation, we will probably not change the attitudes surrounding applied study. Also, the entire area of systematic inquiry and subsequent technological advances needs to be investigated in relationship to its perceived value by performing musicians. Research needs to be conducted in the psychological, sociological, and philosophical areas to determine what constitutes the structures that contribute to present attitudes. For example, if an aspiring performer "needs" to study with a distinguished teacher or has a propensity to eulogize his present teacher regardless of competence or even reputation, as some of my data suggest, then it seems useless to try to prove that a great deal of time could be better spent working with a computer to develop pitch discrimination or that group lessons with rotating graduate assistants provide better progress for freshmen. Any research investigating a "better method" or a particularly effective technique will not be valued unless we can understand and subsequently predict the variables of wanting to perform and wanting to study with a particular individual, as well as how other complex issues relating to applied music might interact.

The second basic area relates to research dissemination and therefore to transfer. Years ago people talked about "disciplining the mind" to produce an informed citizen or effective person or whatever it was that they deemed important. Yet, psychological experimentation seemed to indicate that the mind could not be "trained" except for specific constructs or tasks and that there was no transfer unless one specifically taught for transfer, both vertical and lateral (Gagne, 1974). Vertical transfer or the arrangement of hierarchical constructs seems to receive much greater attention (e.g., the Kodály concept, music theory sequencing) than does lateral transfer or the ability to bring knowledge relating to one situation into another situation that seems to be disparate. Even the transferable value of formal music theory and history instruction to performance or vice versa has yet to be empirically documented, let alone the transfer of subtle musical concepts from one performance situation to another. Issues relating to effective curricular sequencing, as well as specific relationships among the various performance styles, need special attention. It seems to me that the most important education issues relate to a person's ability to make transfers.

Transfer also seems to be the key to gaining greater meaning from research reports as well as all other reading, and I have suggested (Madsen, 1985b) that until each of us as a professional is capable of answering the important question of how this information can relate to us, it is probably fruitless to seek any easy solutions to our many problems. I suggest that many of the reasons given for not reading research may not be the "real" reasons. It seems that one important detriment to research dissemination relates to an inability to transfer information from the research report to one's own teaching situation. I have proposed some things that could be done to teach for transfer, and I have also reported a procedure whereby research reports can be

analyzed and understood: I designed, tested, and redesigned a special one-page form that summarized each research study and asked participants to make several differentiations (Madsen, Greer, & Madsen, 1975; Madsen & Prickett, 1987). Even if musicians could not understand the entire article, they were asked to read the abstract and the discussion. Then they were asked to provide answers to several important questions such as "What did the research attempt to do?" and "What constituted the measurement?" Attempts were made to understand the statistical or graphic data analyses. More important, each musician was asked to write a short paragraph stating what he or she considered to be the basic importance of the study as well as a paragraph concerning how results could be generalized or transferred to other subjects or situations. The last two paragraphs proved the most useful in helping readers relate the study to their own teaching or performing situations. Musicians became progressively better in analyzing and making transfers from published research studies. They also became more sophisticated in their critical analysis and more discriminating in their reading. Another series of studies (Hanser & Madsen, 1972; Madsen, 1982; Madsen & Furman, 1984) indicates that most music students, undergraduate and graduate, can do quite sophisticated research on their own after having read and studied published research.

The third aspect important to the research process is to develop competent researchers. This is a long-term process—Opus 1 doth not a composer make and Opus 1 doth not a researcher make. As long as the dissertation remains the paramount if not the only research product attempted, it is inconceivable that systematic literature will be developed that will help shape music practices. There seem to be several problems and issues that relate to developing researchers, not the least of which involves the question of why some people desire such strong identification with the research community without doing any research.

One problem is with the traditional curricular structure of graduate education regarding the discrepancy between subject matter specialties (e.g., elementary, vocal, band), methodological specialties (e.g., philosophical, historical, descriptive, experimental), and specific subspecialties (e.g., aesthetic learning, computer applications). I suggest that differentiations concerning selection of a major professor for university music students be made along methodological and special interest lines rather than traditional subject matter classifications. For example, I find it difficult to see how a choral director could be sophisticated enough to direct all dissertations that involve historical, philosophical, descriptive, or experimental aspects relating to choruses, let alone be knowledgeable in all the specialties necessary for guidance. Therefore, I suggest that the major professor should direct work that is within his or her methodological expertise rather than tied to subject matter expertise, and the professor whose expertise lies in the appropriate subject matter should serve as an additional consultant. Certainly, it would be better to have one person with both abilities, but this is often not possible.

An ideal environment in which to develop a competent researcher would be one that starts early in developing general musical sensitivity

combined with research prowess. I suggest that we begin by teaching research to undergraduates. We might start with those young people who are sophisticated musicians and are truly curious, especially about the nature of teaching and learning and about perceptual or creative processes in music. It is unlikely that insensitive musicians or insensitive people will develop sensitive research projects. The undergraduate might begin early to integrate theory and practice so that learning methods of research is continuously interwoven with solving actual music problems. If long-term practices are not submitted to empirical investigation, the methods of teaching and research that have always been taught in certain ways go unchallenged and curricula become rigid and unresponsive to current needs. Alternatively, continuous investigation without actual practice tends to become esoteric and removed from the real world of making music. After the undergraduate has attempted several short projects and has read some research literature, the student needs to get into the practicing profession to appreciate better the mammoth demands of "doing it" (e.g., teaching, professional touring, or working as a music therapist). After several years of doing this, the student might return for a beginning graduate degree or might intersperse graduate work with his or her employment. Prospective researchers might help senior graduates or professors with projects while taking statistics, design, and measurement courses. It is especially important that they do a thesis that is publishable.

Perhaps the most important objective for prospective researchers is to begin early to write and, if possible, to publish (even if they coauthor their studies with more experienced scholars). It is at the master's level that a few students decide to attempt an advanced degree and thereby commit themselves to advanced research. Writing initiates the student into a community of scholars who are committed to research.

I suggest this process in contrast to current practice, which consists of adding a scholarly product (i.e., a dissertation or treatise) to many other burdensome requirements toward the pursuit of a doctorate. During doctoral study, identification with a major professor should be strong. It seems axiomatic that the major professor should present a model for important research behavior, but there is also a need for research critics and research administrators. These people are very important to the research process, and without them, research products would be nonexistent or hopelessly naive. The doctoral student should do many research projects during residency study so that one or two projects of publishable quality can be completed for the preliminary (comprehensive) examination. The dissertation should be an almost entirely independent endeavor so that little if any help is necessary from the supervising committee. In this manner the doctoral graduate emerges fully capable of doing research as well as directing other research without "farming out" the statistical or measurement problems to others.

Nevertheless, the nurturing process is still not complete unless the researcher has a network of concerned, highly critical, but supportive people with whom to interact. In this regard, groups are formed with persons of similar interests who possess these qualities. To work toward

this end, I instituted in 1974 a National Conference on Research in Music Behavior, which has met every two years and continues to bring together researchers of similar interests who are academically critical yet socially supportive. All persons affiliated with this group are currently highly productive and continue to provide leadership in music research. Additionally, in 1980 the Center for Music Research was formally established at the Florida State University under the capable leadership of Jack Taylor. As Bennett Reimer (1985) has suggested, other schools should provide opportunities for various focal research interests so that literature can be developed that includes specific thrusts.

I hope that these three issues, if appropriately addressed, will help in the development of sophisticated research that is important for advancing knowledge, promoting greater efficiency, and enhancing the quality of music experiences. Traditionally, rewards in higher education go to people who do whatever can be done within their chosen specialty: If one is a violinist, one plays; if one is a composer, one composes; if one teaches theory, one theorizes (in refereed journals, of course), and so on. Yet, additional knowledge concerning those aspects that could help us with our important work remains elusive, and research does not begin to enjoy the respect it should have. Perhaps some day research will be so valued in the music community that researchers will state proudly one of Cornelia Yarbrough's phrases, "Research is my performing instrument."

In summary, it seems that findings from research and subsequent technology would be especially beneficial in applied music study, but as long as those whose major responsibility is to teach applied music do not really value these procedures, the procedures will not be encouraged or used. Additionally, musicians and music teachers get ideas to try out in whatever manner they can. Transferring from reading the research reported in professional journals is one good source of these ideas, and working toward objective evaluation of any idea is certainly useful. Most important, researchers are ordinary people and therefore subject to the encouragements and punishments of their environments. It has always been difficult for me to understand how research can flourish when only punishing consequences prevail. Unfortunately, we have a few people in our research community whose primary goal seems to be criticism, and they produce little, if any, research. We not only need to be highly critical; we need to be supportive and nurturing as well. It seems to me that the often-perceived gap between the rigorous requirements of scientific inquiry and the art of music begins to narrow with attempts that include both pursuits. Therefore, in developing long-term aesthetic goals, we must strive to provide effective support for research efforts as well. I am pleased that MENC originated the Senior Researcher Award because I believe it is an important step in that direction. I am most grateful to have received this honor.

REFERENCES

- Gagne, R. M. (1974). *Essentials of learning for instruction*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.
- Hanser, S. B., & Madsen, C. K. (1972). Comparisons of graduate and undergraduate research in music therapy. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 9(2), 88-93.

Madsen, C. K. (1982). Graduate versus undergraduate scholarship: What should be our expectations? *College Music Symposium*, 22(1), 73-77.

Madsen, C. K. (1985a). Developing a research agenda: Issues concerning implementation. In National Association of Schools of Music, *Proceedings: The 60th Annual Meeting*. Reston, VA: Author. Used by permission.

Madsen, C. K. (1985b). Making research apply to your classroom. *Music Educators Journal*, 71(8), 18-19.

Madsen, C. K., & Furman, C. E. (1984). Graduate versus undergraduate scholarship: Research acquisition and dissemination. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 21, 170-176.

Madsen, C. K., Greer, R. D., & Madsen, C. H., Jr. (Eds.). (1975). *Research in music behavior: Modifying music behavior in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Madsen, C. K., & Prickett, C. A. (Eds.). (1987). *Applications of research in music behavior*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Madsen, C. K., & Madsen, C. H., Jr. (1978). *Experimental research in music*. Raleigh, NC: Contemporary Publishing.

Reimer, B. (1985, Summer). Toward a more scientific approach to music education research. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 83, 17-21.