



THE CHILD AS MUSICIAN

A HANDBOOK OF MUSICAL DEVELOPMENT



GARY E McPHERSON

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States

by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Oxford University Press 2006

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Data available

Typeset by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by

Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn

ISBN 0-19-853031-5 (Hbk.) 978-0-19-853031-2 (Hbk.)

ISBN 0-19-853032-3 (Pbk.) 978-0-19-853032-9 (Pbk.)

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

AESTHETIC RESPONSE

MARGARET S. BARRETT

Introduction

'Aesthetic response' is one of a constellation of related terms and concepts (e.g., aesthetic experience, aesthetic judgement, aesthetic choice, affective response, musical appreciation, musical preference, musical taste) that have been employed in music education research, theory, and practice when attempting to describe and/or define the nature of music knowing, experience, and judgement. As such the concept of aesthetic response is deeply problematic, an 'essentially contested concept' (Gallie, 1964; Barrett, 2002). To separate the terms, the 'aesthetic' stems from a philosophical tradition established in the eighteenth century, which drew on the legacy of the Ancient Greeks in an attempt to determine the nature, meaning and value of the arts and sensory experience to human existence. The latter term 'response' implies the end-point of some form of interaction; one that could be the result of precipitate stimulation, behaviourist training, or, considered reflection. While originally located in the realm of philosophy, when wedded to 'response', and placed in the context of music education, 'aesthetic response' has also been the object of study within psychology and sociology.

This chapter examines the ways in which 'aesthetic response' has been described and used within the philosophy, psychology, and sociology of music education, and examines relevant research that has sought to identify the nature and developmental trajectory in children's musical engagement within and across these fields. In so doing, it explores a view of aesthetic response as 'performative' and constitutive of identity, and considers the implications of this view for theories of children's musical development.

The topic of 'aesthetics', whether couched in philosophical, psychological, or sociological terms has generated an extensive body of literature. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to deal with the diverse and complex theories that have arisen within the literature, or to add further to the numerous attempts to arrive at a definitive account of aesthetic response. Rather, the chapter is intended to alert the reader to the depth and complexity of theoretical work in relation to this concept, and to provoke further discussion. Necessarily, many perspectives are omitted, some dealt with in a cursory manner when deserving of a more thorough examination, while others are examined in more depth as a particular argument

is pursued. For this reason, readers are encouraged to move beyond my omissions and 'prejudices'¹ and to explore the field in greater depth².

Philosophical views of aesthetic response

Philosophical views of aesthetic response arise from philosophical endeavour that has aimed to provide 'sustained, systematic and critical examination of belief' (Elliott, 2002, p. 85), and make 'the implicit explicit, with the ultimate aim of enriching both understanding and perception' (Bowman, 1998, p. 5). While the study of the nature of music, its effects, and human response, has been the topic of philosophical debate since the writings of Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, the formalization of this debate under the term 'aesthetic', stems from the eighteenth century and the work of Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1735³). Baumgarten created the term 'aesthetica' to describe a type of understanding that occurs through sensory experience of the world, that is, through perception rather than conception. He thereby created a complementary form of knowing and knowledge, a 'second-order' form of cognition. This idea of the aesthetic was taken up by Kant in his work *The critique of judgment* (1790/1952), and expanded upon in distinctive ways. For Kant, aesthetic experience consisted of the apprehension of beauty in an object, an apprehension that rests in our capacity to perceive formal qualities and make direct, personal judgements that are 'disinterested', that is, unmediated by consideration of external issues such as moral or ethical concerns. Unfortunately, Kant considered music's 'formal properties' as being too located in the realm of the sensuous as opposed to the contemplative, thus relegating music to a lowly form of aesthetic experience within the spectrum of the arts.

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a view of the aesthetic arose that sought to identify engagement with the arts as rational, cognitive, and separate from the powerful and seductive effects of the emotions and the sensuous. Philosophers strove to identify 'universal' and 'eternal' qualities that could be drawn on when making judgements about the nature and quality of arts works and experiences, and a unique kind of attention or 'aesthetic attitude' that was employed in such experiences⁴. This focus on universal and eternal qualities necessitated the discarding of all reference to context or qualities external to the work itself: the arts work became 'autonomous', an object or event to be judged solely through analysis of its 'internal' features, its 'form'. This is perhaps most powerfully illustrated in Eduard Hanslick's 'aesthetics of music' (1986) first published in 1854, where the capacity to appreciate the formal properties of musical works over sensuous or emotive properties, was emphasized. Hanslick's antipathy to the consideration of 'context'

¹ I use the term 'prejudice' in Gadamer's non-pejorative sense that 'all understanding necessarily involves some prejudice' (1982, p. 239).

² Analysis of primary sources and interpretations of these (e.g., Bowman, 1998) will provide a greater insight and understanding of the complexities of these debates in relation to music.

³ *Meditationes Philosophicae de Nonnullis ad Poema Pertinentibus*.

⁴ 'Aesthetic attitude' or *disinterest* theories may be traced from Kant, through the work of Schopenhauer (1818/1966), to Bullough's (1912) identification of 'psychical distance'.

or extra-musical features in making musical judgements is evidenced in his discussion of programme music, specifically Beethoven's overture to *Egmont*:

The content of Beethoven's overture is not the character Egmont, nor his actions, experiences, attitudes, but these are the content of the portrait 'Egmont', of the drama *Egmont*. The contents of the overture are sequences of tones which the composer has created entirely spontaneously, according to logical musical principles. For aesthetical contemplation, they are wholly autonomous and independent of the mental image of Egmont, with which only the poetical imagination of the composer has brought them into connection, no matter whether, in some inexplicable way, the image was suitable for initiating the invention of that sequence of tones or whether he invented that sequence of tones and then found the image of Egmont consistent with it.

Hanslick (1986, pp. 74–75)

For Hanslick, musical content consisted of the 'sequences of tones' rather than any extra-musical material, where music '... speaks not merely by means of tones, it speaks only tones' (1986, p. 78). In Hanslick's theory, musical content and form were 'fused in an obscure, inseparable unity' (1986, p. 80) that distinguished music from all other literary and visual arts. Feelings were a secondary effect in music as '... the more powerfully an effect from a work of art overwhelms us physically (and hence is pathological), the more negligible is its aesthetical component' (1986, p. 57). Hanslick (1986) instead promoted a 'deliberate pure contemplation' of music, that yielded an 'unemotional yet heartfelt pleasure', a 'mental satisfaction which the listener finds in continuously following and anticipating the composer's designs, here to be confirmed in his expectations, there to be agreeably lead astray' (p. 64).

This emphasis on the cognition of autonomous form as the determining factor in making meaning and judgements in music continues in various guises through the accounts of musical meaning offered by theorists such as Suzanne Langer (1942/1979) and Leonard B. Meyer (1956). Langer's theory of music does not exclude emotion and the sensuous, as she views music as a type of analogue of emotional experience, where the movement of musical tension mirrors that of emotional experience. However, in her view we do not experience the emotions *as* emotions, rather, we experience music as a 'presentational symbol' of emotions: as Bowman (2004) describes this approach, '... music shares common structural form with the realm of feeling (music sounds like feelings feel)' (p. 32).

Meyer also admits emotion into the ways in which we understand and make meaning in music. In his early work, Meyer (1956) provides an (somewhat behavioural) explanation of musical meaning where music and emotion (or affect) are described in terms of stimulus and response, with musical meaning and 'affect' arising from our close attention to the unfolding of musical patterns that both confirm and contradict our 'listener' expectations. For example, musical 'affect' may be achieved through the development of repetitive musical forms that lead the listener to expect certain musical resolutions that are subsequently interrupted or delayed, before being resolved in conventional or novel ways. Meyer's (2001) continued emphasis on 'expectancy' and arousal and resolution as the 'essential basis for aesthetic-emotional experience' (p. 353) is evident in later work. While emotion and 'affect' are admitted, they are only achieved through cognitive attention

to pattern and structure within the musical work in a manner reminiscent of Hans description of the 'unemotional yet heartfelt pleasure' gained from the 'deliberate pure temptation of music'. For Meyer (2001), uncertainty is of aesthetic importance as 'When the tensions of instability are resolved to the cognitive security of stable patterning, functional relationships have at once articulated and unified musical structure' (p. 359).

Langer's and Meyer's theories are in varying degrees sensitive to stylistic and cultural differences, thereby beginning the move away from an emphasis on universal qualities in the ways in which we understand, make meaning, and respond to music. However, the terms by which Meyer's 'expectations' are unfolded within styles rests in a Western art music definition of 'style' that identifies 'intra-stylistic' features through the 'universal lens' of Western art music. This circular process inevitably judges all music from a common (Western art music) framework regardless of the acknowledgement of style-specific features within that framework, and tends to draw us back to a cognitive focus on autonomous form, albeit one that admits of a form of emotional engagement (for further discussion on the development of *emotional* response see Chapter 10).

Philosophical views: implications for children's musical development

The legacy of these (modernist) accounts of aesthetics and aesthetic response has been an exclusive focus on audience-listening as the key mode by which aesthetic response is elicited/demonstrated, where the listener's increasing ability to identify the interplay of formal features is taken as an indicator of aesthetic understanding and development. Adherence to these accounts of the aesthetic suggests that the development of aesthetic response in children rests in a growing capacity to identify and 'engage' in audience-listening with the formal features of musical works in particular musical styles. Specifically, a child's capacity to identify and respond to musical tension achieved through the manipulation of musical elements (Langer), or, to identify the ways in which musical patterns are established, developed, and resolved (Meyer), is indicative of aesthetic understanding and response.

Such an approach does not acknowledge that music has many roles and functions in our lives beyond that of being an 'object' of 'pure contemplation', roles that I shall explore in greater depth later in this chapter. Furthermore, postmodernist perspectives on aesthetics have challenged the verities that were the foundation of modernist aesthetic theory, such as autonomous form, universal and eternal qualities, and disinterestedness, suggesting that our attention in and to music encompasses more than a disinterested focus on formal properties. Acknowledgement of the particular and local, of plurality, the 'other', a 'bias' or 'prejudice' in a non-pejorative sense move the aesthetic project away from a search for definitive statements. As Bowman (1998) reminds us:

The comforting belief that all music is evaluable by the same, strictly 'aesthetic' criteria has lost its persuasiveness, as has the noble vision of music as an inherently and inevitably 'humanizing' affair. The essentially musical core which 'masterworks' were once thought to represent abundantly is increasingly characterized as ideological and political subterfuge. What the term 'music' designates has become increasingly problematic, and its potential values have become radically multiple. (p. 394)

The admission of postmodernist theory to the discussion of aesthetics has generated considerable debate, and philosophical accounts of aesthetic response in music are contested heavily. However, within the discipline of the psychology of music, the study of aesthetic response has been subject to less debate. In the following section I shall explore the ways in which aesthetic response has been described and interrogated from this perspective.

Psychological views of aesthetic response

Psychological views of aesthetic response have arisen largely from the study of music perception and cognition in the field of psycho-acoustics, specifically, within the subfield of empirical or experimental aesthetics. Empirical aesthetics (Fechner, 1876/1978) was developed as a complementary area of study to that of philosophical aesthetics, and was intended to establish a means to scientific study of those concepts raised in philosophical aesthetics. This work was taken up by Berlyne (1970, 1971, 1974) who established the field of experimental aesthetics in an attempt to develop an 'objective' approach to the study of aesthetic appreciation in music that was *separate* from the 'speculative' nature of philosophical aesthetics.

Despite this distinction in the intentions of empirical and experimental aesthetics, both approaches have a philosophical foundation in modernist accounts of the aesthetic. This is perhaps a consequence of early parallel development wherein empirical and experimental aesthetics developed from *modernist* accounts of philosophical aesthetics, and have not been subject to recent *postmodernist* developments in the field. Within empirical and experimental aesthetics, the research enterprise works from 'universal' features of music (e.g., the perception of acoustic stimuli and/or pattern and form) to identify characteristic patterns of development in the aesthetic/affective perception and cognition of music. Consequently, psychological accounts of aesthetic response are subject to the criticisms levelled at modernist philosophical accounts of the aesthetic in their focus on autonomous form, universal and eternal qualities, and 'disinterested' response.

Studies of aesthetic response in the psychology of music have included the analysis of listener response to hearings of non-musical acoustic stimuli (Berlyne, 1971), of elements of musical systems, such as tuning (Lynch & Eilers, 1991), and of partial and/or complete performances of musical works (Madsen *et al.*, 1993). These studies have included the investigation of responses to auditory/musical experiences that require little prior knowledge or experience of music, and/or extensive knowledge and experience (Madsen & Geringer, 1990; Madsen *et al.*, 1993). The former of these approaches arises in part from nativist views of aesthetic thinking and response that argue that innate cognitive structures govern thinking, learning, and development, and seek to identify the nature of these, and the constraints of their operation. In contrast to the nativist position, contextualist views argue that culture and context play an instrumental role in thinking, learning, and development, and insist that the constructive influences of these factors be admitted to any study of aesthetic thinking and response. Research techniques employed in these studies have elicited both non-verbal and verbal response to listening experience. In the former, devices such as the 'Continuous Response Digital Interface' (CRDI) have been used as a

means to accessing music response unmediated by language and the specialized vocabulary required for the discussion of music experience (Madsen & Geringer, 1990; Madsen *et al.*, 1993). The CRDI involves manipulation of a dial during listening experience, a process that produces a 'map' of emotional response to music experience that indicates the peaks and troughs of such response (in part an application of Langer's suggestion that music is a 'presentational symbol' of emotions). The view of 'aesthetic response' that emerges from this approach is one that highlights music's role in arousing feelings and emotions, rather than one that focuses on the identification of elements of musical structure and form. Essentially, the CRDI maps 'reflection-in-action', providing a means to monitor arousal states.

Non-verbal approaches have been employed also in developmental psychology research with infants and young children as a means to circumventing infants' actual and young children's perceived inability to verbalize a response to musical experience. Researchers examining infants' responses to music have adapted 'head-turn preference procedures' (HTPP) employed in developmental linguistics to test infants' abilities to discriminate between varying aural stimuli (Karmiloff & Karmiloff-Smith, 2001). This procedure has been used to identify infants' musical preferences for consonance over dissonance (Zentner & Kagan, 1996; Trainor *et al.*, 2002); musically phrased segmentation of melodies over non-musically phrased segmentation (Krumhansl & Jusczyk, 1990); and tone repetition in melody (Schellenberg & Trehub, 1999). HTPP strategies have also been employed to identify infants' ability to detect changes in melodic contour (Trehub *et al.*, 1997), and in semi-tonal variations in interval size (Schellenberg & Trehub, 1996). These HTPP studies indicate that infants have established preferences and abilities from an early age, suggesting that music preferences and responses arise from innate structures. An alternative interpretation of these findings takes into account the considerable exposure to music that many infants experience *in utero* and during the first months of life, modifying a purely nativist account of this aspect of musical development to one that admits of the formative nature of culture and environment.

In a bid to address criticisms concerning the ecological validity of some methodological approaches to the psychological study of aesthetics (e.g., asking participants to respond to isolated tones or artificial stimuli that have little or no resemblance to music events) researchers working with child participants have sought increasingly to use complete musical works of varying length and complexity as a means to eliciting and studying aesthetic response. Strategies employed in these studies have included: eliciting verbal response during the aural event using 'think-aloud' protocols (Richardson, 1995); eliciting verbal response after the aural event using interview, verbal checklist, or written reflective responses (Hevner, 1936; Farnsworth, 1954; Flowers, 1984, 1988; Nelson, 1985; Preston, 1994; Rodriguez & Webster, 1997; Rodriguez, 1998; Swanwick & Franca, 1999; Barrett, 2000/2001); eliciting non-verbal 'aesthetic response' during the aural event using devices such as the CRDI (Byrnes, 1997); eliciting non-verbal response after the aural event using movement analogues (Gromko & Poorman, 1998; Fung & Gromko, 2001), adult-generated listening maps (Gromko & Russell, 2002), and graphic tasks (Hair, 1993/1994). In reviewing this body of research, questions may be raised in regard to the timing of the elicitation of the response (during or after the event): specifically, the distinction between responding in listening as

a 'reflection-in-action' strategy as opposed to responding after listening as a 'reflection-on-action' strategy. While some would dispute whether listening is 'action', or indeed, capable of bearing the distinction between reflection 'in' rather than 'on' action, what is accessed 'in' rather than 'after' the event may be qualitatively different in ways that are important to understanding aesthetic thinking and response. Similarly, distinction needs to be made between arousal, affect, and enduring response. Further research is needed to explore these questions in relation to aesthetic response.

The employment of verbal strategies to elicit children's aesthetic response has not been without criticism as researchers have suggested that young children's ability to verbalize their ideas and responses is significantly less than their perceptual abilities (Hair, 1981, 1987). Nevertheless a number of studies have proposed developmental trends in children's verbal responses to listening experience. These include the observation that:

1. young children are more concerned with describing isolated properties of sound than with the affective aspects of music (Rodriguez & Webster, 1997);
2. musically untrained children's and adults' verbal responses are primarily concerned with 'extra-musical' references with some references to timbre, tempo, and dynamics (Flowers, 1990); and
3. children move progressively through stages dominated respectively by
 - a focus on the materials of music (isolated properties)
 - a focus on expressive properties, and
 - a focus on issues of form and structure (Swanwick & Franca, 1999).

The hierarchic separation of children's perception of isolated properties, expressive properties, and issues of form and structure that is outlined in these findings reflects the concerns of modernist aesthetics with the separation of affective issues from those of structure and form, a Cartesian separation of emotion from cognition. It could be speculated that these results reflect the underlying aesthetic theory of such research, in that a theoretical separation of affective and structural properties, of form and content, shapes the ways in which these issues are identified in participant responses, and subsequently interpreted: that is, a dualistic framework inevitably produces dualistic results.

In other approaches to the study of aesthetic response researchers have sought to examine modes of music engagement other than audience-listening as a means to accessing musical thinking and aesthetic decision-making, focusing on children's *musical* discourse as composers (Barrett, 1996, 1998). Findings from this research dispute the hierarchic separation of expressive properties and issues of form and structure in children's musical thinking, a finding that is supported by other research (Marsh, 1995). From this research, a view of the aesthetic as a situated interpretive 'dialogue' between the child, the music event, and the social and cultural contexts in which she experiences music and music-making is proposed (Barrett, 2002). The aesthetic 'transaction' is viewed as a form of contextually embedded action in which meanings and judgements of value are 'demonstrated' through a range of musical processes (Barrett, 2002, 2003a).

Psychological views: implications for children's musical development

Specific aesthetic theories are rarely outlined in many of the studies cited above. However, the emphasis on initiating and mapping response to formal/structural features in isolation from content and contextual features, suggests that the underlying aesthetic theory is formalist and modernist, that is, one that focuses on intra-musical features, and response to these 'aesthetic' qualities. These studies tend to work from musical materials developed within the Western classical or 'art' music tradition, further reinforcing a philosophical view of the aesthetic as autonomous, universal, eternal, creating a sense of internal congruence that results in broad similarities in the ways in which aesthetic experience and response is described (Lychner, 1998).

In these psychological approaches to the study of aesthetic response the development of aesthetic response in children appears to rest in a growing capacity to identify and 'engage' with the formal features of musical works. While researchers have moved beyond a solitary focus on audience-listening as the prime mode of engagement for aesthetic response, to one that acknowledges other forms of engagement, and admitted an expanded notion of 'music' to include music beyond that of the Western music canon, there is still considerable debate on the nature and developmental trajectory of aesthetic response. Indeed, the admission of issues of context and culture has served to add further complexity to the study of aesthetic response. Another element of complexity is evident in the emergence of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of music, music development, and aesthetic response.

While the field of cognitive neuroscience of music is not directly linked to that of experimental aesthetics or the psychological study of aesthetic response, the topics of study in this field have some overlap with the concerns of experimental aesthetics. For example, the study of the processing of emotions provoked by music experience relates to the sensuous aspects of aesthetic experience, and the mode of music engagement that is most often associated with aesthetic experience in music, that of audience listening. Studies that have mapped physiological response (heart and/or respiration rate, skin conductivity, blood flow) to music, suggest that 'music elicits a cascade of subconscious activity' (Trainor & Schmidt, 2003, p. 320). Trainor and Schmidt (2003) propose that 'music may be so intimately connected with emotional systems because caregivers use music to communicate emotionally with their infants before they are able to use language' (p. 310). This implicit linking of the cognitive and emotive through identifying communication as a function of early music engagement is also evident in the work of Dissanayake (2001). She argues that aesthetic imagination arises from the 'pretend play' of mother-infant interactions, interactions in which infants are active agents in their communicative interactions with mothers or caretakers in what are 'essentially *aesthetic* contexts' (2000, p. 219). Dissanayake (2000) observes that 'In these encounters, sensitivities to rhythmic and dynamic change are manipulated in order to co-ordinate the mother-infant pair emotionally and express its accord' (p. 219). This emphasis on interactive social engagement suggests a more holistic notion of aesthetic response that moves beyond a focus on intra-musical features (such as formal features of musical works) to a focus on the *uses* of music in social settings, in short, to sociological views of aesthetic response.

Sociological views of aesthetic response

As sociological studies are concerned with issues such as social organization, action and interaction between individuals and groups, and social processes involved in the production of culture and knowledge, sociological approaches to aesthetics have looked beyond intramusical features to acknowledge the influence and impact of other processes in eliciting and shaping aesthetic response. Writing broadly of sociology, DeNora (2001) characterizes this move as one where 'sociologists across a wide range of specialist areas have devoted themselves to the question of how material-cultural and aesthetic media may be understood to provide models and candidate structures for the production and achievement of emotion and feeling within specific social settings' (p. 164). For music, this has resulted in a concern with 'how it is consumed and what it "does" in social life' (p. 164), and a focus on the practice of music in a range of social and cultural settings, rather than on 'autonomous music objects'. These concerns resonate with those of ethnomusicology, where the interests of musicologists and anthropologists intersect in the study of musical structures and materials (musicology), and their cultural function (anthropology) (Gregory, 1997). Discussion of some ethnomusicological approaches to the study of children's aesthetic engagement and response shall be addressed in this section.

DeNora (2000, 2001) suggests that when music is used to manipulate emotional, cognitive, and feeling states that it functions as a kind of 'aesthetic technology', an instrument of self and social ordering, of emotional and identity work. This enacted and enactive view of the aesthetic, where the focus is on 'use' not autonomous object provides a revitalized view of the aesthetic, one that emphasizes 'aesthetic agency' (DeNora, 2000). In this view, 'Music is a resource to which agents turn so as to regulate themselves as aesthetic agents, as feeling, thinking and active beings in their day-to-day lives' (DeNora, 2003, p. 95). This focus has also been taken up in philosophy by the pragmatist philosopher Richard Shusterman (2000) and is evidenced in his proposal of the discipline of 'somaesthetics' (I shall explore this further in the following section). The emergent view of the aesthetic from these diverse fields is one that is concerned with emotion, specifically, with the 'social distribution of emotion' (DeNora, 2001, p. 167), 'our need for beauty and intensified feeling' (Shusterman, 2000, p. 7), and our 'use' of aesthetic experiences in the structuring of our lives.

Within music, sociological views of aesthetic response have tended to focus on the issue of musical 'taste' or 'preference', under the broad rubric of 'musical appreciation' (Russell, 1997). The examination of the musical preferences of adolescents has been of particular interest to music educators and researchers working from a cross-disciplinary perspective in the social psychology of music (Zilman & Gan, 1997; North *et al.*, 2000; Boal-Palheiros & Hargreaves, 2001). This interest reflects concerns that adolescents' enormous interest in and consumption of music in their lives beyond schools does not translate necessarily into a commensurate interest in engagement in school music (see further, Ross, 1995; Gammon, 1996). Much of the sociological research in aesthetic response has been concerned with exploring adolescents' preferences for specific genres of music and the links between such preferences and music-dependent behaviours (Frith & McRobbie, 1990; Shepherd & Giles-Davies, 1991; see also, Willis's 1978 study of bikeboys' use of music as a means to shaping their behaviour).

A number of studies have explored the relationship between gender and musical taste (Frith & McRobbie, 1990; Bryson, 1997) in an attempt to identify gender-based patterns of musical preference. For example, young girls' preference for romantic popular music and dance music (McRobbie, 2000) appears to differentiate their tastes from those of young boys. However, other research suggests that the differentiation on gender lines lies in the ways in which the respective groupings describe and discuss music rather than in the identification of specific musical works and styles (Richards, 1998). While much of this research has focused again on audience-listening as the main mode of aesthetic engagement, the nature of such listening has expanded beyond traditional 'concert-hall' notions of 'deliberate pure contemplation of music' to encompass types of 'performative listening', for example, listening in and through dance participation (McRobbie, 2000), and 'pairing music with a variety of other materials, practices, and postures' (DeNora, 2003, p. 94). In related work, feminist analyses of music and music experience interrogate the nature of audience-listening and criticism and the gendered assumptions that underlie modes of music engagement and forms of music analysis (McClary, 1991).

In other sociological investigations of aesthetic response researchers have investigated the musical preferences of younger children including the labels they use to describe such preferences (Suthers, 1999), their habits of listening at home and at school (Boal-Palheiros & Hargreaves, 2004), and the ways in which children 'use' music in their daily lives (Campbell, 1998, 2002). Campbell's (2002) study rests in the intersection between sociology, ethnomusicology, and anthropology as she argues that children 'use' music for a variety of purposes in their various musical cultures (p. 61). She identifies nine distinct functions of music in children's lives, those of: Emotional expression; Aesthetic enjoyment; Entertainment; Communication; Physical response; Enforcement of conformity to social norms; Validation of religious ritual; Continuity and stability of culture; and Integration of society (pp. 61–64). Campbell (2002) does not order these various functions in a developmental progression, rather, she emphasizes the diversity of uses of music in the lives of children of all ages. Crucially, the identification of these functions incorporates a variety of modes of music engagement. In other ethnomusicological work, children's songs and musical play have been identified as rich sources of information concerning the characteristic musical structures of adult culture (Nettl, 1990), and potentially a source for understanding the development of aesthetic preferences and practices in these cultures.

An acknowledged antecedent for Campbell's work lies in Blacking's seminal study of the music of the Venda people, and his analysis of children's song in this culture. Blacking's (1973/2000) emphasis was primarily ethnomusicological rather than anthropological as evidenced in his insistence on the analysis of music structure as a means to understanding the nature of music:

We may never be able to understand exactly how another person feels about a piece of music, but we can perhaps understand the structural factors that generate the feelings. Attention to music's function in society is necessary only in so far as it may help us to explain the structures . . . I am concerned primarily with what music is, and not what it is used for. (p. 26)

While this emphasis may be viewed as a perpetuation of a modernist concern with accessing musical meaning through the analysis of music's constitutive elements, Blacking (1973/2000) asserted that musical structures were not separate from socio-cultural and biological structures:

Functional analyses of musical structure cannot be detached from structural analyses of its social function: the function of tones in relation to each other cannot be explained adequately as part of a closed system without reference to the structures of the socio-cultural system of which the musical system is a part, and the biological system to which all music makers belong (p. 30).

In relation to the focus of this chapter, aesthetic response, Blacking's description of the embedded nature of the biological, the musical, and the socio-cultural reminds us that individual and collective experience of music in social and cultural settings is central to the development of aesthetic response, and is manifest in a range of musical modes of engagement.

Sociological views: implications for children's musical development

The sociological focus on the 'uses' of music in individual lives challenges traditional accounts of children's musical development in aesthetic response. Specifically, the 'uses' of music as a means to configure identity, relationships, and social and cultural institutions, suggests that aesthetic response is 'performative' and plays a key role in children's identity work. When these issues are taken into consideration, the study of children's aesthetic response necessitates a move from a singular focus on the musical work and children's response to this, to the study of children's musical action and agency, their active engagement in music in all modes of musical engagement (e.g., composing, improvising, listening, moving, performing, singing), and an admission of multiple ways in which aesthetic response may be 'performed'.

Aesthetic response and the child as musician

In the above discussion of philosophical, psychological, and sociological views of the aesthetic, it is evident that the bulk of research into aesthetic response has emerged in the field of psychology and its various subdisciplines. In terms of studying musical development, the child as musician has been viewed largely through the lens of developmental psychology, a lens that has been shaped by formalist views of the aesthetic that arose in modernist accounts of philosophical aesthetics. As such the development of the child as musician is described as a process whereby an autonomous individual engages with the phenomenon of Western music as it is presented in institutional Western music education practices. These latter tend to work from an 'atomised' rather than holistic account of music and music experience, where the study of music occurs through the isolated study of its constitutive elements rather than through holistic encounters with music practice. Lucy Green's (2002) analysis of the learning practices of popular musicians points the distinction between these

formal and informal music learning practices. In what may be seen as a self-replicating process, research has focused on the study of individual response to the constitutive elements of music, presented variously in isolation, or complete musical contexts.

It is only recently that the child as musician has been viewed through other lenses, for example, that of sociology. Consequently, sociological accounts of children's aesthetic response are less common. Further, such accounts tend to be shaped around the study of social and cultural issues in aesthetic response such as gender, or social class, rather than developmental issues. Indeed, within the sociological study of childhood, many of the assumptions that are inherent in developmental psychological studies of childhood are challenged. This is evident in the emerging field of socio-cultural developmental psychology (Rogoff, 2003) where accounts of the nature and trajectory of development in a range of human functions are demonstrably different across social and cultural settings.

What is common in many accounts of the aesthetic and aesthetic response in both developmental psychology and sociology is a failure to acknowledge and interrogate the philosophical beliefs and values that underpin the research enterprise. I have attempted in the above discussions of psychological and sociological views to identify some of these underlying philosophical theories. It is significant that much of the research draws on formalist aesthetic theories that have been subject to considerable debate in recent years. Key criticisms of these theories include the adherence to universals, the separation of mind and body in human thought and action, and the elision of social and cultural variation. In what follows I shall explore an alternative account of aesthetic response that draws on recent aesthetic philosophy, and discuss the implications of such an account for our views of the development of the 'child as musician'.

Performing aesthetic identity

In a broad interdisciplinary approach to the study of the origins of 'art' and its meaning and function in human existence Dissanayake (1988/2002, 1992/1999, 2000) draws on diverse fields, including those of aesthetics, anthropology, evolutionary theory, biology and socio-biology, psychology, cognitive science, and neuroscience to propose a bioevolutionary theory of art. Dissanayake (2000) argues that the arts are intrinsic to human existence, that love and the arts are 'inherently related', and, that the origins of art lie in human intimacy. Her argument draws on evidence of 'psychobiological mechanisms', or 'rhythms and modes' that she proposes form the basis of mother-infant interactions and communication. While socio-cultural views of developmental psychology (Rogoff, 2003) may query Dissanayake's 'universal' characterization of mother-infant interactions, suggesting that these provide a 'Western' romanticized account of such early relationships, the theory provides a useful lens through which we may explore an alternative account of aesthetic response.

In earlier work Dissanayake comments that '... insofar as we respond *aesthetically* we are aware (at some level; it may well be inarticulate) of the code—of *how* not only *that* something is said. This awareness, which is cognitive, makes our fuller response possible, as we discriminate, relate, recognize, and otherwise follow the code's manipulations' (Dissanayake, 1988/2002, p. 165). Here, Dissanayake (1988/2002) identifies two kinds of appreciation, that

of '... "ecstatic" response to sensual, psychophysiological properties in the artwork, and ... "aesthetic" response to the manipulations of the code or pattern of expectations embodied in it' (p. 164). For Dissanayake, aesthetic response is a result of education whereas 'ecstatic' response arises from sensation. At one level this separation of the aesthetic from the ecstatic reflects the preoccupation of modernist aesthetic theory with separating body from mind, sensuous experience from cognition, a preoccupation that is countered by recent moves to 'embody' the mind (Damasio, 1994/2000, 2000, 2003; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Bresler, 2004). At another level, within Dissanayake's (2000) frame of a 'naturalistic aesthetic', the body and mind are brought together in a psychobiological explanation of aesthetic valuing and response that points towards the 'embodied mind'.

Dissanayake (2000) argues that the origins of the aesthetic lie in the human need for *mutuality*. She suggests that mutuality is characterized by the features of: belonging to; finding and making meaning; competence through handling and making; and, elaboration. Dissanayake's identification of these features draws on Trevarthen's (1998) concept of *innate intersubjectivity*. He argues that infants are predisposed to elicit, respond to, and regulate the mother's emotional as well as physical support and care, and identifies 'mutual action' and 'infant agency' as key components of this process. Mutuality and agency are also evident in Malloch's accounts of 'communicative musicality'. He describes 'communicative musicality' as the 'co-operative and co-dependent communicative interactions between mother and infant' (Malloch, 1999, p. 31) where human communication between mother and infant in the first year of life takes the form of an interactive dialogue shaped by the musical elements of pulse, quality, and narrative.

All of these accounts of the origins of the aesthetic emphasize the role of the infant as active agent rather than passive subject in the aesthetic transaction, and acknowledge that aesthetic response occurs as music-maker as well as music-listener. Others support this view of the child as active 'aesthetic' agent arguing that young children '... are culture-makers by nature ... they are born into history and community' (Abbs, 2003, p. 55) and are engaged in a 'reciprocal relationship' between culture and self. Studies in the sociology of childhood assert that children '... are active contributors to, rather than simply spectators of the complex processes of cultural continuity and change' (James *et al.*, 1998, p. 83). This is illustrated in studies of young children's meaning-making as song-makers (Barrett, 2000, 2003b) where young children are portrayed as active producers rather than simply re-producers of their musical culture, in short, that they work as 'meme engineers' (Barrett, 2003b) in the ways in which they construct musical meaning in and through their lives. Importantly, this early 'aesthetic work' plays a role in the ways in which young children come to understand themselves and others.

Richard Shusterman's (2002, 2004) concept of 'somaesthetics' constitutes one approach to a view of the aesthetic that embraces the sensual and the cognitive, the body and the mind. He defines somaesthetics as '... a discipline devoted to the critical ameliorative study of the experience and use of the body as a locus of sensory-aesthetic appreciation (*aesthesis*) and creative self-fashioning' (2004, p. 51), and suggests that this study addresses the central aims of philosophy, those of 'knowledge, self-knowledge, right action, justice, and the quest for the good life' (2004, p. 51). Shusterman outlines three forms of somaesthetics, analytic, pragmatic, and practical. While all three hold potential for developing our understanding of

the development of aesthetic response in music, it is the latter, the practical, or experiential, that is my focus. For Shusterman, experiential somaesthetics' role is to inform us more fully about our feelings and emotions through attention to the embodiment of these. Knowledge of other courses of action and ways of being helps us 'retrain, reorganise and re-educate' (2004, pp. 56–58). Such awareness can lead us to better knowledge, understanding, and ultimately action in the ways in which we conduct our lives, issues that are closely linked to the development and maintenance of identity. Potentially, admission of somaesthetics may assist our understanding of the ways in which individuals draw on and enact music practices. It is worth noting that the music education system developed by Emile Jaques Dalcroze (1921/1980) holds as an underlying principle that musical understanding arises from developing awareness of kinaesthetic response to music and the subsequent conscious use of bodily movement as a means to explore music's structural and expressive properties. While Dalcroze's chief concern was the development of musical understanding in thought and action rather than self-knowledge and identity work, his philosophy and methods foreshadowed in many ways those of practical somaesthetics.

Three key elements emerge from the literature examined above: first, that the aesthetic is embodied, connecting the body and the mind in children's musical thought and action; second, that the 'child as musician' is engaged from infancy as 'aesthetic agent'; and, third, that children's 'aesthetic work' provides a means for them to 'perform' identity as they come to understand themselves and their worlds. In proposing a performative view of aesthetic identity, I seek to bring these three key elements together to promote a view of the child as aesthetic agent, engaged through mind and body in crucial identity work in and through music. That music is central to identity work is indisputable. Drawing on Judith Butler's performative account of identity, Bowman (2002) sets forth as a 'pivotal claim' for music's ethical and educational significance the view that:

... we are what we do, and do repeatedly. Music's ritualistic actions and the dispositions that undergird them are fundamental to the formation of character, both collective and individual. More strongly still, music plays a fundamental role in the social production and regulation of identity. If music is an important part of the machinery by which people's individual and collective identities are constructed, reconstructed, maintained, and regulated, music education becomes something dramatically more momentous and problematic than an act of overseeing the development of musical skills, musicianship, or 'aesthetic sensibilities'. The view on which this claim is based is performative, one that sees identities not as natural facts, but cultural performances. (pp. 75–76)

I have quoted Bowman's claim in full as it holds significance for any discussion of children's musical development, and of the 'aesthetic'. If we endorse Bowman's central claim, that music is foundational in the construction, reconstruction, maintenance, and regulation of identity, the development of the 'child as musician' becomes a process of 'self-creation' that is concerned not just with the 'sonorous event' but also with the rich interplay of individual, social, cultural, and environmental factors that are part of that event, and the changes and transformations effected in the individual through engagement with all these factors.

In this view the development of aesthetic understanding as evidenced in aesthetic response is a process of growth, not of acquisition, '...more a process of "becoming" than a process of becoming aware or of "Becoming knowledgeable"' (Bowman, 2004, p. 44).

Significantly, developing aesthetic understanding and response is not the sole preserve of the listening subject: the possibility of aesthetic response is present in all modes of music engagement as children construct and 'perform' their emergent aesthetic identities.

References

- Abbs, P. (2003). *Against the flow: Education, the arts and postmodern culture*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Barrett, M. S. (1996). Children's aesthetic decision-making: An analysis of children's musical discourse as composers. *International Journal of Music Education*, 28, 37-62.
- Barrett, M. S. (1998). Children composing: A view of aesthetic decision-making. In B. Sundin, G. E. McPherson, & G. Folkestad (eds), *Children composing* (pp. 57-81) Malmö: Lund University Press.
- Barrett, M. S. (2000/2001). Perception, description and reflection: Young children's aesthetic decision-making as critics of their own and adult compositions. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 147, 22-29.
- Barrett, M. S. (2002). Towards a 'situated' view of the aesthetic in music education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 36(3), 67-77.
- Barrett, M. S. (2003a). Freedoms and constraints: Constructing musical worlds through the dialogue of composition. In M. Hickey (ed.), *Composition in the schools: A new horizon for music education* (pp. 3-27). Reston, VA: MENC.
- Barrett, M. S. (2003b). Meme engineers: Children as producers of musical culture. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 11(3) 195-212.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1970). Novelty, complexity, and hedonic value. *Perception and psychophysics*, 8, 279-286.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1971). *Aesthetics and psychobiology*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts Publishers.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1974). *Studies in the new experimental aesthetics: Steps towards an objective psychology of aesthetic appreciation*. Toronto: John Wiley.
- Blacking, J. (1973/2000). *How musical is man?* Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Boal-Palheiros, G. & Hargreaves, D. J. (2001). Listening to music at home and at school. *British Journal of Music Education*, 18(2), 103-118.
- Boal-Palheiros, G. & Hargreaves, D. J. (2004). Children's modes of listening to music at home and at school. In J. Tafuri (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th seminar of the ISME Research Commission* (pp. 31-38). Bologna: Conservatorio di Musica.
- Bowman, W. (1998). *Philosophical perspectives on music*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowman, W. (2002). Educating musically. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (eds), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 63-84). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowman, W. (2004). Cognition and the body: Perspectives from music education. In L. Bresler (ed.), *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Toward embodied music teaching and learning* (pp. 29-50). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bresler, L. (2004). *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Toward embodied music teaching and learning*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bryson, B. (1997). 'Anything but heavy metal': Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological review*, 61, 884-899.
- Bullough, E. (1912). 'Psychical distance' as a factor in art and as an aesthetic principle. *British journal of Psychology*, 5, 87-98.
- Byrnes, S. R. (1997). Different-age and mentally handicapped listeners' response to Western art music selections. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(4), 568-579.

- Campbell, P. S. (1998). *Songs in their heads: music and its meaning in children's lives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, P. S. (2002). The musical cultures of children. In L. Bresler & C. Marme Thompson (eds), *The arts in children's lives: Context, culture, and curriculum* (pp. 57–69). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dalcroze, E. J. (1921/1980). *Rhythm, music and education*. London: The Dalcroze Society.
- Damasio, A. (1994/2000). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. New York: Quill (Harper Collins).
- Damasio, A. (2000). *The feeling of what happens: Body, emotion and the making of consciousness*. London: Vintage.
- Damasio, A. (2003). *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, sorrow, and the feeling brain*. New York: Harcourt.
- DeNora, T. (2000). *Music in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeNora, T. (2001). Aesthetic agency and musical practice: New directions in the sociology of music and emotion. In P. N. Juslin & J. A. Sloboda (eds), *Music and emotion: Theory and research* (pp. 161–180). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DeNora, T. (2003). *After Adorno: Rethinking music sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dissanayake, E. (1988/2002). *What is art for?* Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Dissanayake, E. (1992/1999). *Homo aestheticus: Where art comes from and why*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Dissanayake, E. (2000). *Art and intimacy: How the arts began*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Dissanayake, E. (2001). Becoming *homo aestheticus*: sources of aesthetic imagination in mother-infant interactions. *SubStance*, 94/95, 85–103.
- Elliott, D. J. (2002). Philosophical perspectives on research. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (eds), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 85–102). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farnsworth, P. R. (1954). A study of the Hevner adjective list. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 13, 97–103.
- Fechner, G. (1878/1978). *Die forschule der aesthetik (The introduction to aesthetics)*. Hildesheim: Geor Holms.
- Flowers, P. (1984). Attention to elements of music and effect of instruction in vocabulary on written descriptions of music by children and undergraduates. *Psychology of Music*, 12, 17–24.
- Flowers, P. (1988). The effects of teaching and learning experiences, tempo, and mode on undergraduates' and children's symphonic music preferences. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 36, 19–34.
- Flowers, P. (1990). Listening: The key to describing music. *Music Educators Journal*, 77, 21–23.
- Frith, S. & McRobbie, A. (1990). Rock and sexuality. In S. Frith & A. Goodwin (eds), *Pop, Rock and the written word* (pp. 371–389). London: Routledge.
- Fung, V. & Gromko, J. (2001). Effects of active versus passive listening on the quality of children's invented notations and preferences for two Korean pieces. *Psychology of Music*, 29(2), 128–138.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1982). *Truth and method*. New York: Crossroads Press.
- Gallie, W. B. (1964). *Philosophy and the historical understanding*, (2nd edn). New York: Schocken Books.
- Gammon, V. (1996). What's wrong with school music? A response to Malcolm Ross. *British Journal of Music Education*, 3, 101–122.
- Gregory, A. H. (1997). The roles of music in society: the ethnomusicological perspective. In D. J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (eds), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 123–140). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, L. (2002). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

- Gromko, J. & Poorman, A. S. (1998). Does perceptual-motor performance enhance perception of patterned art music? *Musicae Scientiae: The Journal of the European Society for Cognitive Sciences of Music*, 2(2), 157–170.
- Gromko, J. & Russell, C. (2002). Relationships among young children's aural perception, listening condition, and accurate reading of graphic listening maps. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(4), 333–342.
- Hair, H. (1981). Verbal identification of musical concepts. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 29, 11–21.
- Hair, H. (1987). Descriptive vocabulary and visual choices: Children's responses to conceptual changes in music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 91, 59–64.
- Hair, H. I. (1993/1994). Children's descriptions and representations of music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 119, 41–48.
- Hanslick, E. (1986). *On the musically beautiful: A contribution towards the revision of the aesthetic of music*. (trans. G. Payzant from the 8th edn, 1891). Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Hevner, K. (1936). Experimental studies of the elements of expression in music. *American Journal of Psychology*, XLV, 111, 245–268.
- James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kant, I. (1952). *The critique of judgement*. (trans. J. C. Meredith) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Karmiloff, K. & Karmiloff-Smith, A. (2001). *Pathways to language: From fetus to adolescent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Krumhansl, C. L. & Jusczyk, P. W. (1990). Infants' perception of phrase structure in music. *Psychological Science*, 1, 70–73.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Langer, S. (1942/1979). *Philosophy in a new key: a study in the symbolism of reason, rite, and art*. (3rd edn). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lychner, J. A. (1998). An empirical study concerning terminology relating to aesthetic response to music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(2) 303–319.
- Lynch, M. P. & Eilers, R. E. (1991). Children's perception of native and nonnative music scales. *Music Perception*, 9, 121–132.
- Madsen, C. K., Brittin, R. V., & Capparella-Sheldon, D. A. (1993). An empirical investigation of the aesthetic response to music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41, 57–69.
- Madsen, C. K., Byrnes, S. R., Capparella-Sheldon, D. A., & Brittin, R. V. (1993). Aesthetic responses to music: Musicians versus non-musicians. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 30(3), 174–191.
- Madsen, C. K. & Geringer, J. M. (1990). Differential patterns of music listening: Focus of attention of musician s versus non-musicians. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 105, 45–47.
- Malloch, S. (1999). Mothers and infants and communicative musicality. *Musicae Scientiae, Special Issue*, 29–57.
- Marsh, K. (1995). Children's singing games: Composition in the playground? *Research Studies in Music Education*, 4, 2–11.
- McClary, S. (1991). *Feminine endings: Music, gender and sexuality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McRobbie, A. (2000). *Feminism and youth culture*, (2nd edn). Basingstoke, UK: MacMillan.
- Meyer, L. B. (1956). *Emotion and meaning in music*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, L. B. (2001). Music and emotion: Distinctions and uncertainties. In P. N. Juslin & J. A. Sloboda (eds), *Music and emotion: Theory and research* (pp. 341–360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Nelson, D. J. (1985). Trends in the aesthetic responses of children to the musical experience. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 33(3) 193–203.
- Nettl, B. (1990). *Folk and traditional music of the western continent* (3rd edn), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- North, A. C., Hargreaves, D. J., & O'Neill, S. (2000). The importance of music to adolescents. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 255–272.
- Preston, H. (ed.), (1994). Listening, appraising, and composing: Case studies in music. *British Journal of Music Education*, 11(2), 15–55.
- Richards, C. (1998). *Teen spirits: Music and identity in media education*. London: UCL Press.
- Richardson, C. P. (1995). The musical listening processes of the child: An international perspective. In H. Lee, & M. Barrett (eds), *Honing the craft: Improving the quality of music education* (pp. 212–219). Hobart: Artemis Publishing Consultants.
- Rodriguez, C. X. (1998). Children's perception, production and description of musical expression. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46, 48–61.
- Rodriguez, C. X. & Webster, P. R. (1997). Development of children's verbal interpretative responses to music listening. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 134, 9–30.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, M. (1995). What's wrong with school music? *British Journal of Music Education*, 12(3), 185–201.
- Russell, P. A. (1997). Musical tastes and society. In D. J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (eds), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 141–158). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schellenberg, E. G. & Trehub, S. E. (1996). Natural intervals in music: a perspective from infant listeners. *Psychological Science*, 7, 272–277.
- Schellenberg, E. G. & Trehub, S. E. (1999). Culture-general and culture specific factors in the discrimination of melodies. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 74, 107–127.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1818/1966). *The world as will and representation* (vols. 1 & 11). E. F. J. Payne (trans.) New York: Dover publications.
- Shepherd, J. & Giles-Davies, J. (1991). Music, text and subjectivity. In J. Shepherd (ed.), *Music as social text* (pp. 174–187). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Shusterman, R. (2000). *Performing live: Aesthetic alternatives for the ends of art*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shusterman, R. (2004). Somaesthetics and education: Exploring the terrain. In L. Bresler (ed.), *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Toward embodied music teaching and learning* (pp. 51–60). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Suthers, L. (1999). 'I sang games': An investigation of the labels used by young children to describe music experiences. In M. S. Barrett, G. E. McPherson, & R. Smith (eds), *Children and music: Developmental perspectives* (pp. 306–310). Launceston, Tasmania: Uniprint.
- Swanwick, K. & Franca, C. C. (1999). Composing, performing and audience-listening as indicators of musical understanding. *British Journal of Music Education*, 16, 5–19.
- Thompson, W. F. & Schellenberg, E. G. (2002). Cognitive constraints on music listening. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (eds), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 461–485). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trainor, L. F., Tsang, C. D., & Cheung, V. H. W. (2002). Preference for musical consonance in 2-month-old infants. *Music Perception*, 20, 185–192.
- Trainor, L. F. & Schmidt, L. A. (2003). Processing emotions induced by music. In I. Peretz & R. Zatorre (eds), *The cognitive neuroscience of music* (pp. 310–324). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Trehub, S. E., Schellenberg, E. G., & Hill, D. S. (1997). The origins of music perception and cognition. A developmental perspective. In I. Delige & J. Sloboda (eds), *Perception and cognition of music* (pp. 103–128). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Trevarthen, C. (1998). The concept and foundation of human intersubjectivity. In S. Braten (ed.), *Inter-subjective communication and emotion in early ontogeny* (pp. 15–46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willis, P. (1978). *Profane culture*. London: Routledge.
- Zenter, M. R. & Kagan, J. (1996). Perception of music by infants. *Nature*, 383, 29.
- Zilman, D. & Gan, S.-L. (1997). Musical taste in adolescence. In D. J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (eds), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 161–187). Oxford: Oxford University Press.