

Music sociology: getting the music into the action

Tia DeNora

tdenora@exeter.ac.uk

Music sociology has addressed the history of the musical canon, taste and social exclusion. It has also addressed issues of musical value and the perceptual politics of musical reputation. More recently, it has developed perspectives that highlight music's 'active' properties in relation to social action, emotion and cognition. Such a perspective dispenses with the old 'music and society' paradigm (one in which music was typically read as distanced from and 'reflecting' social structure) and points to core concerns in sociology writ large and to educational concerns with music's role as a socialising medium in the broadest sense of that term.

Introduction

I have been asked to reflect here on what insights I think my own research area might offer to music education researchers and to communicate recent developments from this area to music educators. Most of my research has been in the subfield of my discipline usually known as sociology of the arts. Thinking about the kinds of research projects ongoing there, and presented in associated networks and specialist journals (see the Resources section at the end of this article), I realise that the focus – overtly at least – on music (or even arts) education has been minimal. At the same time, a great deal of work in the subfield overlaps with music educative concerns, and I want to spend most of this article describing how, as I see it, music sociology relates to, carries implications for, and can benefit from research on music education.

To that end, I have organised what follows in three main sections: first, a review of some of my discipline's key themes and topics writ large (and with special reference to the sociology of education) – to pave the way for a consideration of music sociology's more specific concerns. Second (and this is the main section of the article), I take in turn what I regard to be five major (and interrelated) themes within music sociology relevant to music education. My account will be primarily personal – I will be tapping my own work to tell my story. And I will be only marginally concerned with music education as a classroom enterprise, less concerned with music 'education' as an institutionalised activity and more concerned with musical 'learning'. But I am also conscious that this article should help to bridge our respective fields, and to that end I will make reference to a range of studies in the hope of introducing the subfield to those who may not know it well. I will say in advance that I look forward very much to the reverse side of this project – to reading music educators' accounts of how their work can enrich my own disciplinary perspective.

1. Sociology and the sociology of education

Sociology is often introduced to first-year undergraduates via the so-called Hobbesian question, which runs as follows: How is social order possible? This question in turn alludes to others: What are the mechanisms of social order? What devices are responsible for maintaining a stable social world (i.e. social structure), one that is characterised by patterns of action across time and place, coordination and mutual orientation? Also within this remit are more 'critical' questions, oriented, for example, to unfair forms of discrimination within societies – unequal access to resources, exploitation, domination. There, sociologists are concerned with how patterns of social inequality may persist, and the analytical lens is directed to reproduction of class and gender inequalities. (We currently witness this issue alive and well in debates about universities and widening participation.)

It is obvious that the formal education institutions play a major role in the process of constructing social order. This role is usually described in terms of two basic functions: socialisation and allocation (Abercrombie *et al.*, 1994: 342). What is normally meant by the former is the transmission of conventional patterns of social life such as values, norms and ways of conceptualising the world. By the latter, sociologists mean that the education system serves a selective function, channelling students into different societal realms, positions within the socio-economic system, and thus ways of life.

The sociology of education has been primarily concerned with the *institution* of education, namely, with the school system. It has been less concerned with overlapping topics such as informal socialisation, and I will return to this focus below in section 3. The subfield is often described in terms of dual foci – the 'macro' and 'micro' sociology of education.

Macro-sociological work in the sociology of education deals with topics such as the ideological implications of education policy, considerations of 'hidden curricula' (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Banks *et al.*, 1992), and educational achievement as it correlates with socio-economic background (Halsey *et al.*, 1980; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), gender (Cockburn, 1987; Crompton, 1992; Delamont, 1989; Rees, 1992) and racism (Mac an Ghail, 1988). Micro-work complements these studies and claims (persuasively in my view) to open the black box of *how*, on a daily basis, schools achieve the various functions that more macro approaches describe. For example, there has been a good deal of research on communication in the classroom, focused in particular on how school-linked classifications and judgements of students (and with it social reproduction via the education system) are achieved. Willis's landmark study, *Learning to Labour* (1977), provided one example, in its detailed focus on a group of 'lads' and how their culture of resistance to formal education was ultimately part of the process that both prepared them for and landed them on the shop floor and without options for change. Other scholars have focused on communicative culture in the classroom, for example, Joy Swann's (1988) detailed study of how the (unconscious) paralinguistic features of teachers' classroom talk differentially positioned boys and girls in relation to science lessons.

While there is not scope within the remit of this article to enter into any of these debates (and I do not have the familiarity with them to warrant it), my purpose so far has been to gesture to wider concerns in sociology so as to set the stage for what follows. In particular it should be noted that the sociology of education has been primarily critical

in orientation, seeking to illuminate the education institution's link to social reproduction and, thus, inequality.

2. Themes in music sociology

When I was a postgraduate student during the 1980s, music sociology was undergoing a sea change. In great part fostered by Howard S. Becker's *Art Worlds* (1982) and Richard Peterson's emphasis on what came to be called the 'production of culture' approach (Peterson, 1978), there was movement away from 'grand' and implicitly structuralist focus on music as a mirror or structural parallel to social structure (an approach that can be found in the work of classic theorists such as Sorokin, Weber, Dilthey and Simmel – for discussions of this work see Etzkorn, 1973; Zolberg, 1990; Martin, 1995: 75–167). The focus was shifting instead to one concerned with how music was socially shaped, and how its production, distribution and consumption were mediated by the *milieux* (music worlds) in which these activities took place.

At the time, this focus constituted a significant advance – it helped to highlight from within what it meant to speak of music's link to social structure. And yet, it tended to take a 'one-way' perspective on music's social role: it was concerned with how music was influenced by a wide range of what might be called 'social factors', but not, equally, with how social life could be understood to be – at least sometimes – constituted through the medium of music. It was here that a second strand within music sociology helped address this gap, the focus on music and its link to status group identity, and this is the first of five themes I want to introduce in this section.

A. Music and status consumption

On both sides of the Atlantic, from the late 1970s onward, sociologists of art became increasingly concerned with the question of musical taste and its role as a medium for the construction of social differences. In short, sociologists increasingly took up the topic of musical taste as a mechanism of social exclusion. This work ranged from historical studies of status groups and their music-entrepreneurial activities and attempts to ensconce themselves at the heart of 'good taste'. Notable studies here include Paul DiMaggio's work on the rise of a culture of the musical canon in nineteenth-century America (1982), historian William Weber's *Music and the Middle Class* (1975), and, perhaps most notably, Pierre Bourdieu's monumental study *Distinction* (1984), which suggested that the social distribution of musical tastes mapped onto and helped reinforce socio-economic relations. Bourdieu's great contribution was to show how musical values were not 'pure' but were rather linked to the maintenance of social distinctions. In his work on the education system cited above, Bourdieu emphasised that individuals on the margins of valued cultural tastes and competences come to be marginalised socially and economically because culture is a medium of interaction, a form of 'capital'. If one is not in possession of this capital, in other words, one moves only with severe discomfort through the social realm. Cultural dispositions are thus the means of social regulation which, moreover, are reinforced by the school system where such values are instilled.

B. *The focus on the construction of value and talent in music*

Studies of taste and exclusion help to highlight just how socially and politically fraught is the idea of musical greatness. They show, specifically, how the hierarchy of musical works and music producers (composers, performers) comes to function as a vehicle for social differentiation and exclusion. Bourdieu's work suggested that aesthetic distinctions are, ultimately, arbitrary, that they are artefacts of the ability to 'name' the best, an artefact of social power, authority. Beyond Bourdieu, the sociology of music has developed this theme, through explorations of how musical value is articulated and how reputation can be understood to be the outcome of musical 'politics'. My own study of Beethoven falls under this heading (DeNora, 1995), but so too does the work of ethnomusicologists such as Henry Kingsbury (1988), who has studied what goes on inside the conservatoire.

My original interest in studying Beethoven's rise to fame and renown during the first ten years of his Viennese career was kindled by the fact that my PhD supervisor, Hugh Mehan, was a micro-sociological researcher in the area of sociology of education. Mehan, in collaboration with others, had recently produced a study of how learning-disabled students come to be recognised within the classroom (Mehan, Hertweck & Meihls, 1986). What I found intriguing at the time was their close study of what I will here call practices of registration, practices by which students' identities (such as 'bright student' or 'difficult student' or 'learning disabled') came to be made visible and accountable to members of the education community (teachers, diagnosticians, educational psychologists, parents, and the students themselves). This was especially intriguing because at times some rather odd forms of classification work had to be accomplished, as when two students exhibited similar behaviours but one was declared to be 'just acting up' while another was labelled as learning disabled. Mehan *et al.* studied the ways that students came to be discussed and otherwise defined in the course of their careers so as to follow the process through which identities came to be allocated. Such an approach, it seemed to me, was ideally suited to a history of how the musical canon 'came to be', in particular, to how we might examine the social recognition of musical greatness 'in the making'. It was from this standpoint, then, that I embarked on the Beethoven research: how is it that some come to be hailed as 'great' while others come to be seen as existing in the shadow of that greatness, and does this process exceed 'aesthetic' issues?

I will not describe my own research in detail here – it is reported in DeNora (1995). The methods employed were discourse analysis of Beethoven criticism, a study of the social relations of music technology, a focus on the social dynamics of music and status consumption among Beethoven's patrons (and others) in the context of a changing organisational base of patronage and a focus on some mundane and practical activities that Beethoven and his supporters conducted so as to 'register' his talent. For my purposes here, it is sufficient to say that the case of Beethoven was sociologically 'interesting' for two interrelated reasons. The first of these is that Beethoven can be viewed as the 'hard case' for the study of music's value construction since his work is generally regarded as lying at the very heart of the musical canon (see Burnham's (1995) study of how the 'Beethoven hero' notion came to permeate musical culture). The second is (and this was the entry point for a sociologist), Beethoven was not unequivocally praised during his first ten years in Vienna. There were many for whom Beethoven was anathema to all that

counted as musically worthy. It was precisely this controversy, and its eventual deflection from the legend of Beethoven's talent, that interested me sociologically. I concluded that Beethoven's greatness emerged from the ways in which the very notion of greatness was tailored to 'fit' the forms Beethoven produced. From a music education perspective, I think this points to two key themes.

The first of these is that music educators need to understand the lines of musical value as socially shaped, as the outcome of battles lost and won. The canon, as Bourdieu observed, is a social construction: both the very idea of 'great composers' and its registration in terms of who is lodged where and in relation to whom within it. If we fail to recognise this point we will be implicitly endorsing values that were built into what we take as a 'given' form of excellence, as for example the notion, deeply embedded in the musical canon, that 'great' composers are also male (Citron, 1993).

The second idea is that the social recognition of talent as described in the musical world of Beethoven's Vienna is applicable in *any* musical world, including the world of the classroom. Musical talent is recognised as a multifarious process, one that may not match precisely (or indeed at all) predetermined notions of what counts as 'good practice'. This is a point recently developed by Lucy Green in *How Popular Musicians Learn* (2001). It was also dealt with by my colleague at Exeter, Robert Witkin, three decades back when he referred to music educative procedures as revolving around the correction of 'mistakes' (Witkin, 1974). Hierarchies of talent and articulations of musical value in class may, in other words, serve to allocate students into different categories ('talented', for example), but they may not also map well to students' abilities and tastes outside the classroom. For that, one would need to focus, as Green's study does, on the informal practices of musical learning. And in this shift from teaching to learning, the whole topic of the connections between music and identity – self-identity and group identity – opens up. In the next two subsections I deal with identity and differentiation and then with how music can be understood to provide object lessons (hidden curricula) *outside* the classroom.

C. *Music as a way of being*

In this section I want to make a shift from focusing on music's link to social exclusion to how music can be understood to 'get into' or otherwise help to shape identity, social action and subjectivity. Here I will draw on my work on music in everyday life (DeNora, 2000) and on work by others. In various publications when I introduce this work (see DeNora, forthcoming) I turn to Paul Willis's classic study, *Profane Culture* (1978), in which a group of young men – the Bikeboys – are described in terms of how they *used* music to articulate both their self-notion and their trajectories of action. Of particular interest there was Willis's focus on how, for the Bikeboys, music functioned as a catalyst for action. In relation to this point Willis alludes to two key issues to show how music can be understood as part of a person's (or in this case, group's) equipment for living.

First, the boys preferred music that was seen *by them* (I will return to this point) as analogous to – for want of a better expression – their preferred mode of being: the songs they played on the record player were short and fast-paced; they were characterised by a definite pulse. Willis suggested here that this type of music 'resonated' with the boys' culture, and he went on to describe how the task of sociologically oriented, ethnographic

research is to illuminate the ways in which actors (in this case the boys) make *articulations* between some aspect of culture (here music) and some aspect of their style of living. More specifically, Willis described how actors locate homologous, or structurally similar, relationships between musical and extra-musical phenomena. Music 'is like', in other words, some other thing; and, conversely, some other thing (say conduct style during an evening) is 'like' music. To speak of this latter point is to allude to the ways in which music may come to provide parameters against which some aspect of social being takes shape, and in this respect it is to hark back to the classic philosophical questions, as posed by Plato and Aristotle, of music's influence on social character ('the guardians will build their guardhouse . . . Then, from the start, in their earliest play the young will be kept to law and measure through music' (Plato, *The Republic*, 1966: 72)).

In my view Willis's work offered music sociology two key lessons: first, it taught us that music matters, that music can be seen as a referent for the shaping of values and conduct. Second, and equally important, Willis demonstrated the importance of ethnographic enquiry, by which I mean that his work highlighted how music's significance as a social referent emerged from the ways that actors oriented to and interpreted music within particular social locations and small-group cultures. Subsequent work on this theme has been pursued by sociologists with an overt interest in space and identity (e.g. Bennett, 2000). There was no point, Willis's work told us, in analysing musical texts alone; it was necessary to see how these 'texts' came to be used, consumed and interpreted by situated actors. It was necessary, in short, to focus on socio-musical practice.

In other work (DeNora, 2000, 2002, forthcoming) I have employed the concept of *affordance* to describe music's abilities to, as I put it, 'get into the action', its mediating role in relation to social action and experience. This term, borrowed from psychology (Gibson, 1966) and reworked by sociology (Anderson & Sharrock, 1993), points to how some form of material, whether an object such as a ball, or a type of music (e.g. marching music), lends itself more easily to the doing of some things over others. For example, a ball lends itself to bouncing more easily than a cube. And John Phillip Sousa's 'Stars and Stripes Forever' is probably easier to march in time to than, say, Debussy's 'Afternoon of a Faun'. The concept of affordance, in other words, helps to underline how music's specifically musical properties may – via their physical features (e.g. tempo, melodic and harmonic structure) and their conventional associations (e.g. love songs) – lend themselves to forms of being and doing. To suggest that music may come to afford modes of being and doing, however, is by no means to suggest that music *will cause* such modes. Rather – and here it is important to remember the lesson from Willis concerning the need to explore connections between music and action from within particular locations – affordances only exist if they are real for some social actor(s). The sociology of music, then, can focus on how affordances are created, how links between music and social life/social experience are forged. As Daniel Cavicchi has put it (in a discussion of my work but throughout his own as well), we need to focus on what music will 'do for different people' (Cavicchi, 2002).

It is this last point (the idea that music may come to structure or otherwise influence the shape of action, thought or embodied matters such as comportment or emotion) that, in my view, opened up a new approach for socio-musical studies, one that converges with other disciplines in its aims. In a sense, this work can be seen to illuminate how we 'learn', via music, to experience socially constructed modes of subjectivity and how music serves

as – in the most general sense – a socialising medium. In this sense, the work described in the next section develops the lessons offered by Willis.

D. Music and emotion

Two sociologically oriented studies can be used to illustrate these points (but see Juslin & Sloboda (2001) for cross-disciplinary perspectives), the first by Gomart & Hennion (1999), the second my own (DeNora, 2000). Methodologically, all three authors employed in-depth interviews focusing on music listening practices. They describe how actors can be seen to use music so as to prepare situations within which their emotional states undergo alteration.

In a piece that compares the love of music with the love of taking drugs, and which draws upon in-depth interviews with music lovers and with drug addicts, Gomart & Hennion (1999) follow actors as they engage in 'techniques of preparation' that produce forms of attachment so as to illuminate the mechanisms that produce 'dispositions'. They place in the spotlight what happens when, as part of the musical – or narcotic – experience, the self is 'abandoned' or given over to sensation and/or emotion.

More specifically, Gomart & Hennion delineate how music lovers/addicts engage in a diverse array of practices that pave the way for the experience of being 'carried away'. This consists of priming situations and combining things so that particular effects are achievable. For example, interviewees described becoming 'ready in one's head' for the ear to hear and the body to respond (p. 232), or how they employed particular listening strategies and rhythms so as to be ready to respond in preferred or expected ways. This process is akin to 'tuning in' or attempting to produce, through finely wrought practice, the power and clarity of a signal – its power to influence its recipients. Listeners, they suggest, like drug users, 'meticulously *establish conditions*: active work must be done in order to be moved' (p. 227; emphasis in original). Listeners are by no means simply 'affected' by music but are, rather, active in constructing their 'passivity' to music, their ability to be 'moved'. The music 'user' is thus deeply implicated as a producer of his/her own emotional response, is one who

strives tentatively to fulfil those conditions which will let him be seized and taken over by a potentially exogenous force. 'Passivity' then is not a moment of inaction – not a lack of will of the user who suddenly fails to be a full subject. Rather passivity adds to action, potentializes action. (Gomart & Hennion, 1999: 243)

Gomart & Hennion were thus concerned with the question of how 'events' of musical passion and emotional response – the being 'taken over' by music – is not something that 'happens to' actors but is accomplished by them. Similarly, my own research has dealt with music's role in the day-to-day lives of American and British women as they use music to regulate, enhance and change qualities and levels of emotion (DeNora, 2002). Nearly all of these women were explicit about music's role as an ordering device at the 'personal' level, as a means for creating, enhancing, sustaining and changing subjective, cognitive, bodily and self-conceptual states. Levels of musical training notwithstanding, the respondents exhibited considerable awareness about the music they 'needed' to hear in different situations and at different times, drawing upon elaborate repertoires of musical

programming practice, and were sharply aware of how to mobilise music to arrive at, enhance and alter aspects of themselves and their self-concepts. Part of their criteria for the 'right' music was how well it 'fitted' or was suitable for the purpose or situation they wished to achieve, or for achieving a particular emotional state.

Respondents described how they actively crafted musical events to shift mood or feel particular emotions such as joy or grief. Setting aside time to listen to music so as to calm oneself, or to grieve, or to become properly energised or upbeat prior to an evening out – all of these activities were routinely referred to by respondents for whom music was a technology of self. For example, respondents often chose music that reflected their moods, and in this example they sometimes chose music that would intensify a particular feeling state so as to move beyond it. In this respect, music was a catalyst for reaching the climax of a particular (sad) mood state; it provided a medium through which that mood could be focused, amplified and then dispelled. This sort of activity is, most definitely, emotional work, as the following respondent describes. She takes time out, sits on a settee to listen, follows the score as she listens and works herself up into a particular emotional frame, and she knows which music to employ for which types of tasks:

It depends what mood you are in because if I feel like I want to do something jolly then I may listen to something jolly like Annie or Kiss Me Kate or something like that or Oklahoma say but then if I am feeling a bit more – see, when I listen to a musical I tend to just sit on the settee and listen and I usually look at the words and stuff as well and I just concentrate in the main on that. But . . . if I am sort of feeling a bit miserable I might listen to Les Miserables and then I quite often listen to Jesus Christ Superstar because that is very emotional . . . Sometimes you just want to sit there and just be miserable and my friend and I have this joke thing where, like you want to be miserable and you sort of look in the mirror at yourself being miserable to make yourself more miserable and that is what we always do [laughs].

These events were carefully crafted. Respondents made, in other words, articulations between music and desired emotional states. They used music as a reference point, model or reminder of some emotional correlate and they thought about what music might, under different circumstances, 'work' for them. This practice was shaped by a range of proximal (local, temporal, contingent) and distal (globally distributed) factors, biographical associations and events associated with musical pieces or styles, conventional associations (e.g. 'romantic' or 'sad' music), music's physical properties (e.g. rhythms, pace, volume) and previous patterns of use (e.g. knowledge of what would 'work' on a particular occasion).

They involved pairing music with a variety of other materials, practices and postures, for example, listening only at certain times of day, or in particular rooms or during particular events (e.g. during a bath but not in the kitchen), only with headphones, only played very loudly, heard only while sitting or while moving around doing the housework, paired with candlelight or with sunshine, and so forth. One of the most extensive examples of this type of activity came from the respondent described in Chapter 3, 'Lucy'. In *Music in Everyday Life* (DeNora, 2000: 16, 41–3) I presented Lucy, who described how, on the morning of the interview, she was 'feeling very "stressed" . . . [because she was] in the throes of moving house'. She 'actively decided' to stop and to listen to some music. 'I needed it. It

was only ten minutes or so, you know, I didn't listen to them all ... just ... to the bits I wanted...'

In short, recent studies of music in relation to the achievement of emotional states and events point to music's use in real social settings as a device for entraining and structuring feeling trajectories. Music is a resource to which people turn so as to regulate themselves as aesthetic agents, as feeling, thinking and acting beings in their day-to-day lives. Achieving this regulation requires a high degree of practical reflexivity. And the respondents in both the French and the English/American case studies showed how actors often perceive their 'need' for this regulation and know the techniques of auto-emotion work. These techniques may be found inadvertently (something is tried once and 'works' and so is later repeated and becomes part of an individual repertoire), or they may be suggested through culture and the media (and so be, at least initially, imitative), or they may be handed down by associates (and so exist as part of group or family culture), or be initially encountered in a social setting – all of these technique locations were mentioned by respondents. The natural history of the processes through which feeling states are identified and 'expressed' (i.e. enacted to self or other over time) is, moreover, a topic to be developed as it concerns the question of how aesthetic agency is configured in real time, as passion is choreographed and entrained. Holding on to this focus but widening it from the individual experience of culture (and the social regulation of subjectivity in and through reference to cultural materials) to music's role in relation to the organisation of collective action and its emotional component is but the next step within this programme, and it is here that music's role in the 'informal' curriculum within the school setting can be rethought – is music part of a 'hidden curriculum', part of the collective alignment of subjectivity? This speculative question is well off the map of this current article (and overlaps nicely with some of the motivation behind the 'new musicology', dating as far back as Leppert & McClary (1987)), but it would be well worth exploring through grounded, ethnographic methods of investigation. Thinking about music's subliminal relation to emotion construction raises in turn questions about music as it can be understood as a medium of cognition – a question pursued most systematically by the critical theorist T. W. Adorno (1973, 1976). In this work we see again music's role as an 'educative' medium, albeit typically working insidiously. While Adorno's own work on the subject was pursued at a fairly abstract level, his original perspective – that music is a medium within which consciousness comes to be framed – is alive and well within current music sociology. And this is the final theme to be addressed here.

E. Music as consciousness

In my own work I have been interested in how actors may look to music so as to 'find' exemplars or analogues of other things. For example, in *Music in Everyday Life* (DeNora, 2000) Lucy (described above) told how, within music's harmonic structure, she was able to locate her self-identity. She identified her being – her personality, her way of doing – with music's 'inner voices', and these voices served as a referent (for her) of her role in life. This was a clear-cut example of how music may provide, as Eyerman & Jamieson describe in their study of music and social movements (1998), exemplars of and for action. Music, in short, is good to think with. (On this structuralist point, see Middleton, 1990: 223.)

Adorno's own work dealt with how both music and performed musical events might provide object lessons – via their structures and ways of 'arranging' material – for thinking about social arrangements. For example, in his hypothetical analysis of the conductor, his [sic] orchestra and the audience implied by this structured performance, Adorno suggests that 'The conductor acts as though he were taming the orchestra, but his real target is the audience – a trick not unknown to political demagogues' (Adorno, 1976: 105). While this focus is highly abstract (Which conductor? Which audience? When? Where?), Adorno's perspective nonetheless has considerable heuristic value and can be connected to more empirical investigations of music-as-object-lesson, in and around formal music educative settings.

This question has been pursued in recent years by scholars with interests in music and gender formation, for example in work by Lucy Green (1997) and Susan O'Neill (1997) and in work in progress by myself (DeNora, 2002). While the more specific direction of their question differs from Adorno's (it is concerned with the articulation and justification of gender difference, not with more general political arrangements), it is nonetheless related. Both Green and O'Neill are interested in how gender stereotypes are constituted and reinforced through musical performance, and in particular how ideas about gender relations are formulated through reference to musical arrangements. This is indeed part of Adorno's concern with the *display* of performed music, a topic Green has developed at length in her book *Music, Gender and Education* (1997).

In this book Green develops a theory of *delineated* meaning in music, by which she means a concern with how music may be taken to signify a range of contextual ('social') meaning, how it may be referred to as embodying a metaphor for things external to it. (In this respect her work overlaps with Richard Leppert's focus on 'the sight of sound' (Leppert, 1993).) Although Green does not deal in detail with *conducting* as a type of musical activity, she nonetheless shows how music activity – for example different types of performance and compositional activities – comes to be associated with ideas about what is appropriate and inappropriate for male and female musicians. It is Green's methodology that is of interest here, for she has found useful techniques for illuminating the interpretive work done by different types of actors (music professionals, teachers, pupils) that draws connections between musical and social structures and, in so doing, legitimates particular social forms (in this case gender stereotypes). The point here is that Green engages in two types of work that Adorno left undone. First, she elaborates a theory of how music may come to provide resources for the ideological work of justifying gender conventions – her theory of delineated meaning. Second, she engages in empirical work. She listens to (and serves as participant observer with) socially situated individuals (students and teachers) and follows them as they deploy interpretive strategies, as they describe how music 'reflects' society. Unlike Adorno, in other words, Green shows how, in describing music, her respondents are simultaneously constituting aspects of the social world: when pupils or teachers are 'outraged' at the idea of a girl playing the drums, they are simultaneously engaged in classificatory activity. The act of musical engagement – expressing ideas about what seems musically 'correct' – is simultaneously the act of reinforcing particular social relations. Thus, Green's interrogative focus can be read (though perhaps not with her permission!) as a means for re-establishing Adorno's focus on a more empirical footing.

3. Conclusion

My aim in this article has been to describe some of the new trends in music sociology and to allude to their relevance for music educators and music education. This survey has been overtly personal; I have not sought to offer a comprehensive survey of the field but rather to highlight key themes that, in my view, illuminate music's connection to social being, and to socialisation. In keeping with a pragmatic perspective (and I am well aware of the current controversy in music education between the 'music as aesthetic education' and the pragmatic view (Regelski, 1998; see also www.maydaygroup.org), my overarching aim has been to highlight music in action – that is, music as a medium of social practice. Such a perspective dispenses with the old 'music and society' paradigm (one in which music was typically read as distanced from and 'reflecting' social structure) and has moved forward towards a notion that to do music ('musicking' – Small (1998)) is to do social life. The studies I have described have also been somewhat removed from sociology of music as practised in the 1980s where the central focus was on music's social shaping. By contrast, I have tried to feature here socio-musical research that shows how music 'gets into' social life.

As I write, the boundaries between 'sociology' of music, 'musicology', 'ethnomusicology', 'anthropology of music' and 'social psychology' of music continue to blur – no bad thing in my view since the borders are now open and mutual discovery/respect for differing methodologies is on the rise. An obvious next step in this process would be to further the exchange between music sociology and music education – I salute that conversation!

References

- ABERCROMBIE, N., WARDE, A., SOOTHILL, K., URRY, J. & WALBY, S. (1994) *Contemporary British Society*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Polity.
- ADORNO, T. (1973) *Philosophy of Modern Music*, trans. W. Blomster. New York: Seabury.
- ADORNO, T. (1976) *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*, trans. E. B. Ashton. New York: Continuum.
- ANDERSON, R. & SHARROCK, W. (1993) 'Can organisations afford knowledge?' *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, vol. 1, pp. 143–61.
- BANKS, M., BATES, I., BREAKWELL, G., BYNNER, J., EMLER, N., JAMIESON, L. & ROBERTS, K. (1992) *Careers and Identities*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- BECKER, H. S. (1982) *Art Worlds*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- BENNETT, A. (2000) *Popular Music and Youth Culture: Music, Identity and Place*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Polity.
- BOURDIEU, P. & PASSERON, J. C. (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, trans. R. Nice. London: Sage.
- BOWLES, S. & GINTIS, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*. London: Routledge.
- BURNHAM, S. (1995) *Beethoven Hero*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- CAVICCHI, D. (2002) 'From the bottom up: thinking about Tia DeNora's everyday life'. *Action, Criticism and Theory for Music Education*, 1, 2, 1–15. <http://mas.siu.edu/ACT/v1/Cavicchi02.pdf>
- CITRON, M. (1993) *Gender and the Musical Canon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COCKBURN, C. (1987) *Two-Track Training: Sex Inequalities and the YTS*. London: Macmillan.

- CROMPTON, R. (1992) 'Where did all the bright girls go? Women's higher education and employment since 1964'. In N. Abercrombie and A. Ward (Eds), *Social Change in Contemporary Britain*, pp. 54–69. Cambridge: Polity.
- DELAMONT, S. (1989) *Knowledgeable Women: Structuralism and the Reproduction of Elites*. London: Routledge.
- DENORA, T. (1995) *Beethoven and the Construction of Genius*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- DENORA, T. (2000) *Music in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DENORA, T. (2002) 'Music into action: performing gender on the Viennese concert stage, 1790–1810'. *Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Literature, the Media and the Arts*, Special Issue on 'New Directions in Sociology of Music' (Guest Ed. T. Dowd), **30**, 2, 19–33.
- DENORA, T. (forthcoming) 'Musical practice and social structure: sociology of music and its toolkit'. In E. Clarke and N. Cook (Eds), *Empirical Musicology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DIMAGGIO, P. (1982) 'Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth century Boston'. *Media, Culture and Society*, **4**, 35–50, 303–22.
- DIMAGGIO, P. & USEEM, M. (1978) 'Cultural democracy in a period of cultural expansion: the social composition of arts audiences in the United States'. *Social Problems*, **26**, 180–97.
- ETZKORN, P. (1973) 'Introduction'. *Music and Society: The Later Writings of Paul Honigsheim*, pp. 3–42. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- EYERMAN, R. & JAMIESON, A. (1998) *Music and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GIBSON, J. J. (1966) *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems*. Boston, MA: Houghton and Mifflin.
- GOMART, E. & HENNION, A. (1999) 'A sociology of attachment: music amateurs, drug users'. In J. Law & J. Hazzard (Eds), *Actor Network Theory and After*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- GREEN, L. (1997) *Music, Gender and Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GREEN, L. (2001) *How Popular Musicians Learn*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- HALSEY, A. H., HEATH, A. F. & RIDGE, J. M. (1980) *Origins and Destinations: Family, Class and Education in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- JUSLIN, P. & SLOBODA, J. (2001) *Music and Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KINGSBURY, H. (1988) *Music, Talent and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- LEPPERT, R. (1993) *The Sight of Sound: Music, Representation and the History of the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- LEPPERT, R. & McCLARY, S. (1987) *Music and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MAC AN GHAILL, M. (1988) *Young, Gifted and Black: Student–Teacher Relations in the Schooling of Black Youth*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- MARTIN, P. (1995) *Sounds and Society: Themes in the Sociology of Music*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MEHAN, H., HERTWECK, A. & MEIHLS, L. (1986) *Handicapping the Handicapped*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- MIDDLETON, R. (1990) *Studying Popular Music*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- O'NEILL, S. (1997) 'Gender and music'. In D. Hargreaves & A. North (Eds), *The Social Psychology of Music*, pp. 46–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PETERSON, R. A. (Ed.) (1978) *The Production of Culture*. Los Angeles/London: Sage.
- PLATO (1966) *The Republic*, ed. and trans. A. I. Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- REES, T. (1992) *Women and the Labour Market*. London: Routledge.
- REGELSKI, T. (1998) 'Schooling for musical praxis'. *Musiikkikasutus-Finnish Journal of Music Education*, **3**, 1, 7–39.

- SMALL, C. (1998) *Musicking*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- SWANN, J. (1988) 'Talk control: an illustration from the classroom'. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds), *Women in their Speech Communities*, pp. 141–57. London: Longman.
- WEBER, W. (1975) *Music and the Middle Class*. London: Croom Helm.
- WILLIS, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. London: Saxon House.
- WILLIS, P. (1978) *Profane Culture*. London: Routledge.
- WITKIN, R. W. (1974) *The Intelligence of Feeling*. London: Heinemann.
- ZOLBERG, V. (1990) *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Resources

There are various networks devoted to arts sociology, and all of these would welcome input from and interaction with music educators. The key networks are:

International Sociological Association Research Committee 37
<http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/rc37.htm>

European Sociological Association, Network on Sociology of the Arts
<http://ace.acadiau.ca/artsnet/artsesa.htm>

Social Theory, Politics and the Arts (US based, floating group that meets for an annual conference)
<http://internet.ggu.edu/stpa/charleston.html>

American Sociological Association, Culture Section (broader than Arts focus, but with more interaction with educational researchers)
<http://www.asanet.org/sections/culture.html>