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ABSTRACT

This article reports a cross-cultural analysis of journal articles pertaining to large ensembles published in English and Chinese languages from 2007–17. Topics addressed in the articles included issues of equity and access, the value of large ensembles in young people’s lives and to the field of music education, the development of large ensemble music education in Asia, and implications for the field of conductor-teacher preparation. Three conceptually distinct but interrelated themes emerged: power, participation, and pedagogy. “Power” refers to the authority, command, and influence commonly associated with conductors. “Participation” refers to issues of access, recruitment, retention, attrition, and other sociological issues related to participation in large ensembles. “Pedagogy” refers to calls for changes in the teaching and delivery of large ensemble programs. The article closes with recommendations for international research and pedagogical development concerning music education's large ensembles.

Large ensembles have been integral to the successful establishment of music as a central subject for study in schools, particularly in North America. In North America, ensembles in the Western tradition (orchestras, bands, choirs) are often the most visible elements of school music education in neighborhoods and surrounding communities. An analysis of data collected in 2004 indicated that approximately 21% of U.S. high school students were involved in large ensembles (band, choir, and/or orchestra), with further indication that those who were enrolled were not demographically representative of the total population (Elpus & Abril, 2011; Elpus, 2015). Though some secondary schools in the United States offer music instruction beyond large ensembles, most of the remaining 79% of students likely receive no music education in schools at all.
Many authors in the United States and other Western countries have contributed articles examining this inequity and its juxtaposition with the prevailing high quality of secondary school performance ensembles. Research suggests that “Music Education at the Tipping Point” (Kratus, 2007), one such essay, may be the most read article in the 103-year history of *Music Educators Journal* as indicated by the number of online downloads, print citations, and mentions in conference presentations and other professional discussions (Freer, 2016a; Kratus, 2016). Subsequent articles related to Kratus (2007) have addressed a variety of issues surrounding the large ensemble model of music education. These include, for example, access to school-based large ensembles, changes in technology and society, financial and demographic inequities between and within school populations, the importance of various repertoires and musical genres, the role of conductor-teachers, and the relevance of bands, orchestras, and choirs to young people in the 21st century. The philosophical, ethical, and moral values of band have also been examined from Deweyan (Allsup, 2012) and Confucian (Tan & Tan, 2016) perspectives.

Given the ubiquity of large ensembles in the present globalized world (e.g., Tan, 2016a), one question that appears particularly important and timely emerges: Are the critical issues surrounding large ensembles that have been articulated in Western academia similarly found in non-Western contexts, such as Asia? Insights to this question can have far-reaching implications for music education, both in North America and globally. If the same issues emerge, might this suggest that the large ensemble model of music education is inherently problematic in ways that cut across cultural borders? If the issues identified in the Western literature are not articulated elsewhere, could some Western scholars have gone too far in their critique of large ensembles? Alternatively, could the lack of parallel criticisms in non-Western cultures reflect deeper underlying cultural differences? For example, researchers have distinguished between individualistic Western societies and collectivistic Asian cultures (e.g., Maehr & Nicholls, 1980, Murayama, Zhou, & Nesbit, 2009; Tan & Miksza, 2017). Given that large ensembles are group activities that lead toward collectivistic goals, could critical issues that have been identified, such as the purported “autocratic” nature of large ensembles (Kratus, 2007, p. 45), be based on an underlying normative expectation of Western individualism?

Accordingly, a first step is to identify whether such critical issues that have been articulated in Western academia are similarly found in non-Western contexts. One approach toward this identification is to compare literature pertaining to large ensembles in Asia and in the West. A cross-cultural comparative analysis of English-language and Chinese-language music education journal content pertaining to large ensembles during the past decade appears particularly pertinent, timely, and germane. This project is purposed toward fulfilling that task. The study described here was advantaged by the coauthor’s bilingualism (English and Chinese), the wealth of Chinese-language articles on large ensembles, and the sheer number of large ensembles in Asia. It is hoped that
this endeavor might encourage cross-cultural dialogue and reveal perspectives hitherto unseen due to language, cultural, and/or political barriers. For Western readers, this cross-cultural project offers an invaluable opportunity to reflect on music education’s large ensemble tradition as it is appropriated by a non-Western culture.

Cross-cultural studies have a rich presence in various types of English-language music education journals. For example, authors have compared elements of music education in the United States and Germany (Kertz-Welzel, 2008), Canada and Hong Kong (Wong, 2005), China and Switzerland (Petersen, 2017), England and Spain (Hardcastle, Pitts, & Aróstegui, 2017), and the United States and Singapore (Freer & Tan, 2014; Tan & Miksza, 2017). Brand (2001, 2004; Brand & Dolloff, 2002) authored a series of research articles with music education majors in China and English-speaking countries. Among these were a study of how Chinese and American music majors described their motivations for learning (Brand, 2001), an exploration of music education majors’ self-esteem in America, Australia, and China (Brand, 2004), and a study of how future Chinese and North American music teachers envisioned their careers (Brand & Dolloff, 2002). Cross-cultural comparisons have also been made between U.S. and German philosophical traditions (Kertz-Welzel, 2013), the Western and Chinese philosophical traditions (Tan, 2015a), and Reimer and Confucian aesthetic theories (Tan, 2015b). An additional strand of research has explored historical, political, and philosophical issues of cross-cultural music education (e.g., Cox & Stevens, 2016; Goble, 2010; O’Flynn, 2005). More recently, cross-cultural philosophies have been mined to address contemporary issues in large instrumental ensembles (e.g., Tan, 2014, 2016a, 2016b).

The authors of the present study met at an international conference where their presentations each addressed elements of these critiques. The conversation focused on the types of academic dialogue that influence large ensemble music education in Asia and the West. There is considerable discourse concerning large ensembles in both English-language and Chinese-language journals, and the authors sensed that a comparative analysis of that literature could be of interest to many music educators and scholars. This article accordingly reports results of a cross-cultural comparative analysis of English-language and Chinese-language music education journal content pertaining to large ensembles during the past decade.

**QUESTIONS AND APPROACH**

Three research questions guided this inquiry. First, what themes are predominant in English-language and Chinese-language journal articles concerning music education’s large ensembles? Second, what are the relationships between themes found in the two corpora of literature, and how do authors from different cultures interpret the themes? And, third, what does this analysis suggest about large ensemble music education as practiced in the West and opportunities for further inquiry?
The purpose of culturally comparative research is “both to explore and to explain cross-cultural differences” (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997, p. 142). This study accordingly sought to explore the English-language and Chinese-language sets of literature through an open review of journal articles, identify similarities and contrasts between those literature sets, and offer an explanatory analysis of the major themes. Eisner (1979) examined issues surrounding the purposes and procedures of cross-cultural arts education research, and offered, “The intellectual contexts within which individuals operate, particularly in a field such as ours, are diverse and difficult to operationalize” (p. 32). Indeed, several types of bias are possible in cross-cultural research, with construct bias the most likely in review/analysis projects such as this one. Construct bias occurs when the object of examination (i.e., “large ensembles” or “music education” or “conductors/teachers”) is not identical between the different cultural groups (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). The authors drew on established norms when seeking to minimize construct bias, including “convergence,” which comprises culturally independent research data-gathering techniques that allow for nuances of cultural norms, followed by comparative analysis of that data (Matsumoto & van de Vijver, 2011). As described in the procedures section to follow, the two sets of literature were independently identified with context-specific keywords, collected, and reviewed by native speakers in the United States and Asia. Other bias-reduction techniques included consultation with a second native Chinese-speaking researcher and allowance for nonstandard identification of the data set (as described below for the Chinese-language journals; Matsumoto & van de Vijver, 2011).

PROCEDURES
The review was bounded by the dates of mid-2007 to mid-2017, and it examined journal article content related to large ensembles and music education philosophy, pedagogy, and/or curriculum. Article content was screened according to procedures developed by Littell, Corcoran, and Pillai (2008) to systematically review large, diverse sets of literature. The initial database search terms included large ensembles, choir, chorus, band, orchestra, marching band, and jazz in various combinations. A subsequent search culled the results by filtering for terms related to themes in three articles that bookended the decade (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Kratus, 2007; Major, 2017): philosophy, curriculum, advocacy, and purpose.

There were some differences in the procedures through which English-language articles and Chinese-language articles were identified and evaluated for inclusion in this review. The English-language review began with an extensive search for literature using Google Scholar, ProQuest, and a variety of other academic search engines and databases. Informal methods, such as soliciting suggestions from colleagues, were also included in the search. Hundreds of articles, titles, and abstracts from the past 10 years were examined. Of these, 55 articles were determined to be of most relevance when the terms
philosophy and/or purpose were stipulated in keyword, full-text, and thematic searches. The authors then queried colleagues to identify influential articles that were missing from the list; four articles were added as a result. Twenty-four journals are represented in the collection of English-language articles.

The Chinese-language search was initiated by consulting a combination of Google, Google Scholar, and a website for Chinese-language journals (http://www.cnki.net/). The term *Chinese orchestra* was included in the search as these ensembles follow the Western symphony orchestra model in several respects while they are specific to Chinese culture. The coauthor, a bilingual scholar (English and Chinese), used electronic translation tools and the Oxford Chinese Dictionary where necessary. Results were cross-checked for accuracy with another bilingual scholar whose first language was Chinese and who was intimately familiar with academic writing in Chinese. The equivalent Chinese terms for philosophy and advocacy were rarely reflective of the Chinese-language articles focused on large ensembles. However, 41 articles were determined to be of most relevance when the Chinese equivalent terms for curriculum and purpose were stipulated. Twenty-six journals are represented in the collection of Chinese-language articles.

A narrative, synthetic approach (Boote & Beile, 2005; Hart, 1998; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006) guided the initial analysis of the literature, resulting in thematic integrity within the two individual data sets and allowing for a comparative analysis between the sets. The authors acknowledge that any review of a large literature base contains elements of subjectivity with regard to selection, categorization, and analysis. To minimize subjectivity, the two authors initially worked independently on the English- and Chinese-language data sets. They then reviewed the opposite data set, verifying the results according to procedures offered by Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, and Spiers (2002). Following processes similar to those employed to analyze qualitative data (e.g., Saldaña, 2012), the authors independently made analytical memos on each article and did an open coding on the textual data. They then combined these codes into categories, eventually arriving at the major themes. The themes were subsequently cross-checked between the two authors, who proceeded to modify and refine the themes until they mutually concurred on the themes that best captured the data. Finally, these themes were cross-checked by the same bilingual scholar who assisted the coauthor with the translation of the Chinese-language articles. The literature discussed below is representative of the themes found in the analysis.

**THEMES**

Three conceptually distinct but interrelated themes emerged as major points of comparison between the two sets of literature: power, participation, and pedagogy. “Power” refers to the authority, command, and influence commonly associated with conductors. While English-language authors largely critiqued and debated about the authoritative power of conductors, their Chinese-language counterparts provided ideas on
empowering conductors to be more effective and efficient conductors. “Participation” refers to issues of access, recruitment, retention, attrition, and other sociological issues related to participation in large ensembles. While numerous English-language articles that discussed these issues were found, there appeared no such parallel discussion in the Chinese-language articles. “Pedagogy” refers to calls for changes in the teaching and delivery of large ensemble programs. While English-language writers advocated for pedagogical reforms in light of the above concerns with power and participation, Chinese-language authors called for pedagogical improvements through the development of basic skills and looking Westward for pedagogical inspirations. In what follows, the three themes are unpacked in turn.

**Power**

Authors publishing in English-language journals have extensively addressed issues of power relations in large ensembles during the past decade. These authors have most commonly critiqued the stereotypical authoritarian Western-style conductor in contrast with current understandings of pedagogy and educational theory (e.g., Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Miksza, 2013; Tan, 2014). Kratus (2007) noted, “The teaching model most emulated in secondary ensembles is that of the autocratic, professional conductor of a large, classical ensemble,” further questioning, “Is that the model of music making we want for our students? . . . It is an autocratic model of teaching that has no parallel in any other school subject” (pp. 45–47). Other authors articulated similar concerns. For example, Allsup and Benedict (2008) and Mantie (2012a) critiqued the wind band’s conductor-driven pedagogy and concurrent lack of self-reflection while proposing that many problems in large ensemble instruction are rooted in a constant desire for academic legitimacy. Drawing on the Confucian philosopher Xunzi’s metaphor of “the boat and the water,” Tan (2014) proposed reconceptualizing power relations in terms of construing “the conductor [as] the boat; the players the water. It is the players that sustain the conductor, and it is the players that capsize the conductor” (p. 64). He also posited a transcultural theory of democracy for large ensembles that comprises “the people, participation, equality, cooperation, and conflict” (Tan, 2014, p. 61).

Regelski (2012) and Mantie (2012b) examined conflicting pressures on music teacher-conductors that result in the placement of musical considerations as primary, with educational, sociological, and pedagogical considerations as secondary. Regelski (2012) felt that examples “of taking musicianship to an extreme in inappropriate circumstances—particularly in school music—are situations (far from rare) where music teachers use rote, authoritarian, fear tactics, and other coercive means to insure high quality performances by their ensembles” (p. 22). In contrast, Mantie suggested that teacher-conductors who emphasize the educative value of ensemble literature and performance experiences may paradoxically reduce students’ enjoyment and engagement in musical participation. Other authors have examined elements of these concerns from the viewpoints of composers
Freer, Tan A Cross-Cultural Content Analysis (Andrews & Giesbrecht, 2013), policymakers (Jones, 2007; Teachout, 2007), ensemble teacher-conductors (Collins & Wells, 2014; Freer, 2011; Robinson, 2008; Spring, 2016; Williams, 2007), and students (e.g., Freer, 2015; Saldaña, 2008).

Power and empowerment. While English-language articles critiqued and debated the supposed power of conductors, there is no evidence of such discussion in Chinese-language journals; to the contrary, Chinese-language writers have positively emphasized the importance of conductors and provided ideas on empowering conductors. In comparison with much of the literature in English, the Chinese portrait of the ideal school ensemble teacher-conductor recalled the traditional Western “maestro.” Yuan (2016) noted that a conductor is the soul of the ensemble as he or she gives it life; in like vein, B. Sun (2015) wrote that a fine director is able to lead an ensemble to greater heights and convey the meaning of the musical works to the audience. The lives, memoirs, thoughts, and work of a number of exemplary conductors, such as Huang Xiaotong and Piao Dongsheng, have been held up as models (Jin, 2014; X. D. Yang, 2007).

Given the importance and value attributed to conductors, several writers outlined key attributes and abilities required of ensemble directors and posited methods through which such conductor characteristics might be further developed. These characteristics included knowledge of educational psychology, harmony and music theory, pedagogical and aural skills, musical memory, musical sensitivity, the ability to read full scores, and having a firm foundation in conducting (e.g., Liang, 2014; Liu, 2017; B. Sun, 2015; X. D. Yang, 2007; Yuan, 2016). Authors also wrote specifically about the optimal conducting techniques necessary for directors, expounding on topics such as similarities and differences between professional and educational conducting, conducting Western and Chinese ensembles, emotional expression in conducting, and the effects of conducting on large ensembles (e.g., Kang, 2013; Liu, 2016; Zheng, 2009).

Chinese-language writers have argued that large ensemble teachers lack the proper training to be effective, either as teachers or as musical leaders; furthermore, there is a need to raise teacher quality (Li, 2014; Wang, 2014). Accordingly, several areas for improvement in music teacher education have been identified, including the training of large ensemble conductors. A number of authors have compared various college conducting programs (Liu, 2008; Luo, 2012; Y. Sun, 2007a) and made suggestions for how programs may be reformed to be more innovative and pedagogically sound (Liang, 2014). Several articles detailed specific strategies for teaching conducting in teacher training programs, including using two pianos (Zhao, 2015) or the electronic organ (Fang, 2010), drawing on established conducting texts (Y. Q. Yang, 2008, 2009), and modeling famous conductors through the use of videos (Yan & Feng, 2009).

Participation

Many English-language articles in the past decade have contained reports of research about how school-based large ensembles influence student recruitment, retention, and
attrition. We have collectively referred to these as issues of participation in the sense of enrollment. Nearly all of these articles noted the positive influence of friends and the interpersonal relationships developed in music ensembles (e.g., Hewitt & Allan, 2013). Some authors expressed criticism concerning the lack of ethnic and racial diversity found in many school ensemble programs (e.g., Collins & Wells, 2014; DeLorenzo, 2012). Baker (2009) studied logistical and scheduling barriers to student participation, and Freer (2010, 2012, 2016b) explored intersections between motivation, sociology, and the enrollment of adolescent boys in choral music. Other researchers reported complementary results, including those focused on a private Mennonite school in the United States (Dabback, 2016), pre-university schools in Singapore (Freer & Tan, 2014), reports of innovative approaches to group music making in U.S. schools (Thibeault, 2015), and motivation, flow, and grit among U.S. and Singapore band students (Miksza, Tan, & Dye, 2016).

Researchers have investigated perceived positive and/or negative sociological and extramusical impacts of large ensemble participation (e.g., Miksza, 2010). Hourigan (2009) focused on the development of social identity, acceptance, and tolerance for diversity among student ensemble participants. Several studies examined sociological issues in various types of choral ensembles (Jones, 2016; Major, 2017; Parker, 2011, 2016), the qualities of teacher-conductors that students perceive as supportive and/or motivating in school ensembles (Matthews & Kitsantas, 2007, 2012), and evolution of the sociological and pedagogical values of school band directors throughout their careers (Gossett, 2016).

Several authors probed for reasons that adults continue or discontinue participation in musical ensembles following secondary school, finding that sociological factors—rather than musical factors—are the most motivating components of the ensemble experience (Carucci, 2012; Pitts, Robinson & Goh, 2015; Rohwer, 2016). Jones (2007) proposed that ensembles be repurposed to facilitate engagement in musical activity outside of school and into adulthood. Whitener (2016) further offered that the infusion of cooperative learning strategies within large ensembles might contribute to such lifelong musical engagement.

A small subset of the literature has been focused directly on the reasons that large ensembles alone do not reach the enrollment goals inherent in universal music education. This theme pervades nearly all of the English-language articles examined for this review, but several articles provided unique perspectives. The emergence of and educational/musical possibilities afforded by virtual, online, and media-infused ensembles have been suggested as extensions to the existing offerings of bands, orchestras, and choirs (Dillon, Adkins, Brown & Hirsche, 2009; Tobias, 2015). Authors have posited that the establishment of new approaches to participatory music (Thibeault, 2015) will necessitate the application of market-driven approaches to reform (Jones, 2007) with careful consideration of music education’s ethical and philosophical foundations (Regelski, 2016).
Upon the emergence of participation as a salient theme in the English-language literature set, the researchers conducted a second round of searching for Chinese-language articles with a specific eye for articles that relate to issues of participation and access in large ensembles. As far as could be determined, there were no articles that were primarily concerned with issues similar to those in the English-language journals. This absence is as striking as the strong presence of participation in the English-language data set, thereby justifying participation as a strong theme and basis for cross-cultural comparison in this study. Possible explanations for this finding are proposed in the Discussion section that follows.

**Pedagogy**

Several authors in various types of English-language journals offered strong support for continuation of the current traditional large ensemble model alongside multiple suggestions for reform. Among these, Fonder (2014) offered a brief essay critical of academics who argue against large ensembles yet fail to offer pragmatic pathways toward change. Hess (2012) drew on philosophical analysis and Heuser (2011, 2015) employed case study and autoethnographic approaches to reevaluate the field’s theoretical foundations with a goal of realizing democratic and collaborative models for school-based large ensembles. Analysis grounded in tenets of culturally responsive pedagogy (Bond, 2014; Mixon, 2009; Shaw, 2016) and social justice (Regelski, 2016) frequently complemented suggestions for alternative approaches to the large ensemble paradigm and its pedagogy. Colley (2009) and Jones (2007) emphasized the role of university and college faculty when preparing future generations of music teachers who might implement changes such as nonperforming ensembles (Freer, 2016b), the infusion of technology and popular music (Miksza, 2013), large-scale composition projects in middle school bands (McGillen, 2007), ensembles as the center of broad interdisciplinary units (Teachout, 2007), and a broad expansion of repertoire and eclectic performance styles (e.g., Grant, 2007; Williams, 2011). In his cross-cultural philosophical work, Tan (2016) offered practical strategies for how the current large ensemble structure may be reconceived in more creative terms.

While a number of English-language writers stressed the need for pedagogical reform in light of the above concerns with power and participation, their Chinese-language counterparts appeared to emphasize the need for pedagogical improvements through the development of basic skills and looking to the West for inspiration. The development of large ensemble curriculum and pedagogy was discussed at length by several authors who provided specific ideas for improvement. These include reinforcing fundamentals such as posture, embouchure, and breath support; teaching singing through canons and gestures; choosing high-quality literature; providing opportunities for students to undertake leadership roles; teaching students to watch the conductor; singing before playing on instruments; understanding musical styles, history, and
theory; and providing opportunities for chamber music (e.g., Li, 2014; Qin, 2010; Wang, 2014). Other authors have noted the importance of conducive learning environments (Zhang, 2015) and solid organizational structures (Li, 2014) as prerequisites for ensuring the delivery of good large ensemble programs. In a unique article that aimed to move beyond performative goals, Zhang (2015) stressed the importance of developing students’ creativity through a number of strategies. These include asking students to create visual imageries of the pieces they are learning; inspiring students to see how music amalgamates influences from the other art forms, such as Chinese calligraphy; singing the lyrics (if the instrumental work was originally a song) and thinking through possibilities of phrasal rise and fall; and encouraging students to adopt a creative approach to music. Since individual students differ considerably, directors should use a wide range of pedagogical approaches—including multimodal ones—while teaching (Zhang, 2015).

A strong element in the Chinese literature was the comparison of China’s music education/large ensemble practices with those of other countries, particularly Russia and Western nations. Y. Sun (2007a), for example, compared college choral and conducting programs in Russia and China, noting that the former curriculum tended to be more well-rounded and specialized and benefitted from having more expert conducting teachers. The choral and choral conducting pedagogy in Ukraine and Russia have also inspired Chinese music educators (Luo, 2012; Y. Sun, 2007b), as has the teaching of the legendary Russian conducting pedagogue, Ilya Musin (Liu, 2016). Notable Western conducting texts that have been discussed in the Chinese literature include Elizabeth Green’s *The Modern Conductor*, Benjamin Grosbayne’s *Techniques of Modern Orchestral Conducting*, and Emil Kahn’s *Conducting* (Y. Q. Yang, 2008, 2009). Liu (2008) spelled out four main reasons behind the success of American instrumental conducting programs, lauding them for being systematic, specialized, practical, and innovative. Writers have also discussed the Western praxial philosophy of music education and its Aristotelian roots (Zhou, 2007; Zhu, 2016).

**DISCUSSION**

Bond and van de Vijver (2011) observed that cross-cultural comparative research “yields studies reporting arresting differences between cultural groups in whatever response is of interest. . . . These observed differences provoke intriguing speculations about their origins” (p. 75). In other words, cross-cultural research offers insights into differences between cultural groups that in turn provide opportunities for researchers to speculate underlying reasons for areas of divergence (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Indeed, in this present study, we found several arresting differences between the two data sets—differences that are certainly interesting enough to provoke some intriguing speculations related to the three themes of power, participation, and pedagogy.

It is striking that while the Chinese literature frequently portrayed the conductor as the soul of the ensemble (e.g., Yuan, 2016), a number of the recent English-language
articles construed the conductor in authoritarian terms. The vast majority of the Chinese-language literature emphasized the musicianship skills necessitated by effective conducting. Very little of the English-language literature addressed musicianship or the requisite technical skills of conductors. Further research might explore this specific absence of musicianship-based literature in English-language music education circles. Following Howard’s (1992) distinctions between “authority” and “authoritarian,” it could be that concepts of authority and musicianship are related in a manner wherein higher levels of conductor musicianship function as authority while lower levels of conductor musicianship invite the imposition of authoritarian structures in large ensemble classrooms.

The notion of empowerment in the Chinese-language literature often referred to the strengthening of a conductor’s skills as leader of the ensemble. In contrast, empowerment in the English-language literature related to democratic practices within large ensembles that transfer emphasis away from conductor-teachers and toward student performers (e.g., Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Tan, 2014). There is little evidence of such discourse in the Chinese-language literature. While both sets of literature evidence some discussion about fostering student creativity in and through large ensemble participation, English-language articles tend to equate creativity with the individualized outcomes often identified with democratic approaches to education (Jones, 2007; Tan, 2016a; Teachout, 2007). No parallel concerns about democracy in the large ensemble classroom were found in the Chinese-language literature set. One possible reason could be that as noted earlier, Asian societies tend toward collectivistic tendencies, which contrast with Western individualism (e.g., Maehr & Nicholls, 1980; Murayama et al., 2009). It may be that the large ensemble’s emphasis on group activity is inherently aligned with underlying Asian social values; concerns about democracy are not raised because the supposed lack of individual voices is not construed to be a problem. In the absence of empirical evidence, this proposed explanation, while founded on established individualism-collectivism theoretical support, is at best a speculation. We recognize that such explanations are overly broad when portraying the West in individualist terms and all of Asia in collectivistic terms. Nonetheless, the finding that no concerns about democracy were found in the Chinese-language literature set remains particularly interesting.

Similarly, multiple English-language articles discussed issues related to participation and access while there was no parallel discussion in the Chinese-language articles. There are some possible reasons why this might be the case. In the English-language literature, efforts to bolster student participation and increase student access were largely presented as the responsibility of teacher-conductors (e.g., Baker, 2009; Freer, 2012; McGillen, 2007). In the Chinese context, however, a major role of the Chinese Ministry of Education lies in its responsibility for planning and guiding the political ideological work of schools and the promotion of the arts. . . . China’s music education has long been regarded
as cultural-political propaganda designed to reinforce political ideology and governmental desires to imprint the new social order and values on the masses. (Ho & Law, 2004, p. 150; see also Ho, 2003)

The strong involvement of the Chinese state in music education was noted in Reimer’s 1989 account of music education in China, where “Communism, of course, at least under Chairman Mao’s reign, used music exclusively as an instrument for the propagation of social values, which is in the Confucian tradition in spirit if not in content” (p. 68). Reimer’s observation that the political and social uses of music have centuries-old roots in Confucianism is supported by Chinese scholars (see Tan, 2015c). For example, Chen and Ma (2006) observed that Confucian education centered on “ritual and music” (liyue 礼樂) in the government’s efforts to inculcate social values. Li (2015) similarly noted that Confucius was especially adamant about using the “right” kinds of music (yayue 雅樂) to promote socially accepted behaviors and to avoid “morally reprehensible music” (zhengsheng 郑聲) that could promote supposedly immoral and violent behaviors. These Confucian views influenced future generations over many centuries (Li, 2015). Given that Chinese music education appears to be philosophically grounded in Confucianism (Tan, 2015c) and somewhat more government-driven than the teacher-driven orientation common in English-speaking contexts, it could be that issues of participation and access to music education in China are construed more as matters of policy and deep-seated philosophical values than of advocacy informed by research. Furthermore, Confucianism places a high premium on the cultivation of moral character and virtue through music (Reimer, 1989; Tan, 2015c). As Chinese scholar Mao (2004) noted, Confucius emphasized the importance of being “perfected by music” (chengyuyue 成於樂) within the Six Arts of calligraphy, mathematics, chariotereing, ritual, archery, and music.

Given these philosophical and historical roots, it could be that the Chinese people largely see the value of music education as a cultural given (Brahmstedt & Brahmstedt, 1997). Future empirical research might uncover additional reasons for the broad societal support of music education in China and how these may compare cross-culturally with Western ideas on the nature and value of music and music education.

The Chinese literature concerning school-based large ensembles seems to recall the English-language literature of a few decades ago, with emphasis on the development of the conductor’s musical skills, ability to develop ensemble curriculum, and efficiency in rehearsal pedagogy. The English-language literature reviewed here either focused directly on philosophical or theoretical considerations, or these foundations were used to inform proposed structural and pedagogical reforms. This may reflect the fact that large ensemble instruction in China is currently in a different stage of development compared to the United States and other Western countries. Large ensembles matured in the United States in the early part of the 20th century, while Western-style bands, orchestras, and choirs are relatively recent arrivals within Chinese music education. Music education is required through Grade 9 in Chinese schools, but this does not include large ensembles
A quick review of English-language research literature on large ensembles from 1950–80 suggests a stronger emphasis on the conductor’s musical skills than does literature in the current review. The Chinese-language literature may therefore reflect an earlier stage of development wherein the emphasis is on identifying the skills necessary for ensemble teaching in school settings.

The Chinese-language literature evidenced a strong element of “looking Westward” for models of large-ensemble music education. Even so, there was little evidence of direct connection between music education literature in English- and Chinese-language journals. Language and translation barriers are obvious possible reasons, as is uneven access to journals in foreign languages (Zha, Li, & Yan, 2013). The tendency to look Westward was probably due at least in part to the fact that music education’s large ensemble paradigm originated in the West. A number of historical articles were devoted to tracing the evolution of Western music and Western large ensembles in China (Tang, 2013; Xie, 2015). Han (2009) traced the history of the Western symphony orchestra in China and regretted the fact that China lost its musical voice as a result of the strong Western influence. Still, he expressed hope that there are still elements of Chineseness in Chinese orchestral music and acknowledged that Western borrowing was necessary, especially since the Cultural Revolution resulted in the loss of musicians and artists. Given the strong tradition of large ensembles in the West, there have been calls to model best practices of Western large ensemble music education, with authors such as Zhou (2007) presenting curricula from Western sources. Whether China continues looking Westward is important as it will impact repertoire and teaching methodologies in educational large ensembles. The question of whether China should continue borrowing remains an important one, as does the question of how North American (and other Western) cultures look beyond themselves for future directions in music education that involve large ensembles and/or large-form participatory musics (Thibeault, 2015).

**Closing**

A few limitations regarding this study are acknowledged. First, the articles presented were limited to those that were searchable using the procedures outlined. This study only included articles that were archived electronically, and therefore, there is no claim to be exhaustive. Second, the data set was comprised entirely of journal articles and did not include other sources such as books, dissertations, and theses, which may be included in future studies. Third, the non-English literature consisted only of Chinese-language articles and cannot be taken to represent the whole of Asia. In the same vein, the Western literature surveyed only English-language articles and does not claim generalizability to the entirety of Western academia. Future research may build on the groundwork established here to explore literature beyond these two languages.

Notwithstanding the limitations outlined above, this study contributes to music education in at least two ways. First, the three themes that emerged, namely power, participation,
and pedagogy, offer a concise means of organizing and making sense of the body of literature related to large ensembles over the 10-year period from 2007 to 2017. This is especially true regarding the North American literature. While there might be other latent themes, these themes appear rather compelling; indeed, much ink has been spilled over discussion of the conductor’s power, issues of participation and access, and calls for pedagogical reforms. Would these themes similarly emerge in earlier (and future) 10-year time periods? This study may serve as a foundation for future, similar content analyses. Second, this may be the first English-language article in music education that has compared the literature on large ensembles to literature published in Chinese—a peek through the pinhole to academia in China, one that is probably rather foreign to most Western readers.

This analysis offers an attempt to transcend cultural and language barriers that often impede cross-cultural understandings (Kertz-Welzel, 2013; Tan, 2015a) and to foster cross-cultural dialogue crucial to understanding a globalized world. It is hoped that this comparative analysis will set the stage for future cross-cultural content analyses of music education writings in other languages. In so doing, the international community may enable new dialogues for music education that embrace our worldwide field’s broad multiplicities and pluralities.

AUTHORS’ NOTE
The authors acknowledge the contributions of Mengchen Lu for her role in cross-checking the translations of the Chinese-language articles.
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