

Designing Curriculum for Integrating the Humanities: A Thematic Approach

Timothy Gerber

D.M.A., Professor of Music,

The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43201, USA

(gerber.4@osu.edu)

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Throughout history, people have questioned the role and value of music. Today we most frequently encounter the skeptics in the education of young people, particularly as they advance through school. At least in those communities fortunate enough to have music education in their schools, the availability of music instruction declines as students get older. Evidently, the importance of musical learning comes into greater question at each successive level—from elementary to middle to high school.

It is reasonable to ask why these questions arise, especially when one begins to think about curriculum development. We know that the arts have been a part of the lives of all people from the very earliest times. For example, we have acted out the stories of our ancestors, we have sung and danced for our children, and we have drawn visual images of objects and experiences that hold great meaning. From the beginning of civilization, these creative expressions have been basic in most cultures of the world. Indeed, they have been—and continue to be—an essential part of human nature.

We need to remember that these songs, dances, stories, and drawings were not a luxury in the lives of ancient people. They were not considered to be frills. In truth, they are not luxuries today. However, some unlightened education critics rigidly consider the arts to be nice—but not necessary—in the teaching of their citizens. In many of the world's nations, the arts are not taught in public schools, but are available only to those who can afford private music instruction. In the United States, arts programs are frequently among those to be cut first. Many arts teachers are on the defensive.

Unfortunately, the critics fail to understand the clear facts. Since the earliest history of human life, the arts have provided two treasured values: first, they enable people to find meaning. They help us to make sense of the world by connecting various concepts and physical realities: time and place, mind and body, emotion and intellect, sacred and secular, real and imaginary. As Bennet Reimer has written in the recent *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on Music Education*,

"Many positive consequences grow out of the pursuit of musical meaning as an end. To be human is to make meaning and to seek meaning. A life full of meaning, including musical meaning, is a life fulfilled in one of its primary needs. The consequences of such fulfillment are a sense of wholeness, wellness, and satisfaction. Effects on individuals' physical, emotional, psychological, and spiritual health are profound. These effects radiate outward to the health of families, communities, nations, and ultimately, on the well-being of their members" [Reimer, 2000].

A second prominent treasure the arts give us is their providing the world with a unique record of mankind. In essence, they tell us who we are. They also inform us who other people are and what they value. As written in the National Standards for Arts Education for the United States, they provide "one of humanity's deepest rivers of continuity" [MENC, 1994].

The arts, especially music, provide a unique way of thinking and knowing. In music improvisation and composition, for example, people learn to create original musical ideas in order to express themselves through the medium of sounds organized in time. No other human pursuit permits such activity. Unlike many other disciplines, music provides endless opportunities for divergent, rather than convergent thinking. It encourages us to move and it invites creativity. It helps us understand that not everything is black and white. It teaches us that not all answers are absolutely right or wrong.

The unique intellectual habits and emotional responsiveness that develop from one's involvement in the arts point to yet another benefit: the arts teach us craftsmanship. That is, people learn to care genuinely about their creative endeavors. Musicians learn to refine their performances. They learn to be accountable. They become experts in the art of correcting themselves. They practice continuously to improve their musicianship and their musical products. Remarkably, through this process, music enables people to cultivate what the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development calls a "discipline of mind" and at the same time, it provides continuous opportunities for uplifting the human spirit. Bennett Reimer has called this "thoughtful feeling" and "feelingful thought."

With all of these attributes, why do some people question the importance of the arts in the education of their children? One reason is the cost: they require both money and precious human resources. Another reason relates to community priorities. In most regions of the United States, for example, where music often is taught during the school day, other subjects invariably are considered to be more important. For example, in order to be "globally competitive," many students in the USA are tested in what are considered to be the "basic" subjects. In my own state of Ohio, we require "proficiency" testing in reading, writing, math, science and citizenship for all students in grades 4, 6, 9, and 12. The fourth-grade students must complete "high stakes" testing: those who fail the reading

section are not permitted to progress to the fifth grade. In some communities, fewer than half of these students pass. And in many schools, music and art teachers are required to teach reading—not for curriculum integration, but to help students pass their fourth-grade tests.

In this type of environment, the arts become relatively less important. In effect, we test what we value, and we value what we test. Consequently, the subjects on the tests command most of the available time and money. When we, the international leaders in the field of arts and music education consider this challenge, how will we respond? A cynic might say, "if you can't beat them, join them." In a sense, there is some appeal to this idea, but a more politically correct way of stating it would be to look for ways to "integrate" the arts into the so-called "academic" portion of the curriculum. As Liora Bresler informs us, there are many ways to do this [Bressler, 1995]. And while knowing the distinctions among the varied types of curriculum integration can be useful, it strikes me that a preferred, general label for this process would be "connecting the arts to the lives and studies of students." But how best can we make the arts connect with other disciplines in an intellectually and artistically honest way? More specifically, where does music fit when integrating it into other subjects in the school curriculum? And what is the most efficient way to design the curriculum to enrich and subsequently to assess students' understanding?

The recent history of arts education tells us there are many different approaches that have been tried with varying degrees of success. Some of these fail to adequately interest or engage the learner (often the chronologically-based historical approach), while others actually confuse the student (a curriculum structured on the "elements of the arts" usually falls into this category.) Still others overstep the bounds of reason (for example, "biology in the arts.") So, what instructional process makes the most sense? How do we address curriculum design to maintain a prominent role for the arts in the schools?

In order to answer the "how" question, my experience in the classroom tells me that there are several more critical questions that need to be answered first. In fact, there is a hierarchy of questions that teachers and curriculum designers need to ask themselves. The first and most important at all levels of instruction is this: "what do I want my students to accomplish?" This is where the published National Standards for Arts Education [MENC, 1994], have provided welcome help to music teachers at all grade levels in the United States. And yet, there is such a broad range of acceptable answers to this question—especially on an international scale.

A second question is "what musical or artistic problems do I want my students to solve?" We need to remind ourselves that "telling" is not teaching, whereas posing problems is what good teachers do on a regular basis. Once we answer these two

questions of objectives and problems, we need to ask: "how can we create in our students a need to know or acquire the skills that are imbedded in our objectives and problems.?" Doing this, creating the need to know, truly reflects the art of teaching. And then, finally, we can begin to address the question of "how" to best help students make connections.

I would encourage us to look seriously at the benefits of a "thematic" approach because of its flexibility in facilitating the integration of the arts into other humanities courses for teachers and students at all levels. When learners make important connections through an integrated approach they will more likely find greater meaning in their lives both in the arts and other disciplines as well. I will later provide several examples of basic human themes to demonstrate the viability of this premise.

But first, I believe it is wise to consider the ways in which we might consider changing some of the traditional emphases on school music education. It is my considered opinion that at least in the United States, the greater good (and more students) would be served by rededicating our efforts to develop aural perception skills. We need to put more emphasis on perceptive listening as it relates to fundamental musical activities: listening per se as composers, as improvisers, as solo and ensemble performers and as audience members. In truth, listening is a basic life-skill that among all teachers, music educators are best prepared to teach. This is a tangible benefit that we bring to an integrated curriculum. Across the globe, listening skills are vital. In the USA, the Secretary of Labor considers listening to be a basic skill in the workplace. As Aldous Huxley wrote:

"All our mental processes depend upon perception. Inadequate perceiving results in poor thinking, inappropriate feeling, diminished interest in and enjoyment of life. Systematic training of perception should be an essential element in all education" [Huxley, 1962].

In the context of renewed emphasis on perception, we need to remember that music is something people do. It is an activity that reveals the nature of human feeling. thus is has both a personal and a social context. According to the philosopher Suzanne Langer,

"The tonal structures we call 'music' bear a close logical similarity to the forms of human feeling—forms of growth and attenuation, flowing and stowing, conflict and resolution, speed, arrest, terrific excitement, calm, or subtle activation and dreamy lapses—not joy and sorrow perhaps, but the poignancy of either and both—the greatness and brevity and eternal passing of everything felt." [Langer, 1953].

With these ideas as a foundation for shifting our priorities, I believe music curriculums would be stronger if we placed more emphasis on the social context of music and less on historical facts. We need to give more emphasis to useful information and less to abstract trivia. We would be well served to emphasize the natural, practical, and

fun values of music rather than the technical and esoteric dimensions. We need to put more emphasis on developing informed audiences and less on producing proficient performers. We need to emphasize our academic credibility and relevance rather than suffer low self-esteem in the schools. We need to put more emphasis on a transcultural approach and less on the "multicultural" concept. Finally, we need to put more emphasis on cultivating understanding and respect for music and less emphasis on appreciating and liking it.

Maxine Greene, the great scholar from Teachers College at Columbia University, wrote in *Teacher as Stranger* that "the teacher will know that there is no final explanation of any particular experience with a work of art; he will know that no one can bring about appreciation or enjoyment in another, that he can only help make others see. Nevertheless, he can try to make his students discern qualities they may have overlooked" [Greene, 1973]. To me this idea of remaining open and noticing much with a disciplined mind is one of the most persuasive rationales for using a thematic approach to curriculum design. It fairly commands what David Perkins calls "generative topics" that are both accessible to students and "connectable" to other disciplines. [Perkins and Blythe, 1994]. It helps stretch perceptiveness and deep understanding rather than strive for appreciation. It opens rather than closes doors for students. And it enables arts teachers to reach out to both their students and to their colleagues.

Just what is a theme? My friend and colleague Louis Lankford reminds us that a theme is a concept, topic or subject that serves to unify or relate diverse material. A theme can recur in many different artworks, thereby providing a common thread for study. Themes often represent ideas, events, and relationships that are important to individuals and societies. Love, birth, death, justice, freedom, conflict, war, peace, the environment, faith, family, good, evil, and overcoming adversity are examples of themes found in the arts that can connect easily to other disciplines.

As one might expect, there are some very practical reasons to adopt a thematic approach. First, it invites an atmosphere of inclusiveness in the school. It encourages collaborative planning and projects across subject areas. It stimulates innovative approaches to instruction and assessment. It allows arts teachers to demonstrate the unique aspects of each art form while enabling them to reveal their common philosophical, social and cultural dimensions. It just makes sense!

Let us look at a couple of good examples where both music and art can serve individually and in collaboration to help illustrate a theme, thereby making a more generative topic. . First consider this song as sung by a group called "Quilapayun": [Play *El Pabelo Unido* here]. As you listen, try to solve three brief problems: (1) what language do you hear the singers use? (2) what do you suppose this song is about? and

(3) use your aural skills to remember the melody to sing it on the syllables "buh, duh."
[AUDIO] If you now return to the first problem, and assuming you don't know Spanish, go on to the second problem: what is this song about? Certainly you have some inkling: What is its mood? Its message? Solidarity! It means "The People United Will Never Be Defeated." And solidarity for what? What people? Defeated by what or whom? Well, the answer is the people of Chile—and they sing and chant that they will never be defeated by the oppressive, murderous dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet.

Just what, you may rightly ask, does this remotely have to do with any notion of scholarship or curriculum? Well, certainly, Mr. Pinochet has been on the front pages of the news of late, and this song directly addresses in a very culturally vibrant way a passionate and musical response to political oppression. It fits perfectly with what the late Ernest Boyer calls "the scholarship of integration,," a thoughtful process where we place what we know in a larger, interdisciplinary context in which several different disciplines converge. [Boyer, 1997, p. 16]

From a purely musical perspective, you quickly learned the melodic structure of this song well enough to vocalize it. And so did thousands of people in Chile. But how did they learn it? Did some of the anti-Pinochet forces distribute hundred of copies of sheet music to the men and women singing the song? Of course not! So how did they learn it? The same way most people on our globe learn music—by ear! And, as you will discover in a few minutes, El Pueblo Unido offers us an even deeper example of the basic foundations of music pedagogy: scholarship and artistry. After solving these problems, what type of theme might you assign to this music? Perhaps "overcoming oppression" or "addressing adversity" would be good themes. then begin to think of all the other disciplines that might connect to this theme. And what other examples of music might you use?

One interesting thing about this piece is the way it connects to additional themes. One of these is the idea of "theme and variations." Let's test your aural perception to see how well you can hear this Chilean melody in the following piano piece by Polish-American composer Frederic Rzewski. [AUDIO]. One good question to ask is "how varied are the variations—and how would you describe them?" Are there ways to connect this idea to visual arts? Let's look at this slide by American artist Keith Haring. What aspects of theme and variations do you see here?

統整課程設計：主題教學模式

Timothy Gerber博士

俄亥俄州立大學教授

長久以來，人們始終質疑音樂的角色與價值。現在我們更容易在年輕人的教育中會有這樣的懷疑，特別是隨著他們年齡增長，疑問也越多。至少有幸在學校提供音樂教育的社區，經常是學生年齡越長，接觸音樂教學的機會卻更少。顯而易見的，學音樂的重要是個自小學到國、高中各階段越變越大的問題。

尤其當人們開始思考課程發展時，有這樣的疑問是不難理解的。大家都知道，藝術自古以來即是人類生活的一部份。舉例而言，我們的行為模式是根據祖先事蹟而來、我們為子孫們唱歌跳舞、我們畫下物體及具有重要意含的經驗。自人類文明啓蒙之初，世界上多數文化基本上就擁有這些富創作性的表現方式。事實上，這些一直是--也將繼續是一人類本質的基本部份。

我們必須記得，歌曲、舞蹈、故事、繪畫並非古代人們生活中奢侈的部份，他們並非裝飾品。其實，在今天他們也不是奢侈品。但是一些不明究理的教育評論家呆板地認定藝術在教育上是好的，但卻非必要的。在很多國家，公立學校中並不教授藝術課程，而是只有付得起私人教學的有錢人才會接觸到。在美國，藝術課程通常皆被列為首先被裁撤的課程之一。藝術教師因此得為自己提出辯護。

很不幸的，教育評論家無法瞭解這些明顯的事實。有史以來，藝術即已提供了兩項寶貴的價值：首先是藝術使人們發現意含。透過藝術，人們得以瞭解各種觀念與實體如：時間與地方，精神與軀體，感性與理性，聖潔與世俗，真實與虛幻等之連結。正如班奈黎曼在最近「Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on Music Education」書中所寫：“許多正面的結果是在追求音樂意含之後而生成的。人之所以為人，就在人能創造與發覺意含。一個充滿意含、包括音樂意含的人生，才是一個基本需求得到實踐的人生。這個實踐的結果是一完整、健康及滿足的感覺。對個人身體上、感性上、心理上、精神上、健康上的影響是奧妙的。這些影響更進一步影響家庭、社會及國家的健全，且終究影響其中的成員們。” [Reimer, 2000]

第二項顯著的價值是藝術為人類在這世界上作了獨一無二的見證。本質上，藝術告訴了我們是誰，同時也告訴我們其他人是誰及他們的價值觀。正如「National Standards for Arts Education for the United States」中所寫，藝術提供了“人性最深層延續的一道江河” [MENC, 1994]。

藝術，尤其是音樂，為思考與瞭解提供了一個獨特的方式。譬如，在音樂的即興與創作中，人們學習到如何創造原生的音樂觀念，以時間排序的音響為媒介表現自己的意念。在人類所有追求中沒有任何一種能提供這樣的功能。與其他領域所不同的是，音樂提供了無限多樣化思考的機會，而非其他領域萬法歸一的思索方式。它鼓勵人們求變與創造。音樂讓人瞭解凡事並非皆為黑白分明，所有答案並非都是絕對的對錯。

經由對藝術的涉獵而發展出獨特而知性的習慣及感性的反應更提供了一個好處：藝術教導我們藝術家匠心獨運的特質。也就是人們學會對他們為創作所付出的努力很真切的在意。音樂家學會不斷修飾自己的表演，學會了責任感，他們成了修飾自己藝術的專家，藉由不斷的練習以提升音樂性及音樂的成品。很特別的，經由這樣的過程，音樂使人們培養出Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development中所謂“心智的訓練”，同時也不斷提供人們提升性靈的機會，班奈黎曼稱之為“思考的感性”及“感性的思考。”

談了上述音樂的特質，為何還有人對藝術對教育孩童的重要性提出質疑呢？一個原因是成本：藝術教育需要金錢及豐渥的人力資源；另一個理由則是社會的優先順序。舉例而言，雖然在美國大多學校中都教授音樂，但其他科目卻更受重視。譬如，為了提升“全球競爭力”，很多學生必須接受所謂“基本”科目的測驗。以我的家鄉俄亥俄州而言，舉凡4、6、9、12年級的學生都必須接受讀、寫、數、理及公民的能力測驗，4年級的學生必須通過閱讀的高標準測驗才能升上5年級。有些地區甚至不到一半的學生通過考試，因而許多學校的音樂和美術老師必須教授閱讀—並非為了課程統整，而是因為必須幫助學生通過4年級的考試。

在這樣的狀況下，藝術相對變得不重要了。其實，我們是對重視的事物才舉辦考試，也僅只重視必考的科目。因而，必須受測的科目用掉了多數的經費與時間。當我們這些所謂音樂與藝術教育界的國際領導者面對這樣的問題時，該做何回應？人或許會譏諷地說：“如果無法打敗他們，就加入他們吧！”從某個角度來看，這個想法已被接受，但更正確的說法應該是將藝術與課程中有關學科的部分加以“整合”，使藝術成為所謂課程中“學術”的部份。正如學者莉奧拉布萊斯勒所說，達成此一目標的方法有很多[Bresler, 1995]。雖然瞭解課程整合各型態之區別對我們是有助益的，但當研究所有可能的整合方式時，最令我驚訝的是，最好的方法應是“將藝術與學生的生活與學習相結合。”但我們究竟能將藝術以智慧與真誠的方式與其他領域結合得多好呢？更明確的說，當整合學校各課程時，藝術究竟如何定位？什麼是設計課程時最有效的方法，以便提升進而評估學生領受的程度呢？

藝術教育近來的發展告訴我們，有很多不同的方法已被嘗試過且成功的程度也不

同。有些無法引起或持續學習者的興趣（通常是依時間先後歷史取向的方法），有些卻混淆了學生（將課程建立在藝術的元素上），有些則超過界限（如談藝術中的生物現象）。所以，究竟何種方式最合理？我們須如何設計課程以使藝術在學校教育中保持重要的地位？

爲了回答以上“如何做”的問題，我教學的經驗告訴我，有幾個更關鍵性的問題必須先回答。事實上，有一先後之分問題必須是老師與課程設計人員先捫心自問的。第一個也是最重要的一個是：我希望我的學生能達成什麼？這正是美國National Standards for Arts Education對各級教師提供的第一個助益。然而，這是個可能答案相當廣泛的問題—尤其是考慮到國際間各不同的標準時。

第二個問題是“我希望我的學生解決那些音樂上或藝術上的問題？”我們必須提醒自己“告訴”不是教學，經常提出問題才是一個好老師常應做的。當我們回答了以上兩個有關「目標」與「問題」的問題後，我們要問“要如何激發學生對蘊藏在前面兩個問題背後的求知慾與技能？”爲此，創造學生的欲望與動機，才能真正反映教學的藝術。再者，我們才能開始談談“如何”幫助學生尋找「聯結」的問題。

我希望各位審慎地思考“主題”教學法的優點，因爲它對各層級學校的老師與學生將藝術與其他人文課程整合的可塑性是很高的。當學習者能經由整合的方式產生重要聯結時，他們會在生命中藝術及其他領域找到更深遠的意義。

稍後我將舉幾個有關人類生活中幾個基本主題的例子來呈現主題教學的可行性。但首先，我認爲必須先考慮改變學校音樂教學著重傳統層面的方法。我深信至少在美國，如果能重新全力注力於聽力的發展，將有更好（且更多）的學生。我們應強調敏銳而有洞察力的聆聽，因爲它與基本的音樂活動息息相關，以一個作曲者、即興者、合奏者、獨奏者及聽眾的心態去聆聽。事實上，聆聽是所有音樂老師、音樂教育者準備最週全的基本生活技能，這是我們對整合課程帶來的實際好處。對全球而言，聆聽的技能是必備的。美國勞工部更視聽力爲工作的基本要求，正如艾爾杜赫克斯利所寫：“我們所有心智思考的過程皆仰賴洞察力，不充分的洞察力導致不良的思考、不適的感覺而降低對生命的興趣及喜悅，對洞察力有系統的訓練是所有教育中不可或缺的一環。” [Huxley, 1962]

哲學家蘇珊蘭爾說，“在對洞察力重新加以重視時，我們要記住音樂是人們做出來的。它是一個抒發人類自然感覺的活動。因此，它是關乎個人與社會的。”“我們所稱之的「音樂」的音的結構與人類的感覺形成有邏輯上的相似性—成長及消退、流動與停滯、矛盾與解決、速度、捕捉、極度刺激、冷靜、或精巧的動感及夢幻般的失誤—或許不包含快樂與遺憾，但其一或兩者的深刻—偉大，短暫，及所有一切感覺到的永恆時空。” [Langer, 1953]

以上的看法可作為我們改變優先順序的基礎。我相信如果我們多強調音樂的社會性，減少音樂的歷史性，則音樂課程將更健全。我們需要更加強有用訊息的傳遞，而減少抽象的細微末節；加強音樂自然、實用、及趣味的價值，而減少技巧與神秘的層次；致力於增加聽眾而非專業表演者；我們要強調學術的可信度及相關性，而非在校受卑微低貶之苦；多強調文化互通而非“多重文化”的觀念。再來，我們需致力對音樂瞭解與尊重之培養，而不僅是教導如何去欣賞或喜歡它而已。

麥克辛格林，一個Columbia University Teacher College的偉大學者，在「Teachers as Stranger」書中寫到：“一個老師知道任何一個對某件藝術作品的經驗，都沒有最終的解釋存在；一個老師知道沒有人能將藝術的重視與欣賞加附在他人身上，但他可以幫其他人看到這些點。不過，他仍然可以試著幫他的學生去重新審視他們可能忽略的特質。” [Greene, 1973] 對我而言。這個維持開放而受訓練的心智是在課程設計上使用“主題”教學最有衍生力的論點之一。它成功的運用了大衛泊金斯的“generative topics”論點，此論點可同時為學生所接受及可與其他領域相“連結” [Perkins and Blythe, 1994]。它有助延伸認知與深入的瞭解，而非僅限於欣賞的層次。它為學生敞開大門而非關門，它幫助藝術教育者將觸角延伸到學生及同事間。

但究竟何謂「主題」？我的好友及同事路易司蘭可佛提醒我們，主題是一種觀念、題目、標題，是一種將不同材料事物統合或連結的一個主題。它可在很多不同的藝術作品中呈現，因而提供了研習的共同脈絡。主題常用來代表對個人與社會重要的想法與事件：愛、生、死、正義、自由、矛盾、戰爭、和平、環境、信仰、家庭、奸、壞、克服逆境等都是藝術中可以找到且又能與其他領域輕易結合的主題。

正如我們可預見，採用主題式教學是有實際因素的。首先，它有一種被包括在學校教育的氣氛。它刺激了跨學科、跨領域的共同討論計劃，鼓勵對教學與評量的創新手法，允許藝術教師們展現各種藝術型式獨特的方面，同時呈現各種型式共同在哲學、社會、文化的面向，這是很說得通的！

讓我們看看一些音樂與藝術可以個別又可共同來描繪一個主題的例子，因此也能衍生出更豐富的主題。首先來聽聽由一個叫Quilapayun團體演唱的曲子，請一面聽一面想想如何回答以下三個問題：

- 1.歌者用何語言演唱？
- 2.猜猜這個曲子有關什麼？
- 3.試試記得這個旋律，並用buh、duh的音節唱出來

[播放音樂]

我們看看第一個問題，或許你不懂西班牙文，那麼想想第二個問題，這首曲子關於什麼？你大概知道比如：這首曲子感覺如何？想傳達什麼？團結！正是“團結力量

大”。團結的人不會被擊敗。但究竟為何而團結？那些人團結？被什麼人打敗？其實，歌詞是在談智利人，他們歌唱、吟誦著他們不會被殘酷兇暴的獨裁者Augusto Pinochet擊敗。

所以又如何呢？你可能要問，究竟這個例子與我們談藝術或課程有什麼關係？其實，Pinochet先生是近來新聞頭條熱門的話題，而這個曲子正是對政府迫害，一個熱情且音樂性地反應在文化方面生動的寫照。正是我們剛剛談玻依爾所謂整合的學問，將我們所知的東西放在一個較廣、跨領域的情境的一個週密思考的過程，而各不同的領域也自然凝聚匯合在一起了。[Boyer,1997, p. 16]

從一個純然音樂的觀點來看，你們可能很快就記得旋律的組成而能琅琅上口。同時智利人也一樣，但他們怎麼學這首曲子？是不是有反對Pinochet的人把樂譜影印了分給群眾？當然不是，但是他們怎麼學呢？其實跟我們週邊許多人學音樂的方法是一樣的--用聽的。接下來再想一想，El Pueblo Unido在曲子中呈現出基礎音樂教學一個深刻的例子：學術和藝術。我們答完這些問題了，那麼你會給這個曲子何名稱呢？“征服迫害”、“面對患難”或許會是好題目，然後我們可以再看看是不是有其他領域能與這個主題產生關聯。你是否有其他音樂的例子？

有趣的是這個曲子還能連結到其他的主題上。比方說“主題與變奏”的想法，現在來測試一下你們聽同一首智利旋律，但是由波蘭籍美國作曲家Frederic Rzewski所作的一首鋼琴曲[播放音樂]。一個好問題就是：這些變奏有什麼不同？你如何來敘述這些不同？有什麼方法能把這些想法連結到視覺藝術？我們來看看一個美國畫家企斯黑林的作品—在主題與變奏方面你看到什麼？[放映幻燈片]

