Musics, selves and societies: the roles of music in effecting change - Research Article

The Roles of Music in Effecting Change: Considerations about Public Policy

Elaine C. King

Abstract

The aim of this article is to consider questions, issues, and debates about music in public policy, a topic that featured in the final session of the *Musics, Selves and Societies* workshop at the University of Cambridge in June 2018. The first part of this article provides a backdrop by defining key terminology and describing the political environment in relation to music, specifically in the UK. It deciphers the scope of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) alongside public, professional, and charitable bodies as well as learned societies. The second part highlights three main areas of focus that were identified in the final session of the workshop: considerations about the value of music; considerations about the meaning of music; and considerations about policy-making. Each of these areas are discussed in turn before final remarks are put forward about steps for managing change.

Following the workshop hosted by the Centre for Music and Science at the University of Cambridge in June 2018 entitled *Musics, Selves and Societies: The Roles of Music in Effecting Change*, this account will consider relevant issues and questions arising from the final session on "Music in public policy" as well as summarize the papers and responses presented therein. The aim of the workshop was to explore music's potential to achieve individual and social change, and to assess how that evidence might be used to inform public policy. Given the emphasis upon "change", specifically in considering how music(s)[1]—in the widest possible sense—might bring about change to ourselves and our societies, such as via therapeutic, educational, and social means, it is first important to consider the relevance of public policy in this context. A definition of policy and public policy will be provided as a starting point.

Defining Policy and Public Policy

Broadly speaking, "policy" may be defined as a "course or principle of action adopted or proposed by an organization or individual" ("Policy", 2018a). The Late Middle English origin of "policy" derives from the French *policie* (meaning "civil administration"), which also provides the basis for

the current English term "police," which relates to civil law and order. A distinction can be made between a policy as a "plan," such as to be followed by a government, political party, or business, and a policy as a "document" that might show an agreement or contract of some kind ("Policy", 2018b). A good policy (plan) has three central features: first, it states matters of principle; second, it focuses on action; and third, it is an authoritative statement "made by a person or body with power to do so" (Office of General Counsel, 2016). Policies may be "formal" or "informal" depending on levels of accountability, regulation, compliance, and authority (Kos, 2010).

Policy-makers—those persons or bodies involved in forming a policy—may follow a series of steps, including identifying issues, policy analysis, consultation, policy development, coordination, decision-making, policy implementation, and evaluation. Within such a "policy cycle" (Bridgman & Davis, 2003), the question of who and how

University of Hull, Hull, UK

Corresponding author:
Elaine C. King, School of the Arts, University of Hull, Cottingham Road, Hull, HU6 7RX, UK.
Email: e.c.king@hull.ac.uk

one might influence these steps arises, and this will be revisited below. In the field of policy studies, which focuses primarily on the analysis of both the process and the contents of policy (e.g., Cairney, 2011; Moran et al., 2008), there is a growing preoccupation with cross-cultural and international issues, such as climate change and global economic development. It is also acknowledged that policies can have considerable discursive power and policy-as-discourse is a new paradigm of interest in policy analysis (Ball, 1994; Jones, 2009). This account, however, will concentrate primarily on domestic policy in the United Kingdom (UK) to reflect the emphasis of the workshop session.

The term "public policy" refers to the "principles, often unwritten, on which social laws are based" ("Public Policy", 2018a) or "a government policy that affects everyone in a country or state" ("Public Policy", 2018b). A public policy, then, is a policy that serves the public and, in democratic systems, this may be formed via consultation with public and private bodies. Public policies usually aim to improve or better (hence "change") aspects of a society and are normally implemented by a government, so they may also be referred to as government policies. Consideration of the different types of public policy as well as the complex relationships between different kinds of policy, including public policy and government policy, is beyond the scope of this article (for further insights, see, e.g., Richards & Smith, 2005).

In the context of discussion about music(s) and its role in effecting change, public policy is relevant because it shapes the ways in which people operate within societies: it defines and influences the parameters of our experiences about music, such as in educational and social circles, as well as impacts upon our interactions, beliefs, assumptions, expectations, and so on. One might argue that public policy determines—to a certain extent—the relationship of the selves in a society to music. Indeed, such relationships are exposed in recent publications on policy and music education where considerations of social justice (Benedict et al., 2018) and policy participation (Horsley, 2017; Schmidt & Colwell, 2017) are put forward.

Three main areas of focus emerged in the session on "Music in public policy" at the *Musics, Selves and Societies* workshop: first, considerations about the value of music; second, considerations about the meaning of music; and third, considerations about policy-making. Position papers were given by Professor Ian Cross (University of Cambridge, UK) and Mr. Joe Watt (Second Clerk, Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), House of Commons, the Government of the United Kingdom). Responses to these papers were presented by Dr. Marion Long (freelance researcher and Director, Rhythm for Reading, UK) and Dr. Craig Robertson (Head of Research, Nordoff Robbins, UK). The different professional stances and backgrounds of the session contributors meant that academic, political, educational, and therapeutic perspectives could be gained with particular emphasis upon public

policy in the UK. While Watt provided some sense of the composition and functioning of the DCMS, it is helpful to expand upon the political environment around which public policies relating to music operate in the UK prior to discussion of the three main areas of focus mentioned above. The next part of this article will concentrate particularly on deciphering the scope of the DCMS alongside public, professional, and charitable bodies as well as learned societies relating to music in the UK political landscape.[2] Selected current music public policy campaigns will also be highlighted.

The DCMS

At time of writing, within the Westminster system of government, there are 25 ministerial departments (i.e., headed by a senior minister), 20 non-ministerial departments, over 400 agencies and public bodies, over 70 high-profile groups, 12 public corporations, and 3 devolved administrations (Departments, Agencies and Public Bodies, n.d.). The DCMS is one of the main ministerial departments that is responsible for music in public policy. Policies relating to music education, music therapy, and music industry may be dealt with separately or in collaboration with the DCMS, by bodies such as the Department for Education (DfE), the Department for Health and Social Care (DHSC), or the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). The DCMS committee, currently comprising 11 members, is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy for the Department and its associated public bodies. The mission of the DCMS is to help "drive growth, enrich lives and promote Britain abroad. We protect and promote our cultural and artistic heritage and help businesses and communities to grow by investing in innovation and highlighting Britain as a fantastic place to visit. We help to give the UK a unique advantage on the global stage, striving for economic success" (DCMS, 2018, "About us" section).

It is important to note, therefore, that the DCMS, like other ministerial departments, deals with a very broad spectrum of subjects and affairs (it works with 45 agencies and public bodies). Music is thus subsumed within a multi-layered political landscape where it is represented by broad-based public bodies within the remit of broad-based governmental departments. Interestingly, there are no dedicated music-specific public bodies or agencies listed as working with the DCMS or any other governmental unit (even though—as discussed below—there are numerous music-based lobby and campaign organizations; see Department, Agencies and Public Bodies, 2018). The DCMS does, however, sponsor the Arts Council England (2018), which supports a range of arts activities, including music, as one of its executive non-departmental public bodies.

Admirably, the Arts Council England states that "We believe that great art and culture inspires us, brings us

together and teaches us about ourselves and the world around us. In short, it makes life better" (Arts Council England, 2018, "About Us" section). Arts Council England has sponsored various music initiatives recently, including *In Harmony*, a program to support musical progression for children in disadvantaged communities (modeled on *El Sistema*; see Hallam & Burns, 2017) and Sound and Music (Sound and Music, n.d.), a national charity for new music that provides opportunities for people to create and enjoy music. Sound and Music currently oversees four digital projects: Minute of Listening, The CaN (Composer and Artist Network), the British Music Collection, and The Sampler. Importantly, Darren Henley, Chief Executive of Arts Council England, authored the independent review, "The Importance of Music" (Henley, 2011), which formed the basis of the Government's first National Plan for Music Education (NPME).

There is a plethora of music-specific professional bodies in the UK that represent music and musicians, some of which provide dedicated areas of support or representation and some of which lobby and campaign Government, including the DCMS, on public policies. There are dedicated local, regional, and national music organizations and charities that help music practitioners and educators, with many supporting valuable research activity to develop music initiatives: examples include Inspire Music (to help people realize their creativity), Sounds of Intent (to support musical development for people with learning difficulties) Connect: Resound (to provide music tuition in rural areas), The Sing Up Foundation[3] (to promote singing); and the Chinese Whispers Project (to explore language learning through singing).

Examples of national representative lobbying bodies include, for education, the Music Education Council (MEC), which is the National Affiliate organization for the International Society for Music Education (ISME); the National Association for Music in Higher Education (NAMHE) and Music Mark; and for health and therapy; the British Association of Music Therapy (BAMT); Help Musicians UK; and the British Association for Performing Arts Medicine (BAPAM). Other significant music industry and professional bodies include UK Music, the Musicians' Union (MU), the Incorporated Society of Musicians (ISM), the Performing Rights Society for Music (PRS), and Music Tank.[4] Additionally, the numerous learned societies concerning music in the UK and beyond reflect and promote the academic scope of the subject, from historical and analytical (e.g., the Royal Musical Association (RMA) and the Society for Music Analysis (SMA)) to educational and psychological (e.g., the Society for Music, Education and Psychology Research (SEMPRE)). Some of the research activity that is supported and published by these societies may feed into public policy and governmental discussions, although this depends on the aims and objectives of the original work. At present, there seems to be three main areas of concern by music lobby groups: protecting

performers' rights in the music industry; protecting music education; and promoting health and wellbeing. Selected campaigns relating to these areas will be highlighted below.

Protecting Performers' Rights

UK Music is an industry-funded professional body that represents the collective interests of the recorded, published, and live branches of the British Music Industry. This body has lobbied with the UK Government in relation to various matters, foremost on intellectual property (IP) and copyright, but more recently on environmental sustainability (e.g., the charity Julie's Bicycle, see https://www.julies bicycle.com/). UK Music provides the Secretariat for the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Music which provides a discussion forum for Lords, Members of Parliament, and representatives of the Music Industry. UK Music describes copyright as "the currency" of intellectual property. It claims that "every song or recording made by a creator or artist can be licensed for value in the UK and globally, therefore generating a substantial positive balance of export income for the UK from copyright licensing" (UK Music, 2013, https://www.ukmusic.org/licensing-solutions). This body argues that copyright law "provides an incentive to industry to invest in new creative content" (UK Music, 2013). Likewise, the PRS for music and MU are lobbying the Government on IP policy, the latter arguing that "performers rely on copyright and performers' rights to make a significant part of their income" (MU, n.d., https://www.musiciansunion.org.uk/Home/Campaign/Defending-Copyright-and-Performers-Rights). The (economic) value of music, then, is at the forefront of IP policy, whether considered at global, national, or individual levels.

Protecting Music Education

Music Mark, a UK Association for Music Education, aims to lobby and champion for government-supported "high quality music education provision for all school aged children and young people which addresses diversity, equity and inclusion at its core" (Music Mark, 2018, https://www.musicmark.org.uk/about/). Recently, Music Mark explored the theme of "partnership" in relation to learning across regional music services—"music education hubs"—that were set up as part of the NPME, finding out how different areas work together to share practices and enhance opportunities. Interestingly, in response to the question about the importance of being part of a national network, the representative from Yorkshire Youth and Music remarked:

> Quite a long time ago, a friend of mine was in a taxi with the Arts Minister of the time. "I love your sector," he said. "I get a group in saying this, then another saying that, then a third saying something else. All contradictory. That means I can do what I like." So the value in national networks should be

advocacy and a unified voice; in music, let alone the arts, we haven't quite got to that position yet, but it is important to keep trying. (Hub Partner Member, 2018, https://www.musicmark.org.uk/news/why-networks-matter/).

The agendas of the MEC and ISM are to present a single voice to Government: "one voice for music education" (MEC, 2011); "to create a united voice for music" (ISM, 2018). Given the importance of presenting a single voice, the extent to which these and other related organizations coordinate their efforts is worth determining. It is beyond the scope of this article to investigate the level of coordination, but it is a point worthy of attention in future enquiry.

Two examples of music education campaigns currently underway are "Protect Music Education" and "Bacc for the Future" (ISM, 2018, https://www.ism.org/campaigns/about-our-campaigning; also see https://www.baccforthefuture.com/ and https://www.protectmusiceducation.org/). The first builds on the "music education matters" slogan and focusses at the moment on protecting music education in Wales (#ProtectMusicWales). The manifesto includes three key points:

1. Every child should have access to a high-quality music education at local and national levels.
2. Music education is valuable and valued educationally, economically and socially.
3. In Wales, music services and other groups help schools to deliver opportunities to children who might not get access to music otherwise.

The ISM claim that music education in Wales is under threat because there is no identified central funding for music services, so access to music education could become the preserve of those who can afford it, and local authorities are cutting their music services (or have no service at all) because they are under pressure (https://www.protectmusiceducation.org/). Yet, interestingly, the closure of the Cornwall Music Services in 2014 led to the creation of the Cornwall Music Services Trust (CMST), which now operates as a successful independent charitable organization (Churcher, 2015). The business model adopted by the CMST may perhaps provide a new model for funding and delivering music education regionally in the future.

The second ISM campaign concerns the impact of the English Baccalaureate (EBacc) qualification for 16-year-olds on the uptake of arts-based subjects, including music, in the UK. As part of the EBacc, pupils are required to take a General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) in certain subjects, excluding those that are creative, technical, or artistic. The ISM (2018) make the point that decreased uptake in such subjects will have an impact on the creative industries, which are worth UK£92 billion a year to the UK economy. The

question of (economic) value, therefore, is also used to lever this campaign.

Health and Wellbeing

Aside from the two main lobby areas highlighted above, there is also a growing interest in campaigns about arts, health, and wellbeing, especially creative interventions to support primary (medical) care. The recent All-Party Parliamentary Group Inquiry on Arts, Health and Wellbeing (APPGAHW) highlights "Music and Health" as a key theme, stating that there is a need to "focus on the evidence base for the impact of music interventions on health and wellbeing, including the latest research in neuroscience and benefits of music for people with dementia" (Coulter & Gordon-Nesbitt, 2017). (It should be noted that All-Party Parliamentary Groups have no statutory power but, according to Watt (2018), "they do have a lot of sway and have a good balance of experts and politicians".) Moreover, the Group makes the following two recommendations (among others) to the DCMS: to acknowledge the link between arts engagement and improved health; and to articulate the efficacy and cost effectiveness of the arts in delivering health and wellbeing outcomes. It highlights that "the arts can help keep us well, aid our recovery and support longer lives better lived" and "can help meet major challenges facing health and social care: ageing, long-term conditions, loneliness and mental health" (Coulter & Gordon-Nesbitt, 2017).

An experiment on loneliness conducted by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), for example, probes the issue of social isolation among the UK population. Interestingly, of the "nine ways to feel less lonely," listening to music is pictured under the recommendation "to find distracting activities or dedicate time to work, study or hobbies" (Hammond, 2018). Another recent Government scheme, "social prescribing" (Romer, 2018) allows medical doctors to prescribe arts activities, including creative music-making and singing, instead of drugs as a cost-effective way to support primary care (also see "arts on prescription", e.g., Bungay & Clift, 2010; Coulter & Gordon-Nesbitt, 2017; "Creative Health, 2017"). Indeed, numerous poster presentations at the *Musics, Selves and Societies* workshop evidenced the benefit of music interventions on health and wellbeing (e.g., on stroke rehabilitation, see Kirk et al., 2018; on mental health, see McConnell et al., 2018; on pregnancy, see Sanfilippo et al., 2018; on cancer, see Warran, 2018). It is hoped that the economic value as well as health and socio-emotional benefits of such interventions will be further realized.

It should also be noted that there is considerable interest in campaigning for musicians' health. For example, Help Musicians UK (n.d.) recently commissioned the Music Tank and University of Westminster to look at the incidence of anxiety and depression in music-industry practitioners. The first phase of the study highlighted poor

working conditions, lack of recognition, and physical impacts, while the second phase, entitled "Can Music Make You Sick?" put forward three areas for change: education, a code of best practice, and a mental health support service for those working in music (see #musicmindsmatter campaign, https://www.musicmindsmatter.org.uk/). It is somewhat saddening, then, that for all of the wellbeing benefits captured in studies featuring music intervention programs, there are recognized health problems for musicians themselves working in the music industry and as professional performers.

These public policy campaigns in the UK essentially focus on protecting, promoting and supporting music and musicians. The (economic) value of music features in discussions about the need to invest in music services for education and health as well as to protect creative outputs. The ensuing part of this article will now turn to the three themes identified in the "Music in public policy" session at the *Musics, Selves and Societies* workshop, the first of which concerns value.

First Thematic Area: The Value of Music

So, what is the value of music? In short, it depends on what we mean by music (addressed in the next section) and what we mean by value. Broadly speaking, values are "what we think good and bad, important and trivial, right and wrong, noble and contemptible" (Berlin, cited in Stewart, 2009, p. 14). Alternatively, they might be described as "anything positively or negatively weighted as a guide to action (for example, needs, wishes and preferences)" (The Collaborative Centre for Values-Based Practice (VBP) in Health and Social Care, 2018, https://valuesbasedpractice.org/more-about-vbp/resources-2/). In his position paper at the workshop, Cross considered how values about music might be constructed and articulated in the context of political discourse. It is necessary to do this because, as he claimed, it will give us "scope to argue for a greater role for music in institutional and public life" (Cross, 2018).

Cross identified seven main sources of value about music at the outset of his paper: aesthetic; cultural (heritage), economic, clinical (therapeutic), societal, cognitive, and hedonic/affective. He added an eighth source in concluding his work: communicative. He explained that all of these sources may be validated by different forms of evidence (e.g., humanistic, scientific, practice), addressed by different agencies (e.g., governmental, philanthropic, business, networks), and subjected to different channels of persuasion (e.g., presentational, institutional, media). For example, to evidence the societal value of music, Cross drew upon a range of practice-based and scientific studies that indicate how music may facilitate social inclusion and enhance empathy among individuals. He argued that this endeavor is supported primarily by philanthropic organizations (e.g., learned societies, such as SEMPRE) with (minimal) input from the government. Moreover, he claimed

that this source of value is promoted within institutions and via media and participatory activities. One such promotion, for instance, is reflected in *The Guardian* headline "Want to be happy? Join a Choir," which proffers the idea that "singing facilitates bonding in groups," but also that it enables "self-transcendence" because "the thing only works on a level bigger than oneself" (Burkeman, 2015).

Interestingly, Cross identified governmental agency (among others) as contributing to all of these sources, with the exception of the aesthetic and hedonic/affective. In these cases, where the value of music lies in its pleasure, whether as art for art's sake (aesthetic) or because it is inherently enjoyable and can be used to regulate emotions (hedonic/affective), there is no governmental agency. This suggests that it is harder to gain political investment for pleasure-based sources; indeed, Cross recognized that it is easier "to identify good evidence" for the clinical (therapeutic), societal, and cognitive values of music than the other sources. He also asserted, rightly, that considerations about music's economic value are dominant in policy-making: "the idea that economic [exchange] value is the sole legitimate source of value is still dominant" (Cross, 2018). This supports the observations made previously in relation to current campaigns about music in public policy: the cost of investment in music education or protecting new outputs is most easily evidenced in monetary terms.

Building on previous research about "music as a communicative medium" (Cross & Woodruff, 2009) that theorizes that music and language may have co-evolved and form complementary parts of "the human communicative toolkit", Cross suggested that the "communicative" value of music is "a basic human right" and that "we should *all* have the right to have access to its capabilities" (also see Dahlhaus, 1983; Cross, 2018; Malloch & Trevarthen, 2009; Mithen, 2005; Tomlinson, 2015). Cross argued that the "communicative" source of value encompasses therapeutic, social, and cognitive effects of music, so provides "an integrated account" for policy-makers. One might add that this source could also extend to include the pleasurable qualities too—aesthetic and hedonic/affective—therefore strengthening the breadth of its value.

Three question areas arise from Cross's thought-provoking statement that might be considered in further debates about music in public policy. First, how does one envisage a greater role for music in institutional and public life? Or, as Robertson (2018) remarked in response to both position papers, what do we actually want? He suggested that "ultimately [. . .] we want to improve lives where we can using music in some way." But, if there are improvements to be made, can they be pinpointed? In building more generally on the theme of public policy development, Long (2018) suggested that one objective might be to improve social cohesion by using the idea of "music as salvation" to "promote the feeling of recovery". In so doing, she argued that one can "galvanise and heal social segregation to achieve social cohesion." Additionally, she suggested that

another objective might be to increase "musical participation" so as to "eliminate the epidemic of mental health."

Second, are there sources of value about music other than those identified by Cross? For instance, is it possible to tease out more specific clinical and therapeutic benefits, such as the physical and emotional values of music, and to consider new sources altogether, such as sentimental, experiential, and mythical? It is worth pointing out that there is an implicit relationship between "value" and "effect" in this discourse: Cross identified effects among the reasons that music has value.

Third, to what extent does economic value underpin all values (or effects) of music? In other words, is it possible to identify the clinical value (or other values) of music without considering its economic worth; is "value for money" always the bottom line? Watt (2018) claimed that this stance is foremost in the UK political scene even though it might seem antithetical, such that we cannot put a price on music in terms of how it pays for cultural and national heritage. Indeed, as Oscar Wilde (1892) famously wrote, a cynic is "a man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing". Wilde of course suggested that there may be things in our lives that cannot be accounted for monetarily (as remarked by Smith & Duffy, 2003). Equally significant, Henley's (2016) account of the importance of investing in the arts was based upon the recognition of seven dividends—creativity, learning, feel-good, innovation, place-shaping, enterprise and reputation—all of which, he claimed, "flow only when the art excels" (p. 1). He stated that arts and culture tend to be seen as "'nice to have', rather than a necessity" (p. 12), hence funders "subsidise" the arts; yet, he argued, there is no subsidy, rather investment of public money "for the benefit of all the public" (p. 17).

To probe the point of economic value further, it is interesting to note that a distinction is made in clinical settings between evidence-based practice (EBP) and values-based practice (VBP): EBP models rely on scientific (e.g., randomized controlled trials (RCTs)) and experiential evidence to inform better care and, in turn, generate cost savings, while VBP models look at the interaction between evidence- and value-based issues in determining care ("What is Value-Based Healthcare?", 2017; also see Fulford, 1989). There is a growing trend both within and outside the UK towards exploring value-based models in healthcare provision (see, for instance, The Collaborating Centre for Values-Based Practice in Health and Social Care, 2018). So, the relationship between "money" and "value" is also tied up with the issue of "evidence." Moreover, in these models, value represents quality (such as of healthcare provision). While there might be "good evidence" (Cross, 2018) pointing towards significant positive changes in experiential and/or clinical measures for healthcare patients in a music-therapeutic intervention program, there is "money" attached to delivering that service and, in our

cash economy, the costs are likely to be evaluated in relation to monetary savings in primary care to determine the "value" of a service. The money–value–evidence triangle needs teasing apart in future debates and perhaps there needs to be a renewed drive to separate money from the concept of value in political campaigning about music.

Second Thematic Area: The Meaning of Music

Cross (2018) asserted that the meaning of music (or "musics") is diverse—it "comes in many forms." This all-encompassing view reflects upon the many ways in which music might be seen to exist within and across cultures, including (to cite his examples) as professionalized art and popular performance as well as in formal (ritual) and informal music-making practices. Providing a broad definition of what music might be, though, is not the same as considering what music might mean to individuals and groups. Responding to Cross, Robertson (2018) claimed that "meaning is created through musical experiences". He argued that narrative is vital: "we need to understand the power of narrative within a society or societies [. . .] if we are to truly influence effective music social policies." Narratives in society might involve personal stories, memories and connections as well as insights into how individuals and groups form a sense of identity or experience common emotions or feelings, such as improved mood and empathy. In related research on music and empathy, Felicity Laurence (2017) argued that music has the potential to promote "general" empathy among people as distinct from a special kind of "musical empathy" (see also King & Waddington, 2017). Music, itself, though, does not have agency; rather, as Robertson (2018) stated, "people do." Collective narratives (or "collective fictions") can be powerful, such as belief in the healing power of music.

The process of meaning-making about music may be individualized and dependent upon context: once meanings are developed through musical experiences, these, in turn, can influence our actions, emotions and behaviors. In political terms, according to Stewart (2009), a public policy "constructs a sense of reality by orientating both observers and participants in a kind of emotional space" (p. 14). This suggests that, somewhere in the policy cycle, the emotions of individuals—whether campaigning for a particular policy or making decisions about a policy—are tied up. This helps to explain why both Watt and Robertson, in response, highlighted the importance of personal stories in addressing politicians, specifically to provide a "good hook" into a policy discussion: "personal narratives need to shine through the hard science" (Robertson, 2018); "personal interest really matters and shapes how they [politicians] understand music and engage with it" (Watt, 2018). With this in mind, it begs the question as to how politicians negotiate personal musical experiences in public policy-

making. This issue (among others) will be considered further in the ensuing section.

Third Thematic Area: Policy-Making

In his position paper, Watt (2018) provided an insider perspective on public policy as a member of the DCMS. As described previously, the DCMS is a ministerial department in the House of Commons that deals with policies for a whole gamut of affairs relating to digital, culture, media, and sport, including the arts and music. Given the breadth, depth, and complexity of organizational structures within the Westminster parliamentary system, where each department or body has "different staff, different views and different powers" (Watt, 2018), Watt recognized three key points about this political environment. First, public policy is normally devolved to different countries in the UK and to different departments. Second, the evolution of public policy is slow. And third, the political landscape is constantly changing (for example, Watt reported that at the time of the workshop, there had been two ministerial resignations in one week, so even though continuity can be provided by the DCMS committee, new ministers may join at any time).

In relation to music and public policy-making, Watt focused on addressing why policy-makers care about music and what input they need. The relationship between politicians' personal musical experiences and public policy-making underpins the former issue. Watt presented a double-sided picture of politicians: he suggested that while personal musical experiences might shape a politician's understanding of music and how to engage with it, they might also use policy-making about music to help construct their political identity. For example, if a minister has a keen interest in folk music, this might, in turn, feed their image as a politician "for the people." In addition, Watt remarked that politicians care about music because people tell them to, such as the MU and UK Music as well as outside bodies. Interestingly, no mention was given to learned societies in this regard.

In his position paper, Watt highlighted "markers of useful information" for policy-making. Aside from "value for money" and "personal interest stories", he urged "solutions" to be put forward. Indeed, actions are a central feature of a "good" policy, as noted previously. Watt suggested various ways to achieve such solutions, including developing formal expert networks and integrating policy-makers with the expert (academic) world. Whatever the approach taken, he maintained that it is important to establish a shared set of desired outcomes. Additionally, it was recommended that information should be communicated to politicians in an accessible way because they are non-experts and need to digest information easily and swiftly. This recommendation was predicated on the (unspoken) assumption that policy-makers actually care about research: indeed, if, as Watt (2018) claimed above, policy-makers care about music because someone tells them to, this is not the same as caring about research,

particularly when acknowledging a problem or finding a solution. To this end, while Robertson (2018) suggested in his response that research on the ways that research is communicated would be useful, one might add that research on politicians' perspectives on research could be revealing.

Two fundamental competing questions thus emerged about policy-making: what *do* we, as a community of researchers, practitioners and policy-makers with a passion for music, want and what *don't* we want for music in public policy? By extension, in relation to the overall agenda of the workshop, *what* do we want to change and *how* are we going to do this?

Final Remarks

Upon reflection, there are various actions that need to be taken and certain challenges to address if we, as a community of researchers and practitioners with a passion for music, wish to effect individual and social change through influencing public policy. The following steps are advocated by way of summary. First and foremost, it is important to share ideas and link up with one another so as to ensure that everybody knows what everybody else is thinking and doing. Learned societies provide an extremely valuable role in coordinating research by publishing journals, supporting ventures through award schemes, and organizing conferences, among other things. The growth of Open Access publishing, which aims to make research publications "free to read" for everyone (The Open University, 2019) is helping to address issues relating to dissatisfaction with traditional research publication models and enable wider communication of research but, arguably, there is still a way to go. Research needs to have a far broader reach than academia, extending beyond scholarly bodies into the public domain. Initiatives such as INVOLVE, which aims to support active public involvement in health research in the UK, is, it states, "one of the few government funded programmes of its kind in the world" (INVOLVE, 2019, https://www.invo.org.uk/about-involve/). The problem of reach is particularly apparent in music education, where researchers can end up talking to each other, rather than to teachers.

Learned societies are not the only bodies working to effect change, especially through public policy. Links need to be made across the many different kinds of internal and external organizations that potentially feed the political environment, as highlighted in this account. This might be achieved, for instance, by researchers and practitioners inviting representatives from governmental departments, learned societies, public and professional bodies, and charitable organizations to come together face-to-face or virtually, or by forming smaller groups with coordinators to gather the work of different organizations. Researchers in the field of policy studies, especially relating to music, should be consulted as part of this process, with some

responsibility for recommendations assigned to the researchers themselves. The goal should be to present a united voice, such as intended by various organizations, including the MEC and ISM.

Next, it is necessary to determine what is to be advocated and the reasons for this. In so doing, the problems and issues as well as merits and successes surrounding music education, music therapy and social development should be identified. There are so many successful music initiatives within the UK alone (some of which have been highlighted in this account) that a schematic overview of this endeavor might be a useful practical starting point. There are, however, deeper sociological and cultural issues to address, including looking at the meanings (and beliefs) attributed to music by different members of society. Changing people's understandings of what music might mean is fundamental (Levitin, 2019; see Mithen, 2005).

At the same time, there is scope to be more activist by learning how to build campaigns, lobby, and infiltrate committees, as well as respond to political agendas. There are useful publications in this regard, including UK Governmental guidelines on policy making ("Open Policy Making Toolkit", 2016, updated 2017) as well as authored and edited research volumes (see, for example, Schmidt & Colwell, 2017), although insider knowledge, such as provided by Watt (2018), may facilitate agendas for both researchers and campaign activists. In the UK, the role of All-Party Parliamentary Groups seems to be vital in steering policies.

Finally, it is necessary to be able to write good public policy statements that speak clearly and directly to politicians. These should outline principles and include positive actions. We should use personal stories as a "hook" and present research findings in a readily digestible format. The issue of "value for money" should not be underestimated. Additionally, it should be recognized that not all research or issues about music are intended or destined for public policy.

It is acknowledged that the above discussion has focused on the state of play in the UK. It is essential that perspectives are provided from beyond the UK so that colleagues can share good practice, broaden horizons, draw comparisons, and learn lessons from international perspectives. The *Musics, Selves and Societies* workshop provided a first step in opening up discussions about the role of music in effecting change and, even though it seems like there is a long path ahead to manage this change, it is hoped that necessary steps will be taken.

Declaration of conflicting interests

Funding

ORCID iD

Elaine C. King https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5452-959X

Action Editor

Katie Overy, University of Edinburgh, Reid School of Music.

Peer Review

Stephanie Pitts, University of Sheffield, Department of Music.
Ronald Kos, Boston University, School of Music.
One anonymous reviewer.

Notes

1. It is acknowledged that there are multiple kinds and forms of music, hence "musics," but for the purpose of consistency, the singular "music" will be used throughout this article as an umbrella term.
2. The boundaries of public, professional, and charitable organizations are complex. Generally speaking, public bodies are non-governmental organizations that offer public services, while professional bodies are organizations relating to a particular profession or occupation, although members do not necessarily have to practice the profession (see The Science Council, 2018). Charitable bodies are non-profit organizations that must "help the public" and are for "public benefit" (Department, Agencies and Public Bodies, 2018). Learned societies promote one or more academic disciplines and/or professions and normally have charitable status. Some professional bodies and learned societies have been granted chartered status (by Royal or parliamentary approval), while others are non-chartered.
3. As part of The Music Manifesto, launched in 2004 as a result of a striking collaboration between the DCMS and Department for Education and Skills (DfES, now the DfE), the government funded the Sing Up project to bring singing back into primary schools in the UK. This project, which recently celebrated its 10th birthday and has now launched as The Sing Up Foundation (a not-for-profit organization) is promoting singing in secondary schools, for pupils with special educational needs, teenagers with anxiety or mental health issues, as well as adults with specific conditions, such as respiratory problems or dementia.
4. Other examples of music-specific bodies that lobby and campaign include the Association of Independent Music (AIM), Concert Promoters' Association (CPA), European Songwriter and Composer Alliance (ESCA) and Featured Artists' Coalition (FAC) (see listing of key UK music industry trade bodies and organizations by Music Tank: www.musictank.co.uk/resources/key-industry-bodies/). This does not include other bodies where music is a branch within an umbrella organization, such as the British Education Research Association (BERA), which aims to inform policy by promoting the best

quality evidence produced by educational research (see www. bera.ac.uk/about).

References

Arts Council England. (2018). About us. https://www.artscouncil. org.uk/about-us-0

Ball, S. J. (1994). *Educational reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Open University Press.

Benedict, C., Schmidt, P., Spruce, G., & Woodford, P. (Eds.) (2018). *The Oxford handbook of social justice in music education*. Oxford University Press.

Bridgman, P., & Davis, G. (2003). What use is a policy cycle? Plenty, if the aim is clear. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, *62*(3), 98–102.

Bungay, H., & Clift, S. (2010). Arts on prescription: A review of practice in the UK. *Perspectives in Public Health*, *130*(6), 277–281.

Burkeman, O. (2015). Want to be happy? Join a choir. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2015/dec/18/why-singing-makes-people-happy-oliver-burkeman

Cairney, P. (2011). *Understanding public policy: Theory and issues*. Palgrave.

Churcher, G. (2015). From closure to creation. *Arts Professional*. https://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/magazine/287/case-study/closure-creation

Coulter, A., & Gordon-Newbitt, R. (2017). All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Well-being submission to the DCMS white paper consultation. http://www.artshealthandwellbeing.org.uk/sites/default/files/APPGAHW%20submission%20to%20DCMS.pdf

Creative Health. (2017). The Arts for Health and Wellbeing. APPGAHW Inquiry Report. http://www.artshealthandwellbeing.org.uk/appg-inquiry/Publications/Creative_Health_Inquiry_Report_2017.pdf

Cross, I. (2018). Music, selves, societies: The value(s) of music(s). In L. Stewart (Chair) *Music in public policy*. Session conducted at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Cross, I., & Woodruff, G. E. (2009). Music as a communicative medium. In R. Botha & C. Knight (Eds.), *The prehistory of language* (pp. 113–144). Oxford University Press.

Dahlhaus, C. (1983). Trans. *Foundations of music history*. In J. B. Robinson. Cambridge University Press.

Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. (2018). What the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport does. https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations#department-for-digital-culture-media-sport

Departments, Agencies and Public Bodies. (n.d.). Government organisations. https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations

Fulford, K. W. M. (1989). *Moral theory and medical practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Hallam, S., & Burns, S. (2017). Research into support for musical progression for young people from in Harmony programmes and other disadvantaged communities. https://www.artscoun cil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/In_harmony_Final_report.pdf

Hammond, C. (2018). Nine ways to feel less lonely. Presented on BBC Radio 4 "All in the Mind" series. www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/3nDZXgD7Fz7lBGc3YSQV9jr/nine-ways-to-feel-less-lonely

Help Musicians UK. (n.d.). https://www.helpmusicians.org.uk/

Henley, D. (2011). The importance of music: A national plan for music education. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180973/DFE-00086-2011.pdf

Henley, D. (2016). *The arts dividend: Why investment in culture pays*. Elliot and Thompson Limited.

Horsley, E. (2017). Curriculum as policy. In P. Schmidt & R. Colwell (Eds.), *Policy and political life of music education* (pp. 1–32). Oxford University Press.

Hub Partner Member Yorkshire Youth and Music Tell Us Why Networks Matter. (2018). https://www.musicmark.org.uk/news/why-networks-matter/

Incorporated Society of Musicians. (2018). https://www.ism.org/

Institute for Government. (2018). Our work – Public Services – Public Bodies. https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/our-work/public-services/public-bodies

INVOLVE. (2019). National Institute for Health Research. https://www.invo.org.uk/

Jones, H. (2009). Policy-making as discourse: A review of recent research-to-policy literature. *Joint IKM Emergent–ODI Working Paper No. 5*. https://wiki.ikmemergent.net/sites/default/files/ikmemergent_archive/090911-ikm-working-paper-5-policy-making-as-discourse.pdf

King, E., & Waddington, C. (Eds.) (2017). *Music and Empathy*. Routledge.

Kirk, P., Grierson, M., Bodak, R., & Stewart, L. (2018). Motivating stroke rehabilitation through music: A feasibility study using digital musical instruments in the home. Poster presented at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Kos, R. P. (2010). Developing capacity for change: A policy analysis for the music education profession. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *111*(3), 97–104.

Laurence, F. (2017). Prologue: Revisiting the problem of empathy. In E. King & C. Waddington (Eds.), *Music and Empathy* (pp. 11–36). Routledge.

Levitin, D. (2019). *This is your brain on music: Understanding a human obsession*. Penguin.

Long, M. (2018). Music, selves and societies: Public policy response. In L. Stewart (Chair) (Ed.), *Music in public policy*. Session conducted at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Malloch, S., & Trevarthen, C. (Eds.) (2009). *Communicative musicality: Exploring the basis of human companionship*. Oxford University Press.

McConnell, B., Sanfilippo, K. R., Glover, V., Ramchandan, P., Cross, I., Cornelius, V., & . . . Stewart, L. (2018). Developing

a community singing-based intervention for perinatal mental health in The Gambia. Poster presented at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Mithen, S. (2005). *The singing Neanderthals: The origins of music, language, mind, and body*. Harvard University Press.

Moran, M., Rein, M., & Goodin, R. E. [Eds] (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford University Press.

Music Education Council. (2011). http://www.mec.org.uk/

Music Mark. (2018). https://www.musicmark.org.uk/

Musicians' Union. (n.d.). https://www.musiciansunion.org.uk/

Office of General Counsel. (2016). What is policy? University of Sydney, Australia. http://sydney.edu.au/legal/policy/what/index.shtml

Open Policy Making Toolkit. (2016, updated 2017). https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-policy-making-toolkit

Policy. (2018a). Oxford Dictionaries. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/policy

Policy. (2018b). Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/policy

Public Policy. (2018a). Oxford Dictionaries. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/public_policy

Public Policy. (2018b). Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/public-policy

Richards, D., & Smith, M. J. (2005). *Governance and Public Policy in the UK*. OUP.

Robertson, C. (2018). Music, selves, societies: Public policy response. In L. Stewart (Chair) (Ed.), *Music in public policy.* Session conducted at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Romer, C. (2018). Doctors supported to prescribe arts through new £4.5 m scheme. *Arts Professional*. https://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/news/doctors-supported-prescribe-arts-through-new-ps45m-scheme

Sanfillipo, K. R., Glover, V., & Stewart, L. (2018). Maternal moments: Investigating an app-based music listening intervention for well-being in pregnancy. Poster presented at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Schmidt, P., & Colwell, R. (Eds.) (2017). *Policy and political life of music education*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, M., & Duffy, R. (2003). *The Ethics of Tourism and Development*. Routledge

Sound and Music. (n.d.). *The National Charity for New Music*. http://soundandmusic.org/

Stewart, J. (2009). *Public policy values*. Macmillan.

The Collaborative Centre for Values-Based Practice in Health and Social Care. (2018). https://valuesbasedpractice.org/more-about-vbp/resources-2/

The Open University. (2019). Open Access Publishing. http://www.open.ac.uk/library-research-support/open-access-publishing

The Science Council. (2018). Our Definition of a Professional Body. https://sciencecouncil.org/about-science/our-definition-of-a-professional-body/

Tomlinson, G. (2015). A million years of music: The emergence of modern humanity. Zone Books.

UK Music. (2013). https://www.ukmusic.org/

Warran, K. (2018). An exploration of the process of group singing for male cancer patients: A phenomenological study. Poster presented at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

Watt, J. (2018). Music, selves, societies: Public policy. In L. Stewart (Chair) (Ed.), *Music in public policy.* Session conducted at the workshop on *Musics, selves and societies: The roles of music in effecting change*. June 25–26. University of Cambridge.

What is Value-Based Healthcare? (2017). https://catalyst.nejm.org/what-is-value-based-healthcare/

Wilde, O. (1892). *Lady Windermere's Fan*. A Play about a Good Woman.