

THE CURRICULAR IMPLEMENTATION OF FOLK MUSIC PARADIGMS: THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE 1981 AND 1999 CURRICULA OF FOLK MUSIC EDUCATION IN HUNGARY

ISTVÁN FERENC BÍRÓ¹

SUMMARY. Due to the planned renewal of the Hungarian folk music education, the curricula related to folk-related education (Bolya, 2017) have recently received a new focus. In our comparative curriculum analysis, we examine curricula related to folk music education from 1981 to 1999 with the method of document analysis. We have supplemented our basic method, especially in the initial and informational phase of the research, with the method of questioning. With our formulated research questions, we would like to highlight the educational backgrounds related to institutional folk music education, which will help us to get closer to determine the time of the demand for the original application method of folk music at institutional levels. With our chosen methods, we reveal deeper, more differentiated relationships, as paradigm shift related to authenticity becomes visible not only at the curriculum level but also differences in the curriculum are drawn up. As a result of our comparative analysis, it can be stated that the curriculum of 1999 was a paradigm shift in curriculum level in the field of folk music education, but in the case of core subjects (bagpipe and partly hurdy-gurdy) of the 1981 curriculum some exceptions can be identified, the folk music perception of which exceeds that of the other core subjects.

Keywords: folk music education, curriculum, comparative curriculum analysis

1. Introduction

The basic idea of our research was inspired by a recently published study that met considerable professional acclaim. In his *The Renewal of Professional Folk Musician Education in Hungary (A magyar népzeneisképzés szakterületi megújítása)*, Mátyás Bolya (2017) claims that the first basic-level curriculum of folk music education was published in 1999.² The

¹ University of Nyíregyháza – Music Institute – Hungary, 4400 Nyíregyháza, Sóstói út 31/b.
E-mail: istvan.biro@nye.hu

² Bolya, 2017.

comparative analyses and the points made by his study are based on this statement. The study, however, seems to forget about the curriculum entitled *Az állami zeneiskolai nevelés és oktatás terve – népi hangszerek* (*A Plan for State Music School Education and Teaching: Folk Music Instruments*), published in 1981, thus its significance in the history of education, its role as the precursor of the 1999 curriculum, and its being embedded in the entirety of music education is still to be cleared. On the one hand, our study wishes to call attention to this deficiency. On the other hand, it seeks answer to questions that uncover the deeper correspondences and paradigm shifts in institutional folk music education, determining novel directions in research.

In order to understand our comparative curricular analysis, some basic notions need to be defined, since the understanding of folk music has varied from age to age. Our historical overview does not extend to the periods before the 20th century, since the curricula and the conceptions and interpretations exerting a direct influence on them which constitute the central interest of our research can be regarded to be determining. Our statements are founded on our previous research, of which the results are in harmony with claims of relevant literature which assert that due to trends that may be described as romantic enthusiasm for folk art, certain carefully selected pieces from folk tradition had been elevated to the level of 'high art', especially as for their stylistic elements and ideals, only to make these pieces later, now decorated with the regular stylistic patterns of elite art, find their way again to simple people themselves.³ As regards the topic under discussion, the general applicability of this concept was influential until the 1970s, when the members of the so-called folk dance house movement started to focus on the original folk application, instead of mere folk content.⁴ The questions arises, however, that if, due to the folk dance house movement, such a paradigm shift had already taken place in the 1970s, how was it possible that such a shift had not been obvious as late as the early 1980s. In order to answer this question, complex sociological, scientific, interdisciplinary and educational policy contexts would need to be discussed, which points beyond the scope of the present study. Suffice it to say that the approach represented by the folk dance house movement at the beginning of the 1970s largely pertained to the category of 'counter-culture', which was a considerable obstacle in the way of the quick spread of the paradigm shift.⁵

³ Trencsényi, 2000

⁴ Trencsényi, 2000; Barta, 2014

⁵ Trencsényi, 2000

Based on the data gained in the initial phase of our research, we claim that, despite the circumstances mentioned above, the 1981 curriculum had a determining role both in the intensiveness of the spread of the paradigm shift and in the expansion of folk music education, since even today, when schools have more freedom in forming their curricula, about 70% of the institutions use the national curriculum instead of preparing their own local curricula.⁶ In this regard, the examination of curricula cannot be neglected in order to understand more profound correspondences. From the 1960s, the rigid central curricular centralisation seemed to loosen, and the proportion of ideological and pedagogical aspects shifted, in favour of the latter.⁷ For instance, while the curriculum published in 1969 aimed to contribute to the 'development of the socialist moral characteristics of students', the 1981 curriculum largely replaced the ideological content with a professional one. This does not mean, however, that ideological aspects were completely dismissed from the curriculum, but their presence was covered by a professional guise.⁸ Thus, in curricula related to art education, similarly to core subjects, a sort of relaxation was taking place, and the centrally prescribed materials were replaced by recommended sources. This is parallel with the appearance of 'alternative' textbooks related to core subjects in the 1980s. From the aspect of our subjects, it is important to mention that the 1981 folk music curriculum laid significant emphasis on teacher autonomy because at that time the system practically lacked textbooks on folk music education.⁹

The substantial and structural roots of the Hungarian curriculum related to folk music education issued in 1981 are to be found in the reform that took place in primary school music education at the beginning of the 1960s. The endeavours to standardise music education could be interpreted as part of the entire, unified public education system, of which one of the central aims was education based on the socialist worldview and morals.¹⁰ The nationalisation of music schools in the 1950s and the reform movements of the 1960s channelled music school training towards mass education.¹¹ The reform trends in primary school music education resonated with the recognised failures in socialist curriculum planning which became apparent to those in charge of the education system.¹² The

⁶ Bolya, 2017

⁷ Báthory, 1992

⁸ Báthory, 1992

⁹ Courtesy of Béres János, 2016

¹⁰ Kelemen, 2003

¹¹ Dobray, 1963

¹² Mészáros, 1992

direction towards the unification of music education were laid down in regulatory documents of music school education as expressed in Act No. 3/1961.¹³ The act redefined the place of primary school music education within the education system and determined its place not as something extramural but as a part of the entire education system, which was aimed at educating versatile people with erudition.¹⁴ A report by István Dobray laid down the principles of the reforms that saw the possibility of creating a unified training system in the standardisation of requirements. This was the beginning of the centralisation of (music school) curricula, and with it, the creation of the “socialist” type of person through art education, shifting the emphasis from the pre-1950s music education goals which could be labelled as education through art. Obviously, this education level does not neglect the latter goal and regards it as an important aim, but emphasises the former one as a central aim in harmony with the massification of education.

The elaboration of the 1999 curriculum was preceded by a longer and more thoughtful process. In the middle of the 1990s, a broad curricular reform and the curricular grounding of new subjects was prepared within the framework of a national conference called “Hungarian Culture and Folk Traditions in Educational Work.”¹⁵ The presenters of the conference were invited from the fields of individual special disciplines and from among teachers in public school education. The presentation of the preparation process will henceforth be concentrated on folk music education only and will only be broadened inasmuch as it is necessary to understand its place within general art education. The plenary lecture of Bertalan Andrásfalvy (1996) provided a concise and brief summary of the aim of primary school art education: “*If we teach folk music, the aim is not to train professional musicians who make a living out of this, but to show children the joy of making music.*”¹⁶ The paradigm shift regarding folk music material essentially meant that it was so much not regarded as an end-product in the ethnographic sense but as a factor generating ethnological action on the behalf of its performer.¹⁷ As our research questions reveal, it is assumed that this kind of paradigm shift was bound to take place at the level of curricula related to folk music education. The presentations of the conference agreed that there was no unified way of the traditional learning processes of folk music instruments as compared to the field of classical

¹³ Dobray, 1963

¹⁴ Dobray, 1963

¹⁵ Karácsony Molnár–Kraiciné Szokoly, 1998

¹⁶ Andrásfalvy, 1998: 10

¹⁷ Agócs, 1998

music.¹⁸ The obvious reasons for this are to be found in the social stratification (i.e., that of rural society). It is enough to think of the learning characteristics of shepherds living at the periphery of society.¹⁹ This generic difference basically influenced the unified realisation of the process of curriculum design. In his lecture, Zoltán Juhász referred to the renewal of learning methods and, if possible, the implementation of traditional learning modes in an educational environment.²⁰ The description of the method, in a pedagogic sense, is nothing else than the presentation of the primary socialising role of the family.²¹ This implementation, however, raises many important issues (e.g., How can it foster further learning at higher levels of education? Can the curriculum be flexible enough to manage this learning process?) that none of the presentations actually provided answer for. No examination has been done until today on these questions which could help the actual reshaping of curricula. The professional content of the 2011 curriculum, disregarding the appearance of competences on a terminological level, has not substantially changed as compared to the professional content of the 1999 curriculum.²²

2. Research methods

In what follows, an overview of the applied methods of our research shall be given.

Document analysis was chosen as the basic method of our survey, supplemented by the method of interviewing. In determining the range of interviewees, we aimed at completeness with regard to the authors contributing to the curricula of core subjects in 1981, and out of four authors, due to the death of Mihály Jakab, we managed to interview three of them. The method of interviewing was primarily, though not exclusively, used in the preliminary phase of the research. The acquired data served as the basis of research questions and the basic method necessary for further research was determined. The interview, in its basic form, was oral interview, and as regards its type, semi-structured interview. Personal interaction made it possible, through secondary questions, to check the truth content of the interviews and to reveal the deeper dimensions of the questions.²³

¹⁸ Agócs, 1998; Juhász, 1998

¹⁹ Juhász, 1998

²⁰ Juhász, 1998

²¹ v.ö. Borecky, 2015

²² Bolya, 2017

²³ Nádasi, 2000

Although document analysis chosen as the basic method of research was found sufficient in itself to carry out the investigation, we thought it important and necessary, especially in the initial and main phases of the research, to apply it together with other methods. To analyse the data collected during the research, questions related to the role or influence of educational policy had to be cleared up, taking the circumstances of the birth of the former document into consideration. Answering the research questions seemed best feasible by the comparison of folk music instrument curricula of 1981 and 1999, for which the starting point was provided by the methodology and component system elaborated in Gyula Gergely's study *Tantervelemzés a paradigmaváltás jegyében* (Curriculum analysis in the spirit of paradigm shift) (2004). Thus our analysis was carried out on the basis of five main components, which are the following: *personality development, strategic actions, systematicness, competence development and co-operation*.²⁴ It is important to note that we do not wish to overestimate the effect of curricula on education; based on our preliminary investigation, however, it may be asserted that the historical importance of curricula related to folk music instruments can hardly be underestimated in order to understand the genesis and the evolutionary phases of institutional folk music education. The analysis of extramural documents of management and control and the conclusions drawn from their scrutiny may help international comparison and the work of curriculum development; they may contribute to rectify possible erratic steps; furthermore, they may aid the tracking of the evolution, expansion, development and paradigm shifts of institutional folk music education.²⁵

Research questions

- From when can the demand for the original application of folk culture substances be observed in curricula connected to institutional folk music education?
- Does the paradigm shift related to authenticity take place at the same time in the case of every instrument or are there any exceptions appearing in a "hidden" form? If yes, how can they be identified?

3. A Comparative Curriculum Analysis

Education history research still lacks a complex and comprehensive (not merely descriptive) history of folk music education. Studies in

²⁴ Gergely, 2002; Gergely, 2004

²⁵ Nádasi, 2000

educational history deal with this subject only marginally, and research carried out in curriculum history only provides us with conclusions. This paper is a first attempt in this direction.

4. The Hierarchy of Objectives Curriculum Mission (Philosophy of Objectives)

The 1981 curriculum does not contain any formal hierarchy of objectives in the current sense of the word. The objective system and functions pertaining to folk music education are determined by (it should be added, in a somewhat unorthodox way) in a chapter entitled *A General Guide to the Teaching of Folk Music Instruments* at the end of the guidelines. The chapter, whose tone is fairly personal at some places, clearly demonstrates the deficiencies arising from the early phase of folk music education but its endeavours include the clear aim of elevating folk music and folk music instruments to the level of high art. (To fully appreciate this aim, let us bear in mind the political and social concepts related to the paradigm of earlier periods concerning folk music.) The 1981 curriculum is an education-centred one, which emphasises national education but pays special attention to general (i.e., universal) musical literacy, individual activity and the transmission of the acquired folk music knowledge. In determining the generic identity of folk music and as regards the characteristics of learning processes, the curriculum highlights the correlation between classical music and folk music, as can be seen in the following passage: “[...] *teaching music should primarily be executed on the grounds of folk music, taking its roots to the deep and rich soil from which folk music itself sprang and grew for centuries.*”²⁶

Examining the process of the transmission of knowledge, it can be asserted that it completely neglects the characteristics of reception and transmission familiar from rural societies that can be mainly interpreted as processes of socialisation. Thus, the curriculum strengthens the integration of the genre into the sphere of elite art. As the curriculum puts it, “*The student should be able to perform the musical material according to the grade they attend and their individual capabilities, being faithful to the score and the style, sensibly paying attention to larger units, treating music in its process, as a whole, and with expression.*”²⁷ It must be mentioned that a possible disadvantage of the insistence on generic integration is that, though the classification of folk music is feasible in a historical sense, the

²⁶ Az állami zeneiskolai nevelés és oktatás terve. Népi hangszerek. 1981: 55 (A Plan for State Music School Education and Teaching – Folk Music Instruments. 1981: 55)

²⁷ Az állami zeneiskolai nevelés és oktatás terve. Népi hangszerek. 1981: 6

regional differences must largely be neglected, mainly due to the limiting effect of the score itself. As a corollary objective of the music school, the text mentions *the appreciation of national traditions and educating students in this direction* as well.

The 1999 curriculum entitled *Az alapfokú művészetoktatás követelményei és tantervi programja (Népzene)* [*The Requirements and Curriculum of Primary School Art Education (Folk Music)*] establishes a unified framework for schools with art education programs (music, dance, fine arts, etc). The curriculum does not include any formal hierarchy of objectives. The system of objectives and functions is communicated in brief, concise passages, underlining the importance of universal and European culture, national and folk traditions, the transmission of their values and the shaping of the forms of the conservation of values as strategic aims. Apart from the refinement of aesthetic sensibility, it sets as aims the formation of vocal and instrumental technical skills necessary for producing music, and the shaping of musical awareness. It projects cognitive and emotional goals, while it wants students to get to know the characteristics of different musical genres. In this chapter of our study, the detailed description of different processes will not be carried out; they are going to be treated in later chapters.

A marked difference compared to the 1981 curriculum is that the formation of variation and improvisation skills, widespread in the musical manifestations of members of rural societies, is considered necessary. The 1999 curriculum clearly emphasises the generic characteristics of folk music, besides the organic and mutually enriching relationship of different genres of classical and folk music, and the importance of the knowledge of universal and high culture. As the curriculum itself puts it, “[...] *making students understand the special way of thinking (logic) of folk music, the interrelatedness of tone, harmony and formal structures, the loose interpretation of rhythm and intonation and the stress patterns corresponding to the features of the Hungarian language.*”²⁸ It aims to make students acquire a native language-level knowledge of folk music and educates them to respect, cherish, enrich and transmit values of traditional culture. It also lays emphasis on the extracurricular options provided by the living tradition. We deem it important to highlight this goal of the curriculum because the 1981 text puts the same idea in the following way: “*Today, folk art, especially folk music, does not go from ‘father to son’. It is the task of the education system to transmit and to develop it further with its special means.*”²⁹ The precondition of making use of extracurricular possibilities is

²⁸ Az alapfokú művészetoktatás követelményei és tantervi programja (Népzene) 1999: 11

²⁹ Az állami zeneiskolai nevelés és oktatás terve. Népi hangszerek 1981: 55

raising the processes of reception and transmission to an institutional level. Though this is not explicitly stated in the curriculum, but in a “hidden” form it is obvious in the following thoughts: “*Music education makes students [...] acquainted with [...] the features of different musical genres.*”³⁰ The performing style requiring faithfulness to the score and the style, as laid down in 1981, has been transformed within almost one and a half decades, into the emphasis on the interrelatedness of music and language.

Collective music making gets emphasis not only in solidifying individually acquired musical skills but also in providing opportunity for regularly and continuously applying them. Thus folklore contents are represented in institutional folk music education in a complex form because extracurricular activities are to heal the rupture caused by institutional frameworks between folk music and folk dance, which are organically inseparable in rural tradition. With these endeavours of the curriculum, the complex educational process of folklore contents is realised, at least at a theoretical level.

The Strategic Objectives

The essence of the strategic objectives of the two curricula is practically identical. The basic aim of both curricula is the establishment of a general literacy in folk music and the preparation of outstanding students for further studies. The 1999 curriculum is more detailed and thanks to the elapsed time in between and to the changing trends in professional, social and political life, elevates the entirety of folk music to the level of institutional music education. The 1981 curriculum treats folk music as folklore content enriching high art. It has to be remarked, however, that in the case of certain instruments (for instance, the bagpipe), the sense of paradigm shift, which is transparent in the 1999 curriculum, can already be felt in the earlier text (more on this, see the later chapters). Both curricula sets as a strategic aim the grounding of aesthetic and emotional education based on the interest and the age characteristics of students. Chart 1 gives an overview of the strategic objectives of the two curricula.

³⁰ Az alapfokú művészetoktatás követelményei és tantervi programja 1999: 10

Chart 1

The Strategic Objectives of the Curricula	
1981	1999
The establishment of aesthetic and emotional education.	The establishment of aesthetic and emotional education.
The development of musical skills and capabilities, the grounding of musical literacy.	Acquiring instrumental and vocal skills, raising awareness of musical activity.
The meaningful use of free time, preparation for amateur collective musical activity.	Preparation for the application and reception of music.
The appreciation, respect and selfless transmission of our national traditions.	Respecting, preserving, enriching and transmitting the values of traditional culture.
The preparation of outstanding and able students for pursuing further studies.	The preparation of students choosing a musical career for further studies in the given field.

Source: The author's own compilation on the basis of the 1981 and the 1999 curricula

There is no substantial difference between the strategic objectives of the two curricula, with one exception: the 1999 text mentions the enriching of the contents of folk culture as a strategic objective of basic-level art education.

The Operative Objectives

Differences can be traced in the operative objectives of the curricula as well. As regards its structure, the 1981 curriculum starts with the explication of requirements and closes with the description of the aims and characteristics of the subject. The structure of the grades is divided into four main sections, which are further divided into sub-sections. In order to compare the two curricula, the third and fourth content units are going to be discussed under one heading. *The requirements of skills development*, which include instrumental skills development and the application of musical knowledge; *suggestions for the selection of the material of the school year*, which comprise of the compulsory and recommended course material units; *the recommended forms of the checking of required knowledge*, consisting of the requirements of the end-of-the-year presentation.

The requirements of skills development is a point-by-point, clearly stated list from the basic instrumental skills to the technical means of a high level of instrumental skills, formulating detailed requirements. The sub-section on the application of musical knowledge is likewise very detailed and

reasonable in its structure. It emphasises the role of a given instrument in folk music (and at times in other genres). Besides the above-mentioned content, the relevant material points to the formation of a general musical literacy.

Suggestions for the selection of the material of the school year: The curriculum recommends compulsory and optional materials. The recommendations for different core subjects are written in a unified manner, but behind the structural unity, extensive differences in content may be uncovered. In the case of the folk flute, for instance, the curriculum sets an annual 70-80 pieces, while in the case of the other subjects, there may be half this quantity (for example, as regards the hurdy-gurdy). The mentioned aspect only makes quantity comparison possible. Keeping in mind the initial research question, we need a more profound and quality analysis. While in the case of certain subjects, folk music excerpts comprise half of the required material (flute or zither), as for certain main subjects this proportion reaches 100% in some grades (bagpipe or hurdy-gurdy).

The recommended forms of the checking of required knowledge, the requirements of the end-of-the-year presentation: as regards its quantity, an annual increase is visible. At the beginning of the education, from the second semester, the curriculum requires two occasions during the year, which, in the case of certain core subjects, reaches an annual five occasions. As for the scene of the presentation, in the case of two main subjects (bagpipe and hurdy-gurdy), the application of the instrument in a folk dance house is mentioned, which foreshadows the appearance of the original (folk tradition) role of the folk instruments.

The 1999 curriculum shifts the emphasis to the characteristics of folk music production. In its structure, it is divided into seven main content units. The headings of the units are not completely identical with those used in the previous curriculum; however, based on the three categories so far used in the analysis, the content units may perfectly be identified and the comparison can be carried out.

The requirements of skills development: the curriculum regulates the requirements of skills development for each grade individually and in a summarised form as well. The requirements for grades are at times formulated quite loosely and these tasks are transferred to schools related to the instruments themselves (i.e., instrumental school) or lets teachers make their own decisions. Its formulations encompass larger areas and do not present a unified picture in the case of the core subjects. It has to be emphasised that this is due to the different functions of instruments in folk tradition and is by no means a deficiency. The curriculum, however, is consistent in the sense that, sometimes implicitly and sometimes quite explicitly, it makes it clear that the teaching of folk instruments is

conceptualised within the framework of folk music. The skills development areas pertaining to the generic characteristics of classical music are completely left out of the curriculum; scales and technical exercises are replaced by the application of traditional warming up exercises.

The application of musical knowledge: in this sense, the formulations of the text are more detailed. The emphases clearly transmit the knowledge familiar from folk tradition in the case of every main subject. The application of musical knowledge related to classical music is discarded by the curriculum in the case of the main subjects, and only requires theoretical knowledge necessary for instrumental performance, and thus explicitly defines the borders between genres.

Suggestions for the selection of the material of the school year: differences between the two curricula are most conspicuous in this area. A significant reduction of the syllabus on the level of a grade is the most obvious difference. In the case of certain core subjects, the decrease to even one-quarter of the previous material may be observed. The real difference may be detected, however, in the composition of the syllabus. In every core subject, where a sufficient amount of folk music material is available, is entirely based on folk music excerpts.

The recommended forms of the checking of required knowledge, the requirements of the end-of-the-year presentation: students prove their knowledge during the course of end-of-the-year presentations and main subject auditions within the school. The number and form of extracurricular options are not determined by the curriculum but frequently emphasises the importance of public performances and the advantages of folk dance house productions on the learning process.

The Mission of the Subjects

The mission of different subjects in the 1981 curriculum is not defined formally in the case of every core subject. At certain places (e.g., folk flute) it is explicitly stated that the aim of the subject is the realisation of an authentic, folk-inspired production, but the mission statement of other subjects is missing. Instead, certain not clearly defined contents may be seen which do not straightforwardly determine the goal of the subject. Since the curriculum calls attention to a unified concept many times, authentic, folk-inspired performance can be regarded as a universal aim.

The 1999 curriculum, however, explicitly determines the mission of every core subject in an incomparably richer and more detailed way than the previous curriculum does. Without being exhaustive, just to mention some formulations that are significant as regards authenticity: the performance of

the dance order of the dialects on the syllabus; the formation of improvisation skills based on the performative traditions of a given dialect; the establishment of musical communication with dancers and singers. This latter requirement alludes to the original function of a given instrument in the folk tradition, which is a progressive aspect of the curriculum.

The Strategic Objectives of the Subjects

The mission of a subject is formally stated in both curricula. Although the 1981 curriculum defines folkloric authenticity as an aim, but if the subject contents are examined, we find that they largely prescribe folk song adaptations of classical composers and applies certain instruments in a great proportion in a function incongruent with their traditional functions (for instance the folk flute). Before our claims regarding subject contents are overemphasised, attention must be called to one remark of the curriculum that seems to resolve the contradictions of subject missions to some extent. Insufficient time, little experience and the poor quantity of performable material were available before the preparation of the curriculum. Thus, the document, besides keeping the regulatory framework, lays stress on the teacher's responsibility in this respect, as well as the flexible interpretation and application of the content section. The curriculum also addresses institutions, performers and teachers, urging them to create the material basis of the teaching of folk music instruments in an institutional framework. On the basis of these, far-reaching conclusions may not be drawn from the syllabus. It also has to be added that our previous remarks concerning the prevalence of classical music are not entirely justifiable in the case of all subjects. In the setting of the objectives and in the syllabus of certain instruments (mainly in the case of the bagpipe and sometimes in that of the hurdy-gurdy) some progressive remarks may be found in the interpretation of authenticity. The course objectives of the bagpipe and the hurdy-gurdy (to a greater extent in the former) projects the paradigm shift taking place at the end of the 1990s, concerning the authenticity of folk music, which later appears at the curriculum level. The 1999 curriculum is not content with merely elevating the folklore content to institutionalised education but sets the awareness of environmental characteristics, traditional instruments, their function played in folk tradition and the characteristics of reception and transmission as objectives.

4.1. The Syllabi, Structure and System of the Curricula

The general musical concept of the 1981 curriculum that it reaches on the basis of folk music can be spectacularly detected in the distribution

of lessons and lesson numbers. The curriculum prescribes twice 45 minutes of sol-fa in the preparatory year and introduces it as a main subject from the first year of the basic level either as individual practice in twice half hours a week or in a homogeneous group (with 3-4 members) in twice 45 minutes a week. The sol-fa class is prescribed by the curriculum irrespective of the genre studied by the student, thus its folklore content is irrelevant from the aspect of our research. First, because the students of all genres receive the same training, secondly, because the folk music concept of the theoretical classes disregard variations (for example regional differences). From the third grade of the basic level, the compulsory subjects are supplemented by 30 minutes of piano once a week as an optional subject, which can be carried on until the last year of the training. In the fourth grade, collective music appears as a required subject for one year, which is 60 minutes once a week, irrespective of the composition of the class. Chamber music enters as a main subject from the fifth grade of the basic level training, which is a group class in 45 minutes twice a week. The chart below (Chart 2) shows a summary of the structure of the training.

Chart 2

The Lesson Distribution of the 1981 Curriculum							
Subject	Preparatory year	Basic level					
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Main subject	-	2	2	2	2	-	-
Chamber music main subject	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Sol-fa	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Collective music	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Piano	-	-	-	1	1	1	1

Source: The author's own editing based on "Az Állami Zeneiskolai Nevelés és Oktatás terve" (A Plan for State Music School Education and Teaching: Folk Music Instruments)

The folk music concept is more exactly represented in the lesson numbers and distribution of the 1999 curriculum, which takes instrumental characteristics (e.g., zither or clarinet / tárogató, etc.) into consideration, besides generic features. The expansion of training is not only visible in the number of instruments but in the whole of the training. The vertical expansion of the training is manifest in the appearance of four grades of further training, besides the preparatory years and the years of the basic training. Main subject lessons may also appear (even at a curricular level)

already in the preparatory years. In the number of lessons and organisation there is no significant difference compared to the 1981 syllabus. Besides the classes of main subjects, it is compulsory to attend sol-fa classes until the fourth year of the basic training in the same form as in the previous curriculum; however, the blending of sol-fa with folk music material is recommended from the first year of the preparatory training at a local curricular level. After the completion of the fourth year, the student is required to choose between theoretical and practical subjects. In the case of the former, the duration is a minimum of 45 minutes a week, while in the case of the latter, depending on the form of the class (individual or collective) it is a minimum of 30 minutes or 45 minutes once a week. Apart from these, the student is given the chance from the first year of the preparatory training to choose optional courses for twice 45 minutes a week, which is one or two sessions, depending on nature of the chosen subject.

Chart 3

The Lesson Distribution of the 1999 Curriculum												
Subject	Grades											
	Preparatory years		Basic level						Further training			
	1.	2.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Main subject	(2)	(2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Required or required-optional subject	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Optional subject	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Source: The author's own editing of "Az Alapfokú Művészetoktatás Követelményei és Tantervi Programja (Népzene) (The Requirements and Syllabus of the Basic-Level Art Education [Folk Music])"

The 1981 curriculum catered for career orientation with the help of extra advanced courses, while the 1999 document does this with optional subject, which significantly contributes to the establishment of content variety. The two curricula are similar in the sense that they provide a great degree of freedom for teachers by requiring them to treat the curricular content with flexibility.

4.2. The Component of Personality Development

The 1981 curriculum declares the supplementation of the personality development activity of the primary and secondary school, the

youth movement, the family and the environment with the help of the means of emotional and aesthetic education. It places an aesthetically sensitive, refined character receptive to musical culture in its centre, which it strives to reach, besides the mentioned criteria, by expecting students to read books on music. The music school should educate its students for regular, focused, economical and productive work. It should also develop students' sense of hard work, perseverance, concentration skills, a behaviour necessary for practicing music and keeping a tight schedule. It emphasises the education for individual activity, the appreciation, love and transmission of national values.³¹

The 1999 curriculum focuses on an aesthetically and musically refined and open-minded character, determining a kind of education emphasising self-expression and the adaptation of the values of traditional folk culture in a unified spirit. This document also formally points out the need for focused individual work, adding the criterion of sophisticated listening to music and creative work. Active participation in the cultural field is by no means an advancement, since the previous curriculum also underlines this, but the expecting students to contribute to church music life and self-development can be regarded as progressive steps.

4.3. Cooperativeness

Cooperativeness is present in both curricula as an aim and as a means. There is no significant difference in this between the two documents. Given the nature of schools, cooperativeness is indispensable, which has been demonstrated before by several examples. Cooperation is the basis of collective music, thus both curricula treat this criterion as a principle, though informally.

4.4. The System of Competences

Both curricula expects cooperation, since in the opposite case, certain subject requirements would not be fulfilled. Let us think of the relationship of the main subject and chamber music, but that of the main subject and sol-fa could be mentioned as an example. In this regard, the 1999 curriculum is more sophisticated because, although informally, it mentions this kind of relation between the two subjects. Both curricula lays great emphasis on the professionalism of teachers. The 1981 document determines who can be employed as music teachers. It must be mentioned

³¹ Az állami zeneiskolai nevelés és oktatás terve, 1981

that the curriculum does not prescribe formal pedagogical qualification; it only requires the completion of a course. The 1999 curriculum does not make mention of the qualification of teachers, but in on the basis of the content, the expectation of a high level of professional and pedagogical skills might be inferred. In this period, teacher qualifications were laid down at higher levels as regards the hierarchy of documents regulating the educational system.

Both curricula sets requirements for students, from which student competences may be inferred. Differences, however, may only be found as regards professional competencies, which prove that folk music education shows improvement primarily at a professional level. A similarity between the two curricula in this regard is that neither of them explicitly states teacher or student competences. Certain conclusions may be drawn from requirements and objectives, but one must bear in mind that “implications or vague concepts must not be the characteristics of any regulatory system”.³²

Summarizing

The aim of our comparative analysis is manifold. The results may assist the work of curriculum developers and contribute to the revelation and correction of deficiencies so far. They may help us understand the initial phase of folk music education and the reasons for hardships in the background. They may provide data for educational history to trace the paradigms and determine the directions of progress in the field of folk music education.

The comparative analysis of the two curricula revealed that the basic function of folk music education in Hungary has not altered since the beginnings.

The data gained from the research questions showed that in the case of the teaching the bagpipe and hurdy-gurdy, the paradigm shift regarding the concept of folk music had already taken place in the 1981 curriculum. The conclusions drawn from the explicit and implicit contents of the curricula are corroborated by the interviews conducted in 2016 and 2017. The relationship network extracted from the interviews showed that the paradigm shift was clearly in connection with the so-called folk dance house movement and its members. Both Sándor Csoóri, Jr., the author of the curriculum for bagpipe and his former student, Pál Havasréti, the author of the hurdy-gurdy curriculum, were active members of the movement beginning to spread at the start of the 1970s.

³² Gergely, 2004

The component system worked out by Gyula Gergely as an investigation tool seems appropriate for the examination of curricula connected to art education, for they reveal the differences as well as the similarities between the documents.

REFERENCES

- Agócs, Gergely (1998): Hagymányos hangszeres zenepedagógia. [Traditional instrumental pedagogy] In: Karácsony Molnár Erika – Kraiciné Szokoly Mária (eds.): *Hon- és Népismeret, néphagyomány az oktató-, nevelőmunkában. (Az 1996. október 4-5-i országos konferencia anyaga). (Hungarian Culture and Folk Traditions in Educational Work. The Proceedings of the National Conference Held on 4-5 Oct. 1996)* Budapesti Tanítóképző Főiskola, Budapest. 137-141.
- Andrásfalvy, Bertalan (1998): A néphagyomány oktatásának távlatai. [The perspectives of teaching folk traditions.] In: Karácsony Molnár Erika – Kraiciné Szokoly Mária (szerk.): *Hon- és Népismeret, néphagyomány az oktató-, nevelőmunkában. (Az 1996. október 4-5-i országos konferencia anyaga). (Hungarian Culture and Folk Traditions in Educational Work. The Proceedings of the National Conference Held on 4-5 Oct. 1996)* Budapesti Tanítóképző Főiskola, Budapest. 8-14.
- Az állami zeneiskolai nevelés és oktatás terve – Népi hangszerek – népi furulya, citera, duda, tekerőlant* (1981). (A Plan for State Music School Education and Teaching – Folk Music Instruments. Folk Flute, Zither, Bagpipe and Hurdy-Gurdy) Művelődési Minisztérium. Budapest
- Barta, Tamás (2014): Magyar néptáncmozgalom a korai időkben – társadalmi ideológia vagy nemzeti művészet? [Hungarian folk dance movement in the early times: social ideology or national art?] *Eszmélet*, **26**. 101. sz. 141-166.
- Báthory, Zoltán (1992): *Tanulók, iskolák – különbségek. Egy differenciális tanításmélethez vázlatok.* [Students, schools – differences: The outline of a differentiated educational theory.] Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest.
- Bolya, Mátyás (2017): *A magyar népzenei képzés szakterületi megújítása.* [The renewal of the field of Hungarian folk musician training.] Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Bölcsészettudományi Kar Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest.
- Boreczky, Ágnes (2015): Családkutatások nevelésszociológiai nézőpontból. [Investigating the family from the aspect of the sociology of education.] In: Kozma Tamás (ed.): *A nevelésszociológia alapjai. (The Fundamentals of the Sociology of Education.)* Pécsi Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar Neveléstudományi Intézet Romológia és Nevelésszociológia Tanszék Wlisslocki Henrik Szakkollégium, Pécs. 103-136.

- Dobray, István (1963): Az elvi alapokat kijelölő referátum [Report on the basic principles.] In: Az alsó fokú zeneoktatás reformjáról. [On the reform of primary school music education.] *Parlando*, **1963/1**.3-10.
- Gergely, Gyula (2002): *A pedagógiai tevékenység komponensrendszere. (The component system of the pedagogical work.)* <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00035/00060/2002-05-ta-Gergely-Pedagogiai.html>; 2017.02.20.
- Gergely, Gyula (2004): *Tantervelemzés a paradigmaváltás jegyében. Az Organisationsentwurf és az 1978 gimnáziumi tanterv összehasonlító elemzése. (Curriculum analysis in the spirit of paradigm shift: The comparative analysis of Organisationsentwurf and the 1978 secondary school curriculum)* <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00035/00082/2004-06-ta-Gergely-Tantervelemzes.html>; 2017.02.20.
- Juhász, Zoltán (1998): A népzene-tanulás hagyományos módja. [The traditional way of learning folk music.] In: Karácsony Molnár Erika – Kraiciné Szokoly Mária (eds.): *Hon- és Népismeret, néphagyomány az oktató-, nevelőmunkában. (Az 1996. október 4-5-i országos konferencia anyaga). (Hungarian Culture and Folk Traditions in Educational Work. The Proceedings of the National Conference Held on 4-5 Oct. 1996)* Budapesti Tanítóképző Főiskola, Budapest. 142-148.
- Kelemen, Elemér (2003): Oktatáspolitikai irányváltások Magyarországon a 20. század második felében (1945-1990). A korszak „oktatási reformjainak” természetéről [Shifts in the education trends in the second half of the 20th century in Hungary: On the nature of the „education reforms” of the period] *Új pedagógiai Szemle*, **53**. 9. sz. 25-32.
- Mészáros, István (1992): Magyar Paedagogia – Magyar Pedagógia 1892-1992. *Magyar Pedagógia*. **92**.1. sz. 5-24.
- Nádasi, Mária (2000): Dokumentumelemzés. [Document analysis] In: Falus Iván (szerk.): *Bevezetés a pedagógiai kutatás módszereibe.* [Introduction into the methodology of pedagogical research.] Műszaki Könyvkiadó, Budapest. 317-329.
- Nádasi, Mária (2000): Kikérdezés. [Interviews.] In: Falus Iván (szerk.): *Bevezetés a pedagógiai kutatás módszereibe.* [Introduction into the methodology of pedagogical research.] Műszaki Könyvkiadó, Budapest. 171-211.
- Pataky, Istvánné (szerk.) (1981): *Az Állami Zeneiskolai Nevelés és Oktatás Terve. [A plan for state music school education and teaching.]* Országos Pedagógiai Intézet, Budapest.
- Szűcsné Hobaj, Tünde (szerk.) (1999): Az alapfokú művészetoktatás. Követelményei és tantervi programja. [Basic-level art education: requirements and curriculum] ROMI-SULI Könyvkiadó és Továbbképző Műhely, Budapest.
- Trencsényi, László (2000): *Művészetpedagógia. Elmélet, tanterv, módszer.* [Art pedagogy: theory, curriculum, method.] Okker Kiadó, Budapest.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS:

Questions on planning

1. Who raised the concept of teaching folk music instruments in an institutional framework?
2. Was there a real demand on the part of the members of “civil” society or did they initiate formal meetings with the government?
3. Was there any kind of remark (request or directive) on the part of educational policy?
4. What kind of options were present for the provision of institutional background (other music schools, facilities)?
5. Was there, and if yes, what kind of relationship between the members of the folk dance house movement and the teachers?

Questions on preparation

1. How did the preparation process take place?
2. Who participated in the preparation?
3. What kind of legal requirements had to be met?
4. Who agreed to participate in the educational work?
5. What sort of material criteria had to be met to launch the programmes?
6. How much time elapsed from the conception until the realisation?

Questions on teachers

1. Who were the first educators?
2. What kind of legal criteria did they have to meet?
3. How many of them were there and what qualifications did they hold?
4. How did classical musicians respond to the appearance of folk music in schools?
5. Who prepared the curricula for the individual instruments?

Questions on the curriculum

1. At the start of educational work, was there any regulatory document available for teachers?
2. Who contributed to the curriculum? Did the members of the folk dance house movement have any say or role in forming the syllabus?
3. What kind of books and teaching aids were used?
4. What kind of teaching methods were known and were used in the education?

Questions on the model

1. What sort of model was regarded as ideal for Hungarian folk music teaching?
2. Were there any available foreign examples?

THE CURRICULAR IMPLEMENTATION OF FOLK MUSIC PARADIGMS...

3. Did you have any international connections or experiences?
4. Was there any connection between education in music schools and music lessons in regular primary schools?

Questions on the students?

1. How many students were involved in folk music instrumental education in the first twenty years?
2. The students came from what sort of socio-cultural background? What kind of motivations can be reconstructed or supposed on the part of the students of the first twenty years?
3. Did any follow-up of their career take place?
4. Did any of them become acclaimed folk music performers? If yes, who are they specifically?
5. The students arrived in the programme with what kind of previous knowledge of music and what kind of expectations?