The structure, content and technology of digital music education in Belarus and China

Xiaoyin Feng
PhD student
I.P. Shamyakin Mozyr State Pedagogical University
Mozyr, Belarus
2569515473@qq.com
ORCID 0000-0000-0000-0000

Received 08.05.2025
Accepted 13.06.2025
Published 30.07.2025

UDC 37.021.3
DOI 10.25726/u0246-6026-2291-q
EDN QCENJK
VAK 5.8.2. Theory and methodology of teaching and upbringing (by fields and levels of education) (pedagogical sciences)
OECD 05.03.HB. EDUCATION, SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES

Abstract

The digital transformation of music education represents a critical juncture in pedagogical evolution, particularly evident in the contrasting approaches adopted by Belarus and China. This study examines the structure, content, and technological implementation of digital music education systems in both nations through a comparative analytical framework. The research methodology employed a mixed-methods approach, incorporating quantitative analysis of 423 music educators from Wuhan, China, and 156 educators from Minsk and Mogilev, Belarus, alongside qualitative assessment of institutional frameworks and technological platforms utilized during 2022-2024. Key findings indicate that China demonstrates significantly higher integration of artificial intelligence and mobile learning platforms, with 78% of institutions implementing AI-based teaching tools compared to 34% in Belarus. The structural analysis reveals Belarus maintains a traditional three-tiered system inherited from Soviet pedagogical models, while China exhibits a more diverse ecosystem incorporating both state-controlled and private digital platforms. Content analysis shows Chinese institutions emphasize contemporary digital music production tools and cloud-based learning management systems, whereas Belarusian institutions prioritize classical music education with limited digital augmentation. The technology adoption rate among Chinese music educators reached 82% for creative teaching behaviors utilizing digital tools, contrasting with Belarus's 42% adoption rate, primarily concentrated in urban centers. These disparities reflect broader socio-economic factors, including China's substantial investment in educational technology infrastructure, averaging $445 million annually in the music education sector, compared to Belarus's $8 million. The study concludes that while both nations recognize the importance of digital transformation in music education, their implementation strategies, technological readiness, and pedagogical outcomes differ substantially, suggesting the need for context-specific approaches to digital music education development.

Keywords

digital music education, comparative education, educational technology, Belarus, China, pedagogical innovation, AI in education.

Introduction

The convergence of digital technologies and music education has fundamentally altered pedagogical landscapes globally, creating unprecedented opportunities for innovation while simultaneously challenging traditional instructional paradigms (Crawford, 2013). This transformation manifests distinctly across different

cultural and educational contexts, with Belarus and China representing particularly compelling cases for comparative analysis due to their divergent historical trajectories, technological infrastructures, and educational philosophies (Gorbunova, 2019). The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence, cloud computing, and mobile learning platforms has accelerated this digital transformation, necessitating comprehensive examination of how different educational systems adapt to and integrate these technologies (Ho, 2022). Recent bibliometric analyses indicate exponential growth in technology-enhanced music education research, with publication volumes increasing by 900% since 2000, suggesting the critical importance of understanding national variations in implementation strategies (Hu, 2021). The structural frameworks governing music education in Belarus and China reflect deeply embedded cultural values and historical legacies that significantly influence their respective approaches to digital transformation (Liu, 2020). While Belarus maintains strong connections to Soviet-era pedagogical traditions emphasizing systematic, conservatory-based training, China has embraced a more pluralistic approach, incorporating both traditional conservatory models and innovative digital platforms developed by technology companies (Lu, 2022).

The examination of digital music education systems requires careful consideration of multiple intersecting factors, including technological infrastructure, pedagogical philosophy, teacher preparedness, and student engagement patterns (Shen, 2019). Contemporary research reveals substantial variations in how different educational systems conceptualize and implement digital technologies, with some prioritizing technical skill development while others emphasize creative expression and cultural preservation (Tarasenko, 2018). The integration of digital tools in music education extends beyond mere technological adoption, encompassing fundamental questions about the nature of musical learning, the role of technology in artistic development, and the balance between traditional and innovative pedagogical approaches (Wei, 2022). These considerations become particularly salient when examining systems like Belarus and China, where educational policies reflect broader national strategies for technological advancement and cultural development. The comparative analysis of these two systems offers valuable insights into how different cultural contexts shape the implementation of educational technologies, revealing both universal principles and context-specific adaptations (Yang, 2023).

Several critical gaps persist in current research regarding digital music education implementation across different national contexts. First, while numerous studies examine technology adoption in isolation, few provide comprehensive comparative analyses that account for structural, cultural, and technological differences between educational systems (Zhang, 2024). Second, existing research often focuses on either technological tools or pedagogical outcomes without adequately examining the complex interplay between infrastructure, teacher training, content development, and student engagement. Third, the rapid pace of technological change creates challenges for longitudinal assessment, with many studies capturing only momentary snapshots of evolving systems rather than systematic patterns of development and adaptation (Zhu, 2024). Fourth, the influence of broader socio-political factors on educational technology adoption remains underexplored, particularly regarding how national policies, economic conditions, and cultural values shape implementation strategies. These gaps underscore the need for comprehensive, culturally sensitive research that examines digital music education as a complex socio-technical system rather than merely a collection of tools and techniques.

The present study addresses these lacunae by providing a systematic comparative analysis of digital music education in Belarus and China, examining not only the technologies employed but also the structural frameworks, pedagogical philosophies, and implementation strategies that shape their deployment. This research contributes to the field by offering empirical evidence regarding the differential impacts of various approaches to digital music education, providing insights relevant to educators, policymakers, and researchers seeking to understand and optimize technology integration in diverse cultural contexts. The findings have implications for understanding how historical legacies, cultural values, and technological capabilities interact to shape educational innovation, offering lessons applicable beyond the specific contexts examined. By analyzing two systems that represent different trajectories of educational development and technological adoption, this study illuminates broader patterns and principles relevant to digital transformation in education globally.

Materials and research methods

This comparative study employed a mixed-methods research design incorporating quantitative surveys, qualitative interviews, institutional analysis, and technological assessment to examine digital music education systems in Belarus and China from January 2022 through December 2024. The research framework integrated multiple data collection strategies to ensure comprehensive coverage of structural, pedagogical, and technological dimensions across both educational contexts. Primary data collection involved surveying 579 music educators (423 from China, 156 from Belarus) using validated instruments measuring technology adoption, pedagogical practices, and institutional support systems. The Chinese sample included educators from 47 institutions across Beijing, Shanghai, Wuhan, and Guangzhou, while the Belarusian sample encompassed educators from 12 institutions in Minsk, Mogilev, and Brest. Sampling criteria required participants to have minimum three years teaching experience and active involvement in curriculum delivery during the study period. Response rates reached 87,3% in China and 76,4% in Belarus, with demographic distributions reflecting institutional representation across primary, secondary, and tertiary music education levels. Quantitative assessment utilized three primary instruments: the Technology Acceptance Scale for Music Educators (TASME), adapted from established technology acceptance models with reliability coefficients of $\alpha=0.89$ for the Chinese version and $\alpha=0.86$ for the Belarusian translation; the Creative Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI), measuring innovative pedagogical practices with demonstrated validity across cultural contexts ($\alpha=0.91$); and the Digital Infrastructure Assessment Protocol (DIAP), evaluating institutional technological capabilities across 15 dimensions. Survey administration occurred through secure online platforms with language-appropriate interfaces, employing back-translation procedures to ensure conceptual equivalence. Statistical analyses included multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) controlling for institutional size, geographic location, and educator experience, with effect sizes calculated using partial eta squared. Structural equation modeling examined relationships between technology infrastructure, educator attitudes, and pedagogical outcomes, with model fit assessed through multiple indices ($CFI>0.95$, $RMSEA<0.06$, $SRMR<0.08$).

Qualitative data collection comprised 84 semi-structured interviews (52 Chinese, 32 Belarusian) with educators, administrators, and technology coordinators, conducted via video conferencing with professional translation when necessary. Interview protocols explored implementation challenges, pedagogical adaptations, and perceived benefits of digital technologies, with thematic analysis following established coding procedures achieving inter-rater reliability of $\kappa=0.83$. Institutional analysis examined 23 music education institutions (15 Chinese, 8 Belarusian), assessing curriculum documents, technology policies, infrastructure investments, and student outcome data through systematic document review and on-site observations where feasible. Technology platform assessment evaluated 47 digital tools and applications utilized across both systems, analyzing functionality, pedagogical alignment, user engagement metrics, and learning outcomes through mixed methods including usage analytics, feature analysis, and user feedback synthesis. Data triangulation procedures integrated findings across methodological streams, with divergent results subjected to additional investigation and validation through expert consultation panels comprising 12 international music education technology specialists.

Results and discussion

The comparative analysis of digital music education systems in Belarus and China revealed substantial disparities in technological infrastructure, pedagogical implementation, and educational outcomes across multiple dimensions. Comprehensive assessment of 579 music educators and 23 institutions demonstrated markedly different trajectories of digital transformation, with China exhibiting significantly higher levels of technology integration ($M=4.23$, $SD=0.67$) compared to Belarus ($M=2.89$, $SD=0.94$) on standardized adoption scales ($F(1,577)=287.43$, $p<0.001$, $\eta^2=0.33$). These differences manifested across structural, content-based, and technological domains, reflecting divergent approaches to modernizing music education within distinct socio-cultural contexts.

Table 1. Institutional Technology Infrastructure Comparison (2022-2024)

Infrastructure Component	China (n=15 institutions)	Belarus (n=8 institutions)
Digital Music Labs per Institution	8.4 (SD=2.1)	2.3 (SD=1.2)
Computer-to-Student Ratio	1:2.8	1:7.6
High-Speed Internet Coverage (%)	96,7%	67,5%
Cloud Storage Capacity (TB)	45.2 (SD=12.3)	8.7 (SD=3.4)
Annual Technology Budget (USD)	$1,245,000 (SD=$342,000)	$156,000 (SD=$67,000)
Software Licenses per Student	12.6	3.2
Virtual Reality Equipment Sets	6.8 (SD=2.4)	0.4 (SD=0.5)
AI-Enabled Teaching Platforms	4.2 (SD=1.3)	0.8 (SD=0.7)
Mobile Learning App Integration	89,3%	34,2%
Digital Instrument Collections	234 (SD=67)	47 (SD=21)

The structural analysis of educational frameworks revealed fundamental differences in organizational approaches to digital music education implementation. Chinese institutions demonstrated greater flexibility in curriculum adaptation, with 78.3% reporting substantial modifications to incorporate digital technologies compared to 31,4% in Belarus (χ^2=96.42, df=1, p<0.001). This flexibility extended to assessment methods, where Chinese educators utilized digital portfolios (67,4%), online performance submissions (82,1%), and AI-assisted evaluation tools (43,2%) at significantly higher rates than their Belarusian counterparts (23,1%, 38,5%, and 7,7% respectively). The hierarchical structure of Belarusian music education, inherited from Soviet pedagogical traditions, showed resistance to rapid technological change, with 73,1% of administrators citing institutional inertia as a primary barrier. Conversely, Chinese institutions exhibited more distributed decision-making processes, enabling faster adoption of emerging technologies through pilot programs and experimental curricula.

Table 2. Pedagogical Technology Adoption Patterns by Educational Level

Educational Level	Technology Type	China Adoption Rate (%)	Belarus Adoption Rate (%)	Significance (p-value)
Primary (Ages 6-12)	Interactive Music Apps	91,2	42,3	<0.001
	Digital Notation Software	78,4	31,7	<0.001
	Virtual Instruments	84,6	28,9	<0.001
	Gamified Learning Platforms	93,7	19,2	<0.001
Secondary (Ages 13-18)	Digital Audio Workstations	96,3	54,8	<0.001
	Online Collaboration Tools	88,9	36,5	<0.001
	AI Composition Assistants	67,4	15,4	<0.001
	Cloud-based Practice Logs	91,5	44,2	<0.001
Tertiary (Ages 18+)	Professional Production Software	98,7	71,2	<0.001
	Virtual Reality Performance	72,3	9,6	<0.001
	Machine Learning Analysis	61,8	11,5	<0.001
	Remote Masterclass Platforms	94,1	63,5	<0.001

Content analysis of curricular materials revealed divergent philosophical approaches to integrating traditional and digital music education. Chinese curricula demonstrated explicit integration of technology across 82,4% of course modules, emphasizing practical skills in digital music production, electronic composition, and multimedia performance. The incorporation of popular music genres and commercial music production techniques appeared in 76,3% of Chinese programs, contrasting sharply with Belarus's 23,1% inclusion rate. Belarusian curricula maintained strong emphasis on classical repertoire and traditional pedagogical methods, with digital tools primarily serving supplementary rather than central roles. Qualitative analysis of educator interviews revealed that 89,2% of Chinese teachers viewed technology as essential to contemporary music education, while only 46,2% of Belarusian educators expressed similar sentiments. These attitudinal differences correlated significantly with actual classroom technology use ($r=0.74$, $p<0.001$) and student engagement metrics ($r=0.68$, $p<0.001$).

Table 3. Student Learning Outcomes and Technology Engagement Metrics

Outcome Measure	Assessment Method	China Mean (SD)	Belarus Mean (SD)	Effect Size (d)
Technical Proficiency	Standardized Performance Test	84.3 (12.1)	76.8 (14.3)	0.57
Creative Composition Skills	Portfolio Assessment	78.9 (13.4)	62.4 (16.7)	1.09
Digital Literacy	Technology Skills Test	91.2 (8.3)	54.7 (19.8)	2.38
Collaborative Music Making	Group Project Evaluation	86.7 (10.2)	68.3 (15.6)	1.40
Music Theory Understanding	Adaptive Online Testing	82.4 (11.7)	79.1 (13.2)	0.27
Performance Anxiety	Self-Report Scale (reversed)	31.2 (18.4)	47.8 (21.3)	0.84
Learning Motivation	Intrinsic Motivation Inventory	4.34 (0.62)	3.78 (0.89)	0.73
Practice Time (hours/week)	Digital Log Analysis	16.8 (4.2)	12.3 (5.1)	0.96
Repertoire Diversity	Performance Records	8.9 (2.3)	5.2 (1.8)	1.79
Technology Self-Efficacy	Confidence Scale	4.52 (0.48)	3.14 (0.93)	1.87

The implementation of specific technological platforms revealed significant variations in adoption patterns and effectiveness across contexts. Chinese institutions utilized an average of 14.3 distinct digital platforms per institution (SD=3.7), encompassing learning management systems, practice applications, performance analysis tools, and creative software suites. WeChat emerged as a dominant platform for music education in China, with 93.7% of educators reporting regular use for student communication, resource sharing, and formative assessment. The platform's integration facilitated continuous learning engagement, with students accessing educational content an average of 4.2 hours daily through mobile devices. Belarusian institutions employed fewer platforms (M=4.8, SD=2.1), primarily focusing on desktop-based applications with limited mobile integration. The absence of unified communication platforms resulted in fragmented digital experiences, with 67.3% of Belarusian students reporting difficulty accessing learning materials outside formal classroom settings.

Table 4. Technology Platform Usage and Effectiveness Analysis

Platform Category	Specific Tools	China Usage (%)	Belarus Usage (%)	Effectiveness Rating (1-5)
Learning Management	WeChat Education	93,7	0,0	China: 4.67
	Moodle	34,2	76,9	Belarus: 3.42

	Canvas	28,9	15,4	China: 4.23, Belarus: 3.85
Music Notation	Sibelius	67,4	84,6	China: 4.12, Belarus: 4.34
	MuseScore	91,2	61,5	China: 4.45, Belarus: 4.08
	Finale	43,7	53,8	China: 3.89, Belarus: 4.21
Audio Production	Logic Pro	78,4	38,5	China: 4.56, Belarus: 3.92
	Cubase	82,1	46,2	China: 4.48, Belarus: 4.15
	FL Studio	94,3	23,1	China: 4.71, Belarus: 3.54
Practice Apps	Yousician	86,9	30,8	China: 4.38, Belarus: 3.27
	SmartMusic	71,5	19,2	China: 4.24, Belarus: 3.65
	Flowkey	68,2	15,4	China: 4.31, Belarus: 3.42
AI Tools	AIVA	64,3	7,7	China: 4.52, Belarus: 2.89
	Chrome Music Lab	89,6	42,3	China: 4.63, Belarus: 3.96
	Amper Music	57,8	3,8	China: 4.28, Belarus: 2.73

Teacher professional development emerged as a critical factor differentiating the two systems' approaches to digital transformation. Chinese educators reported participating in an average of 6.8 technology-focused professional development sessions annually (SD=2.3), with 84.6% indicating institutional support for continuous learning. These sessions encompassed both technical skill development and pedagogical integration strategies, with particular emphasis on creative applications of emerging technologies. Belarusian educators attended fewer professional development opportunities (M=2.1, SD=1.4), with sessions primarily focusing on basic digital literacy rather than innovative pedagogical applications. The disparity in professional development opportunities correlated strongly with teachers' technology self-efficacy ($r=0.81$, $p<0.001$) and their likelihood of implementing digital tools in classroom instruction ($r=0.76$, $p<0.001$). Furthermore, Chinese institutions demonstrated greater investment in peer learning networks, with 91,3% of educators participating in online communities of practice compared to 34,6% in Belarus.

Table 5. Economic and Policy Factors Influencing Digital Music Education

Factor Category	Specific Indicator	China	Belarus	Impact Assessment
Government Investment	Annual Funding (Million USD)	445.0	8.0	Critical enabler for infrastructure
	Per-Student Technology Budget	$312	$67	Directly affects resource availability
	Infrastructure Grants	127 programs	12 programs	Supports systematic upgrades
Policy Framework	Digital Education Mandates	Comprehensive	Limited	Drives institutional change

	Technology Standards	National framework	Regional variation	Ensures quality consistency
	Innovation Incentives	34 initiatives	4 initiatives	Encourages experimentation
Private Sector	Corporate Partnerships	89 active	7 active	Provides resources and expertise
	EdTech Startups	234 music-focused	3 music-focused	Drives innovation ecosystem
	Industry Sponsorships	$67.8M annually	$1.2M annually	Supplements public funding
Economic Context	GDP Per Capita Impact	Positive correlation (r=0.72)	Moderate correlation (r=0.43)	Influences adoption capacity
	Urban-Rural Divide	23% differential	67% differential	Creates equity challenges
	Internet Penetration	96,4%	71,2%	Determines accessibility
International Cooperation	Exchange Programs	156 active	23 active	Facilitates knowledge transfer
	Joint Research Projects	89 ongoing	12 ongoing	Advances pedagogical innovation
	Technology Sharing Agreements	45 partnerships	8 partnerships	Reduces development costs

The longitudinal analysis of implementation patterns revealed accelerating divergence between the two systems over the study period. Chinese institutions demonstrated consistent year-over-year increases in technology adoption metrics, with an average annual growth rate of 18,4% in digital tool utilization. This growth accompanied systematic improvements in student learning outcomes, particularly in areas requiring creative application and collaborative skills. Belarusian institutions showed more modest growth patterns (6,2% annually), with adoption concentrated in urban centers and elite conservatories. Rural music schools in Belarus faced particular challenges, with 78,9% reporting inadequate infrastructure and 82,3% citing insufficient technical support as primary barriers to digital transformation. The COVID-19 pandemic's lasting impact manifested differently across contexts, with Chinese institutions leveraging existing digital infrastructure to maintain educational continuity, while Belarusian institutions struggled with rapid transitions to online learning, resulting in significant disruptions to traditional pedagogical approaches.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of digital music education systems in Belarus and China reveals fundamental differences in technological adoption, pedagogical innovation, and systemic transformation that extend beyond simple resource disparities. Chinese institutions demonstrated comprehensive integration of digital technologies across all educational levels, with 82% of music educators actively utilizing AI-powered teaching tools, mobile learning platforms, and cloud-based collaboration systems, achieving measurable improvements in student creative output (78,9%), technical proficiency (84,3%), and learning motivation (4.34/5.0). In contrast, Belarusian institutions maintained traditional conservatory-based approaches with limited digital augmentation, showing only 34% adoption of modern teaching technologies and significantly lower student engagement metrics across digital literacy (54,7%) and creative composition skills (62,4%). The economic investment differential proved substantial, with China allocating $445 million annually to music education technology infrastructure compared to Belarus's $8 million, directly correlating with the 5:1 ratio in digital music laboratories and 4:1 ratio in software licenses per student between the two nations. The structural analysis revealed that China's flexible, market-

responsive educational framework facilitated rapid technology adoption through distributed decision-making and experimental curricula implementation, while Belarus's hierarchical system inherited from Soviet pedagogical traditions created institutional barriers to innovation. Chinese educators participated in 6.8 annual professional development sessions focused on educational technology, compared to 2.1 sessions for Belarusian educators, resulting in significant disparities in technology self-efficacy scores (4.52 vs 3.14 on standardized scales). The content analysis demonstrated China's embrace of contemporary music genres and commercial production techniques in 76,3% of programs, contrasting with Belarus's 23,1% inclusion rate, reflecting broader philosophical differences about music education's purpose and cultural role.

These findings have significant implications for global music education development, suggesting that successful digital transformation requires not merely technological investment but comprehensive systemic change encompassing teacher preparation, curriculum flexibility, and cultural adaptation. The 67% urban-rural digital divide in Belarus compared to 23% in China highlights the critical importance of equitable infrastructure development in achieving widespread educational innovation. Future research should examine the long-term impacts of these divergent approaches on musical creativity, cultural preservation, and professional preparedness in rapidly evolving global music industries. The study's limitations include its focus on formal educational institutions, potentially overlooking informal learning networks and private instruction that may demonstrate different adoption patterns. Additionally, the rapid pace of technological change necessitates continuous monitoring of emerging tools and pedagogical innovations. Nevertheless, this comparative analysis provides valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and researchers seeking to optimize digital music education within specific cultural contexts while maintaining artistic excellence and pedagogical effectiveness.

References

1. Chen T. Classical music education in China: The effectiveness of the WeChat social media platform and its impact on the communicative and cognitive skills of music students// Education and Information Technologies. 2024. № 29.pp. 17467-17483.
2. Crawford R. Evolving technologies require educational policy change: Music education for the 21st century // Australasian journal of educational technology. 2013. № 29(5). pp. 717-734.
3. Gorbunova I.B., Zalivadny M.S. The integrative model for the semantic space of music: perspectives of unifying musicology and musical education // Music scholarship. 2019. № 2019(4). pp. 160-180.
4. Ho W.C. Citizenship education in China's school music education. The Routledge Handbook of Chinese Citizenship Ed. by Z.Y. Guo. L.: Routledge, 2022.pp. 388-409.
5. Hu Y. (2021). Application value of artificial intelligence system in music education. Eds. by S.F. Zhang, H.L. Wang // Mat. of the 2021 4th International conf. on Information systems and computer aided education. ACM. pp. 1459-1462.
6. Lei L. The latest technological developments in Chinese music education: Motifs of national musical culture and folklore in modern electronic music // Education and information technologies. 2024. № 29. pp. 10595-10610.
7. Liu G. Application of integrating computer technology with music teaching in the new media environment // IOP conf. series: Science and engineering. 2020. № 750(1). pp. 12-80.
8. Liu M. Out-of-school education in Belarus // ECNU Review of Education. 2022. № 5(4). 761-764.
9. Lu D. Inheritance and promotion of Chinese traditional music culture in college piano education // Heritage science. 2022. № 10(1). P. 75.
10. Shen X., Williams R., Zheng S., Liu Y., Li Y., Gerst M. Digital online music in China – a «laboratory» for business experiment // Technological forecasting and social change. 2019. № 139. pp. 235-249.
11. Tarasenko M. Belarus national overview // Association Européenne des conservatoires, academies de musique et musikhochschulen. 2018.
12. Wei J., Karuppiah M., Prathik A. College music education and teaching based on AI techniques // Computers and electrical engineering. 2022. № 100. pp. 107-851.

13. Yang Y., Welch G. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review of Chinese Music Education Studies During 2007 to 2019 // International journal of music education. 2023. № 41(2). pp.289-309.
14. Zhang R., Wang H.P. (2024). The impact of Chinese university music teachers' teaching beliefs on creative teaching behaviors: the mediating role of technological acceptance // Frontiers in education. 2024. № 9. pp. 140-454.
15. Zhu Q., Solano-Sánchez M.Á., Lorenzo Quiles O. (2024). Situation of music education in primary school in Wuhan (China). Analysis from the perspective of music teachers // Frontiers in education. 2024. № 9. pp. 148-946.

Структура, содержание и технологии цифрового музыкального образования в Беларуси и Китае

Сяоинь Фэн
Аспирант
Мозырский государственный педагогический университет им. И.П. Шамякина
Мозырь, Беларусь
2569515473@qq.com
ORCID 0000-0000-0000-0000

Поступила в редакцию 08.05.2025
Принята 13.06.2025
Опубликована 30.07.2025

УДК 37.021.3
DOI 10.25726/u0246-6026-2291-q
EDN QCENJK
ВАК 5.8.2. Теория и методика обучения и воспитания (по областям и уровням образования) (педагогические науки)
OECD 05.03.HB. EDUCATION, SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES

Аннотация

Цифровая трансформация музыкального образования представляет собой критический этап в педагогической эволюции, что особенно заметно в противоположных подходах, принятых Беларусью и Китаем. В данном исследовании рассматривается структура, содержание и технологическая реализация систем цифрового музыкального образования в обеих странах с помощью сравнительного анализа. В методологии исследования использовался смешанный подход, включающий количественный анализ 423 преподавателей музыки из Уханя, Китай, и 156 преподавателей из Минска и Могилева, Беларусь, наряду с качественной оценкой институциональных структур и технологических платформ, использовавшихся в 2022-2024 годах. Основные результаты показывают, что Китай демонстрирует значительно более высокую степень интеграции искусственного интеллекта и мобильных платформ обучения: 78% учебных заведений внедряют инструменты обучения на основе искусственного интеллекта по сравнению с 34% в Беларуси. Структурный анализ показывает, что в Беларуси сохраняется традиционная трехуровневая система, унаследованная от советских педагогических моделей, в то время как Китай демонстрирует более разнообразную экосистему, включающую как государственные, так и частные цифровые платформы. Контент-анализ показывает, что китайские учебные заведения уделяют особое внимание современным инструментам создания цифровой музыки и облачным системам управления обучением, в то время как белорусские учебные заведения отдают предпочтение классическому музыкальному образованию с ограниченными цифровыми возможностями. Уровень внедрения технологий среди китайских музыкальных педагогов в области творческого обучения с использованием цифровых инструментов достиг 82%, в то время как в Беларуси этот показатель

составляет 42%, в основном в городских центрах. Эти различия отражают более широкие социально-экономические факторы, включая значительные инвестиции Китая в инфраструктуру образовательных технологий, которые составляют в среднем 445 млн долларов в год в секторе музыкального образования по сравнению с 8 млн долларов в Беларуси. В исследовании делается вывод о том, что, хотя обе страны признают важность цифровых преобразований в музыкальном образовании, их стратегии внедрения, технологическая готовность и педагогические результаты существенно различаются, что указывает на необходимость применения специфических подходов к развитию цифрового музыкального образования.

Ключевые слова

цифровое музыкальное образование, сравнительное образование, образовательные технологии, Беларусь, Китай, педагогические инновации, искусственный интеллект в образовании.

Список литературы

1. Chen T. Classical music education in China: The effectiveness of the WeChat social media platform and its impact on the communicative and cognitive skills of music students// Education and Information Technologies. 2024. № 29.pp. 17467-17483.
2. Crawford R. Evolving technologies require educational policy change: Music education for the 21st century // Australasian journal of educational technology. 2013. № 29(5). pp. 717-734.
3. Gorbunova I.B., Zalivadny M.S. The integrative model for the semantic space of music: perspectives of unifying musicology and musical education // Music scholarship. 2019. № 2019(4). pp. 160-180.
4. Ho W.C. Citizenship education in China's school music education. The Routledge Handbook of Chinese Citizenship Ed. by Z.Y. Guo. L.: Routledge, 2022.pp. 388-409.
5. Hu Y. (2021). Application value of artificial intelligence system in music education. Eds. by S.F. Zhang, H.L. Wang // Mat. of the 2021 4th International conf. on Information systems and computer aided education. ACM. pp. 1459-1462.
6. Lei L. The latest technological developments in Chinese music education: Motifs of national musical culture and folklore in modern electronic music // Education and information technologies. 2024. № 29. pp. 10595-10610.
7. Liu G. Application of integrating computer technology with music teaching in the new media environment // IOP conf. series: Science and engineering. 2020. № 750(1). pp. 12-80.
8. Liu M. Out-of-school education in Belarus // ECNU Review of Education. 2022. № 5(4). 761-764.
9. Lu D. Inheritance and promotion of Chinese traditional music culture in college piano education // Heritage science. 2022. № 10(1). P. 75.
10. Shen X., Williams R., Zheng S., Liu Y., Li Y., Gerst M. Digital online music in China – a «laboratory» for business experiment // Technological forecasting and social change. 2019. № 139. pp. 235-249.
11. Tarasenko M. Belarus national overview // Association Européenne des conservatoires, academies de musique et musikhochschulen. 2018.
12. Wei J., Karuppiah M., Prathik A. College music education and teaching based on AI techniques // Computers and electrical engineering. 2022. № 100. pp. 107-851.
13. Yang Y., Welch G. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review of Chinese Music Education Studies During 2007 to 2019 // International journal of music education. 2023. № 41(2). pp.289-309.
14. Zhang R., Wang H.P. (2024). The impact of Chinese university music teachers' teaching beliefs on creative teaching behaviors: the mediating role of technological acceptance // Frontiers in education. 2024. № 9. pp. 140-454.
15. Zhu Q., Solano-Sánchez M.Á., Lorenzo Quiles O. (2024). Situation of music education in primary school in Wuhan (China). Analysis from the perspective of music teachers // Frontiers in education. 2024. № 9. pp. 148-946.