

Curricular and Pedagogical Reform: Transformative Opportunities for Personalized Learning in Middle School Music Environments

by

David Allen Erickson

M.A. (Education), Simon Fraser University, 2005
B.Sc., Washington State University, 1982

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

Arts Education Program

Faculty of Education

© David Allen Erickson 2012

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2012

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for "Fair Dealing." Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

Approval

Name: David Allen Erickson
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy (Education)
Title of Thesis: *Curricular and Pedagogical Reform:
Transformative Opportunities for Personalized
Learning in Middle School Music Environments*

Examining Committee:

Chair: Dr. Celeste Snowber, Associate Professor

Dr. Yaroslav Senyshyn
Senior Supervisor
Professor

Dr. Allan MacKinnon
Supervisor
Associate Professor

Dr. Stephen Campbell
Internal Examiner
Associate Professor
Faculty of Education

Dr. Peter Gouzouasis
External Examiner
Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
University of British Columbia

Date Defended/Approved: August 7, 2012

Partial Copyright Licence



The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website (www.lib.sfu.ca) at <http://summit/sfu.ca> and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

revised Fall 2011

Ethics Statement



The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator or research assistant in a research project approved in advance,

or

- d. as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

update Spring 2010

Abstract

Paradigmatic shifts in music education, supported by curricular reconceptualization and the braiding of “outside school” informal learning styles with more traditional formal learning patterns associated with classroom music, have developed slowly in North American schools. However, unlike popular music currently incorporated into Swedish, Finnish and British schools, most North American music programs maintain traditional band and choir paradigms as a curricular focus in middle and high school settings. Research in Great Britain, the United States and Canada indicates that these traditional music programs fail to sustain the interest of our youth. Alternate pedagogies, accessible through student-directed information and communications technologies, have transformed music education and displaced sole reliance upon the teacher as musical authority.

The overwhelming value of popular music for most young people has encouraged many music educators to bridge these thriving “outside” interests with school music environments. I argue that while informal learning strategies are vital to assist many of our students, the persistence of formal learning methods that they engage in outside of school should not preclude their continued importance inside our schools, including both traditional and alternative uses of music notation. The notation reform effort of Jean-Jacques Rousseau parallels contemporary efforts on the Internet to use alternate notation for learning music. Correspondingly, Rousseau’s child-centred philosophies have created opportunities for contemporary education reform, witnessed in personalized music learning environments, which value development of student voice. This is significant in middle school environments where many students claim to have fewer decision-making opportunities than in elementary school. A youth participatory action research project named Music Matters, working in tandem with Simon Fraser University researchers and the middle school music teacher, provided notable insights about the value of music and dance to the student researchers.

While I argue that changes in music education curriculum are necessary to demonstrate that educators are listening to and acting upon the needs of students, inflexible systems espousing prior practice over possible practice tend to ignore our youth. I also advocate

for the addition of popular music performance to the middle school curriculum and a focus upon the individual musical needs and interests of students.

Keywords: Middle school music; personalized learning; youth participatory action research; curricular and pedagogical reform; popular music; informal and formal music learning

*In loving memory of Bill, Elvina, Jimmy, Mary
and Kathryne.*

Acknowledgements

I give my profound thanks to Dr. Yaroslav Senyshyn, whose music, wisdom, patience, gentleness, kindness, and encouragement gave me strength throughout all stages of this paper. I also express my gratitude to Dr. Susan O'Neill for allowing me to assist in Research for Youth, Music and Education (RYME) at Simon Fraser University. Her passion and brilliance are a marvel and an inspiration. It is Dr. Allan MacKinnon that I commend for his philosophical and musical insights, as well as providing spontaneous help and necessary levity. My thanks also extend to Dr. Stephen Campbell for his many incisive questions and stirring comments. To Dr. Peter Gouzouasis, I express great appreciation for his helpful criticism and also for sharing his wide breadth of musical experience and knowledge of music education.

I reserve the concluding recognitions for the members of my family by allowing me to pursue my interests in music, education, and philosophy. I especially thank Diane, Rory, and Tor for their motivation, tolerance, and abiding love during my studies. To my father Hank and mother Carol, I voice my eternal indebtedness to you both for the wonderful life with which you have blessed me. I love you all.

Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Partial Copyright Licence	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
Table of Contents.....	viii
Preface.....	x
Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Popular Music, Musical Autonomy, and the Music Classroom	6
Chapter 2. Student-centred Learning and the Social Construction of Music in School	46
Chapter 3. Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Music Reform	63
Chapter 4. Foucault, Modernism, Early Music Education in British Columbia, Musical Exemplars, and Ressentiment.....	83
Chapter 5. Teaching as Control, Conservatory Orthodoxy in Public School Music Education, and Teacher as Authority Figure.....	115
Chapter 6. Music Listening and Performance Fetish Inside the Music Classroom.....	131
Chapter 7. Youth as Deficit Model, Identity Formation and Personhood, Youth as Partner Through Participatory Action Research, and Development of "Student Voice" in Personalized Music Learning	143
The Music Matters YPAR Project	160

Chapter 8. Holistic Perspectives on Informal and Formal Learning, Middle School Music Environments, Technology as Pedagogical Partner, Music Advocacy as Inaction, Performance as Pedagogy, and Popular Music Performance in Middle School Curriculum.....	175
Conclusion	217
References	224

Preface

The sense of urgency I felt to advocate curricular and pedagogical reform in music environments might be characterized as the mark of a lifelong of encounters with music and musicians. My own experiences of regularly witnessing musical prejudices as a student in school, accompanied by those as an adult music performer and music educator, have most certainly added to my determination to express what I believe to be just and true. One might conclude that my resolve for change in music education is derived principally from my own biases regarding what kinds of music making are personally worthwhile. I hope not to portray myself in such a light in this thesis. I believe, as do a host of others, that there are innumerable ways of being musical in this world.

Rightly, by opening up the curriculum to our students' identities, passions and interests, music educators might allow for transformative possibilities to arise. William Heard Kilpatrick, as summarized by William Pinar (2011), "argued that encouraging students...to reconstruct the curriculum after projects of their own choosing, under the guidance of experienced teachers, not only enabled students to pursue their own interests (thus making learning more enjoyable, presumably)" but it paved the way for "purposeful activity" in school by teaching the "democratic values of initiative, cooperation, and curiosity" (pp. ix-x). Considering that Kilpatrick published these words in 1918, it is both an inspiration to and an affirmation for contemporary music educators that the curriculum is something to be originated and not simply repeated. School music environments can be places that naturally allow for these kinds of possibilities, rather than certainties. Lucy Green (2008a), writing ninety years after Kilpatrick, proclaimed: "Pupil-selection of curriculum content breaks down the reproductive effects of many previous music curricula, which by ignoring the musical identities and tastes of vast numbers of pupils prevented many of them from demonstrating or even discovering their musical abilities" (p. 13).

Popular music is often the music chosen by both young and old, inside and outside of school settings, yet it is frequently the brunt of discrimination in music education. Therefore, a defense of this form of musical expression was essential in this paper. As part of further justifying popular music in music education, a critical

examination of music programs that often reside solely inside our schools follows, including a consideration of the opinion that popular music is not a musical exemplar and therefore should not be in our schools. Correspondingly, Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of resentment contained a disdain for democracy because it gave voice to the lesser talented and the weak. I argue that these ideas are very much entwined in the prejudices against popular music and our youth. The notion imbedded in further discussion is that student-centred learning should be a priority in an intensely personal subject such as music. However, since music is so highly individualized in its meaning, popular music is not always the choice for a number of students. To accommodate the wide types of student selected music, availing instruments and technologies for both playing and learning is vital in contemporary music classes.

While many music environments often adhere to controlling and homogenous pedagogy and curricula, I examine alternate ways to recognize student-voice and delineate some histories of social construction in school music performance groups. As an example of how schools can respond to the needs of young people, popular music has recently been added to the music performance curriculum in my middle school, now standing shoulder to shoulder with traditional band and choir programs. This was partially accomplished through findings of a youth participatory action research (YPAR) study in my school with Simon Fraser University researchers, working alongside the students and middle school teacher. Since development of student voice is key to success in personalized learning environments, as is the perception that the students believe that their ideas are being taken seriously and implemented (Price, 2006), the addition of popular music in my school is a testament to the value of youth participatory action research. The opportunity for transformation in our schools, at a time that youth are believed to be increasingly disconnected from them, is vital. Given that school music environments can somehow assist in empowering our youth is a credit to the art of music, curricular and pedagogical reform is an essential step in this process.

Introduction

Post-modern philosophy has helped usher in new pathways on which to navigate music education. There appears now a landscape that displays an openness and respect for other musical communities, yet there remain inherent dangers in the sightless transplanting of one musical ideology for another, as is the case of state-sanctioned popular music as standard curriculum in Swedish schools (Björck, 2011; Georgii-Hemming & Westvall, 2010). If popular music serves community ideals instead of individuality (Subotnik, 1991), then its place in our schools should be a central one. In North American music education, however, it is often marginalized or, if brought into the curriculum, taught using the same formal pedagogy of the traditional classroom (Green, 2001, 2006).

In spite of pedagogical and curricular expansions in music education, modernism finds safe harbour inside the band rooms and choral shells of most of our middle and high schools. Conservatory orthodoxy is still the primary method of music teacher training in North American schools (Regelski, 2005; Woodford, 2005) and traditional performance programs are frequently heralded because they represent a particular strength of the North American music tradition (Deutsch, 2009; McCarthy, 2009). However, the elitism and exclusivity often associated with these programs has helped cause a rift in support from those quarters of humanity that feel left out of these musics (Bowman, 2005; Green, 2006; O'Toole, 1993-1994, 2005; Regelski, 1996, 2009). Stepping into this fissure, music education has advocated forms of musical expression that have previously been shunned and refused entrance to music curriculum such as multicultural music and music from popular cultures (Green, 2006, 2008). Yet, many of these musics become appropriated by the music education establishment to become formal studies, such as the manner in which jazz has arguably been transplanted from its once central place in popular culture to the region of autonomous artwork (DeVeaux, 1997; Eder, 1999; Gould, 2007). There are signs that popular music might fall prey to a similar ensnarement, as becoming evident in its curricular institutionalization in Sweden

and Finland (Björck, 2011; Georgii-Hemming & Westvall, 2010). In spite of this potential, I argue that popular music belongs in the school curriculum, in particular, in the middle school setting. While certainly not promoting the abolition of band and choir programs, I advocate for a reconceptualized curriculum in those areas that focus more upon the individual musical needs and interests of students, rather than to perpetuate reliance upon large ensemble playing that has little chance of carrying over to adult life (Jones, 2008).

The primary age group I base much of my ideas and practice upon is that found in typical middle schools, with the characteristic student ages from ages ten to fourteen. However, most of the concepts discussed in this paper revolve around more generalizable notions related to various kinds of music most Westernized people value, our youth in particular. I also strive to make aesthetic and cultural distinctions about what musics are considered of value in education, using the historically constructed paradigms of band and choir in the American and Canadian school systems as examples (Deutsch, 2009; Gould, 2012; Green & Vogan, 1991; Roberts, 2004). Of considerable importance is the higher aesthetic value placed upon the use of Western notation in Western music and, reflexively, our schools. This is reflected by the perpetuation of traditional band and choir programs in the school curriculum. Many music reformers in the past decade, particularly members of the MayDay Group, have examined the roots of music education through notions about cultural hegemony and the minority musics of dominance such as Western art music (McCarthy, 2009; Regelski, 2003).

Research in educational and community psychology (Abramo, 2008) has helped earn a new respect for our youth as thinking agents and has effected changes in research methods that involve, rather than exclude, young people in areas that directly concern them. An example of such an inclusive research method is YPAR or Youth Participatory Action Research (Langhout & Thomas, 2010). This method was employed in a study called *Music Matters* by Simon Fraser University researchers in my current middle school and it yielded important insights about music and dance, both inside and outside of school, that our youth value (O'Neill & Erickson, 2011). An important issue in this form of research is the frustration many young people experience when their ideas are heard but not listened to, as evidenced by the frequent inaction of highly ingrained,

institutionalized programs (Langhout & Thomas, 2010). While I argue that changes in music education curriculum are necessary to demonstrate that educators are indeed listening to and acting upon the needs of students (Price, 2006), the seemingly inflexible systems espousing prior practice over possible practice tends to trump the voices of our youth.

As a result, most music educators in Canada, America and the United Kingdom can anticipate further reactionary approaches to the significant decline of students choosing music as electives during high school, most notably in the area of band (Gouzouasis, Henrey, & Belliveau, 2008; Jones, 2008; Saunders, 2010). Opportunities for systemic change are stymied when typical music reform groups look to the past, rather than to the future, through benign forms of political activism. These groups, I argue, tread dangerously in areas of exploitation by usurping the rightful time for our students' musical and emotional needs by using it instead for the propagation of teachers' needs to maintain present practice and the status quo.

Michel Foucault's writings (1995) that parallel the organizational systems present in prisons, factories and educational institutions underscore many of the reasons why traditional music paradigms have thrived in our schools for as long as they have. While the concept of control as both a positive and negative element in education is discussed, pedagogical fluidity is necessary in music education due to the natural manner in which all genres of musicians use formal and informal learning methods in a way that is not to be construed as forced. The notion of "professional routinization" (Froehlich, 2007) is a useful reference for music educators who habitually use and promote limited or previously accepted ways of learning music with their students. A belief in the singularity of modalities in so-called multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1993, 1999) can potentially restrict how we teach and avail music to particular students at certain times. Gouzouasis and Bakan (2011) propose that music educators steer clear of reductionist explanations or dichotomizations, which prolong narrow and ill-advised understandings of our youth and their music. Rather than look at informal music learning as a discrete operation from formal music learning, we might instead strive to understand them in ways that are perceived as inclusive. Overton (1997, 1998, 2003a, 2004) suggests a method of "relational metatheory," which aspires to a unity in diverse conceptions of human identity and development through multiple "lines of sight" (Overton, 2003b). In varying ways and

at various times, informal learning methods may provide assistance for some by learning music by ear (Green, 2001, 2006, 2008a). However, at other times our youth might access the music they love through more formal, visual supports such as on-line performances and video lessons, as well as by using Western notation or alternative notational methods found in variations on Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Cipher Notation* and the wide-ranging instrumental tablatures on the Internet. While notation itself has been at the centre of music reform for centuries, as witnessed in the alternative methods of reading music proposed by Rousseau and Pierre Galin during the 18th and 19th centuries respectively, it is not seen to be an impediment to learning the wide-ranging music of preference for our youth. Although popular music is the music of preference for most middle school students in my classes, many have passionate interests in classical music, particularly piano music. As a result, intrinsic motivations to learn Western notation often arise.

Current information and communications technology (ICT) offers student-friendly variations to formal teaching methods by the availability of music lessons and performance videos that are readily available to our youth when they want it, ranging from popular to classical music. The current nature of young peoples' musical interests might range from casual to formal, deliberate to impulsive, mindful to flippant and social to private at any given moment (Finney, 2007). This might frustrate music educators or directors who value efficiency and hold expectations that their students remain on singular and observable tasks. The ease of access in information and communication technologies for students effectively displaces prior claims of the teacher as sole musical authority to other possible regions, both computer-generated and otherwise (S. & H. Giroux, 2011).

The student-centred philosophies advanced by Jean-Jacques Rousseau share many similarities with current personalized learning theories. I argue for their value in music education because they provide opportunity and development for student voice (Price, 2006), particularly in middle schools where many students report to have fewer opportunities than in elementary school (Midgely & Feldlaufer, 1987). While personalized learning strategies have been criticized for customizing education on a mass scale and promoting self-gratification (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2009), the continuation of teacher-focused music programs in a pluralist society is anachronistic. While any approach has

the potential to be misunderstood and, thereafter, misused, I contend that personalized learning provides a platform upon which mutual student and teacher power sharing can stand. For a music educator who is accustomed to being the one doing all the directing, this “podium sharing” might be a difficult concept to adopt. However, I argue that music education is in dire need of new approaches that embrace differences in student musical identities. One way to help do this is by including popular music performance in the middle school curriculum, where musical learning and understanding is based more upon sound, not theory. Therefore, “performance of music is both a site for implementation of pedagogy and an outcome of pedagogy” (Dunbar-Hall, 2009, p. 62).

By engaging youth in a wide range of musical and artistic activities, educators might allow for the discovery that those same differences among us might actually be a source of commonality, which is what I believe many of the musicians and dancers in the *Music Matters* research project did. By providing opportunities in the music classroom that involve longer projects such as this, and not just those that conveniently fit the bell schedule, our youth might find that school music serves their desire for emotional engagement, excellence, relatedness and purpose (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2009). The challenge ahead lies in attempting to bridge “the Great Divide” (Huysens, 1986) that post-modernism simultaneously helped to create and created to help; that of the need to fulfill one’s self while recognizing and acting upon one’s social obligations. In the forthcoming chapter, the idea that popular music, unlike art music, “is in a position to serve an ideal of a community rather than of individuality” (Subotik, 1991) might provide a starting point in traversing this chasm.

Chapter 1.

Popular Music, Musical Autonomy, and the Music Classroom

In American culture one particular musical sphere has been largely, almost completely, absent from music education in any serious, deliberate way. I am referring to the musics of popular culture, those musics most, rather than the least, chosen to be engaged with by the vast majority of America's populace. The musics most represented in American music education – Western classical music (including the literature of bands), songs from various folk traditions, material related to approaches such as Orff and Kodály, and fairly recently, jazz – are all distinctly minority musics, preferred by tiny percentages of people in this culture. *Bennett Reimer (2003, p. 194)*

Every way it turns, pop has its back against the classroom wall. The reason why people get ensnared in trying to argue that pop is a valuable art form, is that they are forced to argue it at every corner, and this in itself is an admission of guilt. Classical music communicates its own educational value and is thus assumed; pop has to face the judgment court in which the judge and jury are composed of classical music. *Lucy Green (1988, p. 110)*

Popular music presently maintains a marginal status in the music education community. Even more significant than this perhaps, attempts to excommunicate popular forms of musical expression from the musical consciousness have historically been successful within the confines of our inherited Western tradition. Yet, as the previous observations from both Reimer and Green indicate, popular music's presence is very much felt in education, whether or not it is genuinely acknowledged or welcomed. I shall endeavour to examine some of the fascinating convolutions that have historically taken place in regard to popular music. When using the informal learning methods of popular music in the classroom, it can be of great benefit but here popular music is too often approached using the traditional pedagogy associated with Western classical music (Green, 2001, 2006). I defend the notion that popular music deserves equal

opportunity and access to student expression in music education, not only because it is the democratic choice of most of citizens of the West but because, as Rose Subotnik (1991) contends, popular music “is in a position to serve an ideal of a community rather than of individuality” (p. 289). As a result of the autonomous artwork, especially prevalent in art music from the late eighteenth century and onwards, this concept of intense individualism in “serious” music is under rightful scrutiny (Tomlinson, 2003; Green, 1988, 2003b).

Presented in strong contrast to popular or “functional music,” autonomous music has been fashioned into something to be revered, promoting the active discrimination against its purported antithesis. Rose Subotnik (1987) suggests autonomous art’s “validity is suppose to inhere in the ability of a structure to carry out its own laws” and, often erroneously, is “assumed accessible to all people, on the basis of a common faculty of reason and human identity” (p. 362). In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, certain other values became inextricably associated with musical artworks: universality, eternity, complexity and originality (Regelski, 1996; Green, 2003b). The later “elevation” of modern jazz to the status of “autonomous art” can be seen as an act of cultural condescension only when jazz, largely created by Afro-Americans, entered the “concert hall” and was no longer entirely associated with popular or dance music (Eder, 1999).

Similarly, Martha Nussbaum (1997) observes that the major composers of modern art music were inspired by the popular music of jazz, despite the slandering of this “primitive” medium along racial lines. Early writings by Susanne Langer (1957) demonstrate a lack of respect for non-European examples of art, which was commensurate with many other writings by musicologists and critics since the eighteenth century. Langer’s assertion that Western composers express forms of art better than popular and non-Western musicians is not supported by the numerous instances of adoptions of musical forms taken directly from non-Western sources (Walker, 1984). In addition to this, many musicologists have involuntarily been inaccurate in the notational rendering of non-Western cultures (Gerson-Kiwi, 1967; Will, 1999).

This need to transcribe the music of the world through the limited analysis methods of Western musical notation has provoked numerous reactions from musicians

of all persuasions. The primacy placed upon “the work,” particularly as an autonomous, universal, eternal, complex and original art object, does not fit the mould of the vast majority of musical expressions found around the world. The moving of musical expression to the “outside” was of relatively recent origin, with deep roots in the writing of Immanuel Kant (Regelski, 1996; Tomlinson, 2003). Yet, many musicians, composers and educators to this very day hearken ancient Greek philosophy to cite a reason to elevate music above everyday life. Music, however, especially that of song to the Greeks, appeared fully immersed in the “everyday” and did not have a hallowed and separate position amongst their society. It is to these beginnings of Western music that I shall first turn.

In his book *Afterwords: Hellenism, Modernism, and the Myth of Decadence*, Louis Ruprecht notes this historical predisposition amongst intellectuals and artists to have their “own crucial myth of classical culture” (p. 238). Ruprecht, quoting William Arrowsmith’s *A Greek Theater of Ideas*, frames the debacle in the following way:

A tradition is, after all, like love; we “crystallize” it, endow it with the perfections it must have in order to justify our need and our love. And classical Greek culture has for some time stood in relation to modern culture as a measure of our fall from grace and innocence....To our modern dissonance, the Greeks play the role of old tonality, the abiding image of a great humanity. They are our lost power, lost wholeness, the pure presence and continuity of reality our culture has lost.

Against a need like this and a myth like this, argument may be futile. But we should not, I think, be allowed to mythologize unawares. If we first deprive classical culture of its true turbulence in order to make ourselves a myth of what we have lost, and then hedge that myth with false ritual, we are depriving ourselves of that community of interest and danger that makes the twentieth century true kin to the Greeks. We deprive ourselves, in short, of access to what the past can teach us in order to take only what we want. (p. 238)

This “false ritual” has been applied in the reification that autonomous music was then, and should continue to be now, something independent from daily life. Music was believed to be anything but this in ancient Greece. Music and word were intimately entwined to the extent that one could not exist without the other. I believe it is largely the result of Plato’s writings that music was adorned as an “outside entity,” mainly because of his advocacy of censorship of those musical modes deemed morally negative for

citizens (Grout & Palisca, 1988). Unfortunately, the ancient Greek musical examples from Plato's time, generally referred to as the "classical age" of around 450 to 325 B.C., did not survive. It is ironic that what we generically refer to now as "classical music," originated from a period in Western art music that consciously attempted to emulate Greek classical art and, thus, reinvigorate music by instilling "truth and beauty" again. Yet there was no known music to use as models for this.

Throughout the history of Western art, starting with the medieval and Renaissance periods, artists have had the advantage of studying or imitating models of Greek antiquity, as in sculpture and literature. Yet, this case cannot be made regarding the music of the ancient Greeks. According to Grout and Palisca (1988): "We do not know how this music sounded" (p. 9). Furthermore, musicians of the Middle Ages did not know a single example of Greek music, although several hymns were identified during the Renaissance period. Today approximately forty examples, although mostly in fragments, are known to exist. It is believed that many pieces of music passed on from the Greeks were destroyed or disallowed performance by the early church in the Middle Ages because of the pagan elements and their associations in the music (Grout & Palisca, 1988, pp. 2-3). Frank Humphreys, writing in 1896, provides this account:

One of the features which distinguishes the Christian religion from almost all others in its quietness; it aims to repress the outward signs of inward feeling. Savage instinct, and the religion of Greece also, had employed the rhythmic dance and all kinds of gesticulatory motions to express the inner feelings, some of them entirely unsuitable to purposes of worship. The early Christians discouraged all outward signs of excitement, and from the very beginning, in the music they used, reproduced the spirit of their religion - an inward quietude. All the music employed in their early services was vocal, and the rhythmic element and all gesticulations were forbidden. (p. 42)

Ironically, although the physical remains of the music were absent, the music was firmly imbedded in services of the early Christian church. Many of the musical modes of the Greeks, to which Plato referred in *The Republic*, established the roots of the liturgy of the early church. According to Martin West (2007), the "earliest example of Christian hymnody seems to spring entirely from native Greek musical tradition" (p. 1434). These musical traditions of the ancients that transferred into the Middle Ages survived, "if only for the reason that they could hardly have been abolished without

abolishing music itself” (Grout & Palisca, 1988, p. 3). Despite the early warnings in the writings of Plato and, later on, in those of Aristotle that many of these modes had deleterious influences upon one’s character, they were regularly set to the early Christian liturgy and chanted by the masses.

If Louis Ruprecht is correct that we, throughout Western history, have carried our own “myth of classical culture,” then there may be no genuine meaning inherent in generalizations often given to denote “Greek thought.” Statements, which imply a “universal knowledge” of what constituted Hellenic culture, might simply be made, as William Arrowsmith warns, “in order to justify our need.” Indeed, in areas of artistic control and censorship, these are crucial distinctions to be made. Ruprecht invokes Friedrich Nietzsche in *We Philologists*, who questions our real knowledge, if indeed any exists, of a high Greek culture: “To surpass Greek culture through our own achievement – that is the task. But to do that, it must first be known!” (p. 239).

Despite this unknowing of Greek culture, some musicologists have inferred a dualism in Greek musical culture. This is a good example of what Arrowsmith referred to as “justifying one’s own need.” Here is an excerpt from Paul Lang’s highly influential 1941 work *Music in Western Civilization*:

In our modern civilization, we are accustomed to speaking about musical art in a dual sense; we deal with popular or folk music and with “art” music. There is not enough material at our disposal to enable us to make this distinction in Greek music....We have no records, either, concerning the utilization of folkloristic elements in art music, a procedure which has refreshed and regenerated our music from the time of the troubadours to Stravinsky. There is no doubt that this music existed...but this whole phase of the antique world resembles a gigantic field of ruins, beautiful even in its decay, but of necessity incomplete. (p. 4)

In his 1934 book *Art as Experience*, John Dewey comments on the role of music in Athenian daily life. Unlike Lang, however, Dewey does not presume that a duality existed:

The idea would not have occurred to any one had art been remote from the interests of life. For the doctrine did not signify that art was a literal copying of objects, but that it reflected the emotions and ideas that are

associated with the chief institutions of social life. Plato felt this connection so strongly that it led him to his idea of the necessity of censorship of poets, dramatists, and musicians. Perhaps he exaggerated when he said that a change from the Doric to the Lydian mode in music would be the sure precursor of civic degeneration. But no contemporary would have doubted that music was an integral part of the ethos and the institutions of the community. The idea of “art for art’s sake” would not have even been understood. (pp. 7-8)

Dewey goes on to examine the shift in the close role the arts once played in daily life to that of “the compartmental conception of fine art” (p. 8) we have inherited due to the rise of modern industry and commerce:

Because of changes in industrial conditions the artist has been pushed to one side from the main streams of active interest. Industry has been mechanized and an artist cannot work mechanically for mass production. He is less integrated than formerly in the normal flow of social services....Put the action of all such forces together, and the conditions that create the gulf which exists generally between producer and consumer in modern society operate to create also a chasm between ordinary and esthetic experience. Finally, as the record of this chasm, accepted as if it were normal, the philosophies of art that locate it in a region inhabited by no other creature and that emphasize beyond all reason the merely contemplative character of the esthetic. (pp. 9-10)

Like Dewey, Thomas Regelski (1996) asserts that music was not “pushed to one side” in ancient Greece. Music “referred mainly to a type of ‘song’”...which was comprised of “poetry, rhythm and melody” (p. 27). The importance that song had and has to music is paramount, and will be examined in a later section of this chapter. For the purposes of the present writing, song was the summation of everything that was good about music. Purely instrumental music was not considered to be music in its fullest sense because it lacked poetry and both the rhythm and melody of speech. Song or music’s function was the “right action needed for good results in everyday living” (Regelski, p. 27).

I defend the belief that music was not dominated by musical dualism as most ascribe it to be. Just as Rose Subotnik (1991) extols the strength and vitality of popular music because it is “in a position to serve an ideal of a community rather than of individuality” (p. 289), so too was the song’s role in the ancient world.

Yet, this situation did not last. Martin West, in *Ancient Greek Music* (2007), gives a summary of the state of flux that Greek music was in during the course of seven centuries:

Towards the end of the sixth century [BC] certain musicians from the Argolid pioneered advances in musical theory and practice. The most notable was Lasus of Hermione, who wrote the first book about music and perhaps invented the word μουσική (music), now the property of the whole world. He introduced a new complexity and expressiveness and a new intellectualism into music, thus starting a process which was to lead to the so-called New Music of the later fifth century and the more intense theorizing about music practiced by men such as Damon and Eratocles. The New Music, characterized by modulation and multiplicity of notes, reached its culmination in Timotheus of Miletus (ca. 450 – ca. 360) and Philoxenus of Cythera (ca. 435 – ca. 380). This was an age of charismatic professional performers, virtuoso cithorodes and auletes.

Conservative critics like Plato and Aristoxenus deplored the New Music, but it was popular with the public; Timotheus remained a classic for centuries, his works often performed. The surviving musical documents down to the time of the Delphic Paeans (127 BC) show no major change of style. There is then a gap in our evidence. When further texts become available, in the first century AD, the situation has changed. Musical style has become less ambitious and elaborate; the diatonic genus has triumphed over the chromatic; different modes are favored; the interval of the fourth is of less importance than formerly. While the third, and the triad formed from conjunct thirds (*do-mi-sol* or *la-do-mi*), are more prominent. Some texts exhibit a florid style characterized by division of syllables between two or three notes and by melismatic ornament, but this is no longer the Timothean manner: a plain diatonic scale underlies it. (pp. 1433-1434)

West’s seven-hundred-year synopsis of Greek music is of particular importance to a certain notion alluded to in this chapter. It is that, despite the protestations of certain

well-known writers such as Plato and Aristoxenus towards the New Music, the music was “popular with the public” and “remained a classic.” Most Western musicians would likely find these statements highly incompatible. Could it be possible that the music was not dichotomized into “art music” and “popular music” and that there was, instead, a general or common understanding by the average person about what was being expressed in song or music? If the function of Greek music was, according to Johan Huizinga (1960), “purely social and ludic” (p. 162), why has it become such an exemplar of artistic distance and seriousness?

The rational application of Pythagorean mathematical explanations for sound phenomena was only one possible reason for this apparent shift. The possibility that music was of divine origin and possessed magical power led to many varying philosophical reflections in the ancient world. Pythagoras claimed that the universe was explicable through harmonies or the distance between notes (Walker, 1990, pp. 66-67). Here, Thomas Regelski (1996) explains:

The study of such harmonic theory was included in the general education or culture (*egkuklios paideia*) of the time and made music the only one of what we now call the Fine Arts to be studied in schools. From the first, then, music has been a pursuit of the leisure class that had definite intellectual and philosophical implications. But its inclusion in the “liberal arts” was as speculative mathematics or metaphysics, not as what we call Art. (p. 28)

One can instantly recognize the political charge of Regelski’s writing. A founding member of a leading group for action in music education reform, *MayDay*, Regelski has written numerous articles criticizing the dominant hierarchy of “classy” music programs in education. His tracing of the causation of this system bears close reading:

By the sixth century A.D., the metaphysics of Greek music theory were transmitted in terms that were to dominate for over a thousand years. Reason and analytic powers of the mind were stressed. Theory and theorists were seen as superior to musicians, who were seen instead as mere practitioners of the theoretical science. Nonetheless, "music theory" largely continued to serve the creation of music that was governed by praxial requirements that, in turn, served as criteria of its "goodness" and controlled its development. (p. 28)

Regelski is one of a number of contemporary music educators, including David Elliott, who advocates general, not individual, praxial concerns as the primary reason for music making in any society. Additionally, Regelski perceives the history of Western music and, by default, its education system to be one of cultural domination by an elite minority group:

What today is called "music history," then, is almost entirely a chronicle of the musical praxis of the privileged leisure class or clerics....The term "musicology" having been institutionally pre-empted for typifying the study of "classy" music, it remained for the institutionalization of "ethnomusicology" to legitimate the study of indigenous and vernacular musics. Today such music is studied from the perspectives of "popular culture," anthropology, social history, ethnic studies and the like, but not as Art music. (p. 28)

In the article *Musicology, Anthropology, History* by Gary Tomlinson (2003), this branch of study "musicology" is further critiqued when it attempts to discriminate, in the negative sense of that word, between oral and written traditions of music:

Music scholarship assays a performative mode akin to the anthropologist's orality; at the same time it moves in the medium of writing naturalized in historiography but uneasily wedded, as a means at odds with its sources, to ethnography. Moreover, music itself was at the moment of musicology's appearance being refashioned in a manner that set it in opposition to the voices behind ethnography. It was assuming a place in European ideology that would eventually exalt it, ally it more tightly with the written than ever before, and distance it from related non-European activities that an earlier, more ecumenical designation had embraced. (p. 32)

This notion that musicology might have promoted unity and understanding in European and non-European musics, rather than elevate written “art” music over those stemming from oral traditions, is saddening. Tomlinson continues:

Musicology – the very name incorporates a word that came, across the European eighteenth century, to betoken a “fine” art at the center of new aesthetic concerns and that designated, by the midnineteenth century, the *finest* art, the art to whose transcendental, spiritual capacities all others looked with envy. Across the century from 1750 to 1850, music lodged itself at the heart of a discourse that pried Europe and its histories apart from non-European lives and cultures. Perched at the apex of the new aesthetics, it came to function as a kind of limit-case of European uniqueness in world history and an affirmation of the gap, within the cultural formation of modernity, between history and anthropology. Music, in this sense, silenced many non-European activities that it might instead have attended to. (p. 32)

Given the eventual “Westerly” direction in which the study of musicology later went, it was perhaps inevitable that Western song became divorced from Art because it shared commonalities with similar musical expression from other non-European countries. European song, not yet divided into popular or art camps, actually contained some functional, and not purely aesthetic, properties in the society from which it came. Alas, by our modern conception, there must not be a general function to be art. Yet, vocal music *was* art at that time. “What the eighteenth-century theorists had in mind...when they baptized ‘music’ Art was always, essentially, music that accompanied a text” (Kivy, 1991, p. 545).

It is fascinating to learn that, throughout the centuries leading up to the beginning of the eighteenth century, it was instrumental music that had connotations with “low society,” primarily because it was the source of many secular dances, as well as retaining its negative historical connection with pagan cult ritual practice when renounced for use in music of the early Christian church (Grout & Palisca, 1988, p. 25).

Immanuel Kant, in his *Critique of Judgement*, cited that music had no intrinsic meaning, and was classed along non-representational objects with a non-definite concept or “free beauties.” Kant declares in §16: “We may also rank in the same class what in music are called fantasias (without a theme), and, indeed, all music that is not set to words” (p. 60). Later, in § 53 of the *Critique*, Kant ranks music the lowest of the fine arts, because it merely played with sensations:

Music advances from sensations to indefinite ideas: formative art from definite ideas to sensations. The latter gives a lasting impression, the former one that is only fleeting. The former sensations imagination can recall and agreeably entertain itself with, while the latter either vanish entirely, or else, if involuntarily repeated by the imagination, are more annoying to us than agreeable. Over and above all this, music has a certain lack of urbanity about it. For owing chiefly to the character of its instruments, it scatters its influence abroad to an uncalled-for extent (through the neighbourhood), and thus, as it were, becomes obtrusive and deprives others, outside the musical circle, of their freedom. This is a thing that the arts that address themselves to the eye do not do, for if one is not disposed to give admittance to their impressions, one has only to look the other way. (p. 158)

Here, Kant makes an important statement that has serious implications for any music, whether containing words or not and whether popular or art music. There appears now to be the pronounced concept that music, indeed all Western art, should be a private affair. If one disapproves of the sound musicians are making, it is well within the rights of the individual freedom of a person to expect this to stop. It is difficult to imagine this occurring within a culture that includes music as a generally held ideal that serves the community, as Rose Subotnik (1991) articulated earlier. Stuart Richmond (2004) notes, in his article *Remembering Beauty: Reflections on Kant and Cartier-Bresson for Aspiring Photographers*, that Kant’s analysis of free beauty “succeeds as it stands only by losing touch with life” (p. 82). In the Kantian world, musical expression

was something to be held inside, close to one's chest, and not be included in the outside community:

The case is almost on a par with the practice of regaling oneself with a perfume that exhales its odours far and wide. The man who pulls his perfumed handkerchief from his pocket gives a treat to all around whether they like it or not, and compels them, if they want to breathe at all, to be parties to the enjoyment, and so the habit has gone out of fashion. ¹⁸

¹⁸ Those who have recommended the singing of hymns at family prayers have forgotten the amount of annoyance which they give to the general public by such noisy (and, as a rule, for that very reason, pharisaical) worship, for they compel their neighbours either to join in the singing or else abandon their meditations. (p. 158)

The previous passages from Kant in § 53 could certainly be used as a defense for those members of contemporary society who consult noise bylaws when neighbourhood garage bands practice. Yet, this development in Western thinking has undoubtedly helped in moving all music from a public to an individual sphere. As Martha Nussbaum (1997) notes in *Cultivating Humanity*, "The concept of the musical artwork that organizes our practices of concertgoing is in fact of relatively recent origin, even in the West; and yet this fact is far from widely recognized" (p. 120).

The concert hall or, as Lydia Goehr refers to it in her book of the same name, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*, has become an insular place of privilege of the leisure classes in Western society, where autonomous, instrumental music was a cultural commodity of high society. Goehr (1992) cites this example from the eighteenth century writer and composer E.T.A. Hoffman:

When E.T.A. Hoffman had his fictional character Kapellmeister Johannes Kreisler quote an ancient law prohibiting 'noisy labourers from living next to educated gentlemen', he had a single purpose in mind. He wanted to know why 'poor oppressed composers' of his day (the early 1800s), who had to 'sell their inspirations for a price', were unable to make use of this law and 'banish themselves from the neighbourhood of windbags and

bores'. Following a description of how Kreisler managed to get the better of a certain party of such windbags and bores, Hoffman suggested that honest musicians should no longer be tortured by the extra-musical demands of social, domestic, and mundane rituals. (p. 1)

This section from Hoffman demonstrates the closed nature of the composer that was no longer part of the fabric of society. The composer was now an "Individual" and wrote music that reflected this new autonomy allowed for musical Art. Throughout all stages of developments in the past two-and-a-half centuries of Western art music was the expectation that the composer continue to be bent upon originality, complexity, perceived universality and eternity. This, however, became a liability to the contemporary composers of the twentieth century when an audience, once there, was lost as a result of their idiosyncratic music.

In her book *Developing Variations: Style and Ideology in Western Music*, Rose Subotnik (1991) contends that popular music has unashamedly both maintained and expanded its functionality to the majority of society, which is an area deemed aesthetically poor for most creators of autonomous art music:

Contemporary popular music, which requires no exclusive place, time, or occasion for its existence, has redefined the relation of music and society so as to insinuate itself into every space and activity that defines a day in the life of the modern American....Popular music has created such a powerful sense of need for itself that it regularly uses every aspect of the existing public landscape – concert hall, nightclub, sports stadium, park – to capitalize on more traditional notions of musical occasion as well. (p. 286)

Subotnik asserts that contemporary art music, unlike popular music, "is handicapped by its perceived inability to provide the kind of vital connection that links a society to the music of its own culture" (p. 286). The case of jazz, once considered America's popular music, is a case in point. Jazz music was vitally connected to the fabric of American nightlife, dancing, recordings, radio and movies. For a short time,

despite the fact that the primary creators of this music were from a minority group of Afro-Americans, jazz was, according to the great musician and historian Gunther Schuller (1996), "America's popular music" from 1935-1945 (p. 219). Only when it began entering the concert hall as "swing" in the late nineteen-thirties did it begin its evolution into a more highly individualized form of expression, similar to art music. It is interesting to note that when Benny "The King of Swing" Goodman played the first jazz concert "proper" in Carnegie Hall on January 16th, 1938, music critic Bruce Eder (1999) remarked it was "considered the single most important jazz or popular music concert in history: jazz's "coming out" party to the world of "respectable" music, held right in that throne room of musical respectability." Ironically, in an interview I once heard, Duke Ellington remarked that, "Swing was dead by nineteen-thirty-eight. Jazz is music; swing is business."

Later in the mid-nineteen forties, when larger jazz orchestras scaled down and "be-bop" came on the scene, musicians tended to solo extensively even more than before, often playing with music that sometimes consisted structurally of little more than a "head" or theme at the beginning and end of the piece. Duke Ellington, in a 1954 interview in *Look Magazine*, had this to say about it: "Playing "Bop" is like playing Scrabble with all the vowels missing." Scott DeVeaux, in his book *The Birth Of Bebop: A Social and Musical History*, mistakenly pronounced a retroactive aesthetic for jazz as an autonomous music that the ever-idiosyncratic bebop helped usher in. "In its wake, all of jazz must be properly understood as an autonomous art, governed by its own laws and judgeable only by its own criteria" (p. 443). DeVeaux's view of autonomy does not account for the social function that jazz had in the overall society. Even Theodor Adorno, though an avowed despiser of popular forms of expression, had a closer idea of what

popular music meant. In her article *Why 'Ideology' is Still Relevant for Critical Thinking in Music Education*, Lucy Green (2003b) makes the observation:

But his (*Adorno's*) concept of autonomy does not necessarily tally with the way the concept is often used by other writers, for he added another aspect: that the truly valuable, autonomous piece of music *does* have a close relationship to the society from which it comes, because it in some way replicates and reveals the forms and processes of that society through parallels in the ways that the musical forms and processes are organized. (p. 7)

Until the popular music of jazz met with the approval of members of the art music community by being “knighted” with musical legitimacy in the late nineteen-thirties, jazz was mainly ignored by musicologists and educators alike. In her book *Cultivating Humanity*, Martha Nussbaum (1997) relates her experiences of this situation in her musical education:

No music teacher among the many with whom I studied piano and voice mentioned jazz, and I hardly heard it until I was in my twenties, although it was a major source of more or less all the modern classical music (by Copland, Ravel, Bernstein, Poulenc) that I did play and sing. (p. 152)

Nussbaum gives a marvellous case for the manner in which both popular and non-European forms of music have been degraded and denounced by the art music establishment. Nussbaum further proclaims that:

Cultural insularity and stereotyping exist in the field of music. It is difficult today to find a major twentieth-century composer who does not owe a considerable debt to jazz. Gershwin, Copland, Bernstein, Dvořák, Ravel, Poulenc, Stravinsky, and many others were exhilarated by the rhythmic sophistication and vitality of African and African-American work. In the minds of these creative musicians, and many conductors and musicians as well, there was nothing “primitive” and “natural” about African-American music: it was work of tremendous sophistication, which challenged the resources of traditional notation and of the traditional ways of playing instruments. This sophistication was less apparent to early scholars and musicologists, who continued, without serious inquiry, to speak of the “primitive” character of jazz, and of the African music that

appeared to lie behind it. In 1959, the publication of A.M. Jones's authoritative *African Music* showed the inaccuracy of such descriptions; his work was followed by Gunther Schuller's analytic history *Early Jazz*, which discusses extensively the relationship between the rhythmic, harmonic, and melodic properties of jazz and those of the African music that might plausibly be connected with it. (pp. 162-163)

Referring to Igor Stravinsky, Robert Walker (1984) explains that the composer came into contact with "the vibrant and virile popular music from North America" and "found his sensibilities so affected that he incorporated some popular rhythms into his compositions" (p. 71). In *Music Education: Tradition and Innovation*, Walker quotes Eric White's biography *Stravinsky* and, regarding the composition *Ragtime*, he claims that Stravinsky wished to:

... produce a composite portrait of the new popular dance music that had just emerged from North America giving it an importance of a concert piece, as in the past composers had done for the minuet, waltz, mazurka and so on. (p. 71)

Although to me, not many of Stravinsky's pieces that incorporated Afro-American rhythms succeeded very well, at least he paid credit to his sources. *Ragtime* aside, even the later piece in which Stravinsky attempted the stylistic use of "swing" in his *Ebony Concerto*, written for the clarinetist Woody Herman, does not "swing" in the least. Unfortunately some composers, in both popular and art music, do not respect certain "other" forms of music enough to leave them to those who render them much more authentically and tastefully. In his article *Popular Music and the Intolerant Classroom*, Yaroslav Senyshyn (2004) notes this tendency to exalt a popular form of expression by raising it into the hallowed ranks of art music:

As time went on and people lost these unnecessary associations and stylistic categorizations, and music was no longer guilty, as it were, of its popular and populist associations, the music became 'good' music and moved from the popular category to the 'serious' or 'classical' category.

We can see this sort of 'evolution' of music, from popular dance music to the 'classical' in more recent examples, such as found in the aesthetic 'apotheosis' of the Viennese, Strauss waltzes. Instead of dancing to them...people are more inclined to sit at dining tables or concert seats during their performances. (p. 115)

Robert Walker (1984) defends this "apotheosis" that occurs so frequently in art music composition by claiming that:

Stravinsky was employing the time-honoured device of transmuting sounds from popular music into serious artwork. Composers who have done this are legion: The Renaissance polyphonists in their great masses and the symphonists in their sonata structures are two great categories where this has occurred extensively, and Stravinsky makes the point that he is doing no more than they did in the use of the minuet in the eighteenth century. (p. 71)

Returning again to Nussbaum (1997), I shall quote her at length because she so clearly elucidates both the social and musical elements at play in the cultural derogation of African music, which was so firmly imbricated in jazz music:

(*Gunther*) Schuller describes the difficulty Western musicologists had in even notating African music, when they first began to do fieldwork in Africa. Before the fieldwork of Jones (an Englishman who had lived most of his life in Africa), the expectation of visiting scholars was that they would encounter "primitive" musical forms. But European-trained musical ears, accustomed to hearing all voices strike together on a downbeat, proved unable to notate correctly the complicated polyphonies of African ensemble music, in which often each of the twelve or more voices will go its separate way, weaving and interweaving. Reconstructions based on the flawed notation seemed to Africans laughably crude. Nor could European ears catch the small rhythmic differences that were crucial to the correct notation of African song, as intervals of a twelfth of a second or less were routinely deployed by the African performer. European music did not operate with such small rhythmic intervals, so European-trained notators made errors.

This humbling experience showed European musicologists that the label "primitive" was a misnomer, and that they were dealing with great sophistication, though not the type of sophistication to which they were accustomed. (Schuller suggests, plausibly, that the downbeat structure of ragtime was black musicians' effort to simplify African rhythmic traditions for Western ears, and that it was only in the 1950s, for audiences by then more sophisticated in jazz listening, that the free-voice movements

characteristic of African traditions could be successfully reintroduced into jazz.) Nonetheless, in the popular mind, the image of the Negro as a pulsating musical animal, in touch with the earth and with “primitive energies” derived from nature, persisted and flourished, as it persists to this very day, untouched by musical reality. (pp. 163-164)

The early days of rock music accurately reflect this observation by Nussbaum. The rhythm and blues that gradually became rock ‘n’ roll was similarly racially derided and musically ridiculed. Although black musicians were gradually supplanted by whites, often with lesser musical abilities, the label of “nigger music” was commonly given to rhythmically syncopated popular music, as it was for jazz music. Since this dichotomy between black and white is no longer quite so distinct in popular music, there appears to be a great deal more acceptance by the general North American population that popular music is a legitimate form of music, as writers and musicologists have noted over the years (Bennett, 2000; Frith, 1978, 1983, 1987, 1996, 2007; Middleton, 1990). Nussbaum offers this plausible rationale for why predominantly white American culture might have its fear in the acceptance of “otherness”:

As is common in the history of mythology, a culture expresses its own sense or value by imagining a distant land that contains the opposite of everything that is prized. Ancient Greeks imagined hypothetical barbarian lands where women ruled, or wantonness ran riot...Likewise, the Africa imagined by Americans was an inversion of Puritan values, and Puritan America defined its worth by contrasting itself with the hypothetical bestial other. (p. 153)

One can note this reticence to accept cultural difference and expression in the early writings of Susanne Langer. In her book *Philosophy in a New Key* (1957), note the ease with which Langer equates African music with “emotional catharsis” and not expressions of art:

We have more need of, and respect for, so-called “pure music” than ancient cultures seem to have had; yet our counterpoints and harmonic

involutions have nothing like the expressive abandon of the Indian “Ki-yi” and “How-how,” the wailing primitive dirge, the wild syncopated shouts of African tribesmen. *Sheer self-expression requires no artistic form.* A lynching-party howling round the gallows-tree, a woman wringing her hands over a sick child, a lover who has just rescued his sweetheart in an accident and stands trembling, sweating, and perhaps laughing or crying with emotion, is giving vent to intense feelings; but such scenes are not occasions for music, least of all for composing. (p. 216)

Langer’s writings indicate the dismissive attitude towards non-European art forms that prevailed in the educational community. Her misapplication of the word “primitive” is precisely what Nussbaum alerted us to earlier. Langer is among a host of other not-yet-humbled Western philosophers of art who lack the ability to discern the rhythmic sophistication of African music. By valuing a cultural artistic expression as little as Langer does by then segueing directly into an equation with a lynching party is callous, if not verging upon racist. This indiscretion aside, Langer’s early philosophy of music was concerned with the formal articulation of “subtle complexes of feelings” (p. 222).

Langer considers Aboriginal and African music to be simple expressions or emotional outbursts, resulting from “temporary feelings.” Yet, a Western composer “knows the forms of emotion and can handle them, ‘compose’ them. We do not ‘compose’ our exclamations and jitters” (p. 222). Langer then quotes the composer, performer and philosopher Ferruccio Busoni to lend support regarding the “psychical distance” she proposes is necessary for and proper to Western composition:

Just as an artist, if he is to move his audience, must never be moved himself – lest he lose, at that moment, his mastery over the material – so the auditor who wants to get the full operative effect must never regard it as real, if his artistic appreciation is not to be degraded to mere human sympathy. (p. 223)

Langer develops her premise further that it is by means of musical form that we find a symbolic carrier of human affect: “Because the forms of human feeling are much

more congruent with musical forms than with the forms of language, music can *reveal* the nature of feelings with a detail and truth that language cannot approach” (p. 235).

Yet Langer cannot look to Busoni for complete support in all areas of musical aesthetics, particularly when it comes to the elevation of form over feeling. In the very same work that Langer looked to Busoni for her own credibility, *Sketch of A New Esthetic of Music*, he expresses a very different opinion about Western music’s adherence to using standard musical forms in composition:

This sort of music ought rather to be called the “architectonic,” or “symmetric,” or “sectional,” and derives from the circumstance that certain composers poured *their* spirit and *their* emotion into just this mould as lying nearest them or their time. Our lawgivers have identified the spirit and emotion, the individuality of these composers and their time, with “symmetric” music, and finally, being powerless to recreate either the spirit, or the emotion, or the time, have retained the Form as a symbol, and made it into a fetish, a religion. (p. 78)

Clearly, Busoni understood the artistic debacle of so-called formless emotion in the “untrained” musician and emotionless form found in many an academic composer.

Antonio Gramsci makes this observation in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*:

The popular element “feels” but does not always know or understand; the intellectual element “knows” but does not always understand, and in particular does not always feel.... The intellectual’s error consists in believing that one can know without understanding and even more without feeling. (p. 418)

Busoni, like Gramsci, appears to hold sympathy with an aesthetic that would easily embrace popular and “world” music, especially given the lack of a musical score or even “charts” for most of these orally transmitted “musics.” Busoni remarked that “every notation is in itself the transcription of an abstract idea. The instant the pen seizes it, the idea loses its original form” (p. 85). So the understanding of original musical or

artistic impulses from popular or “world” musicians would likely fit well with him. These articulations, arguably, come in a pure and free elemental form. However, there is no way of proving that some other form of mediation did not occur as a lightning fast afterthought; an example of a non-notated form of music losing its original form.

This, of course, becomes problematic when popular and “world” musics use their own kinds of formal structures or “moulds” into which artists pour their emotions. However, it is questionable if the elements of interpretation and performance come more greatly into play when discussing any music of an oral tradition. This discussion, however, is beyond the scope of this dissertation and might be of interest to pursue at a later time.

Theodor Adorno had great distrust of purveyors of oral and popular music traditions in society. To return to the earlier discussion about autonomy and ideology, Lucy Green makes some important observations about Adorno in her article *Why ‘Ideology’ is Still Relevant for Critical Thinking in Music Education*. Green (2003b) expresses admiration for Adorno’s analytical method and claims to respect his writing because it was grounded in “actual concrete pieces of music” (p. 11). However, one of Green’s main criticisms of Adorno is that “he often grounded his critiques in his own, highly abstract notions or uses of music” (p. 11). This is one of the keys to why I believe that popular music should be both equally accessible and allowable in general music for study in school, particularly during adolescence. It should not be a continued source of shame for educators who wish to teach it or include it. Popular music should especially not be something for students to feel lesser about themselves because, outside of school, it might be a daily source of extreme pleasure and inspiration in their lives. The

idea that any non-art music could be of possible worth to anyone's life apparently never dawned on Adorno. Green explains:

He made a lot of assumptions about what people 'got out' of music, what they thought about it, what effects it had upon them, and how they used it, without ever actually asking either listeners or musicians about their experiences or about what the music 'meant' to them, and without ever observing them using music. He himself was disdainful of any idea that it was worth asking people such questions or observing their behaviour, since, according to him, people were already so ideologically influenced that they did not know what they thought, and anything they did think or do would anyway be ideological. But if looked at another way, we can see that in order to find out something about the *content* of ideology, it makes sense to ask people what they think or to observe what people do, before we leap to any assumptions. (p. 11)

In her book *How Pop Musicians Learn*, Lucy Green (2001) did just what she criticized Adorno for not doing; she asked questions of musicians, students and teachers living in and around London, UK. Here are some responses that teachers gave to the question: 'Do you teach classical music?':

Yes. It is part of our heritage. It contains valuable musical elements. It is essential for public examinations.

Yes. The heritage should be presented before young people since the opportunity would not otherwise exist. Seeds sown now may well bear fruit in later years.

Yes. It offers the widest field of musical discovery – affords the greatest satisfaction to sing, play and listen to. Any musician worth his/her salt must pass on the source of his/her lifetime enjoyment in the hope that others will derive the same pleasure from it.

Of course! The reasons should be obvious: basic grounding; techniques; standard background to any other musical developments.

Yes in so far as 'classical' = expressive, and in so far as it is an art form, and is the style of music that a) requires the greatest concentration and b) requires the greatest explanation and c) requires the greatest sensitivity. (pp. 138-139)

The following are selected teacher responses when asked: 'Do you teach popular music?':

No. The pupils seem sufficiently saturated in this cultural area to warrant its exclusion from the curriculum.

No. Most teenagers surround themselves with pop music 24 hours a day. Music lessons give the opportunity to show other music exists. (p. 138)

This notion of asking students about their artistic experiences and what they meant in their lives was something I never considered for all my years as a formal music teacher. As I will discuss towards the end of this dissertation in greater detail, for many years I really believed that it was quite fair and sufficient to choose music for all students in my general music class, believing this method to be the "most valid" because the music was released within a reasonably recent time period of the class and was perceived by me as music that was perceived familiar with a majority of my students. However, it was through class discussions and anonymous course evaluations that have become a regular part of my teaching over the past five years that I realized how I never *really listened* in any tangible depth to my students before that time. As a result, the frustrations that so many students feel about lack of opportunities to both sing and dance, nearly all of them females, have brought about a recent change in my classes. Now, expression through both dance and music can be a choice for my students, thanks to some music composition software and the ability to utilize two large spaces in which dance can regularly take place in a room directly next door to the music room. It also "helps" that art and drama were recently cut from our curriculum by a previous administrator and our new school administrator is supportive of any and all attempts by teachers to try to make up for this shortfall in the arts.

This stands in stark contrast from my own music classes in Columbus, North Dakota at the same age as my current students. My fellow students and I sat individually in desks, lined in rows, listening to various kinds of music for two years. We were told what to listen for and what was worthwhile listening to. This rarely included the music that the students listened to, unless, of course, it was certain pieces by The Beatles. The reason for this was because the music teacher liked them but he made sure to mention that he liked the band because The Beatles had many of the features of classical music in their music. As a result, *Yesterday* and *Eleanor Rigby* were named as “popular music exemplars” because the former used a string quartet and a doubled quartet was employed in the latter composition. Graham Vulliamy (1977) noted that The Beatles “became the candidates for legitimation amongst pop intellectuals” (p. 194) because their music’s harmonic structure was akin to many elements found in classical music. However, these music critics neglected or were unable to recognize the Afro-American traditions and other qualities in their music that moved the vast majority of Beatle fans that were musically untutored (p. 194). So, in spite of the fact that popular and other vernacular music began appearing more and more in music education during the last thirty years, the basis of any music’s real worth in school was usually based upon Western art music models. In her article *Musical Meaning and Social Reproduction*, Lucy Green (2005) explains the dilemma this way, in that:

Teachers still tended to operate within an aesthetic of classical musical autonomy, only they referred this aesthetic to a wider range of musics. So popular musics, jazz, and ‘world’ musics were assumed to have some amount of autonomy, universality, eternity and the capacity to express the human condition, especially in their ability to cross cultural boundaries. Such a position therefore appeared to place equal value on a wider range of musics, whilst actually continuing to uphold an aesthetic position that was fundamentally derived from classical paradigms, and was not necessarily applicable to most of these ‘other’ musics in the world outside the school. (p. 86)

One can hardly blame music teachers with any deserved hostility for this predicament, for the students that have historically been accepted into music teaching programs are generally required to have a background in classical music. Regelski (2005) points out that:

Unlike teachers of most other subjects, music teachers are *practitioners*. The 'subject' they teach is, outside of school, a widespread *praxis* that is an important part of popular culture and of culture....To become qualified to teach, music teachers are thus expected to become musicians and musical studies consume the preponderance of their teacher preparation. These studies typically take place in a university setting dedicated to producing professional musicians and scholars. While musics other than Classical may sometimes be addressed, such studies and their influence are still minor in comparison to the conservatory model that dominates studio and ensemble instruction. (p. 8)

In addition to countless hours practicing technique and "jury pieces," music practitioners also are also devoted to Western music history and analysis. In their article *The Roles of Reflective Practice and Foundational Disciplines in Teacher Education*, Allan MacKinnon and Gaalen Erickson (1992) state: "At the heart of program discussion lies the perennially awkward problem of determining what is foundational to teacher education" (p. 192). Discussing the typical foundations in traditional music education programs, David Elliott (2005) explains:

Unfortunately, Western music academies and school music programs today tend to privilege the design dimension of musical works to the exclusion of all others. This is so because Western music schools are products of Enlightenment beliefs that put scientific understanding above all other forms of knowing. Thus, music teachers are trained to teach students to listen to, 'analyze' (and thereby 'understand') music by breaking pieces down into sections and 'elements' (melody, harmony and so forth). Of course, this longstanding, pseudo-scientific approach to musical works also serves to privilege Western European 'fine art' music in the school music curriculum. (p. 93)

If blame is to be levied, it is to the learning outcome-obsessed standards, too often concocted reproductively by curriculum “developers” in government education ministries and by school district arts administrators. As an example of the problem of Western classical standards being applied to other musics in our schools, as described earlier by Green and Elliott, one can look to the current British Columbia government’s prescribed learning outcomes for Grade 10 guitar, revised in 2005. Referred to as “Required Program Model Content,” the class “must reincorporate the following content within the delivery of the prescribed learning outcomes” (p. 10). In addition to demonstrating “technical competence” and particular “performance applications,” grade 10 guitar students must also show “music literacy.” Since most contemporary guitarists learning outside of the school system use non-Western notations such as guitar tablature, chord charts or, more often than not, by ear or on a video tutorial on YouTube, directives such as these are quite simply out of touch with present musical practice in our youth.

As an example of this, in a 2011 Rolling Stone video interview by Eric Helden and Matthew Murphy with singer and guitarist Chris Cornell of Soundgarden and Audioslave, Cornell relates how he often learns new songs:

A lot of the time for fun, I’ll just be sitting around with a computer and just playing guitar and singing songs and just something will strike me to look up a song and, you know, almost anything that I can think of, that anyone could think of, you’re going to find on YouTube or somewhere online, somebody either performing it or actually showing you how to play it.

Because so many of our students come into the music classroom having access to and familiarity with the many music sites in the Internet, it is little wonder why they consider most music classes anachronistic when many teachers, sworn to uphold

Integrated Resource Package (I.R.P.) learning outcomes at all costs, don't seem to care what their students are already doing outside of school to nurture their love for music. Nowhere in the "new" 2010 Kindergarten – Grade 7 B.C. curriculum is the use of technology mentioned, other than in dead-last place behind performance and notation when referring to student representations of compositions. Yet, technology is not listed as a resource for learning performance techniques or alternate notation that our students have access to at home and with their friends. Perhaps music educators feel they might soon find themselves without a job if they encourage "virtual teachers" but it seems presumptuous that any music teacher could believe he or she knew something about *everything* musical. Whatever the reasons for this persistence in maintaining the focus upon the teacher/director and the preoccupation with standard notation, when other forms are often more compelling for our students, these limiting practices in music education continue to join in the burgeoning chorus of the profession's dirge. While Regelski and Elliott previously proposed that the over-abundance of Western classically trained teachers in music education led naturally to the Western model being presupposed, more general music teachers are desperately needed who both understand and respect other methods of learning music outside of the institution.

Regelski (2012) warns that:

Music teachers may easily succumb to the notion that the music of school music—the 'good music' with which the music teacher is most familiar and competent—is somehow special, or is more valuable than the music in the larger music world outside of school, and it is thus addressed to the exclusion of other musics. (p. 12)

By our ignorance as music educators and our arrogance simply as human beings in maintaining the status quo, Regelski cautions that:

Such intentional distancing of the supposedly 'special' world of school music from musics that are common outside the school risks a sense of irrelevance that threatens the existence of school music—an irrelevance that, in failing to provide the pragmatic benefits for which the profession exists, raises ethical challenges. (p. 12)

While Regelski has edited a special issue on ethics and social justice in the online journal *Action, Theory and Criticism for Music Education* (2007), so have other music philosophers taken on these subjects, notably the special issue of the *Music Education Research* journal in 2007 and the Canadian Music Educators Association 2009 publication *Exploring Social Justice: How Music Might Matter*. As a consequence, the surge of interest in the ethical responsibilities of music educators in recent years from the perspective of social justice is very much implanted and at play in this paper. The Western music stranglehold that currently presides over curriculum planning is a worthy cause for alarm, particularly when the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the students that many of us teach are incredibly diverse. The homogenous learning outcomes found in the B.C. curriculum guide, most commonly referred to as the I.R.P., rarely accommodate both non-Western students and those not steeped in the Western classical tradition. Elizabeth Gould (2007) poses the problem this way:

Others, other musics, other students, are depicted in one of two ways in music education discourse: as worthy but needy or worthy and similar, hence not dangerous. In the first case, they require our intervention so they may be included, become part of our curricula or classrooms. In the second, they are co-opted and used to further our original goals of bringing (our) music to every student - through other music that is institutionalized to become our music: jazz, for instance. (pp. 237-238)

As an example, the very first learning outcome listed for Grade 10 guitar British Columbia I.R.P. demonstrates the inherited Western bias towards standard notation;

itself a distinct element of classical music traditions and firmly imbedded in music education practices. It reads:

- music theory (e.g., notation and terminology used in the performance repertoire; note reading to the fifth fret of the fretboard; ability to write all major, pentatonic, and blues scales as well as major/minor intervals to one octave). (p. 15)

American arts educator Philip Taylor (2006), in a strident paper that urgently addresses the dangers of a narrow focus and unflinching adherence to learning outcomes in arts education, believes that “inevitably a dehumanizing process is at work here” and “wonders how an arts curriculum can ever privilege aesthetic processes committed to sustained and probing exploration of the human condition” (p. xix). Taylor further laments: “This obsession with outcomes paralyzes arts educators from activating their classrooms as sites for critical thinking” (p. xix).

The distinct disadvantage this gives to teachers destined to lead a general music class in a contemporary multicultural educational setting is alarming. In the current term for my middle school music classes, I have students with musical traditions harkening from Korea, India, China, the Philippines, Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Russia, Poland, Nigeria, and Hungary. While it is foolish to think that any prior music education training could possibly address any or all of these traditions in any real depth or with sincere respect, the conservatory’s strict focus upon formal pedagogy in teaching music in most modern, urban settings is not only anachronistic but crippling to a future music teacher’s possibility for achieving any success.

It is not sufficient to include “token” musics from popular or other cultures in our music classes, as Lucy Green (2008a) isolates this as a general movement in Western

music education from the 1970's up to the present time. Green contends that attempts to "teach" these musics through formal education have only continued to distance the existing musical identities of many of our students. "World music" in the curriculum, to Green, "by its very nature...tends to involve musical styles which are largely unfamiliar to most pupils" (p. 13). Regelski (2005) surmises that in "music education,...the postmodern spirit of pluralism and multiculturalism did lead to an inconsequential insertion of 'world musics' in the school and university curriculum, but this has clearly amounted more to lip service than a groundswell of curricular change or innovation" (p. 10).

Not only are most students not familiar with the authentic realization of "world" music, rarely are their teachers conversant with these musics. For a short period during the earlier days of my fulltime middle school music teaching, I embraced teaching Ghanaian music in my classes, partly because the music teacher that had previously taught in my school had left with scores of instruments, sadly with the permission of the remaining school administration. I had to use many of my own percussion instruments in combination with the few instruments left behind following the pillaging by the former teacher. However, it was also because I thought that teaching music from another culture was what we music teachers were *supposed* to do, as well as teach formal lessons in Western notation. What a peculiar combination this truly was, when I look back on it now.

Nevertheless, I went to an African music workshop, bought the instructor's book and came away excited to propel myself headlong into this recent music education "epiphany" with my students. After breaking the class into the successive scored parts for cowbells, claves, shakers, xylophones, vocals, dancing and drums, I thought I had really struck something incredibly "authentic," and therefore, "musically valuable." Later

in the school year, after embarking upon a new term with a fresh group of students, a 13-year-old student from Ghana transferred into my class. I couldn't wait to see his reaction when we played the Ghanaian piece "Sansa Kroma." One can only imagine my surprise and solemn disappointment when, following the ending of the piece, he exclaimed, "I do not know this song!" I thought to myself, "This cannot be!" and even played the piece to his parents when I met them during parent/teacher interview night. They too, despite living in Ghana for nearly thirty years, claimed to have never heard the song before.

Upon later reflection, I discovered how it seemed that I had callously underestimated the musical identities of this student and his parents, simply because they came from the song's so-called "country of origin." Instead, I overestimated the authority of the "experienced Western professional" who had led the workshop and availed the various selections of Ghanaian music for publication. Up to this day, one can see various school groups on YouTube from Kentucky to Poland performing this same piece and I can't help but see myself in their same position.

When teaching a beginning music teacher course several years ago at Simon Fraser University, I taught "Sansa Kroma" but cautioned my students with the anecdote about my experience of the song with immigrants from Ghana, noting that Ghana is a country larger than Washington state but with nearly 50 different languages spoken there. Therefore, we cannot claim, as educators, to represent authentic "world musics" because we might have attended a two-hour workshop on music from a particular country. So then, what can we do in our music classes that is not shallow or inauthentic? One thing that was a frequent request from these same beginning music teachers was that they get as many unit plans as possible so they would "not have to reinvent the

wheel” when they got a music teaching job. I did spend much of the class introducing my students to various “school musics” that they would likely encounter, which is why I taught the aforementioned “Sansa Kroma” piece. Other areas that I presented were class guitar, acoustic and electronic drum set use and technique, electric guitar and bass, music on a “low budget” using old drinking water jugs for drumming and arranging popular music for “school music” mallet instruments such as xylophones, metallophones and glockenspiels. In addition to inviting a fellow graduate student to lead a choral and instrumental conducting class, I also gave lessons using the traditional Orff Schulwerk Method and reserved the Simon Fraser University education department computer lab to allow students to explore using the Apple *GarageBand* composition program. I did much of this because many of the student teachers might find themselves in a beginning teacher position where they will not immediately be allowed the freedom to create a program that reflects their values about music education. This is a common concern with training programs for beginner music teachers. As Eric Shieh and Colleen Conway (2004) caution, in the music education “profession’s effort to support beginning music teachers it often robs them of the opportunity to make change both inside the profession as well as society at large” (p. 163).

Although I had the playing of the above varieties of “classroom musics” firmly ingrained in the last half of each music class, I also structured the course by having the first part of our meeting time focus upon engaging the teachers in music education philosophy and theory through structured readings and presentations. Beginning teacher music programs too often do not give enough opportunity for future teachers to explore philosophical and theoretical issues behind music education, often focusing instead upon the question “Does this work?” instead of “Is this right?”. Thomas Regelski

(2002b), using sociologist Max Reger's definition of what constitutes a professional, suggests that music teachers are only "semi-professionals" and believes for this reason: "Without professionally based consensus on ends, no stable criteria exist for selecting means and evaluating results and, thus, no ethic of responsibility can apply" (p. 102). Regleski gives his summation of typical music teacher training programs:

Curriculum theory and sociological and philosophical foundations are rarely included. Instead, most pre-service teachers are typically trained in an uncritical approach to teaching methods (or "methods or materials") classes. The one-sidedness of any class that emphasizes this or that method to the exclusion of all others, and the lack of theoretical premises (especially concerning curriculum), amount to *indoctrination*, not education). (p. 105)

Wayne Bowman (2005) makes a compelling case for "advocating an ethical basis for educational practice in music" (p. 33). He suggests:

Rather than encouraging the pursuit of creative engagements that can take root and flourish outside the confines of the institutions in which we work; we have been content to cultivate appreciation of others' efforts and to mimic the external trappings of music making. What's good. What works. Whatever. (p. 43)

This attitude is what Bowman refers disparagingly to as the "instrumentalism or technical rationalism" that predominates North American music education (p. 30) and charges those in the profession to address contentious issues involving philosophy or theory early on with beginning teachers, rather than to stress teacher training programs in which new teachers simply follow well trodden formulaic and predictable paths without taking the time to question why or how things got to be done the way they are. Bowman proposes "a return to Wittgenstein's 'rougher ground,' an acceptance of respons/ability...grounded in action and pursued without the false comfort of certainty....The positive side of this coin is, I believe, creative freedom, self-

determination, and genuine engagement” (p. 33). These conditions not only apply to teachers but, more importantly, to the students they teach.

I was very fortunate to have had Dr. Allan MacKinnon as a mentor during my student teaching experience in the early 1990s at Simon Fraser University. At the time, many beginner teachers in his science inquiry module were initially perplexed that they were not encouraged to be preoccupied with amassing lesson plans. In fact, several student teachers referred to wanting to possess a “recipe book” upon leaving their practicum experiences that could be used with their future students. However, as time progressed, it became abundantly clear to most of us that what Dr. MacKinnon was doing was fostering a respect for innovation over reproduction in our future roles as teachers, similar to the way that Shieh and Conway (2004) later lamented that “the teaching profession exists as something to be uncovered rather than created” (p. 163). I shall expound more upon the roles of both teacher and student in the reconceptualization of music curriculum in a later section of this dissertation.

Recipe books cast aside, to the innovative educator Lucy Green, other possibilities lie as much, if not more, in music educators considering a change in their pedagogy as in the curriculum content. Both of her remarkable books *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Musicians* (2002) and *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008a) have been an inspiration and a beacon of hope for me in my middle school music program. Green is certainly not the first music educator to promote the acceptance of popular music in the classroom. Much groundbreaking research and work came about in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, which was particularly evident early in Great Britain. Refereed academic journals began to appear in Great Britain and the United States, treating popular music and culture with a

respect they did not often garner earlier, most notably in the publications *Popular Music and Society*, *Popular Music*, and *The Journal of Popular Music Studies*, which were founded in 1971, 1981 and 1988 respectively. Numerous other writings and books on the subject of popular music and teacher pedagogy have been instrumental in raising awareness in both musicological and music education circles (Frith, 1978, 1983, 1987, 1996; Lee, 1976a, 1976b; Middleton, 1990; Small, 1977; Vulliamy, 1976a, 1976b, 1977; Vulliamy & Lee, 1982a, 1982b). Advocating popular music in the classroom during a time in history that it was very unpopular to do so was highly courageous. It is likely that Lucy Green's research in the dawn of the 21st Century benefited greatly from the pioneering work of these early writers and educators. In particular, Graham Vulliamy (1976a) discussed the problem of applying the same aesthetic principles of art music, including notation, to popular music. Vulliamy (1976b) also advocated popular music in pupil-centred teaching, while displaying both respect and caution for the wide-ranging kinds of popular music that youth enjoy. Ed Lee (1976b) examined the exciting challenges to classroom teachers in having smaller groups performing popular music in class, involving the kind of "informality and flexibility" (p. 162) that Lucy Green would later widely advocate in 2001 and 2008. Both Vulliamy and Lee (1982b) subsequently published *Popular music: A teacher's guide*. Since the music educational climate then was still not entirely warm to popular music, the writers spend a good deal of time defending both the music and its culture from its many critics. To those dissenters who decried that popular music was nothing but a debased consumer product, merely out for a quick, commercial profit, Vulliamy and Lee responded accordingly: "Even the 'highest' culture is not 'outside' or 'beyond' the influence of social and economic factors" (1982b, p. 18). Simon Frith (2001) later supported this claim, stating that the publishing of art music was the first "music industry" (p. 30). Undeterred by the regular criticisms of

conservatives and radicals alike, Vulliamy and Lee finally abandoned the debate and, instead, flatly asserted: “We do not have space to rehearse the arguments here” (1982b, p. 18). In her earliest published book, Lucy Green (1988) acknowledges the contributions of Vulliamy and Lee and echoes their sentiments: “The reason why people get ensnared in trying to argue that pop is a valuable art form, is that they are forced to argue it at every corner, and this in itself is an admission of guilt” (p. 110).

Although the previous foundations for including popular music in schools were laid nearly three decades ago, the exponential advancements in ICT have unfortunately rendered many of these early writings and teaching guides obsolete. At the time of this writing, Lucy Green’s book on the ways popular musicians learn (Green, 2001) and her research on using informal learning methods (Green, 2008a) both enjoy the advantage of having a technological currency that their precursors have since lost.

While certainly not being a set of prescriptive lesson plans, Green’s writing comfortably bolsters courage in formal music teachers to complement their current approaches with informal learning strategies. She is also sympathetic towards teachers when they might experience feelings of guilt that they should be “doing more” or intervening early but Green gives sound reasons why they should stay in the background: a place not eagerly occupied by “directors.” Green (2008a) gives sage advice when she encourages us to keep on trying this new pedagogy until we gain comfort with it over time. Referring to the study she conducted, Green gives us further assurance:

In the end, all 17 of the Hertfordshire teachers in the final questionnaire agreed that using informal approaches in the classroom had ‘changed their approaches to teaching for the better’. If there is any strength in the approach, I think it must lie in the fact that the strategies were developed

by learners, through learning, rather than by teachers through teaching. They derive, not from a theory of learning drawn from an experimental or formal educational situation, or from an analysis of a musical outcome, but from observation and analysis of real-life learning practices in the world outside formal education. (p. 22)

In her article *Democracy and Popular Music* (2009), music educator Karen Snell might agree:

I believe popular music deserves a more central place in school music because it is the musical language and culture of the students. When Freire (1970) emphasizes the importance of moving away from the *banking concept* of education and instead towards what he calls the *problem-posing method* of teaching and learning, he argues that the program content should be “constituted and organized by the students’ views of the world, where their own generative themes are to be found” (p. 109). In this type of educational system, Freire continues, “the content thus constantly expands and renews itself.” Popular music is ideal in this sense because it is both student and issue-focused and it lends itself naturally to continual flux and renewal. (p. 173)

While I agree with Snell that popular music is the most common form of musical expression and culture in North American youth, I have found a consistent number of adolescents in all of my classes who regularly do not fit into this mould. As I mentioned earlier of my underestimation of the musical identity of a young immigrant from Ghana, I have frequent amounts of students whose musical identities lie in other genres and styles of music. Rather than prescribe that these students find popular music to learn in my class, I encourage them to continue with their present passions or their current curiosities. By allowing for a breadth of musical identities, as much as practice space and instrumentation might permit, the “becoming” musicians can come closer to achieve Snell’s example of Paulo Freire’s ideal of expansion and renewal. As I will describe in the last section of this paper, I shall go into greater detail as to what I have found works well inside and, hopefully, outside of my music room.

Like my previously cited experiences with listening to popular music condoned as “acceptable” by my own grade 6 and 7 music teacher, Green (2008a) offers this explanation:

Such music is perceived either to offer some authentic, rather than commercial, expression of its time and place; transcendent, universal qualities, and/or sufficient formal and harmonic complexity to warrant study. The inclusion of 'classical' popular music has in this way tended to reproduce traditional, accepted notions of musical value, and with those, of what counts as musical ability. But such music is often, from pupils' perspectives, as far removed from their lives and identities as mainstream classical music or twentieth-century atonal music. (pp. 12-13)

Presently in my general music classes, students can also choose to film and make their own music or dance videos. As "digital natives," these are unquestionably expressive mediums for my students, yet many music teachers are still mired in the past to the extent that new areas of technology in the arts are often deemed "non-musical" or "non-expressive." Most of us with any experience with wide-ranging media in the larger arts community would agree that this is simply "non-sense."

Similarly, British music educator John Finney reports about an urban comprehensive school in the east of England for eleven through eighteen-year-olds that incorporates, albeit it discretely, art, drama, dance and music. Finney (2003) quotes the mission statement of the school's Expressive Arts department:

Given that our pupils already experience the arts within their own cultures and that we understand that the students do indeed provide most of our cultural development, we feel that it is important, as an Expressive Arts department, to address what is prevalent now in the imaginations of our youth. (para. 10)

It is the very idea that only when we begin to listen to our students and acknowledge their own artistic experiences in their own cultures, can we begin to use the imagination and shared values held by "most teenagers." Only then, can music education become a vital part of the lives of the general population for which it should be intended. In his on-line article *From Resentment to Enchantment: What a Class of Thirteen Year Olds and Their Music Teacher Tell Us About a Musical Education*, Finney (2003) contends this: "The case is made for music to become unbound from the rigid

structures of schooling, for it to draw on a wider range of resources and styles of delivery” (para. 2). By listening to my students and honouring their interest in combining music, dance, video and other types of media, this potentially expands the frontier of what music might help express in the vibrant and artistically variegated lives of my students. In their book *A Thousand Plateaus*, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari might offer this:

In no way do we believe in a fine-arts system; we believe in very diverse problems whose solutions are found in heterogeneous arts. To us, Art is a false concept, a solely nominal concept; this does not, however, preclude the possibility of a simultaneous usage of the various arts within a determinable multiplicity. (pp. 300-301)

Andrew Brown (2007), in his book *Computers in Music Education*, might agree. Brown states that there “are many reasons why musical collaborations with other creative arts disciplines can be fruitful and inspiring” noting that “the ability of computers to handle digital image and video has made the integral creation of cross disciplinary work viable (p. 163).

Although not all values held in popular culture are entirely healthy, which is an understandable reason for hesitation on the part of many music educators, there is far more to be gained in the active musical participation by the majority of our students than by their “active disengagement” too often witnessed in traditional music education programs. Rose Subotnik makes this statement:

Because it enjoys the superior power of a generalized structure, popular music has been able to make more effective use than has contemporary music of human strengths that are implicit (Adorno notwithstanding) in its situation. Whereas art music has been unable to make a socially compelling case for individual values, popular music has persuaded millions of individuals, in a way that is felt not to be coercive, of an advantage to be found in general values. (pp. 288-289)

However, a mere transplanting of popular music into the institution of formal music education is not a simple one. Green (2006), in her article "*Popular music education in and for itself, and for 'other' music,*" gives clear warnings that "problematic delineations" can occur in the popular music classroom. In particular, Green states that "pupils' familiarity with popular music's inherent meanings is likely to turn sour if those meanings are approached in formal educational ways" (p. 105). Although much of the reasoning behind these "problematic delineations" is often linked to the insistence of Western notational usage by the music teacher, an area I shall examine more closely later on in this dissertation, Green (2001) suggests "that teachers' classroom approaches are closer to the conventional pedagogy associated with Western classical music...and are very different indeed from the self-teaching and group informal learning practices of popular and other vernacular musicians" (p. 183).

In closing this chapter, it appears that the institutionalization of anything is fraught with perplexity, whether it is the attempt to adopt informal learning practices into a formal learning environment or whether it is the move of a generalized societal music from the "outside" to the "inside," as was arguably done in the late eighteenth century. If Subotnik is correct by asserting that the strength of popular musical expression lies in its "position to serve an ideal of a community rather than of individuality," as positively ecumenical as this sounds, then what happens if the ideals of the collective happen to be wrong? I personally believe that living in a community united by a few common values is better than existing in one divided by many. Yet this gleaming utopian outlook has its own bleakness too. For Terry Eagleton points out in *After Theory*: "It is also paradoxical that those who believe in the sociality of human existence should be forced on this very account to live against the grain" (p. 181).

Chapter 2.

Student-centred Learning and the Social Construction of Music in School

The masterpieces *may* not be the best training materials during childhood – at least certainly not the only ones. *Harry Broudy (1964, p. 35)*

And as to the learning of music in general, I must out of my experience say, that of those persons who are so happy to acquire it, more teach themselves, than are taught. *Roger North (1728, p. 321)*

There are many divisions of thought regarding student-centred learning in music education. While many educators value this concept, the idea of relinquishing a great deal of control is not alluring to even the most self-proclaimed democrats of the teaching profession. Perhaps the most uncomfortable step in this process is for music teachers to accept the informal learning environment that popular and other vernacular musicians largely occupy. As a result, there are “problematic delineations” (Green, 2006) that often accompany the teaching of a historically established “outside” music, found suddenly on the “inside” of the formal music classroom. Disagreements abound as to the styles, periods and instrumentation in which this new music should appear. However, recent dramatic changes have occurred in the United Kingdom and Scandinavia, wherein popular music has overtaken classical music as the primary curriculum. Despite these statistics (Green, 2001, 2002b, 2003a) there still exist implicit challenges to music educators around a frequent focus upon propositional knowledge, the teaching of instrumental technique and the adherence to performance models, areas that formal music programs take for granted. Additionally, the use or disuse of standard notation is frequently the subject of debate in contemporary music classrooms. The anonymous, contemporary “reformers” found on the Internet, with their use of tablature and non-traditional notation, offer great support to educators struggling with the commonly unfamiliar presence of modern music cultures. Computer assisted composition, as

threatening as it might appear to the traditional Western necessity of any “legitimate music” to be represented strictly through standard notation, is a great asset for the modern young person not born into this often exclusive system (Gouzouasis, 2005).

Music reform is nothing new to music education. Perhaps no greater example of this exists than in the music philosophy and reform ideas proffered by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the 18th century. An accomplished music teacher, copyist and composer, Rousseau worked out an alternative music notation system through his own difficult experience, as well as his students’ experiences, in learning to read music (Rainbow & Cox, 2006). Standard musical notation, in particular, represented to Rousseau an impedance to all levels of French society to gain access to music, thus robbing them of a communal sharing in this rich part of life that Rousseau loved so dearly (Simon, 2004). Additionally, the work of Johann Pestalozzi and the influences that Rousseau had upon his teaching will be considered; influences that are still felt in our schools, especially in the area of “student-centred learning.”

There are many assumptions about student-focused approaches that forestall music educators to accept these methods in their classrooms. One is the notion that students really aren’t able to know what is best for them, thus we have an educational system set up to lead our students to those things in life that they likely would not otherwise discover on their own. “The bias of nature is set the wrong way. Education is designed to set it right” (p. 476), wrote John Wesley in *A Thought on the Manner of Educating Children*. The guiding father of the Methodist movement, Wesley never had children of his own and yet held strict doctrines that abhorred self-discovery and strongly discouraged the exercise of self-will in the young. In Lesson II of *Instructions for Young Children*, Wesley directs this:

We came into the World, not to do our own Will, but the Will of him that sent us.

If we are already accustomed to do our own Will, we must break that Custom without Delay. O Lord, save us from our own Will, or we perish.

Referring directly to Rousseau’s book *Émile* in his own publication *A Thought on the Manner of Educating Children*, Wesley professed that it was “the most empty, silly, injudicious thing that ever a self-conceited infidel wrote” (p. 284). Wesley believed that it

was the righteous duty of the educator to emancipate the young from the worldly tether of their selfish passions. Both teachers and parents alike were deemed highly irresponsible if they catered to a child's every apparent need or expressed interest. Referring again to Wesley's *Instructions for Young Children*, he proclaims in Lesson IV: "If your Father or Mother give you every thing that you like, they are the worst Enemies you have in the World." Speaking about popular music in the present time without the moralizing tone of an eighteenth-century Wesley, British music educator Charles Plummeridge (1991), in *Music Education in Theory and Practice*, correspondingly maintains that:

Education is concerned with providing children with *new* interests, *new* experiences, *new* visions. To educate children is to free them from what is often a very limited view of the world. A programme based entirely on popular music would hardly seem to be the way of achieving such an aim. (p. 57)

However, Plummeridge also rightly argues that teachers can never really know what children's interests are at any given time. In spite of the likelihood that most children are interested in popular music, not all of them are. In his article *Educational Theory and the Music Curriculum*, Harry Broudy (1964) makes this assertion: "We cannot assume that preferences of teachers and pupils and even among teachers are uniform" (p. 36). As a teacher, I have personally encountered a handful of young people who earnestly claim that they don't like any kind of music and I had to believe them, as difficult as that was for me. This didn't stop me from trying to discover the "chink in their armour" throughout my time with them, sometimes finding out that they liked to fix instruments instead of play them or that they liked computer game theme songs. Yet to consider themselves as music lovers, let alone as potential musicians, was something of a taboo to these students at the time.

Without fail, each class I have also comprises students who are drawn to and choose to play classical music, while the majority of students often gravitate towards

popular music. In almost all cases, whether it is classical or popular music, students have previously heard the music that they have chosen to learn to play in class. In her book *How Popular Musicians Learn*, Lucy Green lends support to how this rarely occurs in formal education:

From beginner to advanced standard, it is therefore often the case that students will work at a piece...without ever having heard that piece being played by anyone else. How can they be confident in knowing what it should sound like? (p. 157)

While this method, as discussed elsewhere in this paper, has definite roots in formal, classical music, in particular, it reflects the idea that the written music is able to communicate autonomously on its own to each musician. As I pointed out previously, the writing of Rose Subotnik is an excellent example of the difficulty facing contemporary art music, which is an amplification of the scenario to which Green refers. Similarly, Paul Woodford (2005), in his book *Democracy and Music Education*, sees this as an impediment to the formal musician's training:

Younger conservatory and university-trained musicians...value technique over musicality and interpretive ability...Today's composers and classically trained performers speak a private language that for the most part is only understood by, or of interest to, fellow composers, musicians, and academics, and not by the remote and distant public. Composers and classically trained performers have a serious communication problem.(p. 26)

Woodford quotes Leon Botstein from his article *The Training of Musicians* (2000), where he declares, "few have found a way to reach to play that reaches the souls of today's audience" (p. 26). Believing that popular musicians wish to and often can communicate with their audience, Woodford suggests that:

When teaching popular music performance, rather than drilling students in scales and other kinds of formal technique usually associated with the classical tradition, teachers might incorporate into the classroom or

rehearsal room informal learning practices that popular musicians use in the real world. This could include rote learning and imitation of recorded performances by musicians of the students' own choosing. (p. 100)

In the popular music club that I hold during my free time at school, this latter suggestion of Woodford's is indeed what occurs. Students choose music and they learn it, occasionally but not always, with my "guidance." It sounds simple but the music often gets changed when students discover that, perhaps, the music is too hard or too easy for them. Sometimes, they just quickly tire of the song. The musicians also often have turbulence within their bands and personnel changes are something that is a natural part of both informal and formal learning situations. Some of these musicians do not return to the club, despite my desire for them to work through their assorted challenges. Ultimately, this is exactly the way it is "outside" so I dare not impose by "solving" the problems by asserting my will or power as an authoritative teacher.

This also demonstrates clearly the limits of the institution and shows that enrolled popular music courses, no matter the apparent freedom that might be displayed, always seem to have students well controlled and contained within them. If the registered students become problems for the teacher, they can ultimately be denied performance opportunities, given poor grades or, as is also the case in my school district, humiliate their interests and abilities by telling them they are not allowed to play on an instrument of their own choosing. Instead, similar to many school band programs, curricular popular music programs often have the teacher/director choosing the instruments that are "required" for the ensemble to perform in its "best capacity."

School instrumental band programs are notorious for this kind of autocracy, which is particularly poignant when students first are "allowed" to choose their own

preferred instruments. In my current school, the beginner band teacher invites the local music store to come over before the first band practices of the year commence. Arriving with an impressive arsenal of woodwind and brass instruments, store employees play them, one by one, while the wide-eyed, prospective band students listen. Then, a sign-up sheet is produced and there is usually a mad dash to sign up for the alto saxophone and trumpet spots. When this list is full, the teacher then delicately tries to announce that the ensemble's need to be balanced and complete demands that the other remaining instruments must be taken by the students, reminding them that ultimately the ensemble needs are a priority to any individual preferences that the students might have. I clearly remember that for the first two years of my middle school, the beginning band teacher would not even allow any student to choose percussion as an instrument in band. When percussion parts would appear that he deigned necessary to be played, the director would dictatorially assign students to abandon their usual instruments and learn them. "Anyone can drum," he would dismissingly say. Unfortunately, this kind of tyrannical arrogance is what all too often drives our students away from choosing music in school. Why pay money purchasing or renting an instrument that you really have no interest in learning to play in school when you can choose your own instrument and learn what you want, when you want, outside of school?

An example of this kind of egotism that has located itself in the public consciousness can be found in a scene from *Cancer Man* (2008), which is the title of episode four in the first season of the television drama series *Breaking Bad*. In this scene, the younger brother of Jesse Pinkman, one of the main characters in the show, is sitting around the dinner table with his parents, discussing his day at school. One might

think series creator and writer Vince Gilligan had some personal experiences with the very first subject under discussion at the table:

Father: I don't understand why they're forcing you to choose between the piccolo and the oboe. You show so much promise with both.

Son: They say they can't have any switching between woodwinds because no matter how they divide it up, someone would be left out.

Mother: Well, rules are rules, I guess.

Dad: Sure, rules are rules. I'm all for that. But I'm telling you, you really shine on that oboe. You have real talent, and I'm not just saying that.

Son: Thanks.

Mother: What about Mr. Pemberton? Is he giving you enough individual attention?

Son: I'd have to say so. He tries to talk to each one of us at least once during every practice.

Mother: Well, that's good. Feedback's important.

Father: It's key, I think...Hey, so how was soccer practice?

In both instrumental band and popular music programs, student choice is often only paid lip service to because the teacher/director is so preoccupied with the bands being a direct reflection of himself or herself. I now refer to a particular popular music program with which I am very familiar. When students go to perform before an audience, the teacher/director acts as the "master of ceremonies," puts the most insecure bands on to play first and announces that the students, even though it might be flagrantly untrue, have never performed live before, in order to make believe that the audience won't blame him or her for this less-than-perfect performance that they are about to witness. These disgraceful displays occur time and time again, thus hijacking the potential for genuine student agency and individual musical growth. Sheri Jaffurs, in her article "The impact of informal learning music learning practices in the classroom, or how

I learned to teach from a garage band,” brings some needed sense to this kind of teaching practice:

Informal music learning exists in any community in which there is music. At their most basic level, informal music practices are natural and spontaneous responses to music. There is no evaluation, formal or otherwise, and no teacher direction or guidance. (pp. 192-193)

This is supported by Karen Snell (2006), who says that, in popular music ensembles, “self-discovery and peer learning are encouraged and teachers become more of a ‘guide’ for student learning situations (rather than the ‘all-knowing’ transmitters of knowledge)” (p. 189). Judging by these last two descriptions of informal learning, it might suggest that the teacher is little more than a studio manager. I admit that there sometimes exists this misperception in my popular music club. Having rented a number of multi-use rehearsal studios in my past as a musician, the scheduling of main room and smaller practice room time is very much similar to a rehearsal studio. Allocation of equipment, not to mention its repair and maintenance, is of almost constant concern to the teacher/guide/studio manager. In 1964, Harry Broudy declared, “No formal education in music is required if music experience is to operate exclusively or predominantly on the popular level” (p. 36). By many traditional definitions of music education, this might appear to be the case on the surface with popular music programs and is precisely why a number of educators do not value them. However, as I discuss throughout this paper, and describe more fully in the last chapter of what I see occurring in my own music classroom, both informal and formal learning strategies frequently intertwine with students. This is not, I believe, seen as aversive to students or to continue the traditional reliance in music classrooms upon the teacher as musical authority figure. Due to present computer technology, with ready access to formal Internet music lessons and

music performances, the musical authority is often in the hands of a “virtual someone” instead of the classroom teacher.

Some sage insight into this situation might be found in the writing of Vince Bates, a high school teacher from Santaquin, Utah. In his article *Where Should We Start? Indications of a Nurturant Ethic for Music Education*, Bates (2004) claims:

Practices in music education that do not involve sharing power with students should be avoided. Adjudication, juries, grades, auditions, practice logs, and so forth might facilitate short-term improvement, but they undermine the chance that music making will be a source of power long term....

Musical practices can be introduced in ways that allow for a considerable amount of decision-making on the part of students. In a nurturant ethic, the importance of a student’s need for freedom trumps, to a degree, the authority of teachers, institutions, and would-be musical experts; students are able to make choices or, at least, negotiate the particulars surrounding the what, when, where, and how of making music. (p. 11)

Bates rightly acknowledges that the student’s need for freedom can only rise above the formal authority of teachers and the institution “to a degree.” As was discussed previously, Lucy Green (2006) warned against certain “problematic delineations” that might arise when an informal and apparently “free” learning environment is present:

One could allow pupils to bring in their own music; however, what should we do with it then? Consider this question in relation to popular music’s inherent meanings in the classroom. In spite of the mounting enthusiasm with which popular music has been greeted...once inside the classroom it tends to be treated by teachers, exam boards and National Curricular requirements largely as though its inherent meanings warranted the same kinds of attention as those of classical music.... (p. 105)

Green lists other areas that seem to be “infected” by the virus of the institutionalization of any music, whether informal or not. This includes teachers’ inability

to keep up with the speed of the “pupils’ changing allegiances,” as well as how anything, even popular music which is brought into the classroom, then becomes “like classical music” (p. 105).

Lucy Green is wisely wary of the “mounting enthusiasm” for popular music in the classroom. In an earlier study (2002), Green interviewed secondary music teachers in England in 1982 and 1998. Teachers in 1982 claimed to include a very small amount of popular music in their curriculum, compared to classical, which had the greatest majority. However, in 1998, the vast majority of teachers overwhelmingly listed popular music as dominating the curriculum, with folk music coming second and classical moving to third position. Teachers in the latter poll gave many supportive statements. The following are several teacher responses to the question “Do you teach popular music?”:

I think this is an important topic as students relate to ‘popular music’ and this is reflected in their compositions, performances, and the music they listen to.

I feel it is more effective to teach them through a medium they know and can relate to and are interested in. I like to view music as fun and I feel this is the best way to do that. (pp. 18-19)

In spite of the praises given this “outside” music that has found its way “inside,” Green concludes that values associated with formal music education are still operational in schools teaching popular music. Green (2001) states that:

Teachers’ classroom approaches are closer to the conventional pedagogy associated with Western classical music than the wide variety of musics in the curriculum might seem to imply, and are generally very different indeed from the self-teaching and group informal learning practices of popular and other vernacular musicians. (p. 183)

Paul Woodford suggests it is the legacy behind the establishments of the various musical organizations in our Western society that makes this exceedingly difficult to extract from our formal institutions:

The historical roots of traditional school concert bands, orchestras, and choirs are after all to be found in autocratic institutions such as the military, church, or aristocracy, and not in parliamentary or other democratic institutions. One still hears orchestras described as operating under the 'military discipline of the conductor', and music teachers are thought by some critics to be overly controlling. (p. 28)

Green and Vogan (1991) and Brian Roberts (2004) both support Woodford's tracing of the connections between music education programs and institutions here in Canada. In his article *The Social Construction Of Music As A School Subject*, Roberts gives an interesting account of a "new kind of music teacher" that was to have a great effect upon the course of Canadian music education:

After the Second World War, a new kind of music teacher appeared on the scene in Canada....These were veterans whose musical life had been tied to military bands as performers...Because former military bandsmen had the prerequisite requirements of their trade they qualified for a teaching certificate in the same way as a plumber or carpenter. There was a huge need for teachers at the time and there was a tremendous will to re-integrate these veterans into society as well. All sides were served. (p. 10)

In this same article, Roberts argues that the origins of performance-based band, orchestra and choir programs stem from these changes into the hands of ex-military bandsmen. The predomination of these programs still present in our Canadian schools and in many university teacher-training programs, attests to the accuracy of Roberts' argument. Roberts refers unflatteringly to music teachers as being "cloned" by universities, in the past and in the present, in order to represent the "appropriate body of knowledge" (p. 9).

This “body of knowledge” to which Roberts refers, is a remnant of formal practice and is evident in the traditional performance models of band, orchestra and choir programs. Co-inventor of the Moog synthesizer and music professor Herbert Deutsch (2009), in his paper *Where Was Technology and Music Education Twenty Years Ago?*, points to this “appropriate body of knowledge” as being the primary reason why learning “the mastery of sound is not as simple as it should be” (p. 91) in the American school system. “Not because the learning is difficult, but because the teaching goals have often become one-sided, or steeped in the silence of theory, or mired in the politics of systems, or held back by fear” (p. 91). Deutsch explains:

What about one-sided goals? Even today the traditional performance ensembles dominate school music programs. This is understandable because they are the product of many years of evolution. American music education began in the “singing schools” after the revolution. First it served the church choirs, and then it led to the development of school choruses during the days of the Industrial Revolution. Oh yes, what a PERFECT way to teach about the “industrial system,” the discipline of working in factories to become part of “the team.” As the nation matured, and following the Civil War became a military power, the school band was developed. Band playing stressed precision, marching and a more military form of discipline. (p. 91)

In his book *A Concise History of American Music Education*, Michael Mark (2008) writes about the crucial role of musical instrument manufacturers in the history of American school concert bands. Mark suggests that as military markets waned in the United States following the First World War, school band programs picked up the slack in instrument sales. This, coupled with the technological changes to allow easier public access to entertainment, had a profound effect upon American society:

There was no room for concert bands in the new era of social dancing. Radio and recordings also competed with the concert bands. The new media attracted millions of listeners and were a major factor in the decline of professional concert bands. The bands could no longer compete for the

attention of music lovers. With ever-decreasing sales to the military and professional bands, the manufacturers turned their attention to school bands. The companies aligned themselves with school music by helping to create band competitions. It was natural for competitions to develop as school bands proliferated. (p. 125)

Mark asserts that school orchestra and choir programs followed suit, holding competitions of their own by 1929. It was because of these contests, Mark claims, that school band instrumentation became standardized. This was in direct response to a standard repertoire list generated by a recently formed, national governing body named the Instrumental Affairs Committee. This list of repertoire was adhered to by all school bands taking part (p. 126). Herbert Deutsch reflects on this strange evolution of American school music programs:

Now, hopefully, those roots have been long forgotten and performance ensembles have become a means of exploring literature, learning the mechanics of traditional music, and representing the school to the voting public. Well, as important as these goals may be, they cannot be the only goals of the system. There must always be a balance, which includes the areas of both *general* and *creative* learning. (pp. 91-92)

While Deutsch hopes that the collective memory of the martial, industrial and commercial origins of band and choir programs has been erased, Elizabeth Gould (2012) argues that bands were and continue to be “tacitly exclusionary organizations” (p. 101). Similar to the assertion by Janet Mansfield (2002) that modernism perpetuated an inability to address difference and include marginalized and minority cultures, Gould maintains:

Historically, of course, bands served entirely functional roles in both the military and society that had nothing to do with artistic concerns....It was these very roles, however, that connected them directly to the communities they served....These tangible connections make it possible for those participating in bands to feel similarly connected – not so much to each other as band members but to the communities that support them: military, church, business, family, school. As part of everyday life, a

function of material reality, bands do not so much uplift as they make real. And in making real, they are situated in terms of power and history, which also causes them to be rife with a multitude of paradoxes that are exactly their strength and what makes possible potentialities of difference. (p. 113)

To return to Brian Roberts' statement in his essay that examines the notion that music in school is socially constructed, another area associated with the "appropriate body of knowledge" imbedded in formal learning traditions and environments is that of propositional knowledge. Referring to John Paynter's *Schools Council Secondary Curriculum Music Report* from 1973 – 82, John Finney (2002) reports that:

Since the institution of music education in England in the nineteenth century, the intuitive had been consistently overrun by the formal, the practical by the theoretical. The learner's search for personal meaning and relevance had been overhauled by the external world of non-negotiable concepts, structures and formalities and by the inertia of fact and theory. (p. 124)

Finney further discusses the assertion by Louis A. Reid that "all propositional knowledge of music is empty if not based on intuitive, first hand cognitive experience. Experiential intuition is essential" (p. 123). Referring to the students' reports throughout Lucy Green's book *How Pop Musicians Learn*, Finney notices the marked "enthusiasm with which they acquire propositional knowledge through deep commitment to music making" (p. 124). This is something that I can attest to in the time span that I have had a mixture of formal and informal approaches to music in the program in my middle school. It is fascinating to look at and listen to the musical knowledge that they have been intrinsically motivated to seek out.

Interestingly enough, many of my students' enthusiasm to learn notation, through the use of the Internet and each other, is frequently *not* in the sole area of popular music. This differs markedly from Lucy Green's research focus during Phases six and

seven in *Music, Informal Learning and the School*. She did not allow student choice of classical music because she posited “such music is not normally passed on, at least in the present day and age, through informal learning practices” (p. 149). Although not part of her research study, I have little doubt that Green would accept this position in the modern music classroom, since I frequently witness students trying to learn classical music by ear. Also, YouTube and other on-line music lessons are currently thriving since the time she wrote this in 2008, as well as the Internet sites *Piano Tutor*, *OnlinePianist*, *Pianoonlinelessons*, and *TabNabber*. During the last part of this dissertation, I will give praxial examples from my music classes that happily contrast with Green’s experience that classical music is not generally passed on through informal means. Its location as a teacher led, formally transmitted music might firmly be imbedded in the minds of the majority of music educators but this perception appears to be changing, thanks to available technology and the intrinsic motivations of our students that love good music and wish to learn how to play it, whatever that might be for them.

Again, returning to bodies of knowledge associated with formal learning traditions, the expansive topic of notation is of great importance. I shall develop this subject at far greater length in my forthcoming discussion of the reforms of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. However, John Finney (2002) claims the “triumph of the Enlightenment had nurtured a confidence in” the notions of “objective reality and truth” (p. 121). Enlightenment writer Nikolaus Forkel, also discussed in greater detail during the next part of this paper, made culturally biased claims that Western music was evolutionarily advanced over other cultures because only they had written the codification of music. In his article *Musicology, Anthropology, History*, Gary Tomlinson (2003) writes that:

Forkel subsumes the evolution of musics worldwide under a history pointing toward the circum-Mediterranean achievement of the alphabet. In doing so he creates for music both a course of history and a space of anthropology, separating the two in their specific domains: the first traversed by alphabetic societies and their precursors, the second inhabited by analphabetic peoples. Societies with the alphabet can move closer to a perfect musical art; those without must move elsewhere or not move at all. “How long a people can tolerate [the] first crude state of music cannot be precisely determined,” Forkel writes. “We still find it today, however, among many Asiatic, African, and American peoples, whom we also know to have made no progress for millennia in other branches of culture.” (p. 285)

This “Eurocentricism” has been sharply criticized by John Paynter (2002): “Across the ages most of the world’s music has been made up – invented and performed – by musically untutored people. There are still people like that in every culture, and they are still making music” (p. 219). It also belies the notion that non-Western notated traditions signify musically unsophisticated cultures, as was discussed in greater detail previously.

Before capitulating to the lengthier discussion about Rousseau and notation reform, I wish to conclude with the optimistic capacity of popular music in the classroom that has great potential through the enhancement of democratic, informal learning music environments. Referring to the concept of “collateral learning” in *Experience and Education*, Elliot Eisner (2001) points out how John Dewey noted one of the biggest mistakes in education as being “that children only learn what it is that they are studying at the time” (p. 8):

When students get together to rehearse, they learn to cooperate in the context of a forthcoming concert. When they care for their instruments they learn a form of responsibility. When they modulate...so they do not stick out in concert, they sacrifice their own ego for the good of the performance as a whole. When they commit themselves to practice, they learn a sense of responsibility. When they assist each other, they develop

a form of shared expertise. Music education provides all these opportunities when it is well handled.

(p. 8)

As a music teacher who is often unaware of the wonderful opportunities that present themselves before my very eyes and ears, I need to constantly remind myself to watch and listen to my students, lest these experiences be lost to them.

Chapter 3.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Music Reform

The need for a new notation, or a radical improvement of the old, is greater than it seems, and the number of ingenious minds that have tackled the problem is greater than one might think.

Arnold Schoenberg (1924, pp. 354-355)

The child who reads does not think, he only reads. He is not informing himself, he learns words. *J.J. Rousseau from Émile (1762, p. 168)*

Music is Music not Writing (Payge, age thirteen). *John Finney (2003, para. 30)*

There has been no universal agreement on how music should be notated for the vast majority of the last two thousand years of Western music. The current resurgence in alternate notation on the Internet, as well as the use of tablature, whereby written symbols are used to perform on a variety of musical instruments, are promising signs for music education. These resources can produce anxiety in music educators, perhaps because they displace the primacy upon them as the ultimate musical authority figures in the lives of students. The current tendency towards alternate forms of musical representation is likely due to the result of rapidly advancing technological, multi-cultural and varied Western historic developments that have become more prominently recognizable and disseminated. The value-laden stranglehold that standard Western notation has had on the educational system has gradually loosened over time. Now, one can find music on the Internet as easily as finding a food recipe or driving directions. To me, it shows just how essential music is to nearly all of us.

Exploring alternative music notation systems — to make reading, writing, and playing music more enjoyable and easier to learn...Many people struggle to learn to read and play music. Many give up before they become proficient. Could a better notation system make a big difference? We think so. (para. 1)

These are the opening words found on a web site called *The Music Notation Project* (2008) and is not dissimilar to Rousseau's efforts at music notation reform during the Age of Enlightenment, which shall be discussed in this chapter. To many, standard music notation is still considered to be in great need of emendation. At present, most knowing and unwitting reformers alike are largely anonymous ones publishing on the Internet, experimenting with alternate notation, writing out the music they love and wish to share with others, or by using guitar tablature that was established during the Renaissance.

Both Rousseau's educational philosophy and his musical aesthetic were critical of his Enlightenment Age contemporaries. This is revealed in countless passages from his ambitious *The complete dictionary of music*. Throughout this book, Rousseau uses "explanations" of musical terminology to express his opinions about French music and education at the time, which he did not hold in high esteem. In his "definition" of melody, Rousseau tells us that:

In spite of the diversity of parts, which harmony has introduced, and which at present are so much abused, that as soon as two melodies are heard at the same time, they efface each other, and are of no effect, however beautiful each of them may be separately; from whence we may judge with what taste the French composers have introduced in their operas, the use of making an air of accompaniment serve in the place of a chorus; or another air, which is as if they had taken into their heads to make two discourses at the same time, to give greater force to their eloquence. Vide Unity of Melody. (p. 228)

This displeasure over complicated artifice in melody was a very common facet of the general Enlightenment aesthetic. In Grout and Palisca's *A History of Western Music*, the following attempt to encapsulate this aesthetic is given:

Early eighteenth-century esthetics held that the task of music, like that of the other arts, was to imitate nature, to offer to the listener pleasant sounding images of reality. Music was supposed to imitate not the actual sounds of the world of nature, but rather the sounds of speech, especially as these expressed the sentiments of the soul; according to Rousseau and some others, it should imitate a primitive-speech song, assumed to be the natural language of man.... (p. 546)

The aim towards the expression of “sentiments of the soul” and the release of the “natural language of man” seems hardly at odds with a modern, democratic music reformer such as Thomas Regelski, as discussed in the previous and subsequent chapters. However the attempts by Rousseau at music education reform during his lifetime make Regelski's efforts pale in comparison.

Herbert Deutsch (2009), like Regelski, acknowledges that the politics of the institutionalized music system reflect their communities and that modern music education has seized upon the “systems theory.” He maintains: “In every case, these methods have grown from the joy and spontaneity of children's play. Unfortunately, as they became systems, the silence of their theory takes hold” (p. 92). As Rousseau related his difficulties and frustrations in learning to read music as a child, so does Deutsch:

The silence of theory...stress the word SILENCE...is not a sound. There are still too many of us who can recall those awful days when a music class meant a teacher drawing five lines on a board and eliciting the hopefully memorized “Every Good Boy Does Fine” or “All Cows Eat Grass.” All of those silent marks on the board. At least the screech of the chalk gave us a reaction to sound! (p. 92)

Rousseau reportedly came to read music in early adulthood and, as a music teacher and music copyist, he worked out an alternative music notation system through his own experience, as well as his students' experiences, in learning to read music. Rousseau's suggestion that the public will is correct might be from a belief that there is a natural, wild or uncivilized state that lies in "the people." By this, I do not get the sense that he means the aristocracy; rather, it is the peasants and trades people of which he speaks in his writing. Rousseau sees the effects of "civilizing" as deleterious to the human spirit. If the music tradition of Western notation stems from the corruptible aristocracy and not "the people," then Rousseau must naturally find another way to bind this greater community together through the means of music. "The passions bring all men together" (p. 294), Rousseau claims, in *Essay on the Origin of Languages*. In *Musical Persuasion: Rousseau's Platonic Democracy*, Nina Valiquette (2006) points this out:

Rousseau's lesser known "musical" writings celebrate the political role of language: freedom is here dependent on the ability of citizens to communicate effectively with one another so as to unite their singular wills. In turn, this communication is itself based on a type common "language" through which "the people" is able to authentically express its general will to itself as law. (para. 1)

Rousseau shares his thoughts on the teaching of reading, writing and music reading in these lines from stanza 499 of *Émile*:

You may perhaps suppose that since I am in no hurry to teach Émile to read and write, I shall not want to teach him to read music. Let us spare his brain the strain of excessive attention, and let us be in no hurry to turn his mind towards conventional signs. I grant you there seems to be a difficulty here, for if at first sight the knowledge of notes seems no more necessary for singing than the knowledge of letters for speaking, there is really this difference between them: When we speak, we are expressing our own thoughts; when we sing we are scarcely expressing anything but

the thoughts of others. Now in order to express them one must read them.

To Rousseau, “song,” more than words, was vitally important to communicating the “thoughts of others.” The challenge to Rousseau lay in finding a form of notation that all levels of French society could understand, while learning the words by rote. These are taken from *Émile* in stanza 500:

But instead of reading them one can hear them, and a song is better learned by ear than by eye. Moreover, to learn music thoroughly we must make songs as well as sing them, and the two processes must be studied together or we shall never have any real knowledge of music.

Given Rousseau’s admiration for ancient Greek culture and the belief that word and music were “as one,” the concept of “song-singing” was close to egalitarian ideals that Rousseau seemed to hold dear. Contained in the entry for “song” in *The complete dictionary of music*, Rousseau writes this:

The use of songs seems to be a natural consequence from that of words, and, in effect, is not less general; for wherever they speak, they sing....The ancients had not the art of writing at the time they had of singing. Their laws and their histories, the praises of their gods and heroes, were sung before they were written. And from thence it happens, according to Aristotle, that the same Greek name was given to laws and songs. (p. 370)

As was discussed in a previous chapter of this dissertation, this might amount to Rousseau having, what Louis Ruprecht (1996) referred to as, his “own crucial myth of classical culture” (p. 238). Rousseau, in his exultation of Greek song, did what scores of intellectuals and artists have always done and still do; they “endow it with the perfections it must have in order to justify” their “need” and their “love” (Ruprecht, p. 238).

However, Rousseau's glorification of Greek song, having a similar status to the system of rules of their society, certainly has some grounding in Plato's *Republic*. There is a wonderful ancient Greek saying, which declares: "Let me make the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws" (Grout and Palisca, p. 8). Not surprisingly, Rousseau regarded the song in European society as being a primordial form, which was later exploited, for better or for worse, in the music education of Carl Orff. Gary Tomlinson, author of *Musicology, Anthropology, History*, claims:

Song, not music, is the fundamental category here. It is characteristic of a period when a full-blown modern conception of music had not yet taken hold so that song could still impose itself as an expressive mode shared by Europe with the rest of the world... Song... presented authors such as Vico and Rousseau with the conundrum of Derrida's supplement... At once envisaged as the earliest and most immediate of utterances – the form in which language first emerged – and as a passionate but modulated art of the present day, song was endowed with expressive features both primitive and modern, brutally direct and delicately metaphorical, barbarously non-European and of consummate (European) refinement. (pp. 33-34)

Throughout the history of Western music, numerous attempts at humanizing musical notation have been made. Using both Grout and Palisca's *A History of Western Music* (1998) and Rainbow's *Music in Educational Thought and Practice* (2006) as references, notation has passed through an enormous amount of development in two thousand years. Many types of early music, just like their stories, were passed down the generations without being notated; hence they tended to evolve over time. The Greeks and Romans both had non-graphical notations, which used letters of their alphabets to symbolize notes. From this came our use of the letters A to G to represent notes which is still common in most countries. The letter names are sometimes called the "Boethian notation" after Boethius, a Roman writer and statesman who lived in the 5th century. He was the first to document the use of letters as names for notes.

The monk Guido d'Arezzo introduced an alternative method of note naming about 1000 A.D. According to Neil Hawes in his web-based *History of Notation* (2003), this has survived up to today as tonic sol-fa, which will be referred to frequently when discussing Rousseau's alternate music reading system. The most important aspect of this development however, is that it used six of the notes which we use in the major scale today. Also developed was the "Guidonian Hand"; a visual aid for students in memorizing the note names. Because this was prior to the advent of the printing press, facts had to be learned by heart. Rainbow cites endless classroom drilling, intimidation and corporal punishment as grounds for much criticism of music education during the Middle Ages. "The spectre of the switch" is something Rainbow believes to be in sharp contrast to the relaxed and non-threatening way in which ancient Greek music students were allegedly taught: "Another is the use of the birch to stimulate learning: the birch so omnipresent in the classrooms of the Middle Ages that it became as much a symbol of the schoolmaster as the crook that of the bishop" (p. 44).

This common feature in schools of medieval society was refreshingly condemned during the Renaissance in volume five of the essay *Of The Education Of Children* by Michel de Montaigne:

But amongst other things, the strict government of most of our colleges has evermore displeased me; peradventure, they might have erred less perniciously on the indulgent side. 'Tis a real house of correction of imprisoned youth. They are made debauched by being punished before they are so. Do but come in when they are about their lesson, and you shall hear nothing but the outcries of boys under execution, with the thundering noise of their pedagogues drunk with fury. A very pretty way this, to tempt these tender and timorous souls to love their book, with a furious countenance, and a rod in hand! A cursed and pernicious way of proceeding! Besides what Quintilian has very well observed, that this imperious authority is often attended by very dangerous consequences, and particularly our way of chastising. How much more decent would it be to see their classes strewed with green leaves and fine flowers, than

with the bloody stumps of birch and willows? Were it left to my ordering. I should paint the school with the pictures of joy and gladness; Flora and the Graces, as the philosopher Speusippus did his. Where their profit is, let them there have their pleasure too. Such viands as are proper and wholesome for children, should be sweetened with sugar. (para. 90)

In my own years of experience as an adolescent studying classical violin, I was regularly beaten about the head by my teacher's bow whenever I closed my eyes and played. "Look at the music! Look at the Music!" my teacher, Arturo Petrucci, used to command me. Ironically, regular intimidation and punishment was justified with students in Renaissance music education because they *had to memorize* all the music. To assist this, hand signals supplemented the usual switch waving. France, Italy and other associated countries now tend to use the tonic sol fa names, based on C as Doh, as names of notes, rather than alphabetical letters. This is a historically recent change that has only happened in the last two hundred years. Early methods of notation, which used letters of the alphabet, were the origin of some of the symbols used at the present time (Hawes, 2003, para. 3).

In earlier periods, B flat was a different note, and a rounded, lower-case "B" was used to represent it. From this comes our use of a \flat for a flat sign. A squarer, gothic, lower-case "B" was used for B natural, and from this comes our natural sign: \natural . Our sharp sign comes from this gothic B with a line through it: \sharp (Hawes, 2003, para. 3).

This parallel development of musical notation with the written word is striking. Tomlinson cites the late Enlightenment music writer Johann Forkel, who declared that "musical perfection is dependent on notational perfection; notational perfection follows alphabetism; therefore musical perfection follows alphabetism" (p. 36). Rousseau must have been repelled by this kind of thinking and did quite the contrary when he developed his *Plan Regarding New Signs for Music*. At the outset of this work, he stated his

intentions clearly. Although unsuccessful in his 1742 attempt to have this method adopted by the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Paris, his proposed system eschewed letters in favour of new symbols, which were more accessible to the average French citizen:

It would therefore not be right to treat my method as useless because it does not teach how to play according to the ordinary music. For the Science of the Musician does not consist in knowing whole notes, half notes, rests, or Clefs. Whoever knows the art of expressing all sorts of sounds and of movements with the precision that belongs them, and of reading them when expressed by others, has the right to present himself as a Musician, just as a man doesn't fail to speak French even though he doesn't know how to read it or write it by Greek characters, provided that he otherwise knows how to express himself and understands everything others wanted to say to him in French terms by means of these characters. (pp. 2-3)

According to Rainbow, at the time, merely “less than half the male population could sign their names on marriage certificates” (p. 141). Therefore, a way of reading music that didn't rely upon the alphabet might bring about a musical cohesion in French society that reading and writing could not accomplish. With the assistance of word memorization, sans *the switch*, the peasantry or “the people” might ideally unite as one voice. I shall quote Rousseau at length, regarding his proposals to assist the difficulties that beginning note readers experience in *Plan Regarding New Signs for Music*:

This plan aims at making Music more convenient to notate, easier to learn, and much less diffuse. That quantity of lines, clefs, transpositions, sharps, flats, naturals, simple and compound meters, whole notes, half notes, quarter notes, eighth notes, sixteenth notes, thirty-second notes, sixty-fourth notes, whole rests, half rests, quarter rests, eighth rests, sixteenth rests, etc., yields a throng of signs and their combinations from which result two principal inconveniences: the first, that of occupying too great a volume, and the second, that of overloading the memory of Students in such a way that, the ear being formed and the Organs having acquired all the necessary aptitude long before one is in a position to sight-sing, it follows that the difficulty lies wholly in the observation of rules, and not in the performance of the song. The means that will remedy

the first of these inconveniences will remedy the second as well; and as soon as equivalent signs are invented, but simpler and fewer in number, They will have greater precision for that very reason, and they will be able to express as many things in less space. (pp. 3-4)

I have witnessed on numerous occasions, Rousseau's observation that students get bored or frustrated with music because the focus of the classroom experience tends to be preoccupied with decoding and following rules, rather than with performing the music at hand. Rousseau continues with his criticism of then current teaching methods:

In general, what is called singing and playing naturally is perhaps what is worst devised in music. For if the names of the notes have any real utility, it can be only to express certain relationships, certain specific affects in the progression of sounds. Now, as soon as the key changes, since the relationships of the sounds and the progression also change, reason says that the names of the notes must likewise change by relating them analogously to the new key, otherwise, the meaning of the names is overturned and the words are deprived of the sole advantage they have, which is to arouse other ideas with those sounds... Thus, instead of retaining names that deceive the mind and shock the ear habituated to a different practice, it is important to apply ones whose meaning has nothing contradictory about them, but which on the contrary proclaim the intervals they should express...

I appeal to experiences regarding the trouble students have in intoning, by the natural names, tunes they sing with all the ease in the world by means of transposition, provided always that they have acquired the long and necessary practice of reading the flats and sharps of Clefs, which with their eight positions make up eighty useless combinations, all eliminated by my method...

It would be surprising if attention were paid to the quantity of Books and of precepts that have been produced about transposition. Those harmonic scales, those diatonic scales, those imaginary Clefs, make up the most tedious jumble imaginable. (pp. 8-9)

It is reassuring to read that Rousseau notices the "tedious jumble" of confusion that many children experience in the process of learning notation. This is something I too have valiantly tried in the past to teach as part of a general music class and have witnessed a number of formerly well-composed, fine performers turn angry and bitter

towards written music. Several students even refused to play music afterwards, despite the potential they had as musicians, which saddened me greatly. Marie McCarthy, in her article *Re-thinking "Music" in the Context of Education*, affirms this: "When students come to view music as synonymous with the notated work, their relationship to music as human expression is reduced and misguided" (p. 32).

It is also reassuring to hear Rousseau declare many of the key combinations to be "useless" and the practicing of scales and other skills "boring." My background in high school band and in a university music department was certainly very similar. I had to play endless scales and transpose music, often in keys I would never again play in my life. Nevertheless, I was regularly evaluated in these areas and I very much wanted to succeed as a musician in life, no matter the distress it caused me.

A remedy to this "worst devised" method, as put forward by Rousseau as "Cipher Notation" in his *Plan*, is described succinctly by Rainbow in his marvelous book *Music in Educational Thought and Practice*:

Rousseau responded to this situation by determining to do away with the entire apparatus of notation, adopting numerals from 1 to 7 which would allow the Tonic principle to be equally apparent in every key. He did this by employing the figure 1 to represent the keynote of any major scale, the other numbers following in succession for the remaining notes. With this resource it was possible to set down the pitch of a simple diatonic tune. To increase the range beyond a single octave, he employed the dot – written over or under the particular note which entered a higher or lower octave.... (p. 113)

Rousseau's "Cipher Notation" also allowed for key changes, chromatic or half-step movement, time values and signatures, rests and prolonged note values. Unfortunately, the system failed to impress the three-man jury of the Paris Academy of Arts and Sciences enough to endorse replacing the standard of notation in use then, as

it still largely remains in practice now. Rousseau might take heart in knowing that there is currently a cellular telephone music program named *Rousseau MusicPad* that users can install on their *iPhones*. By playing the keyboard numbers on the telephone, the program is based entirely upon his “Cipher Notation,” which seems perfectly suited for our “digital” age (Schmidt, 2012). I have also witnessed many students of Asian heritage using a very similar notation system to learn songs for both piano and guitar.

The ideals implicit in Rousseau’s revolutionary notational system are powerful in their admiration and respect for all members of his society, no matter if these members are part of the dominant groups in power. In an article that discusses Rousseau’s ideals of egalitarianism as evidenced through his theories and practices of music education, Julia Simon discovers the “beating heart” of Rousseau:

Already it is apparent that the new system is designed to bring music to a greater number of people. The enumeration of technical terms in the description of the traditional system for musical notation highlights the difficulties of penetrating what appears to the non-initiate to be a secret code. Moreover, his claims about schoolchildren—that musical notation actually inhibits their ability to sing—imply that the “natural ability” is being hindered rather than helped by the current system. In contrast his new system offers wider accessibility to a broader public, due both to material advantages related to the reduction in printing costs and easier transport and to the pedagogical advantages related to greater ease in reading music. Rousseau suggests that if his system for musical notation were adopted, more people would have access to music; they would learn to read music and gain an understanding of its principles more easily and quickly and have easier access to musical texts. The result would be an enlarged community of musicians who could perform music together. (p. 435)

Continuing with her essay *Singing Democracy: Music and Politics in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Thought*, Simon has found a beautiful way to interpret Rousseau’s aberrant musical system as implicit in his overall philosophical thinking:

What are the advantages of an enlarged community of individuals capable of reading music and singing together? It seems clear that the egalitarian impulse here echoes Enlightenment themes of bringing technical knowledge to the "people." This type of "enlightenment" supports the political goals of democratic theory to create the most egalitarian and homogeneous populace possible. But the desire to create a broader "singing public" seems to go beyond the desire to dismantle an elitist form of culture, although clearly that desire is present as well. Rousseau wants to return singing "to the people" and in so doing restore something that is missing from contemporary music. In practical terms adopting Rousseau's new system will enable individuals to learn to read music and then join with other musicians in order to perform together. The new system of musical notation will help to unify or create more tangible bonds between members of a "musical community," but this desire does not go far enough in explaining the democratic aspects of Rousseau's music theory. Singing together, which is clearly facilitated by a system of musical notation that is easier to learn, leads to something more: the act of singing together helps to create and reinforce more fundamental communal relationships. (pp. 435-436)

It is this potential for the development of communal relationships that must have drawn Johann Pestalozzi to Rousseau. Referring again to Rainbow in his book *Music in Educational Thought and Practice*, schools reformed in 1808 could now have "qualified lay teachers rather than part-time clergy forming their staffs" (p. 136). Pestalozzi was the head of such a school in Switzerland that drew much interest from young teachers who were eager to study his methods:

Foremost among those who sought to put into successful practice the abstract ideas of Rousseau's *Emile*, it was Pestalozzi's achievement to demonstrate that a child's education depended less upon memorizing facts than on the provision of opportunities to make factual discoveries for himself....By relating his teaching to the children's activities and the things they were handling he found that they gained clearer ideas of the concept of number or of the physical nature of their surroundings than from more formal instruction. (p. 136)

Following the example of Rousseau, Pestalozzi wrote his educational theories in novel form. This book, *Leonard and Gertrude*, was widely read throughout Europe.

Pestalozzi later was appointed head of a training college for teachers where Prussian students received training. Rainbow describes the ambiance of Pestalozzi's school:

Pestalozzi was no musician...he could not even sing 'though when excited he would hum snatches of poetry to himself; not however with very much tune'. Yet music found a generous place in his schools. It was not, at first, regarded as a study in its own right but rather as contributing to the general atmosphere of the institution. Significantly, singing was never developed there merely on the grounds that it would contribute to the improvement of congregational singing. Musical experience was made its own justification. In that respect Pestalozzi's attitude marks a clean break with a tradition extending back beyond the Reformation to the beginnings of the Christian era. (p. 137)

Bernarr Rainbow goes on to say that:

For Pestalozzi, music represented a way of introducing the child to beauty, of strengthening feelings of comradeship within the school community, and of providing relaxation between periods of study. Its foundation was the songs which the children had learned while nursed by its mother. He should now learn others of equal simplicity drawn from folk tunes and national airs. For all these reasons singing played a regular part in the daily life of the schools which Pestalozzi ran. The children sang as they walked from one class to another, on their walks to study nature in the countryside, and as they carried out the domestic tasks which formed part of their daily programme. (p. 137)

Rainbow discusses how Pestalozzi did not explore more than "recreational uses" of songs. This summons to mind an example from Thomas Regelski's 2004 book *Teaching General Music in Grades 4-8*. Regelski would appear to have been very comfortable teaching in one of Pestalozzi's schools:

Amateur performance on instruments is a bona fide source of "good time" and deserves its own curricular focus beyond its role in teaching music reading. However, learning to play "real" folk, social or recreational instruments as a basis for lifelong amateur performance is too infrequently an explicit goal of general music education. (p. 213)

While I agree with Regelski that learning to play “real” instruments for lifelong “amateur” performance should be a goal for music educators, Regleski (2004, 2007) refers to “amateur” musicians who play these “recreational instruments” in a musically condescending manner. The “false dichotomization” that occurs here, to which Peter Gouzouasis and Danny Bakan (2011) refer and discuss more fully in the final chapter of this paper, is disrespectful of the musical traditions and virtuosity of the musicians playing these instruments. It ultimately attempts to deny that they are legitimately creative and, instead, gives these “amateur” musicians “recreative” statuses only. Therefore, Gouzouasis and Bakan raise these very important concerns: Who “labels and defines amateur” and “why we make such academic distinctions” (p. 11). Is it also because these “recreational” musicians, apparently performing simply for a “good time” (Regelski, 2004, p. 213), come primarily from an orally transmitted music tradition and not a notated one?

Returning again to Bernarr Rainbow’s discussion of historical music education reform (2006), he notes that in *Gertrude Teaches her Children*, Pestalozzi writes that he did include note reading but that it had to adhere to similar educational guidelines that informed his other teaching: “The teaching of music should begin with the simplest elements. Proceed from one step to the next only gradually; and never allow an unfounded belief that the foundations are secure to confuse or hinder the pupil’s mind” (p. 137).

One such belief that informed Pestalozzi’s teaching was the primacy of experience before language. Again, Rainbow explains how:

Pestalozzi believed that *things*, not *words*, should provide the basis of teaching, and he maintained that learning should begin with the simplest

elements and proceed only by steps suited to the child's capacity. The teacher should dwell on each point until it was understood. Once something was learnt it should be turned to practical use. The child learned through experience (*anschauung*) not by memorizing facts. Almost every feature of the traditional method of teaching was contradicted in these precepts. (p. 137)

As I reflect upon my experiences as a teacher, I can see how perceptive Pestalozzi was and how much contemporary music teaching still relies heavily upon rote memory of essentially useless things, which Rousseau and, later, Michel Foucault have criticized. Another influential music pioneer, Pierre Galin in early 19th century France, was heavily indebted to Rousseau and Pestalozzi. Galin used Rousseau's cipher-notation with children, as "an ancillary device" (Rainbow, 2006, p. 147) because he wanted his students to be introduced to the lines and spaces of the stave as soon as possible. This legacy extends from Maria Montessori and into the present century with "child-centred" practices that are more patient and respectful of the difficulty children experience in learning abstract forms such as Western notation.

A wonderful modern "reform" to this system of notation is in the technological realm. Peter Gouzouasis (2005), in *Fluency in general music and arts technologies: Is the future of music a garage band mentality?*, maintains that computer music technologies are opening up new possibilities in music composition and challenge traditional note-writing abilities to compose *and* perform music. Using the example of the Mac-based *GarageBand* or the "Movie of music software," as it is sometimes referred to, Gouzouasis questions the value of teaching traditional composition when there is a "more direct way" of doing it. With the ghost of Rousseau hovering near, Gouzouasis declares:

Notation will become...more exclusive...relegated to learning and teaching in conservatories, the music monasteries of the 21st century....With the tools we have today, all forms of music can be both related to and relative to what children and adolescents are able to compose on their own, without "music educational" direction...it seems that the only thing holding us back is the traditionalist mentality that has been prevalent in our profession for the past 100 years. (p. 16)

Watching students in my own classrooms composing, using the PC-based cousin of *GarageBand* named *Mixcraft* or the programmable *Reason Propellerhead*, one can understand clearly what Gouzouasis means by this. The students' creative impulses are not impeded by a requirement to "legitimize" their musical expressions by committing them to standard notation. If they wanted it, this could be done for them in the click of a mouse pad, much like "art" music was, in an earlier period of our history, sent out by "serious" composers to their copyists to write out by hand. At present, ironically, the vast majority of professional music copyists use music software to do it in a fraction of the time. Why then should present-day music educators not do this with their students, should they have a wish or a reason to do so? Gouzouasis and Bakan (2011) rightly proclaim that "music technologies have always changed music practice - this in turn *should* change educational practice" (p. 7).

Nevertheless, in the forthcoming chapter, I do reserve some sympathy for those who defend our inherited Western notational tradition, just as I equally believe Rousseau to have been justified in his attempts to reform this same tradition's music notation system. Had he succeeded, one wonders what the present musical landscape would be like. Would there be fewer divisions between high and low art? Would these concepts even be important? Had both popular and art music become "Cipher Notated," would Rousseau's egalitarian principles have been realized in the area of music education?

In closing, an area that I became interested in during the course of research for this subject was that of non-Western notation. Although beyond the scope of the present paper, I believe that some assumptions about Western notation bear mentioning. In her review of Walter Kaufmann's book *Musical Notations of the Orient: Notational systems of continental east, south and central Asia*, Edith Gerson-Kiwi discusses the disruption that the application of Western notation had upon Indian music during the reign of English colonialism:

Compared with the ancient, historically developed notations of the Far East, the Indian form is a very recent adaptation of solmization systems (mainly Western) based on the standardization of ragas. This must be classed as one of the unavoidable accidents of our time and has probably contributed to a radical reduction of micromelodic intonational refinement.
(p. 145)

If Indian colonialism was an "unavoidable accident," then Gerson-Kiwi is correct. However, this is a distinct echo of Johann Forkel's ethnocentric credo, discussed earlier in this chapter, that "musical perfection follows alphabetism." Yet, deemed an "accident" it was and Indian music suffered from Western influences just as their indigenous religions endured the imposition of Christianity upon their traditions. Gerson-Kiwi does, however, identify this alarming tendency inherent in modernism that Andreas Huyssens (1986) criticizes as its universalizing aesthetics (p. 95). Gerson-Kiwi notes that "it was generally believed that the East, indeed the musical world outside the European civilization, was based on oral traditions only, that it was the privilege of the West to develop devices for notating musical sound" (p. 144). From a cursory look at Kaufmann's book *Musical Notation of the Orient*, the possibilities for alternates to past and present dilemmas regarding notation are intriguing. In ancient Korea alone, several types of sophisticated notation exist side-by-side on the page that the average person in Korea

understood (p. 127). This allowed the performer a minutia of expression, in ways that Western notation was incapable of doing at that time. This stands in sharp contrast to the Western tradition of its insistence that there be only one correct way to “read” music. As Wayne Bowman (2010) reminds music educators, “Truth is multiple, though” (p. 1). The quest for more ways to notate or represent music has been an area that I have found to be of great benefit to my music students while I explored alternative notations during my dissertation research. To my delight, so very many of these discoveries were made by watching and learning from my students as they were in the practice of learning to play music in my class. There is much to learn from our students, as doubtless Rousseau must have known. However, he also points to how much they have to learn from us as receptive music educators. I look forward to the spirit of Rousseau to continue accompanying me on my journey as a music educator. Reflecting back upon the great potential latent in student-centred philosophies, and the fluid motion between formal and informal learning environments in the music classroom, I sense that contemporary music educators owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Rousseau. In the words of John Darling (1993) on the value of child-centred education:

Experiential learning and discovery methods are central, as is Rousseau’s refusal to force the pace, aiming for understanding rather than for accelerated learning. Education should be tailored to the capacities and inclinations of the individual child, and the whole operation should be underpinned by an understanding of how children think, and how they develop. (p. 34)

I hope that I too will always try not to “force the pace” and encourage a slowing down to occur in my students’ musical environments. However, the strictures of the school timetable, the rituals of a bell system with back-to-back classes, and a government curriculum laden with spurious learning outcome demands, will certainly test

the mettle of any music educator's commitment to child-centred approaches. The school institution itself impedes genuine individualization, thus providing a giant hurdle to realize the kind of education that Rousseau envisioned. In conclusion, I shall part with these words by Albert Hunt (1976), who renders the school institution into a kind of dramatic sphere. Hunt's observations about ritual and power provide a scaffold from Rousseau's child-centred philosophies to the following chapter's discussion about conceptions of power and discipline.

The sense of other people, with mysterious knowledge, controlling your life is what our education system is structured to communicate. The form of that communication is theatrical, ritualistic. The lining up in the playground when somebody blows a whistle; the morning assembly, where power is displayed, the rituals of moving from room to room when the bell rings; all these are theatrical in their effect. That is to say they work in the way the theatre works, making the abstract concrete, demonstrating in physical terms where the power lies. Until we begin to understand that the education system itself works in terms of theatre to communicate a particular experience of society, we won't get very far in saying what the role of theatre, our theatre, not the education system's— can be in contributing to the true aim of education, that of giving pupils understanding, control, and the power to make decisions about changing their environment. (p. 121)

Chapter 4.

Foucault, Modernism, Early Music Education in British Columbia, Musical Exemplars, and Ressentiment

I think about the snobbishness and elitism that has always been part of the music world. Those unfortunates looking down their noses at 'lesser' souls and their popular music. Those who retreat into the dark shadows and look out disapprovingly at music played for sport and fun and laughter. Fun is not cool, particularly if you never have any.

Christy Moore (2003, p. 272)

Look what fear's done to my body
Look what fear's done to my body
Chorus of "Because You're Frightened"

Magazine (1980)

We have become used to Michel Foucault's "shocking" ways of questioning our modern pride in matters such as psychiatry or penal practices. But the shock now may well be addressed even to academic followers of Foucault, those who have turned his production of destabilizing, and even frightening, demands for lucidity into a "we know better" industry.

Isabelle Stengers (2008, p. 49)

Contemporary music education remains an unsettling mixture of modernism and postmodernism. While a typical postmodern music class from kindergarten to grade 8 usually has pluralist, multi-cultural or popular culture musics as distinct elements of teacher's practice, there exists the characteristic modernist band and choir program which predominantly maintains the teacher or "expert-centered," Western musical canon of white, male European composers for a small, often privileged group of students. Arguably, it is to this small group that is being deferred to, due to an unfounded notion that middle and high schools are the training grounds for the music conservatory in college and university. In the beginning of this chapter, certain of Michel Foucault's early writings in "Discipline and Punish" will be used as examples to suggest some similarities between monastic orders, the military and schools; both in past and present school practices in British Columbia.

One could argue that the chasm separating the postmodern music education of the generalist nature in the classroom and the vestige of modernism, inherent in typical band and choir programs, is in need and is capable of some serious bridge building. However, the vast gulf spanning the staunch, often impersonal discipline of traditional music education and the obscure relativism of what some see is imbedded in new, post-modern custom might very well be ill-fated to remain separate if seen only as a dichotomy. It is not sufficient to say, as many current arts educators do, that all past practice deserves to be jettisoned because it holds no “useful” place in the present world. As a counter to this latter charge, Alasdair MacIntyre (1981) proposes that public education’s mission is to ensure that the student “becomes through his history, a teller of stories that aspire to truth” (p. 216). A crucial point here, however, is that these are the stories of another’s authority and not one’s own. Yet, when pressed to translate these intrusive and exclusive values into music education, MacIntyre devolves into advocating the same kind of musical-skills teaching that has plagued music educators and their students for ages (MacIntyre and Dunne, 2002). Similar to MacIntyre, Michael Oakeshott (1972) suggests that there is “a considerable inheritance of human understandings, sentiments, beliefs, etc.” (p. 34) that one comes to know the world through the process of being educated. Friedrich Nietzsche (1872) declared that “all culture begins with the very opposite of that which is now so highly esteemed as 'academic freedom': with obedience, with subordination, with discipline, with subjection.” Over a century later, Foucault (1984) pronounced “I don’t see where evil is in the practice of someone who...knowing more than another, tells him what he must do, teaches him, transmits knowledge to him, communicates skills to him” (p. 84). The manner in which discipline has become maligned in music classrooms is symptomatic of many contemporary education approaches. Murray Ross (personal communication, February 4, 2007) might

suggest that “rather than say that standards of excellence are simply forms of oppression forced upon us by elites intent on dominating us and excluding us, these standards can be viewed as the basis of human growth in the struggle to overcome our limitations.”

Although the notion advanced by Thomas Regelski (2002a, 2003) that the dominant culture of the Western music tradition unfairly holds sway over popular and “world music” programs in schools, there are those such as Estelle Jorgensen (2003a) who maintain that by including study of the Western tradition as “an organic and living thing,” we better understand “the particular contributions and detractions of Western Civilization” (p. 134). In the latter part of this chapter, I shall examine a number of disparate views held in current music education, particularly the concepts of discipline, resentment and what music should be valued and taught. Although my sympathies ultimately lie with those critics and reformers of an elitist culture that might retain artistic expression in the hands of a few, I explore some of the notions supporting artistic excellence and musical exemplars holding a purported canonical status. However, a more thorough attempt to disentangle the many modernist and post-modernist perspectives shall likely prove to be futile and is a vast area beyond the scope of this dissertation. It is in relation to this subject that I shall now begin.

Griselda Pollock (1999) asserts that modernism is characterized by deeply held ethnocentric assumptions and notes: “Tradition cultivates its own inevitability by erasing the fact of its selectivity in regard to practices, meanings, gender, ‘races’ and classes” (p. 10). Andreas Huyssens (1986) claims modernism’s universalizing aesthetics concern beauty, formal relations, individuality, authenticity, originality, self-expression, negativity, alienation, ambiguity and abstraction. This coalesces into an aesthetic of “the closed and

finished work of art” (p. 209), something usually not of value in popular and other non-notated musics. Post-modern music education, according to Janet Mansfield (2002), must remedy the key failure of modernism in music education, which is in “dealing with difference.” Specifically, Mansfield desires a change that both embraces and gives authority to excluded and marginalized groups.

Here is where much debate in music education circles begins: what music should we value and teach? This “music of the excluded and the marginalized” might or might not include the music of popular culture or the ethnic music of our immediate locale, which includes both immigrant cultural groups and that of “conquered” cultures such as First Nations.

An example of such a dominated culture is the following excerpt from a 1912 feature in the *Conservatory Monthly* magazine, which was then the official publication for the Toronto Conservatory of Music. Ironically entitled *Music Among the Coast Indians of Northern British Columbia*, music director and Toronto Conservatory of Music graduate Isabella Geddes Large described the music that fifty years of British traditions imposed by missionaries in Methodist residential schools had upon the First Nations people of Port Simpson, British Columbia. The bands and choirs she taught performed for Christian weddings, funerals, Hudson’s Bay business functions and the occasional opportunity to direct before royalty (Green and Vogan, 1991, p. 93). Although most of this article is both pathetically and shamelessly ethnocentric, the following statements she makes have specific relevance to the universalizing aesthetic of modernism that Huysens refers to in his book *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture and Postmodernism* (1986). Large (1912) observes that:

while some of their attempts were amusing rather than entertaining, many of the people show marked native ability; and when we realize they are little more than a generation removed from the old heathen dances and barbarous customs, even to the eating of human flesh by some few of them, we are surprised that with their very limited opportunities they have made such progress. (pp. 213-214)

Large declares that the men are “ready to come to any number of practices and to spend any amount of time on their music, indeed much more than we can possibly give them” (p. 212). This was not *their* music, however, because *their* music was considered strange by music director Large, who observed that it was rarely even heard, replaced instead by the colonizers’ band and choir music:

Strange place to look for music you may think. Still these are a music-loving people, though they may not have advanced far in their ability to appreciate the best. Their native music, of which one hears but little now, in this northern district, consisted of a weird minor chant accompanied by the rhythmic beating of a drum. (p. 211)

Earlier in 1873, John Jessop, the first superintendent of schools in British Columbia and a central figure in forming province-wide public schools here, adopted the music programs of the Methodist schools and made them mandatory. Jessop also established a curriculum for high school, because following high school, one was qualified to be a teacher. Music was obligatory in high school for future teachers, right along with map drawing (Green and Vogan, 1991, p. 102). But why music?

During one of my graduate courses, a colleague specializing in dance education expressed frustration that when school budgets precipitate the choosing of what arts programs to support in school, administrators usually pick music first, with dance coming in last. My colleague later cited Ken Robinson in *Out of Our Minds: Learning to be Creative* (2001), where he laments that high schools and growing numbers of elementary schools recognize a “hierarchy within the arts: art and music usually have

higher status than theatre and dance. There isn't a school system in the world that teaches dance every day as a compulsory discipline" (The Culture of Education section, para. 8). This really interested me for a number of reasons. An obvious one was the slight feeling of guilt I had of being in this supposedly favoured group, which made me blind to other fine arts. In my own school district, dance is usually casually placed as "special units" with the regular P.E. curriculum, and visual art and drama are both either combined into the same course or they are catapulted into the pit of core curriculum, to be dealt with by non-specialist teachers. Robinson's comment had a renewed interest for me when I was recently exposed to Foucault and certain other writings on music education.

So why music? What might be some possible reasons why, historically, practical individuals like administrators and politicians supported it and still tend to support it in school? Usher and Edwards, in *Postmodernism and Education*, cite Keith Hoskin who states: "Foucault really discovered something very simple (but highly unfamiliar nonetheless) – the centrality of education in the construction of modernity" (p. 84). The reasons for transplanting religious school curriculum into the new public schools of British Columbia, with music deemed being central to the education of all students, were explained by John Jessop in his second annual report in 1873, not all of them religious:

- A knowledge of vocal music is of more practical value than mathematics, yet there is no gainsaying the fact that probably nine out of ten persons of both sexes will find far more use, and derive greater benefit from, a fair knowledge of this subject than from mathematics beyond the rules of simple arithmetic. But its practical value in *after life* is but one argument, among many, why it should be carefully and generally taught. Its utility in the school room in maintaining order, in the enforcement of discipline, and as an incentive to study, cannot be overestimated. (p. 95)

So, music really covered a lot of acceptable ground here. It carried with it order and discipline, as well as rewards in *this* life for the student and the *next* life. Similarly, Foucault, in “Docile Bodies” from *Discipline and Punish*, describes the control of activity through the timetable as being an old inheritance from monastic communities:

Its three great methods – establish rhythms, impose particular occupations, regulate the cycles of repetition – were soon to be found in schools, workshops and hospitals. The new disciplines had no difficulty in taking up their places in the old forms; the schools and poorhouses extended the life and regularity of the monastic communities to which they were often attached. (p. 149)

Foucault further details the alteration of the methods that these “masters of discipline,” the religious orders, had refined. He speaks about how in:

the elementary school...activities were governed in detail by orders that had to be obeyed immediately: ‘At the last stroke of the hour, a pupil will ring the bell, and at the first sound of the bell all the pupils will kneel, with their arms crossed and their eyes lowered.’ (p. 150)

Other areas within the “control of activity” that are listed by Foucault are “the correlation of the body and gesture” and “the body-object articulation” (p. 152). For the former, he chronicles the disciplinary control necessary for handwriting in 1783 France: “The pupils must always ‘hold their bodies erect, somewhat turned and free on the left side, slightly inclined, so that, with the elbow placed on the table, the chin can be rested upon the hand, unless this were to interfere with the view; the left leg must be somewhat more forward under the table than the right’ ” (p. 152).

Lastly, Foucault included “exhaustive use” as the great moral offense and economic dishonesty “counted by God and paid for by men” (p. 154): wasting time. Foucault uses the example by Bernard of the “mutual improvement school,” whereby “temporal norms” were imposed by “signals, whistles, orders...that were intended both to

accelerate the process of learning and to teach speed as a virtue” (p. 154). Foucault relates the following writing exercise:

9: Hands on the knees. This command is conveyed by one ring on the bell; 10: Hands on the table, head up; 11: clean the slates: everyone cleans his slate with a little saliva, or better still with a piece of rag 12: show the slates; 13: monitors, inspect. They inspect the slates with their assistants and then those of their own bench. The assistants inspect those of their own bench and everyone returns to his own place. (p. 315)

In 1913, the “Manual and Syllabus of Instruction of Vocal Music” was issued by George Hicks, Vancouver’s first supervisor of music who, the previous year had assembled a choir consisting of forty-five hundred students and two hundred teachers to perform in Vancouver for the Duke of Connaught (Green and Vogan, 1991, p. 99). In his manual, a similar preponderance with time efficiency, repetition and discipline of the body is evident:

Do not sing with your students (You may pattern for them). Be careful that the machinery of your music lesson runs swiftly and smoothly, and the same every day. Do not allow them to waste time. Do not teach too much; let your pupils learn instead. Do nothing for them that they can do for themselves – it is not music alone you are teaching. Teach your pupils to start when you say ‘Sing.’ Teach them to keep going until they reach the end of the song or exercise, unless you say the word ‘Stop.’ (p. 100)

Patricia O’Toole, in her article *I sing in a choir but “I have no voice!”*, applies Foucault’s disciplinary control over “the body” to her experiences with and perceptions about the functioning of choral ensembles or “bodies”:

The creation of the individual and collective choral body is an embodiment of this meticulous control. The choral body does not exist naturally; rather, it is an instrument made through discipline. Directors carefully construct the way the body is held, the manner in which specific muscles are used for breathing, and the physical shape of the internal and external mouth. In addition to the physical choral body, directors also discipline the emotional and mental choral body by condoning desired behaviors and attitudes and by valuing the knowledge belonging to

directors over the experience of the singers. This intellectual, emotional, and physical control creates a practice by which every part of the singers' involvement is subjected to disciplinary power. Etymologically, by calling itself a discipline, music draws attention to its technologies of power for creating the practiced and subjected body. (p. 70)

Here is an example of how to evaluate body posture in choral groups that, similar to the monitors in Foucault's writing exercise class, employs the surveillance technique of the time-efficient, "progressive" music teacher: the peer group:

Since good posture is fundamental to good singing, I needed a way to assess students' achievement of expert singing posture. I taught posture by means of a ten-point checklist, starting with the toes and moving to the head: "toes pointed forward," "feet flat on the floor," "knees slightly bent," etc. The instructional process that I used to teach good posture included three steps: I demonstrated it, called on students to model it, and then had students monitor their classmates' efforts. When I was sure that every student could produce correct posture, I had my students grade one another on the ten-point scale. (p. 42)

Kathleen Keenan-Takagi, the author of the above article entitled "Embedding Assessment in Choral Teaching" (2000) in the *Music Educators Journal*, which is the reporting medium for the National Association for Music Educators (M.E.N.C.), chose a subtitle that illustrates the value that modernity places upon efficiency in education: *Embedding assessment in the regular activities of a choral ensemble can give students valuable information about their progress without sacrificing instructional time.* Jean-Jacques Rousseau raged against this sort of thinking in education nearly two and a half centuries ago in Book II of *Émile*: "Dare I expose the greatest, the most important, the most useful rule of all education? It is not to gain time but to lose it" (p. 93).

Keenan-Takagi's text, appearing in what is arguably the most widely read American journal by practicing music teachers, exemplifies the dilemma faced by arts educators to satisfy the data-collection needs of administrators and politicians.

Unfortunately, it is all too often that those not directly involved in actual school music experiences, such as school and district administrators, get the primary direction as to how a music class is structured over those that are its principle players. Those in positions of power and influence can be very persuasive and, regrettably, intimidating to teachers. This sometimes occurs with such frequency and persistence that the teacher may end up implementing and actually claiming to believe what he or she truly knows is not in the best interest of the students:

Early in my career, a parent complained about a student's grade. My principal told me that I should have five grades per marking period. I recalled that principal years later when I was teaching in a middle school. Each quarter, I had 240 choral students and 100 general music students to grade. I didn't want to stop the music in order to arrive at a grade. How was I to grade my heterogeneous group of students on skills, concepts, and repertoire within my time limitations? Yet, assessment can increase the musical value of a rehearsal. It can have a wonderful effect on the morale of an ensemble. Students feel pride in their achievements and accept individual responsibility for learning. The answer was to embed assessment in the rehearsal. (p. 43)

In Craig McCauley's guide *Introduction to Correct Posture for Singing* (2005) for middle school music, one finds an example of the development of discipline in body posture for choral groups which, innocuously similar to the monitors in Foucault's writing exercise class, employs the surveillance technique of the sensitive, "progressive" music teacher: the peer group.

Proper singing technique begins with good posture, setting up the body to produce the best sound possible. Please attempt all of these exercises while standing in a circle facing each other in your group.

Feet: Shoulder length apart, one foot slightly ahead of the other, weight evenly distributed and toward your toes. Rise up on your tiptoes, and lower back down slightly so your heels are barely touching the ground.

Knees: Slightly bent so that you can feel it, but no one can see it. Wiggle your knees forward and back to feel how relaxed they are while still standing tall.

Chest: Raised comfortably, creating a lift throughout the middle of your body (a buoyant rib cage). Tap on your sternum to feel the area you want to lift (ask your partners or look up sternum in the dictionary if you don't know where this body part is located!). In raising your chest you should feel a tilt in your ribcage, rotating upward from the sternum.

Shoulders: Relaxed and lowered comfortably, parallel to your chest. Raise your shoulders to your ears, and then lower them to the ground. Now take a deep breath, relax, and try to lower them an inch more. (Instructions section, para.1)

I might argue that music is considered hierarchical to other arts because it has been, as Hoskin finds in Foucault, an educational discipline well suited to the construction of modernity. Power can be transmitted through discipline, order, repetition, and surveillance. As Foucault has demonstrated, power slipped with relative ease from monasticism to the modern, public sphere. However, as Foucault said in *The Final Foucault* (1988):

Power is not an evil....Let us also take something that has been the object of criticism, often justified: the pedagogical institution. I don't see where evil is in the practice of someone who, in a given game of truth, knowing more than another, tells him what he must do, teaches him, transmits knowledge to him communicates skills to him. The problem is rather to know how you are to avoid in these practices – where power cannot not play and where it is not evil in itself – the effects of domination which make a child subject to the arbitrary and useless authority of a teacher, or put a student under the power of an abusively authoritarian professor, and so forth. (p. 18)

Critics of Foucault, such as Paul A. Bové, find that the stance of his later writings shrinks away from his earlier one in which he left "no room for freedom or resistance to power" (p. 78). In the essay *Power and Freedom: Opposition and the Humanities*, Bové suggests Foucault is reinventing himself when, in *The Final Foucault*, he declares, "One cannot impute to me the idea that power is a system of domination which controls everything and which leaves no room for freedom" (p. 13). Bové goes on to say:

Readers find it hard to believe this comment from 1984 when they recall some others from 1976; Foucault seems to be practicing the art of self-revision. In articulating his notion of "bio-power" which puts "life" and its management at the center of political control and social organization, Foucault makes some comments about power that tellingly raise the issue of the state and suggest that he has forgotten some of his earlier comments on power:

If the development of the great institutions of the state, as institutions of power, ensured the maintenance of production relations, the rudiments of anatomo- and bio-politics, created in the eighteenth century as techniques of power present at every level of the social body and utilized by very diverse institutions...operated in the sphere of economic processes.... They also acted as factors of segregation and social hierarchization, exerting their influence on the respective forces of both these movements, guaranteeing relations of domination and effects of hegemony. (p. 81)

As an example, Bové gives the example of political writer Edward Said who argues that Foucault's work has been haunted by an "asymmetry in his work between the blindly anonymous and the *intentional*" (p. 79). Said's particular work in Palestinian resistance to Israeli oppression "required a critical, political discourse that made more of both the intellectual's engagement on the side of the oppressed and of the nature and availability of resistance than did Foucault's" (p. 80). In her essay *Foucault, truth telling and technologies of the self in schools*, Tina Besley discusses this apparent "asymmetry":

Foucault's earlier work *emphasized* the application of...technologies of domination through the political subjugation of 'docile bodies' in the grip of ... disciplinary powers and the way the self is produced by processes of objectification, classification and normalization in the human sciences...Foucault himself defended the 'determinist' emphasis in *Discipline and Punish*, admitting that not enough was said about agency, so he re-defined power to include agency as self-regulation thereby overcoming some of the problematic political implications in his earlier work...He emphasized that individuals are continually in the process of constituting themselves as ethical subjects through both technologies of the self and ethical self-constitution, and a notion of power that is not simply based upon repression, coercion or domination. By this point

Foucault saw individuals 'as self-determining agents capable of challenging and resisting the structures of domination in modern society.' (pp. 78 - 79)

Whether Foucault's writings on power can or cannot be a blueprint for political action should not diminish their worth nor should Foucault bear the brunt of excessive criticism because he attempted to clarify what he saw as certain indistinct features of his early work. I do argue that Foucault's writings open up possibilities in the area of examining powerful and less powerful voices heard throughout the history of music education, whether or not his intention was for these works to take the shape of political actions. Here, Isabella Stengers (2008) offers her criticism of those academics who would use Foucault in self-righteous politicizing based upon "they believed/we know" (p. 49). Stengers notes:

We have become used to Michel Foucault's "shocking" ways of questioning our modern pride in matters such as psychiatry or penal practices. But the shock now may well be addressed even to academic followers of Foucault, those who have turned his production of destabilizing, and even frightening, demands for lucidity into a "we know better" industry. (p. 49)

A vivid illustration of theories that have been adapted for the purpose of action in music education is in the work of Thomas Regelski. A seemingly tireless advocate for change in the power balance of school music programs, Regelski is one of seventeen cofounders of the "MayDay" group, whose two-fold purpose was "to apply critical theory and critical thinking to the purposes and practices of music education and to affirm the central importance of musical participation in human life and, thus, the value of music in the general education of all people" (MayDay Group, 2009, p. xxxii). Regelski's formulation of a concept he refers to as "critical education" is a result of applications of the critical theorists from the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research. The participants in

this group did not stake claim to being members, as such, but participated in intense critical review of social institutions and dominant groups in power.

I will now suggest that, in the face of our pluralistic, multicultural world, it is difficult to justify teaching subjects such as band and choir in the manner in which they are currently being taught in our schools. Band programs, in a way very much similar to how choir programs came from religious origins, have a history that dates back to support Canada's need to train military band members. As a proposed community support, band programs were added to curriculum alongside choir in the public schools. Arguably, now that the "military state religion" is no longer a growing concern, except on the far right perhaps, a different form of community support is required in music education. As Janet Mansfield pointed out earlier in this chapter, the universalizing tendencies inherent in modernism's selective practices have been unsatisfactory in the area of music education.

However, Regelski and others in the MayDay Group frequently promote only the practical values of music. By comparing lower "classical versus popular" recording sales as an indicator of a public democracy at work, as he did at a MayDay colloquium on July 7, 2003 in Vancouver, B.C., Regelski would make Theodor Adorno cringe, perhaps even more so by using a variant of the Frankfurt School's critical theory as a political platform for action. The argument that the study of an art in an educational setting is only worthwhile if it is likely to be sustainable in the larger social system is a permutation of performativity. Usher and Edwards make the following statement in the section in *Postmodernism and Education*:

The principle of performativity in education is linked to the performativity of the social system, with each aspect of the educational process being

subject to the requirements of efficiency. The task of education is to operate in the most efficient ways to provide individuals with the learning they require to optimize their contributions to the social system. Lyotard argues that certain kinds of skills are required for this to occur: 'any discipline with applicability to training in "telematics" (computer scientists, cyberneticists, linguists, mathematicians...) will most likely receive priority in education. (p. 175)

Hoskin, who stated earlier in this same text that, "Foucault discovered...the centrality of education in the construction of modernity" (p. 84), similarly so do Usher and Edwards make the point that by "fulfilling the requirements of the economy under conditions of global competition" here "education finds its rationale in the postmodern moment" (p. 175).

A good example of this is the way in which certain members of the music education community have positioned themselves into this area of "telematics" of which Lyotard speaks about. As Patricia Campbell (1998) states:

The reinterpretation of the findings of Frances Rauscher and her colleagues on music's impact on the improvement of spatial reasoning skills many times over has produced a myth regarded as "immutable truth," one that has been widely embraced by musicians and made known to the public at large. (p. 99)

Both music educators and music recording companies took this, generalized it and adamantly called for more funding in their discipline, claiming that any and all forms of music made people smarter. Rauscher's 1994 study has since been widely debunked, including by Rauscher herself in 2006. "The research...provides evidence for a Mozart effect in rats...My colleagues and I do not claim that listening to classical music will improve children's mathematical or spatial scores—a common myth regarding the Mozart effect" (p. 16). Nevertheless, Rauscher's research helped spawn the multi-million dollar industry of "Mozart Effect" recordings.

Numerous music educators claim Elliot Eisner (2002) to be correct in asserting that arts education should serve in contrast to the need for educational efficiency that underlies much of schooling, of which the principle of performativity in education is but one example. Joseph Shively (2004) observes that the “manner in which students are grouped for ensemble classes is largely one that is based on the need to be efficient” (p. 181). This attitude that students are unwitting victims at the control of random authority is sharply criticized by Michael Oakeshott in *Education: The Engagement And Its Frustration*:

Many of the writers who believe this condition of things to be both desirable and unavoidable are of no account. They affect to believe that ‘School’ as a deliberate initiation of a learner into an inheritance of human understandings and proprieties of conduct is, and must be, children condemned to a prison-like existence in cell-like classrooms, compelled by threats to follow a sordid, senseless and rigid routine which destroys all individuality, dragooned into learning what they do not and cannot understand because it is ‘remote’ from their ‘interests’ and from what they have hitherto encountered, the victims of a conspiracy against ‘life’ who acquiesce in their degraded condition only because to revolt would be to forfeit the subsequent opportunity of profitable employment. (pp. 28-29)

An ambitious project was undertaken by Estelle Jorgensen. She solicited fifteen people who shared three things in common: they were all philosophers, teachers and musicians. One contributor was Ralph Smith (1993) and he recommended that music education should, in addition to the study of masterpieces or exemplars, contain a humanities curriculum. Smith admitted the difficulty education faces in preserving traditional aims and purposes of the humanities while adapting them to changed social conditions. Smith asks these crucial questions:

How, for example, do we deal with the humanities’ having become practically unmanageable as a result of their trying to encompass the works of all civilizations, non-Western as well as Western? How can a

democratic society grounded in egalitarian ideals defend a tradition of learning whose origins are rooted in an essentially aristocratic culture? (p. 119)

J. A. Saunders (2010), writing on adolescent student identity in the music classroom, might agree: “The delivery of a ‘musical canon’ may alienate some pupils and further strengthen the perception of school music as ‘other’ thereby continuing to encourage only a minority of pupils to pursue the subject” (p. 72). Similarly, Jorgensen project contributor Peter Kivy (1993) doubted that the study of music outside of our students’ immediate lives or “tribes” could ultimately be helpful. Kivy speculated that this might bring about an absence of “regard for their own tribal rituals” (p.91). This suggestion that the study of music “outside” of one’s own confines or tribe is brought into question when reading a passage from Friedrich Nietzsche’s *The Genealogy of Morals*.

Among primitive tribes, each new generation feels towards the preceding ones, and especially toward the original founders of the tribe, a *juridical* obligation (rather than an *emotional* obligation, which seems to be of relatively recent origin.) Early societies were convinced that their continuance was guaranteed solely by the sacrifices and achievements of their ancestors and that these sacrifices and achievements required to be paid back. (pp. 221-222)

Although taken largely out of Nietzsche’s context, there exists the idea that modern “tribal” obligations, in place of legal ones, come in the form of emotions. The emotional guilt that one experiences, albeit it a rational one, for not honouring or “paying back” one’s ancestor’s achievements, might come in the form of the recent denial of our inherited Western musical experience. My sense, in regard to Kivy, is that he is referring to all the inherited music of any particular culture.

Perhaps the required discipline of teaching the reading and writing of Western music notation will eventually become extinct in future music classrooms, as Peter Gouzouasis (2005) suggests, instead “relegated to learning and teaching in

conservatories, the music monasteries of the 21st century” (p. 16). Yet, others consider it important to acknowledge our inherited past, if not to reify it but to pay it the respect it might be accorded. So much remarkable, notated music has been written and performed that cannot be denied a place inside and outside our classrooms in this nebulous future. Oakeshott’s suggestion that those students who come to know school “as a deliberate initiation of a learner into an inheritance of human understandings” (p. 29) are going to be denied the opportunity to experience the tutelage of those teachers who have this inheritance and believe it is their obligation to pass this on to successive generations.

A particular consequence of this attempt to politicize music is the discouragement of note reading as a kind of “bourgeois” activity for many music educators. Although time limitations in music programs often determine choices teachers make regarding the primacy of “literacy” over performing, Estelle Jorgensen (2003a) asserts that by including study of the Western tradition as “an organic and living thing,” we better understand “the particular contributions and detractions of Western Civilization” (p. 134). Jorgensen views Western music as a continually transformative tradition, which has acquired many non-Western world-views and musical practices along its course of history. In her article *Western Classical Music and General Education*, Jorgensen defends inclusion of this tradition in education:

Musical notation is one of its singular achievements....Remaining illiterate in this tradition leaves one deprived of knowledge essential to full participation in a society that regards itself as Western. This deprivation, whether intentional or not, is racist and classist...failing to develop musical literacy in at least one notated musical tradition makes it difficult to break out of aural/oral into a literate one, something that exponents of aural/oral or little musical traditions may wish to do, sooner or later. And leaving students limited is arguably mis-educative since it stunts and prevents their further development. (p. 135)

Lucy Green (2003b) cautions us “against throwing out the baby with the bath water” (p. 2) in her article *Why ‘Ideology’ is Still Relevant for Critical Thinking in Music Education*. Green summarizes the dilemma accordingly:

With reference to music, it is necessary to understand ideology within the terms of the whole musical field, because specific categories of music are only manifest in contradistinction to others. Some of the main distinguishing forces in creating different categories of music involve ideological constructions of value. These constructions often contain the idea that valuable music is imbued with qualities such as universality, eternity, complexity, originality or autonomy. Whereas classical music readily lays claims to such qualities, popular, jazz and other ‘world’ musics do so less readily, and often only with qualification. But in all cases, the claims of value are ideological in so far as they involve reification and legitimation. (p. 17)

In the article *Pax Americana and the World of Music Education*, Estelle Jorgensen argues that music educators, as “members of this tribe,” need to “give voice to those who are silenced, encourage those who are hopeless, and empower those who believe themselves powerless toward creating a more humane world” (pp. 3-4). Jorgensen (2004) calls upon the common ideology, which she believes to be inherent in much of our art music, to provide this voice. Returning to Paul Bové’s claim earlier in this paper that Edward Said “required a critical, political discourse that made more of both the intellectual’s engagement on the side of the oppressed and of the nature and availability of resistance than did Foucault’s” (p. 80), Said seems to have found some satisfaction through the common medium of Western music, as is proposed by Jorgensen:

The Western classical tradition can epitomize this poly-vocality and provide opportunities to empower and give voice to musicians and their audiences. For example, it is not unusual for a piece by a German composer, for example, Brahms, to be played by a Japanese artist in the United States, Israel, India, or Australia....And their audiences are likely representative of many nationalities and ethnicities. Such is the power of

this cosmopolitanism and collaborations that Daniel Barenboim and Edward Said discuss the possibilities of beginning to forge peaceful solutions to intractable political problems through musical collaborations even within this tradition, for example, as when Arab and Israeli musicians came together to perform at Weimar in 1999. (p. 4)

The Frankfurt critical theorists, a group of fiercely disparate thinkers, were formed during a time of totalitarianism, yet they had but one mind: to “abolish social injustice” (Bronner, p. 201). Therefore, it is ironic that an attempt to radically amend the established paradigm of Western music should have totalitarian overtones, especially in light of Jorgensen’s appeal that the Western classical tradition act as a kind of mediator in the world’s human rights struggles. Writing again in *Pax Americana*, Jorgensen does not wish to supplant one dogmatic paradigm with another. By applying critical theory, or “critical appraisal,” to all areas of music education, Jorgensen suggests that *any* assumption can be examined before making it a belief and putting it into practice:

Teaching the young to think in a particular music necessitates a critical appraisal of this tradition and its beliefs and practices. By critical appraisal, I refer to its strong sense in analyzing and de-constructing taken-for-granted assumptions and making careful judgments of the value of particular beliefs and practices. One cannot engage in an educational enterprise of any sort without values that are normative in a particular tradition. (p. 11)

Jorgensen suggests the following way out of the Western and non-Western music maze by offering a *pax* of her own:

Not enough has been said in music education about the value of musics that have sophisticated intellectual traditions in helping develop the intellectual qualities desired. For example, classical traditions are of especial interest in music because they exemplify the sorts of intellectual prowess that educators need to develop in the young. They represent sophisticated attempts to create musics that surpass the ordinary. Such traditions have often emerged out of folk and popular musics, for example, rock and jazz may come to be thought of classically, even as a part of the Western classical tradition. People need to see examples of imaginative intelligence at work musically as in other ways. (p. 11)

A similar sentiment is demonstrated by Alasdair MacIntyre in *The Idea of an Educated Public* (1987), wherein the traditions and “canons” of a given community have an acknowledged status that are deemed worthy of passing on:

An educated community can exist only where there is some large degree of shared background beliefs and attitudes, informed by the widespread reading of a common body of texts, texts which are accorded a canonical status within that particular community. When I speak of a canonical status, I do not mean that such texts provide a final court of appeal. I mean only that appeal to them has to be treated with a special seriousness, that to controvert them requires a special weight of argument. This common possession by a community of such a shared body of texts is only possible when there is also an established tradition of interpretive understanding of how such texts are to be read and construed. So not every literate and reading public is an educated public; mass literacy in a society which lacks both canonical texts and a tradition of interpretive understanding is more likely to produce a condition of public mindedness than an educated public. (p. 19)

To “controvert” the canonical texts of which one might speak of in music education, music philosopher Peter Kivy (1993) makes this observation in his essay:

Suppose I were to play to an average audience of educated men and women recordings, respectively, of Hamlet’s famous soliloquy that begins, “To be, or not to be...” and the opening measures of the *Eroica*. It is my hypothesis that almost everyone in such a group would know that the first excerpt I played was from a play by William Shakespeare called *Hamlet* and that almost no one would know that the second was the opening of Beethoven’s Third Symphony. (p. 79)

Kivy then goes on to explain how this symphony inhabits a “place of honor and importance equal to that of *Hamlet* in the world of literature” (p. 80). It is precisely this tradition that some fear to be in peril should educators have an unflinching philosophy of “student-centredness.” Herein lies the notion that music, as a possible form of story-telling in the Western tradition, has humanizing elements which contain truths necessary for continuance of our Western civilization; a civilization for which many educators would have us feel shame. MacIntyre (1981) offers these following insights:

A central thesis then begins to emerge: man is in his actions and practice, as well as in his fictions, essentially, a story-telling animal. He is not essentially, but becomes through his history, a teller of stories that aspire to truth. But the key question for men is not about their own authorship; I can only answer the question 'What am I to do?' if I can answer the prior question 'Of what story or stories do I find myself a part?' We enter human society, that is, with one or more inputted characters - roles into which we have been drafted - and we have to learn what they are in order to be able to understand how others respond to us and how our responses to them are apt to be construed....Deprive children of stories and you leave them unscripted, anxious stutterers in their actions as in their society, including our own, except through the stock of stories which constitute its initial dramatic resources. Mythology, in its original sense, is at the heart of things. Vico was right and so was Joyce. And so too of course is that moral tradition from heroic society to its medieval heirs according to which the telling of stories has a key part in educating us into the virtues. (p. 216)

This concept that each student, as citizen, enters into a kind of pact with the past is reintroduced later in this paper in a discussion about youth participatory action research and the interrelationships between our students' self-interests and their civic or community concerns. However, applying this "education into the virtues" to so-called "canonical" musical texts might not be quite so straightforward when MacIntyre focuses his attention upon teaching music to children. Here, his imposing ideals deteriorate into promoting the tacit teaching of skills that music educators have been struggling with for eons. Unsuitably, MacIntyre applies the same concept to music education as he does for learning to read in another language, stating that:

small children are able to learn and to exercise some skills while participating in enjoyable and purposeful activities, such as singing or playing some musical instrument. But even in those activities there are levels of achievement that require what you call inescapably laborious drills. No sane child can enjoy learning Greek irregular verbs, yet that is a necessary prologue to reading Sophocles. It is important early in life to learn how to deal with the boring, the repetitive, and the routine. (MacIntyre & Dunne, 2002, p. 6)

To educate students “into the virtues” or for the possibility of finding truth by learning of a world against which the modern, practical world can be compared, might appear to be a reasonable responsibility for educators. However, as has previously been discussed by writers such as Thomas Regelski, the dominant Western music culture associated with modernism is often portrayed as being singularly oppressive and intolerant towards difference. Oakeshott (1972) warns against this tendency:

[The engagement to educate] may...be hindered...by the belief that, although there may be a considerable inheritance of human understandings, sentiments, beliefs, etc., in terms of which a newcomer might be released from the grip of his immediate world and come to understand and identify himself as a civilized human being aware of the standards of excellence in thought and conduct little or not at all reflected in the current enterprises and activities of that world, this identity is both distracting and ‘socially dangerous’. It distracts from the ordinary business of life and, since it is an identity not equally attainable by all, it is more apt to be socially ‘divisive’ than integrative. Hence, the apprenticeship of the newcomer to adult life should be an initiation, not into the *grandeurs* of human understanding, but into the skills, activities and enterprises which constitute the local world into which he is presently and actually born. (p. 34)

However, I do agree with this depiction of Western music being intolerant towards difference in our schools. Music education’s solution through the teaching of universal musical exemplars and standards has proven to be a failure, given the lack of a living culture that any attempts to reify these exemplars have managed to produce.

Kieran Egan (1983) is critical of Oakeshott and observes:

The distance, and the preservation thereby of a sense of real difference, was achieved by the use of leisure and education for initiating one's children into an arbitrarily chosen dead culture. It has been purely a matter of fashion which dead culture is chosen. In the eighteenth century the social division was marked and preserved by artificially resurrecting Roman culture as the differentium; in the nineteenth century the fashion shifted to Greek culture as the distinguishing criterion; in the twentieth century, ironically, it is eighteenth and nineteenth century cultures that are resurrected which, when living cultures, were derided in their time by the predecessors of those who now use them to mark themselves off from

the living culture of today. The central characteristic of this culture - what Oakeshott so inappropriately likens to a conversation - is that it is entirely passive; its appropriate response is "appreciation." It is dead and gone so one cannot do anything to it, with it, or about it, except "appreciate" it. (Progressive Responses section, para. 2)

Nevertheless, Oakeshott continues his condemnation of post-modern education reform, claiming that a "higher calling" is in order here. This elevated status brings to mind the words of my father Henry when referring to those who are so high-minded that "they are no longer of any earthly good":

It is to be recognized as a frustration of the educational engagement and a destruction of 'School' because it attributes to the teaching and learning which compose this apprenticeship an extrinsic 'end' or 'purpose'; namely, the integration of the newcomer into a current 'society' recognized as the manifold of skills, activities, enterprises, understandings, sentiments and beliefs required to keep it going; in short, 'to rear the most "current" men possible, "current" in the sense in which the word is used of coins of the realm.' (p. 34)

Herein, Oakeshott provides a footnote to Nietzsche's lectures at the University of Basel, fully a century preceding Oakeshott's published remarks, in which Nietzsche elucidates a similar philosophy:

For I repeat it, my friends! All culture begins with the very opposite of that which is now so highly esteemed as 'academic freedom': with obedience, with subordination, with discipline, with subjection. And as leaders must have followers so also must the followers have a leader—here a certain reciprocal predisposition prevails in the hierarchy of spirits: yea, a kind of pre-established harmony. This eternal hierarchy, towards which all things naturally tend, is always threatened by that pseudo-culture which now sits on the throne of the present. It endeavors either to bring the leaders down to the level of its own servitude or else to cast them out altogether. It seduces the followers when they are seeking their predestined leader, and overcomes them by the fumes of its narcotics. (Nietzsche, 1872, para. 37)

This is not a fashionable attitude in most classroom music education circles but it is prevalent in the teaching of band and choir. The idea of "useless discipline," as was

discussed earlier in this paper regarding Foucaultian elements in past and present music education, now returns as the subject of a rather different value. Certain late writings of Foucault suggest that discipline, when not arbitrarily applied and carried out for the purpose of passing on useful, not useless knowledge, is an important element of the educating of our students. I certainly have a regime of discipline that I expect my students to follow, should they express an intrinsic desire to approach a level of virtuosity upon the various instruments that they play. This regime of discipline is a longstanding value in Western music. The pedigree fetishism inherent in many academies and music conservatories is far different than demonstrating respectful mentorship in the circumstance of an experienced music teacher relating to his or her musically engaged student. This is not exploitive when handled with equal doses of humanity and humility. However, unlike MacIntyre's proposal that the boring, the repetitive and the routine be precursors to creative engagement in music education (MacIntyre and Dunne, p. 6), I maintain that the intrinsic interests of the student will determine whether or not these states of boredom and routine are genuinely at play.

However, Nietzsche's previous quote regarding the dethroning of leaders, and their subsequent relocation to the "lower" echelons of the subjugated masses, corresponds to his writings in *The Genealogy of Morals* about "ressentiment." Nietzsche considered this concept in relation to a slave/master mentality. Put roughly for the purposes of this discussion, he posits that those who succeed become scapegoats by those who fail. Those who fail are only made aware of this failure by those who succeed and, therefore, a kind of seething hatred for them develops. Nietzsche held Christianity in particularly low regard. In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche proclaimed that:

With the aid of a religion which has gratified and flattered the sublimest herd animal desires, it has got to the point where we discover even in political and social institutions an increasingly evident expression of this morality: the *democratic* movement inherits the Christian. (p. 107)

To some, Nietzsche's concept of resentment might be applied to the democratization of the "high and low arts" and, by extension, to music education's relatively recent consideration to allow popular music gain admittance into its fold. Popular music might now, through democratic processes, be allowed the same status as classical exemplars. Yet, as I argued earlier in this dissertation, many music philosophers claim that Western music is evolutionarily progressive compared with other cultures because of the written codification of music. As Enlightenment writer Nikolaus Forkel wrote, "musical perfection is dependent on notational perfection; notational perfection follows alphabetism; therefore musical perfection follows alphabetism." Murray Ross (personal communication, February 4, 2007) suggests: "This resentment manifests itself in a discourse that attempts to deny there is such thing as excellence or that such excellence is worth pursuing and valuing. It manifests itself in a displaced form of self loathing projected onto those who do succeed."

Philosopher Max Scheler, influenced greatly by Nietzsche before him, was concerned with the subject of resentment and devoted an entire book to this purpose. In it, Scheler refers to how resentment might involve itself in human values, including values about art:

In all problems of value — whether they concern law, the state, religion, economy, science, or art — that which all men can produce and judge takes on the importance of an "ideal" by which we should measure the concrete and positive creations of civilization. The meaning of the expression "generally human" is endowed with the highest value. However, the psychological basis of this attitude is nothing but hatred and negativism against every positive form of life and civilization, which is

always a courageous rise above what is merely “generally human” and must therefore come to naught when judged by this criterion. If we take an object (and especially a value object) in the plain sense of true objectivism, general agreement in its acknowledgment is at best a social criterion for the social right of affirming its existence — it can never be a criterion for the truth of this affirmation, and even less for the essence of objectivity. Therefore the fact that one nation or one group, however small, is alone in understanding and acknowledging a domain of value can never be a meaningful argument against its genuineness and its reality. (pp. 119-120)

My understanding of what Scheler means here is that humanity, at its lowest operating level, does not and cannot value excellence at all. There may only be relative truth in judging an art object, an art form or an artistic practice as attaining excellence because of the “taint of the human” forever associated with resentment by Scheler. The latter part of Scheler’s statement is interesting because he suggests that excellence, achievement and value need not be universally recognized or generalized to ultimately be considered worthwhile. The following contains what might lie at the heart of why popular music might never wholeheartedly be accepted into the musical world that deems Western cultural achievements to be at the vanguard:

But the modern doctrine of equality as a whole — whether it pretends to be a statement of fact, a moral “postulate,” or both — is obviously an achievement of resentment. The postulate of equality — be it moral, social, political, ecclesiastical equality or equality of property — seems harmless, but who does not detect behind it the desire to degrade the superior persons, those who represent a higher value, to the level of the low? Nobody demands equality if he feels he has the strength or grace to triumph in the interplay of forces, in any domain of value! Only he who is afraid of losing demands equality as a general principle. (p. 114)

As this chapter nears an end, I wish to pay a passing observance of how often the aid of intellectuals has been invoked at various times in this paper in the hopes of justifying change, be it Edward Said looking to Foucault for the fight against oppression or Thomas Regelski calling upon the critical theory of the Frankfurt School to challenge

the dominant Western music culture in education. In the case of the latter, I earlier voiced alarm that the type of totalitarianism Regelski was espousing for music education was paradoxical to the anti-totalitarian spirit of the school that his actions were to be based upon. A similar irony surrounds discipline. As Foucault and Nietzsche have shown, it runs counter to many concepts about “freedom” held in such high esteem during both their time and ours. Even seemingly untouchable democratic ideals are held suspect, as in certain writings of Nietzsche and Scheler. Obedience, subordination and subjection are processes that, at least to Nietzsche, are vital elements in maintaining one’s culture. Quite a dramatically different conception of culture belongs to Paolo Freire. In a world of dominance and tyranny, Freire welcomes a new conception of culture for humankind wherein art belongs to all:

From that point of departure, the illiterate would begin to effect a change in his former attitudes, by discovering himself to be a maker of culture, by discovering that he, as well as the literate person, has a creative and re-creative impulse. He would discover that culture is just as much a clay doll made by artists who are his peers as it is the work of a great sculptor, a great painter, a great mystic, or a great philosopher; that culture is the poetry of lettered poets and also the poetry of his own popular songs - that culture is all human creation. (p. 41)

Surveying the history of music education, precisely *what* and *whose* cultural achievements that obedience, subordination and subjection might have maintained are brought into question. Marie McCarthy notes, in her article *Re-thinking “Music” in the Context of Education*, that this disciplined approach blindly “reproduced” the Western standards of excellence or “values of a narrow, albeit socially and culturally powerful, stratum of society” (p. 30). McCarthy claims that, historically, North American music education was unable to integrate or tap into the “wealth of musical traditions in the culture at large” (p. 30). The negative result of this was that “as music in public education

evolved since the middle of the nineteenth century, its connections with the functions and practices of music in society weakened” (p. 30). McCarthy discusses this further:

In the process, it minimized the human dimensions of music transmission, ignoring the fact that, “Fundamentally, music is something that people do” (Elliott 1995, 39), and presented music to students devoid of its social and cultural contexts. The aspects of music transmission that came to be valued were: standardization, technical virtuosity, competition, classical music repertoire, aesthetic idealism, individual musical talent and achievement, and development of musicianship based on the model of the professional musician.” (p. 30)

These values were very much part of my undergraduate training in my music department. It is with no minor difficulty that I, as a teacher, have been forced to question my long-standing values around what constitutes so-called “legitimate” music making. The case for resentment here might suggest that feelings of “inferiority and jealousy” compel a music educator to allow for other forms of musical expression in the classroom. Am I hateful or jealous of Western classical music exemplars because I, more often than not, feel most expressive while listening to or playing popular music or jazz? In a local music teacher meeting I attended, the music teacher association president started the proceeding by asking that each music teacher describe what music they last listened to by choice. There was a noticeable hush in the room. Educators would call that “think time” but to me, my sense was that it gave the opportunity for many music teachers to think of something that would impress and, thus, solidify the impression that they were “serious musicians.” Some responses that I clearly recall were “Jan Garbarek and the Hilliard Ensemble,” “Das Lied von der Erde” or “Song of the Earth” by Gustav Mahler, and J.S. Bach’s “St. Matthew’s Passion.” I did all I could to not openly laugh upon hearing the last example because I heard that same music teacher listening to the song “Rusty Cage” by the Seattle hard rock band “Soundgarden” when

he parked his car in the lot before the meeting. Regarding many Western classical, exemplar-touting writers of music philosophy, Yaroslav Senyshyn remarked in his graduate music seminar entitled “Artists, Society and Arts Education” on June 22, 2001 at Simon Fraser University: “It’s nonsense, most of these people listen to popular music but can’t be honest enough to admit it.”

A concern that popular music’s admission to the fold might dilute professed standards of excellence in music education, Marie McCarthy adds:

One of the primary strengths of music education in the United States is its performance tradition, particularly in the context of ensembles at the secondary level. Should this tradition be challenged to integrate the social and cultural contexts of music into instruction, and if so, what impact will these have on maintaining its norms of excellence? In performance programs, there is already an implied goal of life-long participation in music; furthermore, band programs serve an important social function in the school and community. While these arguments are valid, ensembles serve but a small fraction of the secondary school student population and are limited to a specialized, albeit important, function of music in education. (pp. 31-32)

Wen-Song Hwu (2004) challenges this notion that so-called standardized norms of excellence can even be attained in education:

I argue that prevailing structuralist-minded schooling has excluded the dynamics among students/teachers; that it offers false hope of certainty in achieving educational excellence; that it overlooks the social matrix embodied within itself; and that it diminishes the tensions of race, gender, class, and ethnicity by creating a homogenous educational enterprise. (p. 181)

The writer of these same lines, “And as leaders must have followers so also must the followers have a leader—here a certain reciprocal predisposition prevails in the hierarchy of spirits: yea, a kind of pre-established harmony,” Nietzsche would himself declare something quite different eight years later. In aphorism number 267 from *The Wanderer and His Shadow*, he declares:

There are no educators. As a thinker, one should speak only of self-education. The education of youth by others is either an experiment, conducted on one as yet unknown and unknowable, or a leveling on principle, to make the new character, whatever it may be, conform to the habits that prevail: in both cases, therefore, something unworthy of the thinker – the work of parents and teachers, whom an audaciously honest person has called *nos ennemis naturels*. (p. 70)

As a result, I have struggled and shall continue to struggle with the enormously varied ideas that I have come into contact with as a music educator and as a student of the arts. As uncomfortable as this struggle might sometimes be for me, I am content in the present situation that I not am so terribly quick to strive for a definitive end to this conflict, both as an artist and as an educator. To struggle is to be authentically human. Certainly, Nietzsche and Foucault are each praised by some and admonished by others for changing their prior stances about obedience and power. This should serve as a sign that we, as thoughtful educators, can and must continue to wrestle with ideas and sometimes even with our own consciences. I wish to conclude this chapter with the summative, reassuring words of Nicholas Birns from *Ressentiment and Counter-Ressentiment: Nietzsche, Scheler, and the Reaction Against Equality*:

Nietzsche did not wish to live in such a utopia, one which sought to sweep all pain, all suffering, all inadequacy under the rug. He recognized not only the pain of human life but that we somehow need this pain in order to live genuinely. Any mode of artificially inoculating ourselves against this pain, whether through religion, culture, or politics, would have met with his sharp disapproval; any attempt to transcend it by a utopia, whether the modernity dream of collective enfranchisement or counter-modernity's of a relaunched elite, would meet with scepticism. Look at these remarkable words on the Black Death of the fourteenth century:

“Human beings, often enough, get fed up: there are entire epidemics of this process of getting fed up (for example, around 1348, at the time of the dance of death). But even this disgust, this exhaustion, this dissatisfaction with himself—all this comes out of him so powerfully that it immediately becomes a new chain. The No that he speaks to life brings to light, as if through a magic spell, an abundance of more tender Yeses. Even when he injures himself, this

master of destruction and self-destruction, it is the wound itself which later forces him to live on.” (The Genealogy of Morals, III, 13)

Chapter 5.

Teaching as Control, Conservatory Orthodoxy in Public School Music Education, and Teacher as Authority Figure

Clearly, one expects professionals to exhibit routinized behavior; otherwise our trust in them would not be warranted. The paradox I am interested in lies in the fact that to be called professional also means one must be willing to question and let go of routinized behavior when the situation calls for it. *Hildegard Froehlich (2007, p. 4)*

However, life is not within our control. We cannot control how we experience a situation, what others do in the world that we occupy, nor the consequences of our own actions in the world
Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (2004, p. 275)

Many music teachers, myself included, have often been stricken with concerns for control, order and a desire to make perpetual sense of what we do with our students. We thrive upon predictable lessons that can be carried out by others, should we ever be ill and away from work. Even our administrators often tell us to plan our days free of ambiguity, thus conceivably allowing for a system with a reduction of misbehaviour and its accompanying frequency of office referrals. It is dreadfully easy to succumb to this form of pedagogy, especially as a beginning teacher. Susan O'Neill and Yaroslav Senyshyn (2011) provide caution for teachers who might regularly be attracted to this approach of music instruction:

To desire an ordered world in music education is to some extent understandable, but to achieve it by relying solely on behavioral objectives and an unrelenting behaviorist approach that is interpreted

from within an authoritarian framework ultimately fails and betrays learners. We sometimes forget that merely having a clear statement of objectives and/or measures of assessment does not necessarily provide an unambiguous path to learning. (p. 21)

Beginning teachers are, in general, more often evaluated by their local administrators than are they given an opportunity to consult with their own peers or have mentors in music education. In their collaborative piece *Professional Induction: Programs and Policies for Beginning Music Teachers*, Eric Shieh and Colleen Conway observe that the opportunity for reflective practice and support innovation in new teachers is thwarted by traditional teacher induction mechanisms:

In other words, the idea of induction into the teaching profession presumes that the teaching profession exists as something to be uncovered rather than created. This reified idea of the profession at best encompasses the current practices of whoever is doing the inducting or, worse, encompasses all the stereotypes of what a 'teacher' is. In both cases, the capacity of the beginning teacher to generate new practices or reflect upon current practices has been pre-empted. (p. 163)

Yet even collegial teaching groups, purportedly established to assist in reflective practice, can discourage new ideas to flourish. My own experience as a new music teacher was that the planning for honour group "enrichment" and adjudicated "festivals" in my district music association trumped discussion about the manner in which music was delivered to the average general music student. Even school district sponsored "focus groups" had agendas that held traditional band and choir programs in a very sharp "focus," to the extent that other musical initiatives were virtually blurred out of recognition. Band educator and ensemble adjudicator Joseph Shively supports this observation in his article *In the Face of Tradition: Questioning the Roles of Conductors and Ensemble Members in School Bands, Choirs, and Orchestras*, namely that the tradition of music ensemble teachers needs to step "down from the podium" (p. 179) and

embrace more humane interactions with their ensemble members. Shively suggests that the tradition requires the immediate supplanting of teaching ideas that “allow for a more highly democratized learning environment” (p. 181). Paul Woodford, in *Democracy and Music Education*, states that school music programs stem from a decidedly undemocratic past, namely that the “historical roots of traditional school concert bands, orchestras, and choirs are after all to be found in autocratic institutions such as the military, church, or aristocracy, and not in parliamentary or other democratic institutions” (p. 28).

In her heartrending piece *I Sing In A Choir But I Have “No Voice!”*, Patricia O’Toole (1993-1994) would concur with Woodford: In this article, I tell a story that is a composite of the many choral experiences I have experienced both as singer and director. This is not a happy story. I have chosen not to dwell on the beautiful and aesthetic moments that can occur when making music, because they rarely happen for me as a choral singer or director. I find that the conventions of choral pedagogy are designed to create docile, complacent singers who are subject to a discourse that is more interested in the production of music than in the laborers. (p. 65)

With some irony, I am reminded of the fate of the giant metronome near the end of Federico Fellini’s *Orchestra Rehearsal*, following the mutiny of the orchestra’s musicians in favour of this democratic, albeit inhuman, timekeeper. However, like Fellini, I am not convinced that the mere feigning of a democracy can eradicate the deep-seated traditions inherent in the conductor-musician dynamic. How can democracy enter in to a musical world so historically “director-centric” without changing the music itself? In both Lucy Green’s books *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education* (2001) and *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008a), a possible resolution she provides is that music educators must acknowledge that there are musical worlds “out there” that they did not create. Secondly, Green asserts that these musical worlds have learning practices that have far more lasting effect and hold more intrinsic student interest than anything traditional teacher-centred traditions might have to offer. “Stepping down from the podium” (p. 179), as Shively suggested earlier, is a very difficult paradigm shift for any music teacher to make. At the

heart of this is, after all, that of the music conservatory. There is an often too-proud tradition that musicians are simply the products of their teachers.

In my own experience at Washington State University, students in the faculty of music gave regular recitals each semester and were adjudicated in order of who their teachers were and not by who they were as individuals. Conservatory-trained pianist and educator Henry Kingsbury points out this trait of the music conservatory in his book *Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System* (1988), saying that “another manifestation of the link between a teacher and his or her students is the fact that teachers are named on the printed program for student recitals: the performer is named as ‘student of John Doe’ ” (p. 44). Kingsbury argues that the conservatory system’s “relationship between teachers and students recapitulates the structural principles of political patronage, and that in such a context the pedagogical lineages that are presented...are indications of musical authority” (p. 45). Therefore, it is difficult to expect otherwise from music teachers, most who hold a performance degree from a music department or conservatory. Peter Gouzouasis and Danny Bakan (2011) proclaim:

...despite our attempts to introduce music students in university music and teacher education programs to new materials and pedagogies, the majority seem too comfortable in their own knowledge bases and experiences and are reluctant to adopt new ideas. In other words, it seems that people want to teach the ways that they were taught and ignore new developments. They recapitulate their own learning in their practices rather than become innovators. (p. 7)

I discovered this while teaching a university course designed for beginning music teachers. One student consistently told me that she would never deign to allow popular music or student-centeredness in her music program, lest her years of conservatory training all be for naught. By the end of the class, this student claimed to have grown in

her respect for popular music and revealed that she might consider including it in her classroom as a future music educator. Thomas Regelski (2003) observes that:

Most classically trained musicians are not among the dominant economic class; nor do their favored music and its ideology dominate or dictate musical tastes and preferences. Yet the cultural authority of the conservatory or university ideology, with its instructional paradigms and paragons, its ideals and standards of “good music,” and its orthodox aesthetic terms of discourse and value, is the dominant influence on music teachers and thus on formal music education in schools. (p. 5)

The orthodoxy of the conservatory asserts itself prominently with a predilection for pedigree. While this obsession with ancestry transcends more than just the musical world, here it is an undeniable facet of the Western art music tradition. Kingsbury supports this with an anecdote from his graduate conservatory experience. On his first day with a new teacher, Kingsbury was told:

“My teacher was Arthur Schnabel, the famous pianist. Schnabel studied with Theodor Leschetitzky, Leschetitzky studied with Liszt, Liszt studied with Czerny, and of course Czerny was a student of Beethoven. So you see, you come into a good pedigree here.” All of this was to be said in mirth, but certainly not in irony. (p. 46)

There is a clear line between this pedigree fetish and the music teacher’s relationship with her students. Both are focused upon establishing an objective authority, in hopes of gathering unquestioning support. The difference for the classroom teacher is that authority is questioned, when a student’s own sense of musical self is brought into question. In Lucy Green’s most recent study, *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*, music learning for one stage of her project had the musical authority resting upon the CD of recorded music, rather than the teacher. She points out the irony that even though the CD is “a much more inflexible, and in that sense tyrannical, teacher than any human being, pupils seemed to find it less threatening to

work with, and in many ways...it seemed to produce more fluent, 'musical' results" (p. 55).

Green notes that the main difference between learning through a music teacher and learning by a recording is the matter of "speed":

In some musical styles and cultures such as Gamelan, teachers do not slow down the music in order to make it easier for learners to pick up. The learners simply have to watch, listen and do their best to imitate the teacher at full speed. Likewise, when music is learnt mainly through enculturation, such as in African drumming, children acquire their skills simply by joining in with adult music-making, which carries on without any compromises. Similarly, in popular music's informal learning practices, playing along with a recording is always up to speed. Such approaches to music learning have perhaps, each in their different ways, held on to an understanding which we in Western formal education may have lost. (p. 55)

While I do agree for the most part with Green about the re-examination of the concept of musical authority, if, indeed, one truly exists at all, I have witnessed possibilities within current technologies that are accessible on the Internet and through music computer programs. Green's concept that music "in real time" somehow is more authentic bears closer examination. There are numerous lessons on Internet sites such as YouTube that my students use at home and in school. The consistent reliability of the musical "authority" is sometimes questionable but there is incredibly good computer software that can truncate or "loop" an instrumental passage, slow it down to a speed that a beginner can play and then speed it up gradually. The current computer software programs such as *Song Surgeon*, *Riffmasterpro*, *Amazing Slowdowner*, *iRehearse* or *SlowGold* all allow playing difficult or fast passages in the correct key, while slowing the music down to a speed that doesn't usually intimidate the student.

I also believe that Green's insistence upon having students learn solely by ear by means of a compact disc has, through no oversight of her own, become dated, as will surely the modes I see my students use at the time of this writing. Technology moves faster than one can write about *what it is*. Instead, one writes about *what it was*. Green may not have had Internet access in all music classes participating in her research projects, thus providing sound reasons to ask that students only use compact discs and learn strictly by ear, rather than combine informal and formal learning strategies, which would have compromised her studies on isolating the informal music pedagogies at play. In a rejoinder to a panel presentation at the September 2008 American Educational Research Association Conference entitled *Special Edition – Beyond Lucy Green: Operationalizing Theories of Informal Music Learning*, Green responded to criticisms in papers by the panel members. Directed towards those critics that claimed her approach called for the “disappearance of the teacher” (p. 1), as well as charges that she was being “prescriptive” with the curriculum and that it might be overly limited by her proposed methods, Green (2008b) insisted: “For research purposes it was indeed necessary to request teachers to take a common approach, otherwise it would not have been possible to draw overall conclusions” (p. 7). In the last chapter of this paper, I shall provide a snapshot of my current music classroom practices, which extracts many of Lucy Green's ideas from her philosophical writing and research, while being tempered and cautioned by the kind of music and arts curriculum expansion espoused by John Finney and Peter Gouzouasis, among others.

Returning to my present classroom experiences of students using formal and informal learning methods, by going to YouTube or any other Internet site that has music instruction on it, I have seen ambitious students learn significantly more music at a faster

rate than using Green's method of playing only by ear. Attention spans are often considered to be becoming increasingly shorter in the young and old alike in this age of technology so the near-lightning response of the Internet to a sudden passion or interest shown by a student in class could quite possibly be the appropriate action for this compulsion. As John Finney relates in his article *Music Education as Identity Project in a World of Electronic Desires*, "The regularities, rituals and formalities that circumscribe school music creates boundaries between the exercise of free and unfettered musical impulse and the channeling of these into musical contexts" (p. 11).

Returning once again to Green, one wonders why music teachers have very often a negative or negating effect upon the musical enjoyment or realization? I believe it to stem from a number of possibilities. Something that all professions seem to encounter is a certain professional expectation to control, to step in and take charge. We are even given labels that alert others that we are leaders, such as music director, director of nursing, team leader, department head, etc. Historically, music directors have mounted a podium not only to be seen better by the musicians but as a not-so-subtle way to assume a dominant physical position over those being "directed." Music directors and teachers can accrue, over time, an inflated sense of their own significance that leaves them always *in charge*. In her article *I sing in a choir but "I have no voice!"*, Patricia O'Toole describes her own bitter experience of this:

The director is then positioned in front of the choir, so singers see the director primarily and each other only peripherally. All attention and focus moves vertically toward the director. Horizontal interaction that might create "dangerous" community among the singers is strongly discouraged by the director as a distraction from the focus on music-making, that is, from the director's control. (p. 68)

This heightened feeling of importance is addressed by Charles Hoffer in his book *Introduction to Music Education (2009)*:

It does seem that most music teachers are susceptible to greater ego involvement in their work than are most teachers. It may be that the “leader” role that many music teachers have as part of their jobs attracts people with greater ego needs. It could be that the circumstances of the job tend to encourage a heightened sense of personal involvement. It may be that some music teachers would rather be performers. Whatever the reason, many music teachers tend to view their work as an extension of themselves. For example, a number of times the author has heard music teachers almost boastfully relate how the choir or band “fell apart” after they left a particular teaching position. Some teachers work hard with students who have ability because they bring recognition to the teacher. On the other hand, they have little time for less talented students because they won’t. (p. 38)

In my own school district, there is a great deal of pride taken by band directors in grooming these “students with ability” and in alerting other music teachers, through the mixed blessing of mass e-mails, about their ratings in adjudicated competitions:

We now have the largest band program (275 students) in the district and, I dare say, one of the best (to the delight of our secondary feeders). Our grade 8 concert band and jazz band both won “gold” standings at the Vancouver Kiwanis (band 8 this year) and Fraser Valley Kiwanis (jazz band last year) Music Festivals, as well as a scholarship and trophy from Fraser Valley for the “Most Promising Junior Jazz Band.”

Thomas Regelski, in *Curriculum Reform: Reclaiming ‘Music’ as Social Praxis* (2009), affirms that this example is, unfortunately, paradigmatic of the vast majority of North American school music programs:

Over the years, all of these paradigms, practices, and habits have created a new ‘field’ in the music world called ‘school music’. In some places this leads to ‘positioning’ between schools (e.g., “Our school’s music program is the best in the city”) and between ensembles (e.g., “Our chorus is better than our orchestra”), and between their directors (*viz.*, according to which ensemble program in a particular school wins the most awards, competitions, or accolades). (p. 71)

Another fixture of many district school music calendars is the “festival.” During the course of these events, selected students play scales, hold long tones or play snare drum rolls, in addition to the standard ensemble performances. My own experience of the aftermath of “the festival” has been that some students never again return to play in band or choir. Students have reported feeling intimidated and even embarrassed by the larger-populated ensembles that performed. Following her festival participation as a concert band member, one grade-eight student once remarked to me, “There is nothing festive about festival.” Further to this subject, Regelski (2009) notes that this:

also promotes not just ‘positioning’ but often outright *competition* between students for ensemble seating, solos, and the like—formal competition or the informal kind of ‘comparatition’ that is natural in the identity formation of adolescents—where social ‘status’ is the goal more than music and musical learning. As a result, all this ‘positioning’ itself becomes more important to ‘school music’ than making a pragmatic *musical* difference for life. (p. 72)

These kinds of situations not only draw attention to hierarchies between individuals within same ensembles, they also serve to rank schools based upon their socio-economic standing. The school whose band director boasted earlier of the accolades bestowed to her school ensembles in adjudicated competitions also has the advantage of being located in one of the most expensive real estate areas in the district. Furthermore, the school sits in a neighbourhood where only single-family dwelling homes are allowed. As a result, parents’ financial levity is far greater for families there than in many other school communities. This makes it relatively easier for parents of a higher socio-economic standing to purchase expensive band instruments for their children. The music teacher who previously held the band director’s position in this same school marveled that she had so many parents voluntarily writing large cheques to her

music department that she never had to do any fundraising whatsoever. This is a privilege that most publicly funded music programs simply cannot fathom.

This particular area of inequity was just one subject of the 2007 issue on social justice in music education in the *Music Education Research* journal, in which a wide variety of educators and philosophers offered their thoughts on the following questions:

How do issues of equity inform music teaching and learning? What does it mean to teach music through the lens of social justice or social consciousness? How is a philosophy of equity and democracy enacted? What can research on this topic reveal? (Allsup, 2007, p. 167)

Estelle Jorgensen makes a formidable contribution to this journal in her article *Concerning justice and music education*. The schools that benefit from the high socio-economic status of the parent community of which they are an inextricable part, are to Jorgensen, an example of the inequity inherent in our North American education system. Here, the cries of “No child left behind!” ring hollow in American music education:

Participating in extracurricular activities is often dependant upon having the resources to afford fees and costs of ensemble trips and uniforms. Stereotypical expectations of countries of origin are also prejudicial, leading teachers to expect more of students from some countries and less of those from others. Suburban, urban, and rural environments in particular parts of the country predispose to widely different public expenditures on education and music education, and musical experiences in publicly supported schools. (p. 170)

Upon a recent examination of the websites of all middle school music programs in my district, for those music teachers that did produce web pages, all wrote strictly about their band and choir programs with absolutely no mention of what happened in their general music classes. One can be genuinely sympathetic with this oversight, simply because most middle school music teachers are hired by their administrators primarily by virtue of their abilities to direct band and choir programs and a tacit

assumption that teaching general music is of lesser difficulty and importance. The previously quoted “trophy case” director even presumes to know what students *really* want, to the extent that band has been allowed to be part of the regular school timetable in her school, thus disallowing participation with their peers in general music and even in visual art classes:

Students who take band 8 do not get general music 8 (fine, since band *is* music) or art explorations 8, which are both 1/2 year, single block courses. Having at least the grade 8's in the timetable encourages many more students to continue in band. It's an incentive. It also allows for almost perfect attendance, a much better time to teach them, and another, more advanced band level. So much more progress can be made.

Patrick Jones (2008) cautions this kind of directorial liberty and states that programs that “have evolved almost strictly to support school-based ensembles, limit music education from having a greater impact on society and helping schools accomplish their social mission” (p. 2). Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (2004) inserts a much-needed humanity and consideration for the needs of the student into this scenario:

In the classroom, the teacher in particular must not see the learner as someone whose purpose is to fulfill his or her personal needs, but as someone who has equal being and who both shares existence and has an individual existence that the teacher must see, respect, love, and acknowledge as such. (p. 278)

Patricia O’Toole (2005) lends her support to this matter:

Identity is the process of becoming that is as much about who one imagines oneself to be or not to be. Fundamentally, all identities are unstable because they are always in process and music is one of the sites of identity that is engaged in the process of identification. (p. 300)

O’Toole continues by quoting part of a presentation given to the Music Educators National Conference by Virginia Caputo (1996):

It is this point that has much to do with how music can play a profound role in understanding students' interests, hopes, and aspirations, and especially in how they wish to identify themselves, their differences and commonalities. Music can enable one to suspend expected ways of behaving and play with other imagined identities. Students can engage with music to understand similarities and differences as they are lived and not by appealing to biological explanations and other quantifiable "truths." Rather, through discourses such as popular culture, for example, students can speak and make sense of their social relations, making the process of identification an open-ended and shifting one. (p. 300)

A considerable number of teachers that I know who work with middle school age students often talk about them as though the students cannot possibly know what might be in their own best interests, degradingly citing their adolescent developmental stage as being explicable through "raging hormones." Whether or not this might be entirely true, it is still not justification to make decisions as to "what is best" for our students.

Adolescence is a period of intense conceptualizing and reconceptualizing. Therefore, for a mis-educative maneuver such as this, music directors can be of enormous detriment to an adolescent's identity formation. For a music educator to assume he or she knows what is the best-suited musical identity for anyone at any particular time is most certainly a form of oppression. Similarly, Susan O'Neill and Yaroslav Senyshyn (2011) might give warning to teachers who subscribe to pedagogy of such an unprincipled kind:

The ideological significance of existentialist approaches to music learning would be lost if, for example, the main purpose of a pedagogical approach was covertly to segregate children, win music competitions, or put on public relations events in the name of some dubious educational value. (p. 28)

Etienne Wenger (1999), in *Communities of Practice*, might provide further caution in regard to a music director presupposing a student's identity formation, based upon the teacher's own self-serving demand for performance ensemble competence through an advanced level of technical progress in his or her students:

One problem of the traditional classroom format is that it is both too disconnected from the world and too uniform to support meaningful forms of identification. It offers unusually little texture to negotiate identities: a teacher sticking out and a flat group of students all learning the same thing at the same time. Competence, thus stripped of its social complexity, means pleasing the teacher, raising your hand first, getting good grades. There is little material with which to fashion identities that are locally differentiated and broadly connected....Focusing on an institutionalized curriculum without addressing issues of identity thus runs the risk of serving only those who already have an identity of participation with respect to material in other contexts. (p. 269)

Herbert Deutsch might also disagree with this band director that “band *is* music,” if given a priority at the expense of general music. Deutsch isolates what he calls the “two tracks in American music education today” (p. 93). The first track is the visible performance ensemble, which represents its school, its community and its director through competitions. The experiences of students in these performance-oriented groups are usually good ones, according to Deutsch, and the high visibility of these disciplined and “technically-competent” instrumentalists and singers attracts community support and financial assistance. The second track in American music education to which Deutsch refers is not as positive:

The second track of school music is another issue. Called “classroom music” in the lower grades or “general music” in secondary grades, it is really at the heart of what music teaching should be, but it is almost always so overshadowed by the visibility (and expense?) of the performance track that it remains a “weak sister” at best. Many schools have dropped elementary classroom music or limited it to a relatively few minutes a week....One administrator sadly confided to me that because her district has such an excellent performance program (with 75% of the students involved) that junior high school general music has suffered. Of course! Since the performing groups are so popular, the teachers have already prejudged the final 25% to be unmotivated and untalented leftovers. (p. 93)

Another frequent complaint of students with their music teachers is a tendency towards verbosity that often might exceed itself. It was a greatly beneficial experience,

albeit a humbling one, when I read my first set of anonymous student evaluations about my music teaching. Students were asked to write their impressions of me at the conclusion of a term of music. An entirely optional request to my class members, many students wrote things that I “wanted” to hear, such as that I showed them some important hints about instrumental technique or that the music I chose was to their liking. The critical comments that I really wanted to hear, or *needed* to hear rather, were along the line that I sometimes talked more than necessary. Additionally, I visited the Internet site *ratemyteachers.com* and found mostly flattering comments about me, such as “...he’s awesome on guitar and everything else” or “...when u (sic) get something wrong he doesn’t make u (sic) feel totally stupid like the other teachers.” However, two uncomplimentary comments that struck me were “...he waists (sic) about half the class talking about his little stories” and “talks wayyy to (sic) much.”

To me, this points favourably towards the pedagogy implicit in Lucy Green’s (2008a) informal learning project, which “involved open-ended learning outcomes, a high degree of pupil autonomy, and a low level of teacher direction” (p. 28). If students feel that music class can reflect “the importance of listening to young people’s voices and taking their values and culture seriously” (p. 185), then music education might still stand a chance in an era where, more often than not, a more natural and authentic kind of music engagement takes place outside of the institution. In closing this chapter, John Kinney (2007) proposes:

The school can now be accessed from home, home accessed from school, and the rest of the world from both. There are indications that the nine-to-five factory day is being replaced by a more flexible arrangement and that learning may take place in multiple, diverse environments. While state-managed curricula intensify, with attention to ever more precise outcomes, standards and standardization, in lively counterpoint runs a call for the re-modelling of schooling. A revolution is taking place with the

demands for creativity, innovation, fresh models of learning and the melting down of generic skills.

(p. 1)

Chapter 6.

Music Listening and Performance Fetish Inside the Music Classroom

All I can remember about music lessons in my middle school was hiding in the toilets during one of the lessons. (*A British high school student's memory of music classes.*) *Lucy Green (2001, p. 141)*

The teacher open to the mystery, open to the wonder, open to the questions is the one who can light the slow fuse of possibility even for the defeated ones, the bored ones, the deserted ones. *Maxine Greene (2001, p.146)*

The role of the progressive educator, which neither can nor ought to be omitted, in offering her or his 'reading of the world' is to bring out the fact that there are other 'readings of the world,' different from the one being offered as the educator's own, and at times antagonistic to it. Let me repeat: there is no educational practice without content. The danger, of course, depending on the educator's particular ideological position, is either that of exaggerating the educator's authority to the point of authoritarianism. Or that of a voiding of the teacher's authority that will mean plunging the educand into a permissive climate and an equally permissive practice....Even when calling themselves progressive and democratic, authoritarian educators of the Left, inconsistent with at least a part of their discourse, feel so uncomfortable with critical educands, educands who are investigators, that they cannot bring themselves to terminate their discourse, any more than can authoritarian educators of the Right. *Paolo Freire (1994, pp. 96-97)*

Something makes me hesitate to suggest a parallel relationship that the dominant ideology in school music, as “oppressor” of popular musics, might have with the political significance of the “oppressor” in the philosophy of Paolo Freire. The climate in Brazil for illiterate peasants learning to read and therefore becoming freely humanized is overwhelmingly more significant in its context than is a “Western school-music”

concern. I feel a certain indignity in even considering this, yet music educator and MayDay reformer Thomas Regelski (2003), discussed in a previous chapter, made similar comparisons between the minority, nevertheless dominant music ideology of high art and the majority, yet subverted, popular musics in the history of music education.

In spite of this reluctance, I cannot help but wonder if the “codes” or drawings that Freire (1974), used in developing literacy with Brazilian peasants through his “culture circles,” are not too dissimilar to alternate and invented musical notation that one can witness on the Internet, on pages of student music or imprinted upon the keys or frets of musical instruments. Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (2004) refers to Freire’s codes as “talking documents” and suggests that through them “improved cognition was developed through intellectual analysis of their circumstances, and this process enabled them both to alter their situation and to become human” (p. 269).

Much has been written and said about the value of encouraging composition in music education. However, the notion of copying others’ music and lyrics through intense listening experiences suggests something similar to Blumenfeld-Jones’ argument that art, aesthetics and pragmatic reflection allow us to act ethically. Madeleine Grumet (1997) writes “the speaking of another’s words is easy compared to the task of exchanging her walk for mine, discovering what her tongue does when she isn’t talking, and what her toes do when she isn’t walking” (p. 47). Many of my students report that through the act of listening to or re-creating the music of others, they are “inside the heads” of these musicians and songwriters.

Not long ago, a fourteen-year-old student moved from El Salvador to Canada. She entered my middle school in a rather precarious position because she enrolled in

the last grade level and had no close friends. Many students choose to form a band or work alone on music of their own choosing. However, this student asked me if she could listen to music, while copying and translating the music into English as her music plan. Performing in front of the class is an expectation that I no longer have of my music students and, in grade eight, it is likely the last music class they will ever choose to take in the remainder of their public school education. This particular student listened to her *iPod* player unfailingly every class and copied down the lyrics to innumerable songs from Central and South America. She also took breaks in copying song lyrics by listening to various other students and bands perform but generally kept to herself during most of the early part of the semester.

When I asked her privately what kinds of songs she was drawn to, she answered, "I like music that tells me a story and these stories tell me about the person...I feel that I know what they are experiencing inside." During the remainder of the music term, I was privileged to be played her music through headphones and shown various videos of the Latin music that she found so compelling. In the world of frequent inaccessible, adolescent cliques, this student's musical interests were an entry point to bring others into her world and allow them a glimpse at her musical identity. In so many instances with students not fluent in English, they are often not approached by their peers. However, as the semester progressed, this particular student became part of a small but considerate group of male and female students that ended up embracing her, even after my class had ended. To me, that was a more vital event to her life than having her learn and perform a song for me. As an aside, I often spend my coffee breaks walking around the school to see how many of my students are alone and do not have others who care to be with them. Therefore, anything that we as teachers can do to help

with this most important human need of liking someone and, in turn, being liked by someone else should be an overriding concern for the young people in our care.

Another student recently asked me if she could stay later after class to transcribe some lyrics from selected songs she chose so they could be printed out for her to take away. The fourteen-year-old explained that she had just moved to a new home because her parents had only just separated. She reported that her new room was feeling very cold and empty and she wanted song lyrics on the walls so she could sing, read or “just listen” to them and feel better about being there. How does this fit into the British Columbia I.R.P. learning outcome-based curriculum guides?

Curving back to the previous point that so much of contemporary music education encourages performance over thoughtful listening, I am weary of the clichéd speech of so many music colleagues who repeatedly maintain that everyone is a musician, quoting a so-called Zimbabwean proverb that “If you can walk, you can dance, if you can talk you sing.” While I respect that art educators do this out of a deep belief that performance is inextricably linked with expression, I believe most of them to be blind to other ways of being engaged in music. In *How Learning Theories Shape Our Understanding of Music Learners* (2011), Susan O’Neill and Yaroslav Senyshyn refer to “several key ideologies inherent in particular learning perspectives that have become ingrained in our thinking and are therefore less likely to be scrutinized or questioned” (pp. 15-16). These beliefs “become deeply rooted in the language we use to describe learning and thereby embedded in our consciousness” (p. 16).

All commonsense beliefs contain one or more contrary themes – for example, the maxims “many hands make light work” but “too many cooks spoil the broth.” In music, we encounter beliefs such as “all children are musical” but “some musicians are born with a special gift or talent.”

Attempting to identify one or more contrary themes or dilemmatic referents to prevailing ideologies helps to provoke critical thought and encourage a deeper awareness of taken-for-granted beliefs and practices. (p. 16)

Yet, this “everyone is a performer” credo is overshadowed by Alexandra Lamont who, in her 2002 article *Musical Identities and the School Environment*, refers to a 1997 report entitled *Musical taste in adolescence* by Zillman and Gan. In this study, Zillman and Gan claim that listening to, not performing, popular music is the “primary leisure activity of adolescents in contemporary industrialized societies” (Lamont, p. 46). Music teachers, at least the many that I know that only equate legitimate musical experience with performance, are quick to apply a belief from a non-Western culture to our own, provided that it bolster their own highly Westernized philosophy of music education. In his 2006 review of Paul Woodyard’s *Democracy and Music Education*, John Finney makes this comment:

Performance-based music education becomes the harbinger of intellectual passivity and conservatism. No longer is the music teacher seen as intellectual, critic, generator of ideas and proposals for social change. Instead, there is the tendency for such teachers to develop their own rhetoric and propaganda, to become zealots of particular methodologies, to resort to quasi-philosophical claims with dogmatic advocacy coming to replace authentic conversation and the generation of socially useful knowledge about the purpose and practice of music education. (p. 240)

Several years ago, I remember my feelings of incongruity upon seeing a photograph of a spear-holding Zulu warrior with an *iPod* and a pair of headphones on his head. Although I experienced some discordant thoughts, in particular, I questioned the truth of the previously discussed Zimbabwean proverb. But certainly this suggests that all indigenous Africans must always create their own music. This is, of course, an awkwardly Western ethnocentric view of the indigenous African I was harbouring but it

demonstrates how entrenched some ideologies of the kind described by O'Neill and Senyshyn truly are. Once I reflectively examined the meaning of the image further, then I asked why would indigenous Africans not have access to personal music listening devices just like anyone else? It also provoked the thought: How can listening to music possibly be a form of expression? Bennett Reimer, in his highly entertaining article *Merely Listening*, begs or, rather, cajoles to differ:

I used to listen to music....But I gave it all up. I got educated. I read what a lot of educators had to say about listening and it wasn't a pretty picture. I began to realize what a musical clod I had been. All that energy, time, money, wasted upon being a listener....And getting you regarded with contempt by those who know better, who are above all that. Those who are musically active, not passive, creative not brain-dead, making music not taking it. (pp. 88-89)

In his article *No One True Way: Music Education Without Redemptive Truth*, Wayne Bowman makes this astute criticism about performance-fixated music educators whose "professional membership devolves into discipleship" and implies that listening to music might be some students' way of being actively engaged in music:

We have embraced particular modes of musical engagement (performance, for instance) as though they exhausted the range of educationally useful action. We have sought to universalize instructional systems and strategies that are effective only under certain conditions. This naïve faith in one true way of being musical and of implementing curriculum is rooted in an understandable human need for confidence and security. But it is not well suited (whatever its therapeutic value) to the musical needs of students in a diverse and changing society. (p. 8)

Listening to music, as Bennett Reimer (2004) asserts, "is the most pursued musical role of all, involving far more people than all the other roles put together" (p. 95). While my past teaching placed a great deal of importance upon performance, it was only in the past five years or so that I "loosened the reins" and let the twelve, thirteen and fourteen-year-old students determine their own course of action in my music class.

What appears as “action” to me in my class also presents itself as “inaction” to many art educators. How can there be “passion” embedded in “passive listening”? Educators are often fooled by physical action being an objective measure of learning, yet how many of these same people return home to an uninterrupted listen to their favourite music? Do I know that all of my students have the home environment to really listen? To blindly or deafly make performance mandatory for students is to also assume that they have no worthwhile musical world or experiences outside of the school setting. Reimer (2004) adds that “we cannot go on assuming that everyone must adopt the performer’s perspective...In our present world, where performance is an option chosen by relatively few, we have massively neglected all the other ways to be musical” (p. 95).

In an engaging critique of David Elliott’s book *Music Matters* by music educator Patricia O’Toole entitled *Why Don’t I Feel Included in These Musics, or Matters* (2005), O’Toole lends support to my argument that listening to music is relevant contextually for some individual students in our music classes, particularly in cosmopolitan environments. The recent immigrant from El Salvador that I discussed previously is an example of how music educators, so often steeped in a single-minded predilection for performance, need to aware of and provide for the assertion of self in our students. This goes “against the grain” of most formal training one receives in music education teaching programs. Patricia O’Toole (2005) recognizes this but declares that “music education methods are not universal” (p. 297). She provides reassurance for my own experiences as a formal music teacher, recently entering the seemingly chaotic but incredibly vital world of student-centred music environments (2005):

As I read *Music Matters*, I become aware of the differences between the worlds in which Elliott and I speak about music. Our differences are based on our identities as musicians. The problem I have is that my

identity has radically shifted since my formal education in music to the extent that I feel as if I barely fit into the category of “music educator.” (p. 297)

O’Toole’s sentiments are very much like my own, now that I have a mix of formal and informal musical pedagogies, combined with the individualized music arrangement I currently have in my class:

I will also argue that a primary reason for music making is identity affirmation, and that though Elliott has hinted at this in his text, mostly he is concerned with technical and performative aspects of musicing, which offer musicians limited identities. Because context is the playground for identity formation, I will visit Elliott’s discussion of context and offer some extensions. (p. 297)

I would like to ensure that my music room and other practice rooms and spaces are allowing for the kind of “playground for identity formation” of which O’Toole speaks. By providing as wide a range of individual musical possibilities for our students in school, this might be achieved in some small part. O’Toole continues:

As teachers, then, we need to recognize, support, and offer a variety of identity positions to accommodate and encourage differences between students. It is perfectly reasonable for children to explore their and others’ ethnic identities through music, even if this process looks different from conventional music education....Otherwise, by seeing all students as the same, we see them as ourselves, which in the case of most music teachers means white and middle class. It is ludicrous to think that all white, middle-class people have had the same experience, let alone people of Asian, African, Hispanic, or Jewish descent. It is equally ludicrous to believe that one form of musicing can incorporate all of these identity positions. However, in music education, our conventional methods suggest that we believe this to be true. (p. 300)

I believe that this value is very much entwined with a teacher’s desire to control or have control than it is to unearth a latent talent within students. By saying that every person in our culture is a performer simply does not make it so. In my conversations with people both young and old, I have heard many stories of their experiences, both

promising and regretful, in performance groups. A student services teacher I had the honour of working with for many years once confided in me that both his band and choir teachers asked him to pretend that he was playing or singing when the music came to be performed publicly. I have heard many students relay similar tales from their elementary school experiences. Three former students who joined the densely populated high school band told me about an experiment they conducted, whereby each of them handed in practice sheets but yet wanted to find out how long it would take for the director to notice that they did not actually play their various horns or woodwind instruments during rehearsal or concerts. To their disappointment, they finished the entire year without ever alerting the teacher. It is no surprise that not one of them returned to band the following year.

I find stories like these extremely disheartening, yet they isolate a key ingredient that is missing in most performance-based music programs: autonomy. This too can be a cliché in music education but I argue that autonomy is something that develops at different times and in different forms than institutionalized programs have the ability or patience to address. Student choice of their music, should they choose to perform it, is very important. The vast majority of musical choice comes from the field of popular music. Yet, my experiences with informal music practices in popular music “programs” have been that not all students are happy with the music that their band ultimately chose. What does this say for the advantage that popular music practice has on the development of autonomy?

Often times, this is the “chief complaint” of students when first joining a band. In some cases, compromises are made and the learning of music that appeals to each band member is achieved. However, this is a rare occurrence, both inside of the school

and outside. As a drummer, I have played in a large number of bands during my lifetime and I didn't always have a voice in the choice of material unless I wrote it and it was liked by the more prominent band members. Nevertheless, I still enjoyed playing in those groups and making music with people that assumed roles as leaders perhaps more aggressively than I felt like doing. In the process, I learned that I could "step into" a piece of music. I could then glean the parts that appealed to me as a musician from the original recordings, whether that might be attempting to render the "feel" or the particular drum fills in the music. Growing up in the United States and playing snare drum in marching bands until I was fifteen, I feel sympathetic with many American drummers who integrate marching cadences with rock and jazz like I have experienced. There is something of a "knowing" that I am aware of when I play the way another drummer plays. Like my student from El Salvador who would listen to music and write the words, I too feel like I might know what that drummer is experiencing inside. Unfortunately, to measure this objectively is quite difficult, if not impossible to do.

Music education, as in the overall area of education, requires some form of objectification to demonstrate that learning has occurred. Previously, I used an informal self-evaluation but more recently, I have listened to students, written anecdotal comments on what they have done and instruct them that I have no intention of surprising them with a low mark in the class on their report card. This area of quantitatively evaluating student expression is a pox to most art educators and I rock like a ship at sea with the various pulls it has on my conscience. Traditional music education tends to eschew all of this internal wrestling and plants the teacher at the front and centre of the music classroom. This is a position that I am all too well acquainted with

and old habits are extinguished slowly. Blumenfeld-Jones (2004) reviews this familiar situation:

Conventionally, the teacher (as the more experienced person) is responsible for protecting the learner (the less experienced person) from danger and bringing structure to the learner's life. The learner's responsibility is to attend to the teacher's actions and words and to be instructed (that is, to internalize the teacher's structure) by the teacher....Classroom rules are ethics documents that stipulate how each person is to act in the classroom and offer a truncated version of seeing. In this type of covenant, all learners are made to be the same ("the learner"), and the teacher is made to be the generic "teacher." Learners keep their work to themselves, share when sharing is acceptable, do not disrupt others' opportunities to learn, and so forth. Teachers invoke the punishments for breaking the classroom rules, or learners are authorized, through the rules, to enforce the rules on their own. (p. 276)

This latter point of students policing the rules on their own is something that Foucault spoke of. The move from external control to the disciplined, internal policing by students was discussed in great detail in his book *Discipline and Punish*, to which I referred earlier on in this paper. Blumenfeld-Jones' reference to conventional classroom rules as "ethics documents" is, for me, especially critical of the way that these rules limit ways in which both the teacher and the student can "see" or experience in my music class. This is very different from a child-centred approach, whereby all students are expected to be very different from one another and the teacher is not held in a strong focus. Here, Allan MacKinnon and Gaalen Erickson (1992) suggest that teacher practice be based on an attentiveness not only to students and their experiences, but to the ever-changing possibilities in each successive encounter with their students:

Construction of a practice is quite different from deliberation about it. For example, construction of a practice does not carry the instrumental separation of 'theory' from 'practice'; conceptions and perceptions of practice situations are inseparable from the 'appreciative systems', or ways of 'seeing' available to practitioners, the context of their world, the way they recognize dimensions of their students' worlds. These

appreciative systems are acquired through experiencing classrooms in a new way—learning to pay attention to particular events in particular ways while at the same time acquiring a feel for situations of practice. (p. 199)

The differences between my experiences as a formal music teacher and what I have become now are beyond compare. Since opening up my classes to individual music designs, I truly believe that I have a greater idea of the unique person in my presence unlike a class where expectations of the learner were generally homogenous, such as expecting everyone to play a particular song on the guitar, learn twelve chords each term, perform a mallet part to an arranged pop song, or play a percussion part to a piece of multi-cultural music. I cannot recall ever really getting a glimpse of the person behind any of the musical costumes I used to ask them to don time and time again. Now, all it takes is a boy to sit behind a piano and begin playing quietly, or a girl who suddenly fills a room with her enthusiastic singing while dancing for me to wonder why it took as long as it did for my music class to become a place of individual opportunities instead of homogenous activities. My later introduction during graduate school to a wide variety of philosophical concepts about art and the importance of individual expression really allowed these doors to open more fully for me. I owe a great deal to my teachers at Simon Fraser University for this. In the following chapter, I discuss ways in which philosophy helped me to further transform as a pedagogue and reconceptualize curriculum with students as agents of their own musical destinies.

Chapter 7.

Youth as Deficit Model, Identity Formation and Personhood, Youth as Partner Through Participatory Action Research, and Development of "Student Voice" in Personalized Music Learning

"Thank you for giving me the chance to make a difference."

These words, inscribed on the back of a large, framed photograph of an alliance of student researchers by one of its young participants, were dedicated to those significant adults who had not only acted as her mentors but to those same adults who had been her research partners. The sense of empowerment conveyed by this "gift of chance" is the kind of "problem-posing" education to which Paulo Freire (1970) refers, "responding to the essence of consciousness – *intentionality*" (p. 79). By this student "being *conscious of*" her actions as making a difference in her own life and in the lives of others, this serves as a gently understated example of Freire's goal of "liberating education" and how both teacher and student "become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow" (p. 80). As Freire asserts that education is the practice of freedom, so does Maxine Greene (1988) declare: "Freedom shows itself or comes into being when individuals come together in a particular way, when they are authentically present to one another (without masks, pretenses, badges of office), when they have a project they can mutually pursue" (p. 17). It is through this freedom that intentionality can allow us to feel that we are capable of having control over certain distinct facets of our lives "in a particular situation or at a given time" (Wiggins, 2011, p. 91).

The words of the student researcher above challenges a number of prevalent beliefs that our youth, either by nature or by will, are careless and selfish. Yet, it was not terribly long ago that adults were directed to overpower them for having any expression of personal agency. Founder of the Methodist Church John Wesley advised two hundred and fifty years ago in *On Obedience to Parents*: “Break their wills betimes; begin this great work before they can run alone, before they can speak plain, or perhaps speak at all” (p. 170). Even more recent is the “adolescence as illness” model espoused by Granville Stanley Hall in 1904, first president of the American Psychological Association:

Many of the most successful malingerers, simulators, and even dissimulators, that often defy both judicial and medical experts: the most preposterous impostors famous in history...these have been adolescents in whom the tendencies and characteristics normal to this age are here seen only in persistent or exaggerated forms...Psychoses and neuroses abound in early adolescent years more than at any other period of life. This causes great emotional strain, which some have described as a kind of repressed insanity that is nevertheless normal at this period. To keep down morbid impulses is often a very difficult matter in this age of stress. (p. 266)

Children have either had a will that needed suppressing because it was tainted with sin or it was a medically aberrant “condition” requiring treatment during this period of development of “psychology as science.” As a contemporary remnant of this, students in the middle school years are now often referred to as “hormonally disadvantaged” (Larsen and Akmal, 2010, p. 62) or “walking hormones” (Bloomstran, 2002, p. 55). Willis Overton (2006) criticizes the dichotomization or “split” associated with a “youth as deficit” model, compared to its other conception from a “person standpoint” as a healthy and positive form of human development in coordination with biology and culture (p. 37). Similarly, Lerner et al. (2003) disapprove of the way our youth are often depicted as developmentally deviant and believe this has “disembedded the adolescent from the study of normal or healthy development” (p. 172). By referring to them as medical

symptoms and not as persons, it is little wonder that educators struggle to accept the idea that our children might have a personhood of any possible worth.

In this chapter, I propose that the development of personhood in school is embedded in and reliant upon the pedagogies music teachers employ in their classrooms and performing ensembles. I contend that the liberating education and freedom of which Freire and Greene speak might only be attained if curriculum and the control issues that commonly yoke music teachers and directors are transformed. This writer also encourages music teachers to discover for themselves how philosophy might liberate education by providing concepts that inspire change and resist stasis. Additionally, social science research in adolescence provides justification that educators should provide greater choices for musical self-identities and opportunities to exercise personal agency and empowerment, particularly at the middle school age level. Moreover, adolescents are at a critical point in their lives when self-interests alternately merge and diverge with concerns for helping their community and others. Therefore, cultivating both self-interest and concern for others in and through music is an essential step towards a healthy and helpful personhood.

Hays and Minichiello (2005) insist: "Music is an important part of the lives of people because it is through music that they can come to know and reflect upon their own personhood" (p. 440). Furthermore, music can lead "towards an understanding of another person's *personhood*" (p. 449). This is one of the many great challenges in teaching music to students in middle school where knowledge of one's "passionate" self and how it might positively affect others are in a state of coalescent flux, "which means they can be incredibly mature, thoughtful, and independent in one moment and remarkably childlike, egocentric and needy in the next" (Larsen and Akmal, 2010, p. 62).

David Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2009) speak of three important questions that are posed to all undergraduates at an opening lecture when first arriving at Boston College “that should animate their entire liberal arts education” (p. 3). They are as follows:

- Do you have a passion?
- Are you good at it, or can you become so?
- Does it serve a socially compelling social need?

Similarly, in asking my own middle school age students to anonymously write about their loves or passions, the overwhelming majority from ages eleven to thirteen chose sports. A disappointing regularity in written responses to how their love of sports might somehow help others was “It doesn’t help anyone but me” or “It helps the team win.”

However, significantly more students that wrote about their passions for music and art connected how it could help others in various ways. Some students believed that music could inspire others to keep searching for themselves, by listening to lyrics that teach you something like love or respect for others or by making you stay calm or think before you do something you might regret later. Other students admitted that they had never considered how their passion might assist others, while several students with a love of sports proclaimed that they would like to try something that does.

While it is not my intention to antagonistically polarize sports and arts, I lament the dominance that athletic programs have in our public schools from elementary schools onwards. Teachers are frequently hired for their professed coaching passions and abilities, more so than for artistic and humanistic capacities. The expression written on posters that hang on many of our classroom walls claiming, “There is no ‘I’ in team,”

is a misnomer. The “I” is a team and it arguably exists solely to compete with other teams, with victory being the only option (Glover, 2000). Varda Burstyn (2000) believes:

The problem...is that sport divides people in ways that are often destructive and antisocial. Sport divides people against themselves. It separates children from children, men from women, men from men, and community from community. Sport models and exacerbates social conflict and encourages antisocial and antidemocratic values. (p. 27)

Despite criticism from the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989) and Dan French of the Center for Collaborative Education (2003) that middle schools should promote personalized instruction and fitness, rather than have the emphasis on interscholastic team sports or competitive curriculum or clubs such as adjudicated music performing groups, these warnings have gone largely unheeded (NASPE and MASSPEC, 2002). As children become more and more competitive at earlier ages, it is crucial that our arts programs reflect values that temper this tendency. Traditional music classes and performance-based ensembles in band, choir and popular music need to consider alternate ways of functioning other than in the manner of their athletic counterpart in schools. Thomas Regelski (2009) notes:

Over the years, all of these paradigms, practices, and habits have created a new ‘field’ in the music world called ‘school music’. In some places this leads to ‘positioning’ between schools (e.g., “Our school’s music program is the best in the city”) and between ensembles (e.g., “Our chorus is better than our orchestra”), and between their directors (viz., according to which ensemble program in a particular school wins the most awards, competitions, or accolades). The situation also promotes not just ‘positioning’ but often outright competition between students for ensemble seating, solos, and the like—formal competition or the informal kind of ‘comparitition’ that is natural in the identity formation of adolescents—where social ‘status’ is the goal more than music and musical learning. As a result, all this ‘positioning’ itself becomes more important to ‘school music’ than making a pragmatic musical difference for life. (pp. 71-72)

Band educator and ensemble adjudicator Joseph Shively (2004) supports Regelski's observation, namely that music directors need to step "down from the podium" (p. 179) and embrace more humane interactions with their ensemble members. Melissa Abramo (2008) took a like-minded approach and stopped bringing her students to competitive, adjudicated festivals. Too often, the only outward difference between the "trophy-case" music director and sports coach is the wielding of a baton instead of a whistle (Bruenger, 2004).

Regelski continues: " 'School music' thus makes a pragmatic musical difference for only a select (or self-selected) few—those with the 'talent' or interest needed to submit to such instruction—and, of these, usually only for the school years" (p. 72). Etienne Wenger (1999) warns: "Focusing on an institutionalized curriculum without addressing issues of identity thus runs the risk of serving only those who already have an identity of participation with respect to material in other contexts" (p. 269).

Prendergast, Gouzouasis, Leggo & Irwin (2009) advise this: "We are reminded of how the arts may provide a space in schools for students to express their identities in a freer and more creative way than is generally seen in other subject areas" (p. 311). Correspondingly, Patricia O'Toole (2005) asserts that music's role in our lives is to support identity formation, something that strictly technical and performance based music programs cannot do because of their highly limited potential to support multiple student identities. O'Toole contends that "context is the playground for identity formation" (p. 297). Similarly, Henry Giroux (2010) insists: "Schools are immensely important sites for constituting subjectivities" (para. 3) and a music program that offers the opportunity for technical performer as the only identity to conceive of oneself is not likely to maintain wide student interest in continuing to take music as a school elective in the future. Based

upon a 2006 Gallup poll on what instruments are played in the household age five or older, Patrick Jones (2008) states that: “Americans are widely engaging musically in ways that are not taught in schools” (p. 3). Jo Saunders (2010) reports that 92-93% of students in the British school system opted out of continuing with school music as electives between 2000 and 2006 following their middle year experiences. Although there is no data from large scale research on this for Canadian households or schools that I have located, Gouzouasis, Henrey, and Belliveau (2008) found that the majority of grade seven and eight music students from Langley, B.C. attributed their unsatisfying experiences in band and general music classes as reasons not to choose any kind of music whatsoever as an elective in high school. Clearly, something vital is missing in school music programs to cause this.

Emergent approaches to personalize and revitalize general music classes are an exciting way to empower our students and their sense of agency. Lucy Green (2001, 2006, 2008a) has led the way in this area, particularly in pedagogy and promoting inside of our schools the informal music learning found “outside school,” most commonly associated with popular music. I have been inspired by her research and innovations to include “outside music” identities in school music programs. Because so many pre-existing musical identities and curiosities exist across cultures in middle school, I encourage students with “outside school” musical abilities to continue with their passions and interests “inside” the school, even though these often shift throughout their time in my class. I have witnessed more students become interested in learning to read music, simply by being inspired by their peers.

I often wonder why many music educators do not support the same belief held by colleagues in other curricular areas that our students build upon what they already know

and love. It is far too often that music teachers do not care to know about the outside musical experiences of their students, treating them instead like blank slates or as “musically unenlightened” until setting foot in their classrooms. This does nothing to endear educators to students, nor to parents who have often provided their children with music lessons since a young age.

By providing as many pianos, electronic keyboards, acoustic and electric drum sets, acoustic and electric guitars, electric basses, music recording and composition stations, Internet access for music sites, and practice rooms or spaces for students to play and play in, the developing personhood of adolescents can become something of value and not as something insignificant. Susan and Henry Giroux (2011) name “the emergence of pedagogical sites outside of the schools” as transforming education into “both a form of schooling and public pedagogy” (p. i). As technologies become further refined and musically engage youth outside of our institutions, it is vitally important for music teachers to accept them as legitimate pedagogies.

How many of us ask ourselves, not once and for all time but frequently and at different times, *how might one live?* How many of us embrace that question, not only in our stories but in our actions, our projects, our commitments? How many of us open the door to the possibility that, however it is we are living, we might live otherwise? *Todd May* (2005, p. 1)

One of the most important things you first need to learn as a teacher is how to deal with ambiguity.

Allan MacKinnon (Personal communication, February 27, 1992)

It means developing usefully vague concepts, which are capable of stretching and contracting... *Brian Hulse* (2010, p. 47)

What draws a music educator to embrace new, seemingly ambiguous philosophical concepts? Reducing the myriad of influences seems an impossible task for why I first came to marvel at many of the concepts explored by the late French

philosopher Gilles Deleuze. Leading directly up to my first encounter with the work of Deleuze, there was a painfully despondent time for me as a general music teacher in a middle school that I was becoming resigned to believe that the institutionalization of music in the public school offered little hope to value the music or the individuality of students (Erickson, 2005).

In addition to my own general music class, my experiences of band, choir and popular music performance programs in my own school and in others worried me. Worse yet, the thought that these institutionalized programs saw little hope in changing was rendering me indifferent. Incited by the worrying words of John Eisenberg (1992) that, for the “institutional self”: “No room is left for individuality, rebelliousness, creative reconceptualization, or imaginative activity” (p. 39), a new dose of conceptual smelling salts was in order for me.

Henry Giroux, a high school social studies teacher for six years, must have experienced a similarly agonizing place of pedagogical purgatory in which educators can inhabit when he wrote: “My work has always been informed by the notion that it is imperative to make hope practical and despair unconvincing” (Giroux, 2010, para. 3). In an exploration of Giroux’ idea that the teacher’s role should be one of “transformative intellectual,” George Demetron (2001) proposes that:

One of the more proximate goals for teachers as transformative intellectuals is the reestablishment of their power as curriculum decision makers against the "de-skilling" of teaching through administrative control of pedagogy. Thus, in the administered society curriculum is created for rather than by teachers. (p. 67)

This suggestion has serious implications for music educators in regard to whether or not they blindly follow education ministry standards for the various grade

level groupings and developmental stages of our students. How do we justify the adherence to governmental and local school district standards when we might strongly believe that they are misguided? If a student's growing sense of personal agency and identity development are thwarted by dictated standards that all too often exist simply so they can be measured and reported upon, then is there any real need to include music, or any arts for that matter, in our school curriculum? Maxine Greene (1997) mourns how standard classroom preoccupations with efficacy, technical efficiency, and immutable standards have not solved the problems in communication that teachers have with their students. These fixations have served to enlighten neither teacher nor student about "the arts and mystery of being human" (p. 8). Instead, these concerns in our schools have served to "eclipse the public," as Greene applies John Dewey's words, or rather, "eclipse our youth." Greene serves to cast light upon this overshadowing by proclaiming that "teachers may well be among the few in a position to kindle the light that might illuminate the spaces of discourse and events in which young newcomers have some day to find their ways" (p. 5).

David Elliott (2006) charges that music teachers have the duty to "protect the intrinsic motivations of our students" (p. 53). Because of this responsibility to their learners, Elliott recommends that teachers act outwardly or politically in ways that satisfy "the paper monster" of "the curriculum police" (p. 54), while they inwardly guard the music programs that are created by the teachers themselves:

So, let us write down on paper whatever our supervisors require in whatever standards-speak they demand, then hand in the paper curriculum, and then close the door and get on with what really matters: our humanistic, artistic, and caring efforts....If this sounds too subversive, keep in mind (again) that acting professionally means caring for the growth and development of your students, not your inspectors. (p. 54)

I don't believe that as a beginning music teacher with scant job seniority that I would explicitly do what Elliott proposes. However, his message is clear that our priority should be to attract and maintain the musical interests of our students. For this reason, Elliott stresses how "it is imperative that we conceptualize and practice *teaching* as a 'subversive activity' " (p. 55).

Therefore, reconceptualizing music education for the sake of subjectivity construction in our students, no matter how limited our time with students might be in our programs, is vital to development of their musical identity and personhood. It is here that the imagination must seize *the concept* and take it somewhere that only the individual teacher might go. For me, this is what lies at the heart of what Giroux and Demetrian referred to earlier as the teacher being a "transformative intellectual." The use of the word "intellectual" might bring one to connote an aura of arrogance to those in the teaching profession. Contrarily, by referring to Antonio Gramsci in *Education Under Siege*, Aronowitz and Giroux (1987) believe that "all people are intellectuals in that they think, mediate, and adhere to a specific view of the world" (p. 34).

Similarly, Estelle Jorgensen (2003b) speaks of "transforming music education" through individual ideas about music curriculum found in the unique personalities of music teachers as they "find their own imperatives." Jorgensen suggests this alternative: "Instead of focusing teacher training efforts on preparing disciples or technicians...it is much more important that teachers discover and articulate their own perspectives and voices and develop the skills and confidence to forge their own particular approaches" (p. 126). Here I caution that music teachers remain vigilant so that by establishing their own methodologies, it does not take precedent over fostering the identity formation in the students with whom they are entrusted, lest it become what Thomas Regelski

(2002b) disparagingly calls “methodolotry” or the “method-book syndrome” that places technique over the development of independent musicianship. This can create the necessity of a difficult, although not irreconcilable, balance to strike between teacher identity and student identity, which will enter into the discussion later, since they need not be perceived as mutually exclusive.

By reconceptualizing curriculum, Jason Wallin (2010) conceives it this way: “A concept is a way of approaching the world, or put differently, a way of creating a world through the *active* extension of thinking the possible. Such extension is not simply idealistic, but rather, an opening of experience to *what it is not*” (p. 1). Wallin then argues that the curriculum in education has become “emaciated” and “ossified,” which belies the active meaning in the Latin word *currere*, meaning *to run*. While not making a case based simply upon an etymological misrepresentation of the word *curriculum*, Wallin suggests we reconceptualize so that “currere creates a line of *becoming* that expands difference, implying experimentation, movement, and creation. Along this line of flight, currere abolishes an image of the world given dictatorially” (p. 2), lest we, as music educators, languish “in cul-de-sacs rather than in openings” (Greene, 1997, p. 3). William Pinar’s (2011) conception of *curre* as a “complicated conversation” cautions that the complexity implied by this “running of the course” has “almost infinite possibilities, not a few of them awful” (p. xiii). Hence, to Pinar, curriculum “requires us to reconstruct the character of complicated conversation as ethical” (p. xiii).

Similarly, in his *Letter from the Vice President* to the American Educational Research Association (2006), Donald Blumenfeld-Jones warns:

When we produce a curriculum that prevents people from asking questions, we are preventing those people from pursuing the

development of their selves as thinking beings making sense of experience. When we produce a curriculum that prevents people from making mistakes (we are being saved from our own bad judgment) we are preventing people from understanding what constitutes a bad choice and from self-forming through coming through some crisis that is not life-threatening but may, using Dewey's ideas, induce growth. (p. 3)

The notion that music education should resist the negative reproductive effects of traditional conceptualizations of curriculum as “the image of life imprisoned within the closed circuit of a racetrack” (Wallin, p. 3) and the resulting petrification of student identity growth is supported further by Maxine Greene (1995):

To feel oneself en route, to feel oneself in a place where there are always possibilities of clearings, of new openings, this is what we must communicate to the young if we want to awaken them to their situations and enable them to make sense of and to name their worlds. (pp. 149-150)

Moving metaphors like Greene's for resisting stasis and being open to other possibilities abound in scores of philosophical and educational writings. Likewise, Elliot Eisner (2008) intones: “We ought to be helping our students discover new seas upon which to sail rather than old ports at which to dock” (p. 28). The conception that thoughts and ideas could, in a sense, move from one place to another, while gaining meaning and momentum for the thinker, is present in Friedrich Nietzsche, who “compares the thinker to an arrow shot by Nature that another thinker picks up where it has fallen so that he can shoot it somewhere else” (Deleuze, 1962, ix). Mikhail Bakhtin (Todorov, 1984) echoes Nietzsche here:

There is no first or last discourse, and dialogical context knows no limits (it disappears into an unlimited past and in our unlimited future). Even past meanings, that is in those that have arisen in the dialogues of past centuries, can never be stable (complete once and for all, finished), they will always change (renewing themselves) in the course of the dialogue's subsequent development, and yet to come. (p. 110)

It is then my hope, as Todd May (2005) articulated previously, that I might continue to ask myself how my commitment to my students as persons might be different, “not once and for all time but frequently and at different times” (p. 1). The moment that I subjectively sense it is time for reconceptualization is when music class no longer feels adventuresome, exploratory and uncertain. Hildegard Froehlich (2007) refers to these “stable patterns of actions and thoughts” as “professional routinization” and maintains: “It takes courage to embrace uncertainty in the teaching act, a message that perhaps has been neglected in our pursuit of ‘fool-proof’ teaching methods and step-by-step instructional sequences that promise inevitable success” (p. 16). Instead, many music educators circumvent “incentives for thought” by devotion to formulaic and sequential methods and “the systematic elimination of ambiguity and contradiction” (Bowman, 2005, p. 31). “In all these ways, students are protected from the challenges associated with authentic personal growth and the profession, in turn, from creative self-transformation” (p. 31). Within conceptual challenge and ambiguity lie *possibilities* in curriculum, as Allan MacKinnon and Brian Hulse might suggest. Herein lies the hope in “the casting of light,” “the running course,” “becoming...a line of flight,” “an arrow landing and launching in perpetuity,” “a possibility of clearing,” or “the sailing upon new seas” that Greene, Wallin, Deleuze, Nietzsche, and Eisner could all imagine.

As I stated before, I sensed that a conceptual rejuvenation was necessary to rouse me from my uneasy feelings about the ineffectiveness of institutionalized music education. There has been a significant amount of alarming research with middle school age youth, particularly in reduction in academic incentive and success (Eccles et al., 1984; Simmons, 1987), as well as a rise in depression (Compas et al., 1997, and Galaif, 2007) and other forms of psychopathology (Ozer et al., 2010) at this stage of their

adolescent development. Of great surprise and dismay to me were findings that young people in middle school believe that they actually have fewer opportunities to feel a sense of personal agency and take part in decision making than they did in elementary school (Midgely and Feldlaufer, 1987). It seems natural that as school age proceeds, so should more frequent chances to exercise empowerment. Unfortunately, schools can be dreadfully unnatural places.

A possible path leading to the reconceptualizing of curriculum is to include our middle school aged youth in the planning of their general music programs. One instance of empowering student involvement is by availing inclusive research opportunities to them. In *Imagining Participatory Action Research in Collaboration with Children* (2010), Langhout and Thomas provide sound reasons for this kind of research method:

For example, dominant narratives in many societies hold that children are not able to participate in making important decisions that affect them. Yet an empowerment perspective demands that we question these dominant narratives and to seek out alternative stories that challenge assumptions about children's capacities. (pp. 60-61)

Youth participatory action research (YPAR) is a relative newcomer on the psychological and sociological research landscape (Langhout and Thomas, 2010) and is even more recent to music education. It stems from the significant shift in *conducting* research *on* people to the realm of *accompanying* them during much of the process.

Although not unanimously applauded by stakeholders in the social sciences that this process might, from an extreme postmodern view, call for the "dismantling of disciplinary boundaries" (Tolman and Brydon-Miller, 2001, p. 4), the positive potential it holds for education seems enormous. Given that so many academic subject areas have their own idiosyncratic and, often, isolative languages and localized procedures, those

disciplines fearing disassembling might embrace “the greater good” that could be derived out of such a new addition to previously established research methods.

Since participatory action research (PAR) calls for professionals and non-professionals alike to work together and where all members develop in their understanding of themselves and others, one way in which a reshaping of the music curriculum can occur is within the area of artistically crafted research (Eisner, 1995). As another step in promoting healthy personhood by offering activities in the music classroom that promote intentionality and freedom, Eisner believes artistic research can “help us to understand because their creators have understood and had the skills and imagination to transform their understanding into forms that help us to notice what we have learned not to see” (p. 3). This latter point is vital because it suggests that all of us, both young and old, whether student or teacher, are never fully fused in the development of personhood. There is always the potential to perceive something differently than before and transform ourselves. As Bakhtin revealed earlier: “There is no first or last discourse, and dialogical context knows no limits” (Todorov, 1984, p. 110).

One vivid example of artistically crafted research is found in a study by Prendergast, Gouzouasis, Leggo & Irwin (2009), in which members of a secondary school rhythm and blues band were informally mentored by a university researcher and their own ensemble teacher for three years. Through the means of a “haiku suite,” the students’ responses were “transcribed across interviewees without distinction of individual voices in an attempt to form a collective portrait of these students’ thoughts, attitudes, reflections, and philosophical statements in response to each question” (p. 307). Some of the questions included how they became involved in music, why the students chose their instruments, what role music played in their lives and what it meant

to them. Therefore, by using the artistically expressive medium of haiku, it was the researchers' "hope to create further openings - new forms of data representation - that may enable music education researchers with contemporary methods and new lenses through which to view music learning and the impact of music education on our lives (p. 312).

In this haiku project, the comfortable connections and democratic rapport that resided between the supportive adult mentors and the students were vital. For Lerner, Dowling, and Anderson (2003) report that individuals across the lifespan have "relative plasticity," and that they will experience "healthy, positive functioning" (p. 173) when feeling that they are making a contribution to a group or a community that is, at the very time, displaying reciprocal support for these same individuals. Similarly, both adolescents and adults who express a sense of purpose to causes "greater than the self" demonstrate "consolidated identities and deeper senses of meaning" than those without (Damon, Menon, and Bronk, 2003, p. 9). I reiterate the words written by the young person who expressed gratitude to the adult researchers during her YPAR experience: "Thank you for giving me the chance to make a difference." One plausible interpretation that the student's comment indicates a positive growth in personhood is that the group or community, represented by the researchers, was perceived by the student as *supportive* and the student's activity was *purposeful*, aimed at something *greater than oneself*.

As I cautioned earlier, teachers who are developing their own methodologies should be cautious not to discourage independence or displace identity realization in students. Wiggins (2011) warns that "music teachers...must remain cognizant of their own actions and decisions to be sure that they are enabling learner agency and not

inadvertently constraining it” (p. 92). For “without a sense of agency, young people are unlikely to pose significant questions, the existentially rooted questions in which learning begins” (Greene; 1997, p. 3) Although “PAR is a theoretical standpoint and collaborative methodology that is designed to ensure a voice for those who are affected by a research project” (Langhout and Thomas, 2010), it has the potential to benefit the growth in personhood of both student and teacher. Lerner et al. (2003) conceptualize a process for young people in PAR they call *thriving*, and draw upon something in adulthood that Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and Kevin Rathunde refer to as “idealized personhood” (cited in Lerner et al., 2003, p. 173). This is when one assists self, others and cultural institutions in a manner that is regarded as valuable. By encouraging our students to think about their own and others’ musical interests and concerns, it might follow that their feelings of empowerment, purpose and contribution to the greater good are also being fostered.

The Music Matters YPAR Project

I shall now share several examples of some YPAR projects that took place in my own middle school. Directed by Susan O’Neill of Simon Fraser University, the research project was carried out on behalf of RYME or *Research for Youth, Music and Education*. Below is the synopsis of the research study *Engaging Youth in Artistically Participatory Action Research* (O’Neill and Erickson, 2011):

The study strove to examine how young people, working within their own peer cultures, have a perspective that is not always easy for researchers and teachers to tap into. Yet, their “insider” knowledge can make an important contribution to understanding the ways that youth value arts and music at school. This exploratory study draws on youth-led participatory action research (YPAR) frameworks and artistically crafted research methods to engage young people, teachers, and researchers in a collaborative project focused on issues that matter to them about music engagement in their school. The study explores how we might use youth-

led artistically crafted research to build and sustain a culture of “knowers” in the music classroom.

The study further sought to develop research, advocacy, and leadership skills in and through the arts from young people’s perspectives.

Aims of the Study

- Engage youth in reflective thinking about why youth value participation in music.
- Gain “insider” knowledge about youth music engagement.
- Understand and make a contribution to the way knowledge about music learning is constructed, used, and exchanged.
- Promote equity in music education practices by building a culture of “knowers.”
- Develop leadership skills and awareness of the need for youth advocacy in music education.

Music Matters had the following guiding principles from the outset:

What do we want youth do to?

- **THINK** about your musical world
- All the music activities you are involved in, what matters to you and why, what got you started and keeps you interested, what benefits you get out of being involved in music – think about your triumphs, passions, struggles, possibilities...
- **IDENTIFY** and choose one thing to focus on
- Focus on an issue/problem/question that might help music students feel connected, or valued, or better prepared, or successful, or motivated, or treated equally, or...?
- **RESEARCH** your focus area
- Find out more about it, compare others’ experiences, collect data, analyze what you find...
- **ADVOCATE** the message from your research
- Get the message “out there” in some way, who needs to hear your message? Explore the possibilities for this, come up with a plan, and produce a final outcome.

The *Music Matters* study followed the four stages to inquiry-based research that is part of Youth-led Participatory Action Research methods. There were a total of twelve students, consisting of six thirteen-year-olds, with five females and one male. The six twelve-year-olds were comprised of two females and four males.

The twelve students, two university researchers and the classroom teacher all worked as partners during each of the following stages:

The Inquiry and Research Process

Stage 1: Preparing for Research

- Define
- Explore
- Identify
- Relate

Stage 2: Accessing Resources

- Locate
- Select
- Gather
- Collaborate

Stage 3: Processing Information

- Analyze
- Evaluate
- Test
- Sort
- Synthesize

Stage 4: Transferring Learning

- Revise
- Present
- Reflect
- Transfer

In the first stage focus group activity, the students were asked to discuss their musical and other artistic activities, what got them started, what keeps them involved and how being involved in this activity impacts upon their lives, not dissimilar to some of the questions asked of how music mattered to the secondary school R & B band members in the “haiku suite” study that was discussed earlier (Prendergast, Gouzouasis, Leggo & Irwin, 2009). Students discussed important messages about why music and art at their school matter to the various shareholders that the students themselves identified. Following this, the students chose their own groups to “brain storm” their special interest. Adult co-researchers visited groups to assist with choice of focus and later, they returned for a full-group sharing session.

“Why does music matter to you at your school?”. After formulating this general question, students made it more distinct to fit the persons or “shareholders” involved by arranging it into the following subgroups:

- To you?
- To other students?
- To your teachers?
- To the school?
- To your family?
- To your community?
- To the world beyond?

Some student responses to the questions of why music matters to them personally were:

- It gets your mind off homework
- You can express yourself
- Music enriches your life
- You can show your progress

- It keeps you calm
- Music is just for fun

I shall now describe four YPAR activities that were planned and completed by students. One group used a digital classroom studio to record the song *Dani California* by the Red Hot Chili Peppers for use on the soundtrack of a final video being put together of all the student projects. This group initially had three members but one twelve-year-old male left mid-session, leaving the remaining recording musicians consisting of one male and one female, both age thirteen. Since the group was also going to record a song advocating artistic expression that was being written by the boy who eventually left, the soundtrack recording was the extent of their involvement, much to the disappointment of the two continuing group members.

Another group, however, worked by using *artistically crafted research* methods in the manner described by Elliot Eisner (2008) earlier. One grade eight female student, who was a classically trained pianist, arranged “Don’t Stop Believing” by the band “Journey,” which at that time had been revitalized by a newly recorded arrangement for the television series *Glee*. This music accompanied choreography created by three female dancers, one age thirteen and two age twelve. The piece was designed to deliver the positive message to themselves and others that “No matter what anyone might ever tell you, don’t stop believing in yourself.”

This YPAR project also allowed for the students’ expressed desire for their involvement in curricular reconceptualization of their music class by integrating dance and film, thus feeling a more complete sense of their intended artistic expression.

Another group interviewed their community-based guitar teacher who also performed in a rock band comprised of young adults. Members of the band, who put on an impromptu instrumental “jam” at one point, were interviewed and filmed by the students, responding to a wide range of questions such as “What do you get your inspiration from?” or “How do you write your music?” and “Where and when did you start playing your instrument?”. By sheer coincidence, the drummer from the band was an ex-student of mine and had begun playing the drum set in my music class. He was also employed as a percussion salesperson at the community Long and McQuade music store and was known by many students in the school who frequented the store or who took private music lessons there.

The last group of student researchers I will discuss sought to ask a large group of students and staff members what music meant to them in their lives inside and outside of school. One striking feature of this student research group was their ability to draw out statements of personally meaningful musical identities from individuals that were marginalized in the school. One comment during a showing of the video was, “I’m so sad that I’ve never even seen him here at school...why does he hide away like that?”.

The experience was a fascinating and fulfilling one for me as a valuable variation to my erstwhile experience as a teacher facilitating music and art making. However, to say that the entire YPAR project was effortlessly self-propelled would be a great mistruth. Having adults as mentors, who were also co-researchers and sometimes participants, was often a tricky water to navigate. I tried to reassure the participants that they should not hold back their comments and criticisms of both the school and its music programs. Students were told that their honest perceptions and ideas for change were invaluable to this being something meaningful. On this topic, Langhout and Thomas

(2010) note: “Children are often not consulted or even asked to participate in civil society, nor in research that is about their lives” (p. 60).

When the projects were completed and edited, students posted the final video on YouTube and invited the school administration for lunch while they showed the video, responded to questions and discussed their ideas. Before this lunch meeting could take place, the “Music Matters” students met to plan their presentation. These are the original notes that were written, which were read and embellished upon by the students to the principal and vice principal:

Music Matters:

- Music means a lot to students
- Students enjoy music and play or listen to music every day
- Kids do better in school when music programs are around, kids are less bored and also look forward to school
- Kids develop social skills through music and develop self-confidence through performing for others
- You make friends when you form bands
- Express yourself when you write songs or play an instrument
- Fun way to let loose
- In the future, we would like to see more awareness to music and how much of an impact it has upon students

Although not written in their notes, students requested that the administration continue to support the arts in school and received the administration’s commitment of “\$upport” to the school’s popular music program for the following school year. I can happily report that this year’s program has been fully funded and I have not had to invest large amounts of my own money to sustain the club as I have in previous years under a different administrator.

Following the project, students were asked to complete a final evaluation of the project. The questions were as follows:

- What did being in this project make you THINK about?
- What did it make you FEEL?
- What did you DO that was interesting/important to you?
- What might you do differently in future based on what you have learned?
- What did the project help you CONNECT with?

Some very fascinating responses came out of this, particularly how this project pertained to the students' sense of connectedness and responsibility. I shall share several:

- What might you do differently in future based on what you have learned?
Involve more students in the school.
- What did the project help you CONNECT with?
The people that don't have the privilege of music like I do.

What is interesting to note is that, while the first three questions involving what students thought, felt and did while being in the research project, they did not tend to involve other people in responses, unlike the last two follow-up questions regarding what the student might do differently in the future and what *Music Matters* helped you “connect with.” Perhaps this is because students have grown accustomed to the initial three kinds of direct questions asked of them in reader response journals, as well as the many times other subjects in the British Columbia *I.R.P.* curricula list the ways that students are feeling and thinking as part of *Prescribed Learning Outcomes*. The *I.R.P.* for music in particular has a clear focus upon what is important to the individual but a dearth of attention is paid to what others might need or want. Interestingly, “personal and social responsibility” (p. 44) is said in the same breath on the grade 7 *I.R.P.* under

Suggested Achievement Indicators, yet it only addresses the *Prescribed Learning Outcome* of performance skill expectations. It is little wonder that many musicians, and other artists in general, can often become focused only upon themselves in their artistic practices.

A troubling facet for me as an arts educator with developing adolescents in middle school is when some “becoming artists” sometimes “self-express” themselves apart from other “becoming artists.” It is more often than not that these very same “others” who could serve to unite with others to maintain their own arts “lifeline” are involved in artistic areas that “self-exile” or “auto-excommunicate” from other “becoming artists.” Therefore, asking that our music students reflect upon how what they do might help others is an important, yet missing link in our present music curriculum guide. Simply writing the word “social responsibility” renders it into the realm of empty, educational jargon, rather than attempt to fulfill its potential as an important area of inquiry into student agency and identity. Charles Taylor, in *The Ethics of Authenticity* notes, “The agent seeking significance in life, trying to define him- or herself meaningfully, has to exist in a horizon of important questions” (p. 40). Music education’s preoccupation with “the self” confines authenticity to only that which benefits the individual. Taylor gives this important insight:

That is what is self-defeating in modes of contemporary culture that concentrate on self-fulfillment *in opposition* to the demands of society, or nature, which *shut out* history and the bonds of solidarity....Authenticity is not the enemy of demands that emanate from beyond the self; it supposes such demands. (pp. 41-42)

In the end, their trust and candor resulted in several art and music activities getting direct attention from the administration and, as Ozer, Ritterman, and Wanis

(2010) asserted in their research, middle school age students need to see that something is done with their time and efforts through the action research process and that it's not just talked about.

Another indirect but satisfying surprise was, late in the school year, witnessing that other older groups of students were using some YPAR research techniques, which had been shown them by some of the project participants on their own, and applying them to other curricular areas. Without this as a feature of the project, even a number of parents of some student researchers, who had not been previously interviewed or asked to participate in any formal part of the students' research designs, spontaneously stopped by my room to talk after school or sent me lists of what music meant to them in their lives. Here are some examples of some ideas that were given by several parents:

- Music Matters because music shows support.
- Music:
 - Brings people together
 - spiritual/prayer/churches
 - Flash mobs/dancing
- Music Matters in Celebrations.
 - Birthdays
 - Weddings
 - Bar Mitzvahs
- Music Matters because it is a language on its own.
 - around the world
 - through history
 - gives a voice in protests

In the end, the students presented the research project in a “Designs for Learning” music class at Simon Fraser University for beginning teachers. In a previous research group session, the middle school students had brainstormed a series of

questions about the “what, where, when and why” of music intended for future discussion with the student teachers. The questions that the students came up with were scaled down to five groups, with four different questions for each group of student teachers. Two to three middle school students questioned, listened to and discussed with the five groups, comprised of four or five student teachers. The responses to these questions were presented formally to the class following a significantly long discussion period. Taking the time to reflect is vital in any meaningful educative enterprise. Through a natural modeling of this with the student teachers, the middle school students gave their own “music lessons,” paired with their compilation of questions:

- Why does music matter to you?
- How does music affect schoolwork and social life?
- When you were our age, what was your music program like?
- How are you going to teach students that music is important to their lives?
- How are you going to show your students that you value the music and arts that are already an important part of their lives?
- What got you into music and what kept you interested up until now?
- What inspires you?
- What instruments did you and do you play now?
- What’s the best part of music?
- How has it changed your life?
- How do dance and music apply to each other in school?
- How does dance help you in music?
- Should schools/students be allowed to bring in outside dance groups?
- What made you interested in teaching music to other individuals?
- What do you think about music programs today?
- What would you want to achieve as a music teacher?
- Who got you involved in the arts first?
- How has music been a part of your life?
- What have you been able to accomplish because of music?

The federal election of 2011 in Canada yielded quite a curious event. According to a live CBC television report on May 2nd by Gloria Macarenko, a poll of Canadian youth not yet of voting age, as tallied by *Youth Vote Canada*, appeared to more closely resemble the final national vote than did all the major public opinion polls done with adults prior to the election. Low voter turnout internationally for all young adults notwithstanding, this Youth Vote result arguably lends credence to a belief that our youth know more about the world they occupy than we often acknowledge. Youth Vote Canada is a significant new face witnessed in the media during recent election coverage, which refers to itself on its Facebook webpage as a “grassroots, youth-led movement towards Participatory Democracy” (para. 1). In parallel movement, “Community psychology challenges us to create spaces where those who have structurally been denied a voice in democracy can begin to build power for civic engagement” (Langhout and Thomas, 2010).

In summary, I believe that the YPAR project succeeded largely because it provided an opening for the voice of these oft-neglected, young people to be heard. *Music Matters* was also able to engage students whose musical identities did not reside solely in “school music,” yet many of these “outside” passions somehow found a way “inside.” Another area of success was by providing examples of ways to possibly reconceptualize the music curriculum by combining artistically crafted research methods with YPAR. This might help revitalize music programs with increasingly disengaged students who often find their real musical sustenance lies outside of school.

Elliot Eisner (2008) argues one of the ways education can learn from the arts is that “slowing down perception is the most promising way to see what is actually there” (p. 26). This is not a concept that is new to education and is especially particularly

poignant in J. J. Rousseau (1762): “Dare I expose the greatest, the most important, the most useful rule of all education? It is not to gain time but to lose it” (p. 93). Yaroslav Senyshyn (2010) might agree. He proposes that we as people must “preserve our individuality through subjective reflection” (p. 82). Yet the time made available in our schools for student reflection is a travesty. David Hargreaves (2006) stresses that authentically personalized education, with all its best intentions, necessitates that longer, meaningful undertakings be emphasized in school (p. 19), instead of the pervasive short lessons that fit the bell schedule. YPAR research projects are a promising way of engaging those students who want a greater sense of connection to their community and each other, which is at the heart of personhood. Yet, this requires patience and time.

YPAR, although potentially becoming just another method or formula, holds potential by its sharing of power. Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (2006) looks to Martin Buber for curriculum critique by how he conceptualized freedom and in what way Buber posited that education has to do with the “release of powers”:

When we think of the idea of power, we usually think of it in terms of our ability to do something. To have power is to be able to act... “power” derives from the Latin word *potere*. *Potere*, in turn, is made up of two Latin words: *pos* and *esse*. *Pos*, in Latin, means “to be able.” *Esse*, in Latin, means “to be.” If we read *pos* and *esse* in linear order, power becomes not “to be able to do something” but, rather, “able to be.” That is, now power isn’t only about accomplishing ends in the world. It is also about our sheer existence. It is about our very status as being, as existing, sentient beings. Just as Buber asserts that our being is grounded in being able to commune with our destiny, our nature and with others, so this communing leads us to our very being in life.

How can we bring these ideas into our curriculum thinking so that they become central to how we consider both what it means to work with others to create curriculum and what it means to enact curriculum? (pp. 3-4).

Bereft of tidy lesson plans, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) warn: “In no way do we believe in a fine-arts system; we believe in very diverse problems whose solutions are found in heterogeneous arts” (p. 300). Susan O’Neill (2011) cautions that the “problem with philosophical approaches is that they can be idealized and prescriptive” (p. 191). Similarly, Hildegard Froehlich (2007) applies Andrew Abbott’s term “jurisdictional vulnerability” to a professional malady, whereby prescribed actions are followed uncritically. Froehlich warns that: “Any pedagogy, no matter how innovative at one point, can fall prey to jurisdictional vulnerability” (p. 14). Even so-called progressive efforts to open up the curriculum by giving individual students a token “voice” and opportunities at “power sharing” can become shallow. Personalized “Third Way” learning strategies, currently gaining wide favour in the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada, are also vulnerable. David Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2009) warn that personalized education can become “mass customization” (p. 2), designed only for self-gratification (p. 84). William Damon (1995) urges that children “should concern themselves about things *beyond* the self and *above* the self” to “thrive psychologically” (p. 81).

Hargreaves and Shirley (2009) propose a “Fourth Way” for education in which personalized learning “acknowledges our needs for emotional engagement, our quest for excellence, and our craving for relatedness and purpose” (p. 85). Charles Taylor, in *The Ethics of Authenticity* (1992), contends: “Only if I exist in a world in which history, or the demands of nature, or the needs of my fellow human beings, or the duties of citizenship, or the call of God, or something else of this order *matters* crucially, can I define an identity for myself that is not trivial” (p. 40-41). Richard Rorty (1993) notes that “being authentic, being faithful to ourselves, is being faithful to something which was produced in collaboration with a lot of other people” (p.2) In a Harvard University Press book press

release for *The Ethics of Authenticity* (2012), the author encapsulates the dilemma this way: “At the heart of the modern malaise, according to most accounts, is the notion of authenticity, of self-fulfillment, which seems to render ineffective the whole tradition of common values and social commitment” (para. 2). Joseph Torchia laments: “The real casualty, however, in the postmodern denial of a human nature is the notion of human personhood. Once the objectivity of human nature is called into question, the objectivity of personhood easily falls by the wayside” (p. 219).

Therefore, promoting music programs that engage the individual interests of our students, while finding ways to connect these “selves” to a greater community that helped them become who they are, should be a presiding goal for music education. In this way, might music truly *matter*. However, finding these community connections that are understood and valued by students is the challenge at hand. Otherwise, any claim to genuinely reconceptualize curriculum through student agency rings hollow and enters into the realm of educational jargon, similar to references about “social responsibility” that are often trivially added to expected learning outcomes of music curriculum. The final chapter of this paper shall illustrate attempts I have made during my years as a music educator to better listen to and respect my students’ musical and artistic interests by offering a range of possible musical experiences in school for them.

Chapter 8.

Holistic Perspectives on Informal and Formal Learning, Middle School Music Environments, Technology as Pedagogical Partner, Music Advocacy as Inaction, Performance as Pedagogy, and Popular Music Performance in Middle School Curriculum

Where *is* music education? The answer is complex: all around, in and out of school. It is regular, ritualized, spontaneous, irregular and pervaded by ICT. The learning is both intentional and unintentional, formal and informal, casual, frequently private and variously directed by self and others.

John Finney (2007, p. 11)

In the context of early twenty-first century education, musical values in education are increasingly motivated by multiple sources—political democracy, cultural policies, mass media, arts advocacy, social justice campaigns, school communities, and not least the individual musical preferences of teachers and students. The presence of these various sources is indicative of the breakdown of monolithic value systems, the demise of cultural hegemony, and the emergence of a world-view that acknowledges diverse ways of being musical.

Marie McCarthy (2009, p. 31)

Traditional music education, as discussed throughout this paper, has gradually lost its control over preserving conventional ways in which young people engage in music in their schools. Extensive changes in technology, coupled with equally expansive transformations in philosophies about art, curriculum and teaching pedagogies, have greatly helped accomplish this. In light of important insights through research in educational and community psychology, contemporary music classrooms should provide opportunities for more personalized musical surroundings for their students. Music educators must learn to respect and value the musical cultures of their students, using a

“pedagogy that both supports and respects the identity and voice” of our students (Stauffer, 2003, p. 109). As a result of these influences, my music classes have taken on a very different character compared to my earlier approaches. Current music education reformers such as Thomas Regelski and John Finney, to name only several, have also helped provide certain philosophical underpinnings necessary to inform my classroom practice. I propose that music teachers, particularly in the middle school years, promote both the active and imagined music cultures of students. This might include the many forms of popular music that often inspire and nourish the lives of our young people. However, I also argue that personalized learning approaches in the music classroom should neither assume that popular music is exclusively the preferred music of students, nor that all students best attend to informal learning. As I have discussed in previous chapters, the research of Lucy Green in applying informal learning pedagogies to music classrooms has had a monumental impact upon my teaching practice. Green (2008a) asserts the interrelatedness between student-led music environments and individual musical identity succession, in that: “Pupil-selection of curriculum content breaks down the reproductive effects of many previous music curricula, which by ignoring the musical identities and tastes of vast numbers of pupils prevented many of them from demonstrating or even discovering their musical abilities” (p. 13).

Green’s comments provide a sound reason for providing opportunities in wider-ranging forms of musical expression, including dance, film and other activities that step outside the close confines of traditional classes. Vital Canadian research has also been done in the areas of arts integration, pedagogy, classroom practice and technology (Gouzouasis, 2001, 2002, 2003; Gouzouasis & LaMonde, 2004). Not only should the musical cultures of our students be given respect but also so should the auditory, visual

and kinesthetic learning modalities that they alternately utilize when engaging in music. Projects using both youth participatory action research and artistically crafted research methods, as discussed in this paper, are notable examples of the kinds of extensions possible for our young artists. By working as peers with our students, we might help them discover both passionate and compassionate ways to connect themselves and their art to someone or something that is greater than themselves.

This question raised now and in the previous chapter about how one can personalize music that is self-fulfilling, yet matters to others, is a thorny one. It might appear as if these concepts might be mutually exclusive. Personalized learning environments that, as discussed in the previous chapter, encourage student agency may or may not also involve helping others. Are there ways in which music educators might reconceptualize curriculum to compensate for the absence of genuine importance placed upon their/our responsibilities to others? The insincere usage of *social responsibility* in the language of music curriculum and expected learning outcomes is an example of this neglect that requires remedying.

Another significant question to consider is this: Are the middle school students, with whom I chose to involve, both emotionally and intellectually ready to do this? A newspaper reporter who came to our middle school to listen to, watch and interview students during the earliest stage of the research project asked me, "Are these students too young to begin caring about why music matters to them?". Given the palpable interest and valuable responses that eventually came to the surface, it appeared that the students were very much aware and able to articulate the ways that music was important in their lives and those around them.

My journey into these new regions of music practice began in early 2011 and, therefore, I am still in a very early stage of this. I believe that the child-centred focus and mix of formal and informal pedagogies that are well established in my class lend themselves to allowing choices for curricular expansion in my music classroom. Students have been given the option to imagine a curriculum that involves how music might help other people, while providing that it also allows individual musical interests and curiosities to flourish. This may appear incompatible at first but the *Music Matters* research students developed significantly in their awareness of how they, as unique individuals, might be part of a larger network of artists.

Using the *Music Matters* research as a springboard, some projects that were planned and carried out through this past school year had great possibilities for future applications. I opened up the choice for grade eight students, as a first step to trying this in my school during the 2011-2012 school year. While most students chose to fully participate in the personalized music curriculum, a small number of other interested grade eight students chose to extend their musical interests in various ways into their communities. Several groups planned out visits to the community's largest elderly care centre to visit and perform music for some of the residents, some of whom were close relatives of students. In one instance, some female students brought school percussion instruments for the residents to play, if they chose. Other students visited music classes from their previous schools in our local catchment area and performed music for younger groups of students. Similar to those visiting the senior's residence, many of the students were usually interested in playing for their younger siblings in these schools but not in all cases.

Because all of these activities took place during class time, the students' parents provided the transportation to and from the care facility. Parents verbalized unanimous support for doing this as an extension of their children's music class. As I indicated earlier, I only attempted this with grade eight students during one school year but next year may try to add grade six and seven students. In conclusion, I intend to continue engaging all interested students to imagine other ways of allowing music to *matter* to others beside themselves. As Barrett and Stauffer (2009) voice with hope, "In such instances we can begin to see the world through the eyes of others, to experience empathy, and to move towards an understanding of the ways in which worlds are experienced and 'othered' " (p. 2).

Before I start to describe certain facets of my classroom practice, I shall briefly express what I have come to value about "personalized learning" in the middle school music classroom. Instruction in middle school music is best achieved when one purpose is firmly kept in mind: to increase student voice (Price, 2006, p. 5) Genuine student voice in the music classroom can only come about through a climate of "trust, effective listening and openness" (p. 5). The teacher must have a commitment to ensure that something identified by the student *changes* as a result, based upon the trust and openness of the student (Ozer, Ritterman, and Wanis, 2010; Price 2006). This "individual voice" (Price p. 5) must be respected by confidential criticisms given individually or "inside" their chosen group of trust. This runs counter to much classroom practice in which both teachers and fellow students alike openly criticize individual students. Even the so-called "safe" student feedback technique, so very common in classrooms, of using "two likes and a wish" that often follow a student performance or project, might just be *one* wish too many. This is consistent with research on ten and

eleven year old students receiving both peer and teacher criticism for their computer music compositions (Ruthmann, 2008). It is difficult to imagine how anyone might care to continue with music in any voluntary capacity, following humiliations associated with a betrayal of trust during times of self-expression. This should take place in a climate of confidence and security for our vulnerable youth.

The typical middle school ages of ten to fourteen are a difficult time for our students. During these ages, they are “easily offended and...sensitive to criticism of personal shortcomings,” feel “self-conscious...alienated...and lack self-esteem” (Mohnson, 2008, p. 532). Experiences and feelings frequently appear exclusive only to the students themselves, thus making this age group of adolescents more vulnerable to depression and suicide (Compas et al., 1997; Galaif, 2007; Ozer et al., 2010) Therefore, my intention as a music educator is to provide a non-critical and supportive environment filled with as many musical opportunities, equipment and instruments that I am capable of granting. This is not to say that I will not give help on an instrument or assist with a challenge that is articulated to me in confidence by a student. I believe this to not be the same matter as when a teacher openly and regularly abuses his or her power by humiliating a student. This is the kind of thing that I believe Michel Foucault (1984) meant in his later writings on power, “I don’t see where evil is in the practice of someone who...teaches him, transmits knowledge to him, communicates skills to him” (p. 84).

I shall now provide examples of some ways that personalized music learning has taken shape in my classroom. This is certainly not intended to be a lesson plan or a curriculum. I believe it important that music educators have the freedom to create their own programs, as discussed in the previous chapter on curriculum reconceptualization. However, music making is highly dependent upon the potentials and limitations of the

physical environment, as well as the musical materials on hand, such as instruments, computers and other essential electronic or written resources for the students to access. Last but certainly not least, the planning of music curriculum revolves around the changing musical interests of the students and their communities. As David Price (2006) emphasizes, “The student is the most important unit of organization, not the classroom, nor the school system” (p. 3).

My experiences have, in some sense, been enriched by their deprivation. As I mentioned in the very first chapter of this paper, I needed to supply many of my own instruments during a transition period when a junior high school “converted” to a middle school. Because this was accomplished with the full permission of the school administration, there was little that could be done about the sudden exodus of instruments to the outgoing band director’s new location. Therefore, my eventual impression was that I really had no entitlement to anything and, therefore, I had every right to reinvent the music curriculum. Of course, the minor issue of not having even a fraction of the instruments that were there at the end of the previous school year had something to do with this “reconceptualizing.” Yet, I realized then, as I still do now, that I had a deep sense of awe and respect for music making. No matter what the obstacle, I vowed to find ways to provide musical opportunities for my students, which often required bringing many of my own instruments for students to use, as well as financially “investing” in the school music program. Becoming a full-time music educator gave me yet another yearning. David Hargreaves and Dennis Shirley (2009) put this beautifully by assuring teachers that “you will experience pure joy” (p. 85).

Put aside the progress managers and the spreadsheets, the testing and the targets, the data and the delivery systems, and we are now at the very core of what calls teachers to teaching, keeps them in it despite the

overwhelming pressures and demands of the job, and inspires students to achieve far beyond levels anyone thought possible. (p. 85)

In a speech given in 1965, when sworn in as U.S. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John W. Gardner proclaimed: “What we have before us are some breathtaking possibilities disguised as insoluble problems” (para.1-2). These words are an inspiration for me because there are frequently numerous hurdles that seem to materialize along our paths as teachers. By remaining committed to exploring new approaches, such as attempting youth participatory action research methods, trying out new music technologies or braiding informal and formal pedagogies in my music classroom, I try to steer clear of the pitfall of “professional routinization” to which Hildegard Froehlich (2007) referred in the previous chapter.

Of particular importance in my music class is the area of informal learning. Throughout this paper, I have frequently referred to Lucy Green’s research (2004, 2008a) in the way popular musicians learn using an informal approach, as compared with a formal one. Green’s research on popular musicians in 2001 led to the later establishment of the innovative music organization *Musical Futures* in the U.K., in which Green maintains a high profile, avails her research and acts as a resource. Some highly honourable reasons for starting this organization are offered on the website:

The starting point for Musical Futures was to try to understand the factors affecting the disengagement of young people with sustained music-making activities, at a time in their lives when we know music is not only a passion for many young people, but plays a big part in shaping their social identity. (para. 2)

The following valuable outline of informal learning methods is taken from the introduction section of a downloadable resource on informal learning, which is available

on the same U.K. *Musical Futures* website. It holds vast resources for both the curious and the practicing music educator interested in using informal learning pedagogy:

The informal learning model is therefore based around five key principles:

1. Learning music that students choose, like and identify with, as opposed to being introduced to music which is often new and unfamiliar, and chosen by a teacher
2. Learning by listening and copying recordings, as opposed to learning through notation or other written/verbal instructions
3. Learning alongside friends, instead of learning through instruction with continuous adult guidance
4. Assimilating skills and knowledge in personal ways according to musical preferences, starting with whole 'real world' pieces of music, as opposed to following a designated progression from simple to complex, involving specially-composed music, a curriculum or a graded syllabus
5. Maintaining a close integration of listening, performing, improvising and composing throughout the learning process, as opposed to gradually specialising and differentiating between listening, performing, improvising and composing skills. (p. 131)

John Finney and Chris Philpott (2010) explain some of the distinctions between informal and formal learning by providing specific examples of both operations as they might appear during the process of music making:

The moment of informal learning is an orientation to playing and making music. The formal moment is an orientation to learning how to play music. In this sense all musicians are constantly engaging in a dialectic between these two moments (if indeed they can be separated). Theoretically we can 'flip' or 'slide' between them in a matter of seconds. For example, imagine a group of youngsters jamming in a garage after school where the orientation is informal....One of the group asks a friend to teach her how to play a chord on a guitar to go with one of the songs, where the orientation becomes formal. Musicians constantly learn music in this way in all traditions i.e. in a dialectic between the formal and informal. However, music education has typically privileged the formal at the expense of the informal and hence 'buried' the informal moment. (p.9)

Finney (2007) also identifies that some schools might have an alternative curriculum, one that exists “on the edge” (p. 11). It is on this periphery that so many of my middle school students reside. Finney identifies that this region occupied by students is often called the “open curriculum” and his description is very reminiscent of my music classroom, whereby:

Content and style are determined by the students themselves, where interests and concerns, fantasies and ambitions are given space to grow. Students seek to take advantage of resources and space where they can find autonomy over the musical decisions made. Their engagement with this informal curriculum, possible only in negotiation with the music teacher, may be casual, spontaneous and irregular or indeed regular and far from casual. (p. 11)

Students do indeed frequently consult with me about their ideas and possibilities in class. I am fortunate to have four enclosed, sound-reinforced practice rooms in the upstairs of a considerably large room designed for traditional band music rehearsals. It is the size of a miniature gymnasium but unlike most auditoriums, it has soundproofing and beveled walls, which refract standing sound waves from echoing. As a result, the sound in the room is “dead,” which also makes it ideal for putting on smaller, more intimate, popular music shows, of which I will discuss later on in this chapter.

The private practice spaces are a unique feature for my students because, other than the school washrooms, there really are no places that they can go to and truly be alone or be in a small group. Having been a musician who rehearsed in university music department practice rooms, basements, garages, and living rooms, in addition to rented studio spaces, I equate the school practice rooms with all those kinds of environments. Also, due to the necessity of growing class numbers, I utilize the hallways and other alternating free spaces such as a “multi-purpose room” next door to my music room. I

am fortunate to be situated in a relatively quiet end of the main school building, far from the office and the younger-age students' classrooms. As a result, I am able to close some heavy, windowless metal doors to gain some privacy and a modicum of soundproofing when students wish to practice one of three acoustic pianos available to them, although other forms of music making do occur in the hallways, such as violin, guitar and singing. The "multi-purpose room," on the other hand, is a miniature gymnasium of the same height as my music classroom. This practice space, when available, lends itself beautifully to those students who wish to reconceptualize their music curriculum to include dance as a vital part of their musical expression.

When students inhabit most or all of these spaces, I can't help but be reminded about the similarities it has with my experiences in university music department practice rooms and in rented studio spaces. In both cases, one is always aware of someone else playing music nearby. The only notable difference was that, depending upon the instrument of specialization in the university's classical performance program, the students often practiced the same pieces for their upcoming "juries," recitals or concentrated upon music of their student symphony's orchestral repertoire. Nevertheless, the beehive of musical activity in all of these cases was and is exciting for me to experience. Seeing and hearing student music making coming from the different rooms and spaces during music class assures me the perpetual experience of joy of which Hargreaves and Shirley (2009) spoke.

I wish to clarify again that I do not have a music program that features only informal pedagogies. Although Lucy Green's research and classroom applications in this area are highly engaging and rewarding to many students in my music classroom, I have learned through watching and listening that the majority of them naturally interweave

both formal and informal learning styles. Whether it is focusing on a song's guitar part by listening to an *iPod*, then playing the electric guitar, perhaps again stopping to go on the computer to search for guitar chords or "tabs" to play or even watching someone giving a lesson on how to play it on YouTube, it is fascinating how our students understand and negotiate the various means available to them in order to make the music that they love. I argue that to have expectations where music educators confine students to a strictly informal pedagogy is to remain blind to the multifaceted and resourceful world of music they already know and apply in their own lives. John Finney observes this:

Educators have not been sufficiently radical in reviewing the place of music in the curriculum. They have failed to grasp music's essence as a 'way of having thoughts, feelings and ideas'. While it is a subject that people learn, it is not one in need of being 'taught'. At best, music teachers have gone only half way towards embracing an appropriate model of the arts in education. They have been ultimately restricted by a teaching persona built on their own musical authority rooted in skills, techniques and knowledge about music. (p. 237)

I agree that music, to most of our students, needn't be taught in the manner that it has been traditionally done in school but I strongly believe that one of our primary strengths as classroom teachers should lie in our abilities to understand that many of our students are already deeply engaged in music in a number of ways, whether as an intense listener, as an interested instrumentalist, singer or as a composer. Music educators need to respect the fact that there are often individual musical worlds and experiences that are intensely private that we will never know about, something that John Finney (2007) refers to as "the private curriculum" (p. 11).

The pattern of the formal and informal curriculum, the regulated and unregulated, is replicated out of school: students may themselves find commitment to a formal musical learning environment in which there are regularities and rituals similar to those in school, where content and style are in the hands of others, and where choice and autonomy are

constrained. Just as school may find space for the informal, the unregulated, so out of school there will exist an informal musical education where autonomy is sought and found. A distinctive aspect of these informalities will be a realm of privacy: music learning takes place in solitude, is contemplative in character and work may or may not be held back from future publication. I will call this the private curriculum. (p. 11)

Finney makes a critical distinction between the “open” and the “closed” curriculum of the student. He also observes that many of our students already float between the formal and informal outside of school, be it through private voice or instrumental lessons or participation in other musical activities. A possible list might include involvement in “pop” bands, music theatre, pipe bands, drum corps, or community bands, orchestras and choirs. Another significant part in the lives of some students and their families is that of church choir and the instruments played during worship services. Some students choose to learn or practice an instrument for this purpose as part of the personalized approach to music in my class. There was a time in history following the American revolution when music education began through the “singing schools,” in order to support community choirs (Deutsch, 2009, p. 91) so it seems reasonable for me to support those students who might value their school music engagement for their own outside religious purposes. It also provides opportunities for students to share living examples of their musical identities with their peers in an informal way that is not performance oriented.

Some other keyboard instruments that I currently have available, other than the three pianos recently mentioned, are a Rhodes electric piano and a Korg *microSTATION*, which is a recordable workstation with a 16-track programmable sequencer. In the area of stringed instruments, there are approximately twenty acoustic, nylon string guitars, two right-handed, electric six-string guitars, and one left-handed,

electric six-string guitar. Students also have access to two right-handed electric bass guitars, as well as a left-handed electric bass guitar. Often, students voluntarily bring their own instruments from home to music class. In the case of electric instruments, I raised sufficient money through rock show ticket sales and other fundraising events to purchase six portable, low-wattage practice amplifiers for them to use in the upstairs practice rooms, if they so wish. The low-wattage component is important when allowing students to go into closed practice rooms, in order to inhibit the potential of a more powerful amplifier, which might damage students' hearing through playing at dangerously high volume levels. As is the case for all instruments in the various music environments that students inhabit in my class, excessive volume levels always need to be kept in close check. I try to impress upon my students that if anyone must ever yell in order to talk and be heard, then the volume level is too loud.

This leads to the next instrument under discussion: the drum set. I have Pearl and Yamaha acoustic drum kits in my room. Both use mutes on all the drum sets and their cymbals when I conduct my regular music class, the only exception is when individual bands practice by themselves during an extracurricular pop club, which I shall describe more fully later in this chapter. Although the true timbre of the drums is missing when students play upon these muted sets, I always try to show each new drummer at some point how they *really* sound but insist that our retaining good hearing is of greater consequence than hearing the *real thing* when other ears share the same performing space. I always stress to those students who really want to hear the true drum sound to join the extracurricular pop club or come by sometime after school so they can play them.

Another drum set that sometimes satisfies those students with a taste for the wide-ranging sounds of the drum kit is a Yamaha *DTXTREME* electronic drum set. Although it is physically set up in a fashion nearly identical to the regular drum set, students can select thousands of different sounds on its computer controller. The added pleasure of this set is that students use headphones to experience the wide range in sounds of the set and its overall stereo field. This drum set also allows students to plug in their personal listening devices, adjust each set of equipment's output volume level and play along with their choice of music. Students can set metronomes or "click tracks" to practice staying in time and most of these electronic sets have programs that record and rate how well you remained in time throughout your session. In fact, it is becoming more common for many bands having drummer auditions to use this feature in shortlisting candidates for the position. The electric drum kit available to my students also has recording capabilities so they can compose solos, ethnic percussion ensemble pieces, orchestral instruments and numerous other possibilities. Since it is an electronic instrument, it also transcends the standard expectations one might have from anything that is played with sticks. There are sounds available that belong far more to the class of the keyboard synthesizer than to the standard drum set. Lastly, this instrument allows for a clear and, as an unfortunate testimony to the limited time available in most class music activities, quick recording when paired with an *M-Audio* audio recording interface.

Moving on to the area of recording technologies, students wishing to rehearse music and record it with programs on computers in the classroom also use this audio interface. Typically, should the student or students desire to record a traditional pop band arrangement, I record the drums with a bass, rhythm guitar, keyboards or vocals playing live as a "guide track." In most cases, the guide track is incrementally phased out

during the recording process so students gradually gain the ability to internalize the songs they are recording. In some instances, students record their own compositions in a pop or rock style but it is most usual to have students do more familiar “covers” or cover versions, although students sometimes have their own radically different arrangements of the songs they choose. An advantage that direct plugins to recording interface equipment has in the personalized music classroom is the fact that students can be recording yet not outwardly distracted to the music being played by others in the class. This is usually accomplished through the use of closed or sealed headphones, although sometimes students might wish for the more ambient sound of a microphone recording of an amplifier. In these cases, I ask students to come to the music room when it is empty, such as during my teacher preparation time or after school, in order to have the room quiet enough for a clearer recording. This is almost always the case when recording vocal tracks and young people, particularly boys, often seem especially sensitive to others listening to them sing unless they are a trusted friend or directly involved in the recording project.

This area of “trust” is vital to promoting a respectful environment for music making in the classroom. I no longer have “public” performance requirements for my students in general music. I shall discuss some ideas and possible distinctions to be made between performance expectations for general music programs and voluntary clubs later in this chapter. However, I only ask that students in my general music classes sign up on a calendar to allow me or, if they request, their choice of several trusted members of the class to more formally listen to them several times during the course of the music semester. I have named this “Have-A-Listen” on the calendar and I try to impress upon the students that it is not a graded evaluation; rather, it is simply an

opportunity for me to hear them and have an informal discussion. During several sequential stages of the music term, students explore their interests, plan their curriculum and then evaluate themselves along the way.

There are some classes that, due to size and the fluctuating manner in which instruments, computers and practice spaces are used by different combinations of students throughout the term, I sometimes ask for students to sign up in those “high demand” areas. Students generally work out their own disputes over sharing and issues of fairness but occasionally this student-monitored signup list is the deciding factor in *who* might belong *where* on *what* day. I do ask that students try to remain flexible with anomalies in the schedule due to student absences, disputes that sometimes impede groups temporarily or permanently, and other issues that surface from time to time. I have discovered that there are few office referrals associated with this personalized music approach, even though the occasional teacher or teacher’s assistant fears it as a certain invitation to chaos by actually allowing particular students into practice rooms with closed doors. Due to the fact that these same students cannot and should not be monitored in every room they visit in the school, I tend to ignore this kind of inconsistent and irrational preoccupation with control, which is usually more imagined than real.

Personalized learning also has advantages in providing a respectful learning environment for disabled and special needs students. I stopped making formal adaptations seven years ago for these “categories” of students at the time my curriculum generally consisted of guitar, multi-cultural percussion ensembles and Orff instrument arrangements. Because the focus of each of these classes was, to varying degrees, uniformity of group performance over individual music potential, many disabled or special needs students “acted out” in class, much to the stark awareness of the other

students. I began to feel that their conspicuousness by not being able to do what the other students could do in the class must be humiliating to them at some level of their experience. Add that to picturing a scene with a musical instrument getting knocked down or thrown over and seeing a teacher's assistant quickly spiriting the child away and out of the room. Now, personalized learning in music class finds special needs and disabled students always welcome to come and go as they choose, without disrupting the class or being humiliated.

As an extension of this openness that personalized learning programs provide to a wide range of student needs, a new program for all high-risk, non-attending students from our school district is currently based in an outlying building connected to the school. With the permission of my administration, I invited the small group of students, many of them of First Nations heritage, to come to the class whenever they might have the opportunity or interest. These students have a schedule that is highly flexible and, thus, unpredictable. In previous years, I would likely not have thought to ask anyone to come that might be potentially be "disruptive" to my classes but I have had no complications so far in the three months that the new program has been in the building. Even though they are not on any class list, the students have dropped by to use the "hands-on" *iPod/CD* turntable mixer, the DJ scratch and mixing software, virtual turntable mixing studio, computer music programs, electric guitar and electric guitar game for *PlayStation 3*.

Now, I shall describe some of the various electronic media, computer programs and other technology mentioned above that is available to my students. On three computers in the classroom, I currently use *Reason Propellerhead*, *Reason Record* for live studio recording, *Mixcraft* virtual recording studio, *Serato Scratch Live* DJ mixing and *Virtual DJ Prophet: Turntable Mixing Studio*. At the click of a mouse button, each section

of music that was previously composed by various loop dragging, drum programming or virtual and real instrument recording can appear in score on standard notation on the *Reason* and *Mixcraft* programs, making printing possible. Occasionally, students have written or transposed music for other band or group members to play who have difficulty playing by ear. This is another reason why informal and formal music environments can and should peacefully coexist.

Understandably, these computer programs are very popular with the students and I often resort to the shared student-monitored signup list to try to keep some equity of time for the students. This year, I was finally successful in getting the computer course placed after music in the timetable rotation, which has allowed all but one term of students to film music videos after leaving music and entering the computer lab, which also shares some of the same software to make videos. Some students who are enrolled in computer and are making films come back and forth to music class to use the USB keyboards and the audio interface with live instruments to create soundtracks. I have striven to make the computer class and music class as borderless as possible over the years, given the student interest in technologies available to them in both classes. Now that the schedule has been changed, it is much easier for this to occur. Gouzouasis and Bakan (2011) acknowledge “the fluidity of digital systems” that might serve to support the reconceptualization of music curriculum in our schools: “New technology suggests a spiraling curriculum, one that is self directed, spontaneous, open-ended, and has direct meaning to the learner. As such, it throws current hegemonic notions of teacher-student and teacher-learner into question” (p. 8). This is what I believe John Finney (2003) meant when he encouraged educators “to address what is prevalent now in the imaginations of our youth” (para. 10).

Returning once again to my classroom, a very challenging and fun addition to my class this year has been the *Rocksmith* electric guitar game for *PlayStation 3*. Unlike the more limited *Guitar Hero* game, this uses a real electric guitar and is something that all levels of guitar players can use. There are fun games and lessons that include over one thousand chords. In addition to playing a wide range of songs using a slight variation on standard chord tablature, it has games for note bending and even playing harmonics above the fret bars. *Rocksmith* also includes songs and games using drop D string tunings, which involves tuning the top E string down a whole step to D. Since much of the “heavy” music played by contemporary alternate bands use this guitar tuning, this is a great feature to have for the students. This year, I observed two students in particular, who are incredibly adept at video games outside of school, master basic guitar chords when they showed no demonstrable interest in guitar for the previous two years that I had them in my class before having access to *Rocksmith*.

Some students also bring in their own *iPads* and *iPods* to continue making music they are already passionate about outside of school. *GarageBand* is a mainstay for almost all students with *iPods* and *iPads*, for use in both live playing and recording situations. While programs and applications vary from student to student on their *iPads*, one of the most popular ones is the *MadPad* recorder that has a feature that records you visually and aurally when you sing into it. Separate studio tracks can be layered and the final composition is as much visual as it is aural, which students at this age particularly seem to enjoy. Another application that is good for students to play together is the *RockMate*, which allows two players on opposite sides of the *iPad* to play and record together in a virtual rock band. Lastly, another common application is the *iDJ*, which allows students to take any of their music stored on *iTunes* and “mash” or remix it.

The latest equipment I have in my class is a *Numark* compact disc and *iPod* mixer, with two sturdy wheels that act as substitutes for the more traditional turntable decks. Since I have many hands on the equipment each day, I chose to go with this equipment rather than the larger, traditional vinyl turntables that might have their stylus arms or cartridges damaged through misuse or by accident. Students can plug in headphones and bring their own *iPods* and mix with compact discs with “burned” mp3 file playback capability. “On the fly” live mixing, much like playing music on certain instruments, is a very physical activity, and engages kinesthetic learning modalities. As a result, watching these students mix is very much like watching someone dance.

This area of turntable mixing artistry is a contentious one from some traditional music educators and musicians alike. I once watched a television interview with trumpeter Wynton Marsalis where he put down “turntablists” in a most dismissive and insensitive way. Educators and musicians who slavishly hold originality as a high, aesthetic standard of measure often have difficulty in accepting that “remix” culture could be either musically compelling or artistically legitimate. Most of our young people, however, find it on par with live music, created by musicians playing standard rock instruments. Large music festivals like Sasquatch, held each year in Gorge, Washington, feature DJ artists on main stages as they would the more traditional rock bands. DJ mixing or “turntablist” culture has a wide range of styles and traditions, which our music students are very aware of and have an abiding respect. Many of these bands play live instruments and use vocals along with the turntables to shape incredible sounds and textures through elaborate mixing board manipulation. Yet, many traditional music teachers don’t know how or even care to know how to use much of this electronic equipment that is essential to producing this kind of music.

In an online preview for her forthcoming article in the Canadian Music Educators' Association book *Personhood and Music Learning*, music educator Karen Snell (2011) contends that "turntablism" is a legitimate genre of popular music that helps "youth to shape and define their identities and thus should be explored more in music education research (and used more in teaching!)" (p. 3). Finnish music educator Lauri Väkevää (2010) might agree and also suggests that the traditional rock band's place as the sole inhabitant in curricular popular music programs in schools may be one-dimensional:

I suggest that it is perhaps time to consider the pedagogy of popular music in more extensive terms than conventional rock band practices have to offer. One direction in which this might lead is the expansion of the informal pedagogy based on a 'garage band' model to encompass various modes of digital artistry wherever this artistry takes place. This might include: in face-to-face pedagogical situations, in other contexts of informal learning, and in such open networked learning environments as remix sites and musical online communities. The rock-based practice of learning songs by ear from records and rehearsing them together to perform live or to record is just one way to practice popular music artistry today. Such practices as DJing/turntablism; assembling of various bits and pieces to remixes; remixing entire songs to mash-ups in home studios; collective songwriting online; producing of one's own music videos to YouTube; exchanging and comparing videos of live performances of Guitar Hero and Rock Band game songs – all of these indicate a musical culture that differs substantially from conventional 'garage band' practices. The global eminence of digital music culture can be taken as one indication of the need to reconsider music as a transformative praxis. (p. 59)

Before I stray too far from further details about my students' music environment and move on to some descriptions and discussions about extra-curricular pop music and the nature and value of music performance, I wish to make observations and recommendations about inherent dangers that I see in promoting a singular focus on informal learning practices in music programs. As I discussed in an earlier chapter related to Rousseau and music reform, there are students who are strongly compelled to learn how to read Western notation. Their personal reasons for this may often vary but

the most common one is that they genuinely love classical music. In later stages of her research involving learning classical music informally, Lucy Green (2008a) did not allow student choice of the music because she observed that “such music is not normally passed on, at least in the present day and age, through informal learning practices” (p. 149). Although not part of her research study, I have little doubt that Green would accept this position in the modern music classroom, since I regularly witness students trying to learn classical music by ear. As one striking example of this, one student learned several Chopin études by ear in class. His love of the classical piano music led him later to include learning notation as a part of identifying personally with the music of that culture. As Estelle Jorgensen (2003a) observes about the Western classical tradition:

Musical notation is one of its singular achievements....Remaining illiterate in this tradition leaves one deprived of knowledge essential to full participation in a society that regards itself as Western. This deprivation, whether intentional or not, is racist and classist...failing to develop musical literacy in at least one notated musical tradition makes it difficult to break out of aural/oral into a literate one, something that exponents of aural/oral or little musical traditions may wish to do, sooner or later. And leaving students limited is arguably mis-educative since it stunts and prevents their further development. (p. 135)

By the time school returned in the fall, this same student had taught himself to read music using the Internet over the course of the summer, which is not only a testimony to intrinsic musical motivation that students might possess but also to the enormous educational potential of current information technologies. Lucy Green (2001), in her study on how popular musicians learn, reports similarly that the musicians who were interviewed tended to get obsessed and motivated to play better by learning technique at a much later time (pp. 84-93). However, learning technical terms to play music or what Green refers to as “technicalities” (p. 93) was not a priority for any of the popular musicians interviewed except for one. This differentiates between the various

“technicality” needs of the classically leaning, beginning musician and his or her popular musician counterpart. Where there is a love of any kind of music, and a corresponding motivation to internalize this music as a genuine part of a student’s identity, then the drive to learn music notation is a far more genuine one. There is nothing oppressive about learning notation, as it might sometimes sound in certain music reform circles. However, it becomes oppressive when it is the only perceived method or avenue in order to apprehend music. As Marie McCarthy (2009) warns, “When students come to view music as synonymous with the notated work, their relationship to music as human expression is reduced and misguided” (p. 32).

In spite of this, many of my music students use currently available websites such as *Piano Tutor*, *OnlinePianist*, *Pianoonlinelessons* or *TabNabber*, among many others, to find various forms of piano notation to play the music they want. Strict proponents of informal learning methods need to respect that many people, both young and old alike, constantly operate by using a number of different learning modalities at alternating times. All of us might primarily use auditory information for certain areas in our day-to-day functioning, while visual modalities become more important for us at other times. The use of kinesthetic modalities is something that a headstrong and disembodied musician too frequently ignores and often refers to insultingly, even though all musicians experience it. Celeste Snowber (2004) suggests: “In classical Greek thought the body was equated with irrationality and had no capacity for rational discourse. The body was thought to only get in the way of pursuing knowledge, truth, or the greater things in life” (p. 41).

As I mentioned in the previous chapter on student reconceptualization of the music curriculum, there are scores of students who carry music as an embodied

concept, if indeed not all of them. While a protracted discussion of this concept is beyond the scope of this paper, it is arguably an area from which many musicians often shy away. In a parallel fashion, Western art music is argued to have eventually detached itself from the human voice on its exacting path to construct “music alone,” calling it “pure” or “absolute” music (Kivy, 1990), based solely upon instrumental performance, which spared any possible tainting through human “imperfection.” This has brought to the table a certain dichotomized view of the musician, particularly in the classical field, as merely communicating musical understanding “from the mind of the composer to that of the listener” (Maus, 2010, p. 16). Fred Maus observes, “In such a conception, embodiment, whether of composers, listeners, or performers, drops out” (p. 16). Admittedly, I often find myself guilty of this kind of thinking and do not consider that there might be other ways that music is embodied by musicians, other than while singing and dancing or engaged in significant body movement. Maus suggests that this is really a misconception and, citing descriptions by organists (Cusick, 1994) and cellists (LeGuin, 2005), deflates the notion that classical musicians are confined only to their heads and have no somatic experiences when performing (Maus, pp. 16-17).

This leads to a possible discussion of how Howard Gardner’s concept of multiple intelligences might promote artistic individuation, rather than integration (Gardner, 1993, 1999). By continually referring to “the musical” as discrete from “the kinesthetic” among Gardner’s primary eight intelligences, it jettisons music making into the solitary realm of disembodied intellectual processes of thought, hearing, recognition, memory, and identification (Nelson, 1998). Rather than maintain seemingly impermeable boundaries between the body and mind in the arts, a more fluid concept is essential. To this end, Elizabeth Gould (2007) might suggest, “It involves affirming and evaluating life instead of

judging, by exploring both the body and thought in order to make connections and new configurations” (p. 234). Embracing the ambiguity that these new pathways and possibilities might create is not easy for most educators, wishing instead for dichotomized and categorical explanations for areas in the arts that are far too heterogeneous to justify this. Music is precisely one of those regions. As Gilles Deleuze (2006) suggests: “Music is in fact not without ambiguity...because it is at once the intellectual love of an order and a measure beyond the senses, and an affective pleasure that derives from bodily vibrations” (p. 146).

Therefore, as Gould might advocate, a reconceptualizing of music education in both curriculum and pedagogy must reflect an integrative ethic, rather than a divisive one. Gouzouasis and Bakan (2011) criticize how “youth music practices have been framed in false dichotomies” (p. 12) by music educators, citing Lucy Green’s emphasis upon discretely operating formal and informal learning methods as just one example of this. Gouzouasis and Bakan propose that music education avoid such dichotomizations which “are contributing factors to our ongoing misguided misunderstandings of youth music and youth music making” (p. 12) and point to the research done by Willis Overton who:

recommends that, rather than looking at artificial, split binaries and differences, we need to look at these issues as amateur and professional, informal and formal. They should be considered from a relational metatheoretical perspective that bridges biological, cultural, and person-centered approaches to inquiry—they should be considered from an embodied person-centered approach. (p. 11)

Overton (1997) conceptualizes the importance of the person “according to the three qualities of ‘embodiment’, ‘agency’, and ‘action’ ” (p. 316). He attributes our predilection for dichotomization to Descarte, who developed this as a way of knowing

our world. Overton (2003a) explains: “*Splitting* is the foundation of a dichotomy - of an exclusive either-or relationship – and *foundationalism* is the claim that one or the other elements of the formed dichotomy constitutes the ultimate real” (p. 32). He encourages the application of a “principle of the identity of opposites,” which relates and does not exclude “differentiated polarities of a unified inclusive matrix” (2004, pp. 204-205).

Overton explains:

Within an embodied perspective questions and research strategies focus on functional intra- and interrelations among dynamic self-organizing systems including biological, cultural, and person systems as these arise and develop from the body as a form of lived experience, actively engaged with the world of sociocultural and physical objects. (p. 218)

Overton (1997) proposes that “a developmentally oriented cultural psychology needs to carefully identify the nature of the person who enters, and who defines and is defined by, the cultural context” (p. 316). In a contemporary middle school music classroom, with students having diverse cultural backgrounds and values, in addition to carrying various artistic practices and traditions with them, this can be a helpful approach. Overton (1997) argues that:

rejecting the dichotomy of ‘either/or’ moves us toward an integration which maintains the legitimacy and the identity of each type of change. More generally, rejecting all foundationalism opens the door to building a relational metatheory that is inclusive in nature, and that offers a coherent approach to both unity and diversity. (p. 318)

Overton (2003a) also discusses the idea of reductionism and how historically this has “blindered” our ability to more fully make sense of the world around us because it “does not aim at analyzing how wholes are put together from parts, but rather at explaining wholes away” (p. 29) Instead, Overton (2003b) suggests that “the unity that constitutes human identity and human development becomes discovered only in the

diversity of multiple interrelated lines of sight” (p. 26). Therefore, conceptions of the performing classical musician as being void of embodiment are equally as erroneous as accepting that popular musicians don’t think when they play. These are both commonly accepted misconceptions by many music educators and are considered shortly in regard to the concept of performance as pedagogy.

It is imperative that music educators do not claim to understand how our students learn music best, lest we disallow their unique development and growth as human beings. While applying Antonio Gramsci’s concept of cultural hegemony to particular forms of common or acceptable learning in music education, O’Neill and Senyshyn (2011) note:

This is because some ways of understanding learning become dominant or hegemonic in a particular culture or society...As such, they may assume an authority that imposes certain expectations on the way we view music learners. These expectations may become taken for granted in ways that no longer serve the best interests of all learners or prepare them for the future world of meaningful music engagement. (p. 15)

I return now to the earlier subject of how popular music has shifted from its prior minority status in music education to one as the dominant culture. Although disparaged by Thomas Regelski in previous chapters that Western classical traditions maintained an undemocratic dominance over the music education hierarchy, a major criticism of the experience currently in some Scandinavian schools is that, by having popular music as the only curriculum, it inadvertently exchanges a different set of reproductive effects, the kind of which Green (2008a) warned earlier. Student identity growth suffers in those who have a taste or curiosity for musics other than singularly popular music. Since popular music has been in the middle school and high school curriculum for over twenty years in

Sweden, there has been sufficient time to study its benefits and detriments. Eva Georgii-Hemming and Maria Westvall (2010) point out that:

One objective with an informal pedagogical approach is to emphasize the individual student's personal experiences and his/her freedom to choose. Although Swedish music teachers' general intention is to take account of the students' 'own' music, studies have shown that this purpose is not fulfilled since not all students' musical life worlds are represented. (p. 22)

Cecilia Björck (2011) believes there to be a serious problem in Swedish music education by not availing more opportunities for student musical identity play and exploration in compulsory school:

Instead, a certain canon of pop and rock music dominate music teaching in Sweden, while Western art music, jazz, folk music or music from other cultures are only marginally integrated into the teaching, leading...to question whether this pedagogical strategy is, in fact, leading to participation, inclusion, and emancipation. This question reveals a mismatch between pluralistic individuality, an idea so central in contemporary Western society, and the collective conformity that might appear in music education practice. (p. 19)

Similar is the case in Finland, where a number of important MayDay Group music philosophers such as Thomas Regelski and Heidi Westerlund have assumed teaching posts or sabbaticals over recent years. In Finland, Väkevä and Westerlund (2007) report that "all piano teachers have to teach comping and improvisation in non-classical styles, which in turn introduces a need for in-service training and extension studies for the classically trained instructors" (p. 97). Unlike the predominance of more classically versed music teachers common in North America, Finnish universities expect music teacher training programs to reflect the more dominant culture of popular music:

All students are required to have, for instance, hands-on competence with pop/rock band instruments, the ability to make their own arrangements, as well as possess the skills to lead and perform in a school pop/rock band. This is based on the idea that classical music skills and

understandings are not necessarily transferable to other types of music. Consequently, current music teacher education attracts more and more students with a folk or popular music background—a radical change within a decade or so. (p. 97)

Väkevä and Westerlund's study of Finland's state-sanctioned, popular music curriculum brings up another paradox. One might consider that popular music programs in schools be spared a preoccupation with performance and competition, so commonly associated with mainly Western music education traditions. Sweden and Finland both have performance learning outcomes as a distinct part of the curriculum. However, prescribed performances for these "informal" popular music programs in general music classes have the propensity to propel curriculum more forcefully towards the reproduction of hollow "products," rather than create vital forms of individual musical expression. In a study by Neal Winter (2004), he suggests that "placing a greater emphasis on the performance activity enhanced the learning of popular music" (p. 244). This is a very difficult subject to begin disentangling because students often appear to *want* performances in front of an audience. I am of several minds on the subject of public performance in school, whether in standard band or choir programs or in popular or other musics. Bennett Reimer (1996) makes an important distinction:

In the performance electives, I argue, performance itself is the point, purpose, and dominating involvement, because performance has been chosen by students as the way they want to learn to be involved with music...general music, and electives focusing on a particular musical engagement, should not be redundant... (p. 69)

I very much agree with Reimer in this respect. Performance simply for its own sake, instead of the musical growth of a young, developing musician, is certainly not right. However, if a student at the outset chooses that his or her type of musical expression pivotally involves some form of public performance, then it is arguably not the

right of the teacher or director to deny the student this opportunity. Many of my own students in our extra-curricular, popular music performance club have their imaginations ablaze and are incredibly excited by the prospect that they might be up on stage, with lights and sound equipment, in front of friends, family and even strangers. For music educators to relegate performance into a negative category, whereby the performance is the sole focus, is really not the case here. It can become the primary emphasis in many popular music programs when the teacher/director considers his or her “reputation” or “ego” to be at stake and does not respect the sense of excitement and accomplishment that the students might be experiencing. Many music educators forget how attending a popular music show, whether as a younger person or older, can elicit incredible feelings that sheer listening to recorded music or watching a concert video cannot achieve. Live concerts can be, at their very heart, a deeply moving social event to celebrate with others who share a similar interest or passion. Christopher Small (1977) relates his feelings as an audience member when he attended a concert by the rock band “The Who” at the Isle of Wight Festival in 1970:

There came into at least partial existence the potential society which lies otherwise beyond our grasp; young people released from the stresses and restrictions of their everyday life were engaging in the celebration of a common myth, a common life-style, which, even if it did not yet exist, they were able to conjure into existence for a while...For a brief moment in western society, music became, not merely an intellectual, aesthetic or even emotional experience, but the centre of a communal ritual which subsumed all the other experiences and showed how partial and incomplete they in fact are....It represented to me the closest that some people in our society have come to achieving that kind of communality which we have noted in other musical cultures, and of which ours is in desperate need. (pp. 171-172)

During early adolescence is when many young people have their first concert experiences. Being in the company of others who share a common bond with them in a

concert, as Small describes, can be a transcendent experience. Resembling a kind of rite of passage for modern youth, adolescents begin to find physical independence from their parents and often start to separate themselves from or question their parents' values. To encounter live music as an audience member or a performer engaging with the audience, as is the case of many students in popular music programs, can be profoundly life-changing events during adolescence. Several *Music Matters* student researchers gave personal accounts of how attending rock concerts changed their attitudes towards merely "liking" music, to passionately wanting to take it seriously as a performer. In particular, one student reflected warmly about the confidence that singing in front of an audience gave her, while another enjoyed his feeling that the audience was responding positively to the music his rock band played at a series of shows the previous year in the school. Therefore, to deem all school music performances as exploitive or shallow is misguided. My experience in the school's popular music performance program is that the majority of students do, as Winter (2004) pointed out previously, bring in another kind of intensity to learn music through a mixture of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation when focusing upon the performance.

A fascinating case study was conducted by Peter Dunbar-Hall (2009), which intended to show how performance itself is pedagogy for learning music. By teaching Balinese gamelan to undergraduate and graduate students in pre-service music teaching programs, Dunbar-Hall sought a parallel of sorts to Lucy Green's "dropping pupils in at the deep end" (Green, 2008a, p. 25). While Green's research project gave students no teacher guidance to learn and copy a song of their choice, Dunbar-Hall's class was led by an Australian specialist having a wide background in Balinese music. Dunbar-Hall posited that those music students coming from mainly Western music

backgrounds would encounter learning an unfamiliar music away “from their musical ‘comfort zones’ ” (p. 64). The ambiguity of this “empty conceptual space” brought with it an accompanying student prejudice, such as resistance to learn non-notated music, non-Western instruments and by not accepting the educational opportunities latent in the experience (pp. 64-65). As I described in an earlier chapter, I had student teachers that strongly resisted the idea and practice of popular music in my university pre-service class. However, some of my students’ openly intolerant attitudes towards popular music did not transfer to multi-cultural music. I believe this to be a similar situation whereby in some sectors of Canadian society, even in schools, anti-Americanism is tolerated yet racism is not. Popular music has been and still is an “easy target” in music education.

However, Dunbar-Hall’s study lends itself to a number of other vital issues in popular music performance programs. He conceives that “from private studios to community music groups to classrooms in schools and universities, there is an agreement that performance of music is both a site for implementation of pedagogy and an outcome of pedagogy” (p. 62). The “spatial organization” or performance stage for Balinese gamelan is a “box” that always allows visual contact between the performers, unlike most band, orchestra and choir performing environments where they all face forward, looking at the director or their music.

Importantly, Dunbar-Hall suggests that teaching popular music performance *is* teaching multi-culturally:

If the definition of multi-culturalism, that different cultures inhabiting the one location are guaranteed equity and unqualified co-existence, is accepted, not to teach music through the methods and strategies used in its origins is a contradiction of the basis of multi-culturalism. (p. 76)

While not all popular music practices are the same, neither are their performance environments. However, their methods of rehearsal and performance are generally quite different from orchestra, jazz band, concert band and choirs. Dunbar-Hall suggests a parallel between Balinese music and the manner in which most popular musicians move around their environments, often engaging with the other musicians in the band, as well as with their audience. Of great importance in advocating for popular music performance in schools is that the musical understanding or analysis “is sound-based, rather than theoretical, is non-notated, relies on memory, and results in each player being familiar with...all the parts” (p. 67). Dunbar-Hall concludes: “That a form of ‘analysis’ is performed, rather than conceptualized without sound, reinforces reliance in this example on performed music as the basis of learning (and teaching)” (p. 67). This is supported by research findings in higher-order operations in developing mental representation (Müller, Sokol, and Overton, 1998) in which:

understanding and meaning are ‘embodied,’ that is, contingent upon subjects being embodied agents who are engaged in, or acting upon, the world. Through these embodied interactions, human beings construct the mental structures, which, in turn, organize experience and make further understanding possible. (p. 160)

Therefore, the profound experiences often reported by performers of popular music might partially be in response to the deep musical understanding that just took place with them.

This leads to a short history and general discussion about the popular music performance opportunities offered in my school, which is something that I argue should be available to all North American middle school students. Since the first days of teaching in my newly opened middle school, I extended the opportunity for students to teach each other and perform their choice of music outside of the regular class time. In the early days of the club, some staff members referred to me being a student service teacher instead of a music teacher, and disrespectfully thought the students to just be an unrefined group of juvenile delinquents, rather than an alliance of expressive musicians. This points to the hypocrisy latent in many teachers who are dedicated listeners to popular music outside of school, yet they exclusively play classical music in class because they heard someone in a teaching workshop say that it makes kids smarter.

These kinds of stereotypes that some teachers have about students who play popular music are reflective of essentially the same values imbedded in North American music education philosophy. It was only until a large number of “gifted” students regularly joined the club each year that most of these insults stopped.

In the very beginning, it was a daily, informal lunchtime activity filled with regular performance opportunities on outside stages and in the gymnasium, always coupled with other performing groups. After three years, all this changed when a new administrator manipulated a staff meeting to vote for a longer lunch break. During the meeting, before the staff voted, I asked if she planned on moving curriculum into the lunch period, because the proposed lunch was precisely as long as the present course blocks. The response was, “This could *one* day be a possibility.” The staff overwhelmingly passed her proposal and a month later, the choir of twenty students was moved into two lunch blocks in my music room, bumping out my “non-curricular” popular music time, which affected more than thirty students.

Instead of resigning myself to a potentially hiccupping practice schedule of only playing every other day for three days a week during lunch, I decided to have rehearsals in my preparatory period during the last block of the days the choir occupied my room for their lunch practices. Fearing that no previous grade-eight students in the club would return, following little commitment from most eighth-grade teachers in allowing those students to come play music during their regular curricular time, I proceeded to alert any other interested students in grades seven and eight to come meet in my room during lunch. There were well over a hundred students who came and several sets of meetings were necessary to deal with such a large number of young people.

Due to the great interest, I divided the school year into half because there would not have been enough regular practice time in the main music room for each band to have. Unfortunately, this is a major limitation for having small ensemble play as part of school schedules and is one reason why many music educators do not consider them.

Large groups, with many students playing identical parts, are typically deemed a better, more efficient use of teacher time and classroom space. As Joseph Shively (2004) contend: "I have come to believe that the use of large ensemble as the organizational structure comes too early in performance-based music education" (p. 180). However, unlike band and choir programs, both popular music rehearsals and performances almost always require the use of sound reinforcement equipment such as microphones, public address or P.A. systems, and amplifiers, making a shared practice space for more than one band a sonic impossibility. Therefore, I scheduled a flow of individual bands to rehearse through upstairs practice rooms, using most instruments except the full drum set.

Another exciting part of this experience is the opportunity for many other students in the school to participate as sound engineers, as well as stage or lighting crewmembers. For the stage and lighting crew, this involves attending practices throughout the latter phase before performances so the students can find where they want to aim a spot light, add colours or lighting effects such as strobe lights, use smoke machines. This usually involves working directly with the musicians and it involves a high degree of communication, especially since the musicians get frustrated when there might not be adequate stage light for them to see their instruments while playing.

Another key difference between popular music playing and band and choir is the use of the mixing board as a distinct part of the band's sound. I have a background in sound engineering and am able to use this in showing interested students how to use the mixing board, effects and stage monitoring. The latter area is a concept with which most student musicians or sound crews have little experience. Stage monitors or speakers are mounted at the front of the stage and are directed towards the stage and

not the audience. These provide discreet sounds that only the musicians on stage hear so, for instance, the instruments for one band might be rhythm guitar, keyboards and vocals, while in another it might be a drum machine, keyboards and vocals. Because of the many variations in instrumentation for each band, the sound engineer is responsible to keep track of all this. I show the engineers how to write up a list of channels that allow this seemingly complex responsibility to be more manageable. Yet like any performance, things happen that can't be foreseen, such as nervous singers not singing close enough to the microphones or even going to the wrong stage microphone for their vocals. I stay behind the mixing board with the engineers and it can be equally as exciting and nerve-racking as performing. One thing that is important, especially when a beginner band is only playing one or two songs that they have chosen to play, is to take the time to do a quick "sound check" as each successive band takes to the stage. If the sound engineers have done their "rehearsals" on the mixing board during previous practices and dress rehearsals, this sound check usually is brief.

One difference between my approach and other high school "rock school" performances is that I don't ask students to use the school guitars to perform with during the concerts. Although it makes for a "slicker" show without the brief sound check before a new band plays, it denies a musician to use his or her own instrument. While many teacher/directors insist upon this, due to the difference in volume or tone between one instrument and the next, caused by variations in the guitar itself or the guitar pickups, I believe this to be a wrong approach. An instrument is usually very important to who that student is and is not only part of their sound but as their identity as a musician. Remove their personal instrument and you are not really hearing the person. While use of personal drum sets are another tricky matter, due to a prolonged set up time for using

microphones, I have on only one occasion been asked by a drummer to use his massive drum set because he insisted that his drum solo demanded it. He was quite correct, as I found out during the dress rehearsal. During his band's performance at night, I had a raffle draw for a donated electric guitar during his drum set up and this long pause in the show seemed to work out fine. However, when he went to a high school rock school program for the next four years, this was never allowed. I believe it is important for teachers not to focus so much on "the show" and look instead to how we can help our students feel most comfortable and do their best.

While I worked as a full-time music teacher in my middle school, I also taught a beginner teacher music course from May until August at Simon Fraser University. Because I wanted to show that popular music in education was vital in school to the student teachers, I added an extra evening performance on the day before the main Friday night show with the student bands. Conveniently, this was the usual class night for the beginner teacher course, so before the show I gave a hands-on workshop on how to mix live sound and use stage lights with the student teachers by using some alumni musicians who were going to perform that evening and still required a sound check. By a happy coincidence, one of the student teachers lived directly across the street from the main parking lot of the school. During a previous class, she had kindly offered to have the entire class over for a barbeque following the sound and stage workshop. While most of the student teachers left to eat, others who were interested remained at the school with me to look after some minor equipment concerns that often surface before most performances, as well as to wait for students to arrive, get tuned up and, especially, get excited to play.

During the school day before the evening shows, there are two shorter performances in front of most of the student body, due to the fact that I can't comfortably fit two hundred and fifty students in my music room, as large as it might be. Over time, I began including performances by school alumni who returned and, if any student in the school asked, could play music with members of their family. To me, this is a beautiful experience when brothers, sisters, cousins or parents come together musically on stage inside of a school environment. It honours the roots of where the students' love of music so often began. For me, this is when it truly becomes a community school.

My sincere belief is that popular music programs have an important place in middle schools. Traditions of band and choir are firmly established in the school organization and allotment of preparatory time for teachers leading those music programs. These programs continue because they "follow established practice," which is a term I have heard many times as an excuse for not trying something new by making popular music a curricular course in middle school. There are many dangers in making popular music a "course" but in times of withdrawal of teachers' extra-curricular activities, it might be just the right time for beginning the integration of these kinds of musical opportunities into our schools. There is a strong indication that middle school students are choosing neither band nor other music courses offered in high school (Gouzouasis, Henrey, and Belliveau, 2008). Although the researchers originally thought that this might be from the curiosities the students had in the other wide ranges of electives offered in high school, their research discovered this lack of interest to be from the students' wish to avoid band. The researchers used student narratives to examine the reasons behind their choices. "Without exception, every student used the term 'geek' in reference to band students" (p. 86). Given this attitude and the importance most

adolescents place upon being popular and not a potential source of ridicule, there may be a retuning necessary in the way band programs are “grandfathered” in school districts, which might appear to be based more upon the teacher’s need to maintain a prior position rather than to address the genuine artistic and emotional needs of students. Therein lies the rub.

It is of little wonder that music advocacy groups are in full bloom at the moment. Music educators in my school district have become increasingly involved in a one-day only event on the first Monday of May called *Music Monday*, which is a music education coalition with the admirable intention of raising awareness about music programs in schools. Since 2005, a Canadian musician has written a song that many music educators teach their students and have them perform it simultaneously across Canada. Found under “10 Reasons to Join” on the *Music Monday* webpage, the sixth motive listed is “Proactive Positive Advocacy”:

Music Monday celebrates all the important values music education provides to our children – community, self-esteem, diversity and more. It allows us to deliver key messages to our communities and the media in a consistent, united effort across the country. You can find everything you need about attracting media, what your key messages should be and more in the promotion toolkit on the Music Monday website.

While this might appear as a noble enterprise on the surface, it ultimately exploits the students’ musical needs and interests in deference to those of their teachers. O’Neill and Senyshyn (2011) warn against this kind of covert manipulation by music educators:

The ideological significance of existentialist approaches to music learning would be lost if, for example, the main purpose of a pedagogical approach was covertly to segregate children, win music competitions, or put on public relations events in the name of some dubious educational value. (p. 28)

While one could argue that if there were no music programs in our schools, where would this leave our students? The more appropriate question might be where this might leave music teachers, for as John Finney (1999) claims, “The status of school music is not high in the minds of young people” (p. 237). With music education more often being friendlier and more meaningful for our youth on their own home computers and not in their schools, Gouzouasis and Bakan (2011) warn: “One of our concerns is that our profession, at least at the public school level, may be next on the digital ‘hit list’ ” (p. 3). It is not without irony that Lucy Green (2003a) observes, “The decline of music making has occurred in tandem with the expansion of music education” (p. 263). Thomas Regelski (2005) critiques music advocacy groups, basing his reasons upon music educators’ refusal to accept that something might be wrong with their current practices, and not the debased attitudes of contemporary society, in order to turn young people away from engaging in school music programs. Instead, music advocates project their blame on to other members of society and lobby for pity. Regelski asserts, “The *politics of advocacy* in music education today is a compelling indication that music educators themselves recognize and are on the defensive against the progressive marginalization of music education in the schools” (p. 10). The application of the cliché used in sports that, “The best offence is a good defense” might be what music educators should not be doing. In the end, music education advocacy “efforts” don’t really look like efforts at all. It might make more sense that genuine attempts to develop viable programs be a priority, rather than continually refer to the perpetuation of accepted practices as some sort of “Paradise Lost.” In spite of the overwhelming decline of interest our young people have for choosing school music, Wayne Bowman (2005) suggests music educators are still most concerned with being efficient at what is already being done and are not trying other ways to transform their practices (p. 29). Bowman

applies certain concepts by Nietzsche to music educators when they resort to advocacy, referring to them as “passive nihilists” with a tired and depleted will, as exemplified by the “Last Man” in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (p. 40). Bowman submits instead that music educators promote the “nurturance of life affirming values” (p. 29).

This inquiry into musical values was something that the student researchers in *Music Matters* engaged in through asking what mattered to them and others. Admittedly, there was an element of advocacy imbedded in the research. However, it was derived by listening to students’ needs, and not to those of the music teacher or adult researchers. Although there were students from both band and choir involved as researchers in the project, not a single student advocated for either of these programs in school, yet requesting popular music programs and the ability to reconceptualize music curriculum by integrating dance were notable areas of interest for these students. If it is true that personalized learning environments can only be effective when an atmosphere of “trust, effective listening and openness” is at hand, resulting in a measurable change in the areas of concern for the student (Price, 2006, p. 5), then student voice is present. It is sadly absent when the music educator or the institutions they work in will not or cannot effect change. When music educators genuinely show that they are willing to *listen* to their students and not just *hear* them, perhaps only then might the profession hold any hope for a justifiable future.

Conclusion

You say she can't change that, it's the way you've always done it
She don't care about that, she thinks you've just begun it
Why? Why?
Roger McGuinn and David Crosby of The Byrds from "Why?" (1966)

The continued advocacy for school music activities that hold little or no interest for our students is perplexing. To justify the perpetuation of band and choir paradigms in our school systems, solely by virtue of past teaching practice, is frustrating for both students and progressive music educators alike. There is hope, however, for popular music performance programs to become part of the middle school curriculum in the foreseeable future. Yet, even this might not be enough to save public school music education from the dire situation it has created for itself, largely because of its refusal to treat music as an individual form of expression that might find its way into our depersonalized institutions. I have argued in this paper that the child-centred philosophies of Jean-Jacques Rousseau have a place in our schools. With a similar disregard for time and efficiency as goals, personalized learning environments are a natural extension of this and hold great potential for encouraging agency and voice in our students.

However, even attempts at a personal approach to music making in schools can get mired in seemingly exclusive theories of music acquisition, such as the informal learning methods espoused by Lucy Green (2001, 2008a). By viewing music learning in a more holistic way, informal and formal learning can be seen as collaborative, rather than solitary, processes (Finney, 2007; Gould, 2007; Gouzouasis and Bakan, 2011). By

interrelating what might appear to be diverse elements or concepts, Overton (2003b) proposes a vantage point that assumes multiple “lines of sight, ” rather than maintaining reductionist or dichotomized views of human behaviour.

Similarly, polarized perspectives on the presence or absence of somatic experiences in popular and classical musicians might be reconciled (Cusick, 1994; LeGuin, 2005; Maus, 2010). All forms of music performance can be conceptualized as a place for the simultaneous operation and outcome of pedagogy (Dunbar-Hall, 2009). Unlike conceptions of musical analysis more often associated with notated music, Dunbar-Hall suggests that popular music’s understanding is reinforced when performed because it is based more upon sound than theory (p. 67). Although criticism that twenty years of absorption of popular music into the Swedish general music curriculum might have deprived other forms of musical expression from occurring (Björck, 2011; Georgii-Hemming and Westvall, 2010), the continuance of teacher-centred North American music education is equally disempowering. Traditional band and choir performance programs, too often a source of personal pride and ego bolstering for the director more so than for the student performer, do not transfer as a continuing interest for students following their school experiences (Jones, 2008; Saunders, 2010). Even competitive popular music performance programs are vulnerable to become vehicles for teachers’ accomplishments, rather than for the young people they claim to represent. Nevertheless, I believe that popular music belongs in the general music curriculum, as well as in music performance options, in middle schools. It is absurd to maintain them as extra-curricular clubs, when popular music, band and choir are offered in most high schools as performance electives. Its exclusion from the middle school performance curriculum is a remnant of the belief that popular music is not a worthy form of musical

expression. Moreover, the reluctance to accept technology in music education echoes a similar belief, nearly rendering viable classroom music extinct.

While on-line sites such as YouTube are accessed daily by our students at home and at school, music education publications on how to use it are scarce indeed. The website for the major music publishing company *Hal Leonard* claims that the 2009 book *YouTube in Music Education* by Thomas Rankel and James Frankel to be “the first complete music educators' guide to harnessing the power of YouTube for students” (para. 1). Although the book won the 2010 National Association of Music Merchants award for “Best Web Tool Award,” the only music categories listed in the chapter titled “YouTube in the Music Classroom” are classical music, American folk music, world music and jazz. The conspicuous absence of popular music is a clear indicator that our profession has a considerable distance yet to go in recognizing the most pervasive and important kind of music existing in the lives of our young people.

One of the greatest responsibilities I believe that I have to the profession of music education is to assist those young people who express interest in learning to negotiate the Internet. It is simply marvelous to behold the resources that are in store for students and educators. In this fashion, these same students can traverse the borders between “inside” and “outside” music communities. Importantly, Susan and Henry Giroux (2011) name “the emergence of pedagogical sites outside of the schools” as transforming education into “both a form of schooling and public pedagogy” (p. i). As technologies become further refined and musically engage youth outside of our institutions, it is vitally important for music teachers to accept them as legitimate pedagogies.

In addition to this area of pedagogical hesitancy for music educators, the previous discussion concerning the YouTube book in the music classroom indicates that many teachers honour neither the presence nor the potential of popular music in their students' lives. Music educators must learn to respect and value the musical cultures of their students, using a "pedagogy that both supports and respects the identity and voice" of our students (Stauffer, 2003, p. 109). I believe that many formal, classically trained music teachers would find it a pleasant surprise to witness how much intrinsic motivation there regularly is in students to learn how to read music and to perform pieces in the classical repertoire. This is an affirmation that the beauty and lure of the music itself is the reason for the students' motivation, not due to the frequent moralizing or the self-righteous exhortation and elevation of "high art" by their teachers. This strain of music educator who openly deprecates popular music in the presence of their "captive" student audience must bear partial responsibility for the paradoxical attitudes our society holds about both popular and classical music.

A vivid example of this is the practice of "classical music as weapon" (Hirsch, 2007). Lily Hirsch of Cleveland State University came across several stories about the uses of playing pre-recorded music to repel various hangers-on and other assorted vagrants outside of their business establishments. Hirsch discovered a column in the New York Times describing a *7-Eleven* store in Tillicum Washington that played classical music to ward off teenaged loiterers. Hirsch located another instance of this phenomenon, chronicling the playing of classical music throughout a problematic main street in Oceanside, California to dissuade vagrants. Baroque music in particular is cited as being the most effective music to send loiterers elsewhere. In the article, sadly named

“The homeless hate Handel...” (Sherman, 2005), the writer traces the custom’s origins to British Columbia. Hirsch writes:

When I contacted 7-Eleven Corporate Communications representative Margaret Chabris, she confirmed that 7-Eleven was the first to purposely flip programmed music's primary function from lure to repellent. Chabris released the following statement:

A number of 7-Eleven stores in British Columbia, Canada, were experiencing a loitering problem in 1985. It was not a problem confined to 7-Eleven, but more of a concern throughout the community. Our 7-Eleven management team there met with store personnel and psychologists to explore ways to deal with the issue of loitering. Several good ideas came out of these brainstorming session[s] that, when combined, produced a successful program to reduce the incidence of teen loitering. One of the ideas was to play "easy listening" or classical music in the parking lot. The thinking was that this kind of music is not popular with teens and may discourage them from "hanging out" at the store. (Chabris, 2007, p. 245)

One wonders if the originator of this “aural repellent” had a less than pleasant experience as a young person in the music classroom. Ironically, the “use” of classical music has held a different reputation with the *Mozart Effect* industry, originally proffered and then later recanted as “a common myth” by its principal author Frances Rauscher (1994, 2006). Rather than examine some possible reasons why music education practice has lost its hold on our youth and its general support from those communities from where they come, most music education advocacy programs are condescendingly constructed to shield music educators from the criticisms of those who are not as “enlightened” as they are (Bowman, 2005; Regelski, 2005). Yet, as O’Neill and Senyshyn (2011) reveal, the “contrary themes or dilemmatic referents to prevailing ideologies” (p. 16), latent in the conflicting concepts of how the *right* kind of music can both soothe *and* scare the savage beast, lead to questioning exactly how we expect our

youth to value music of any kind when our wide-ranging societal uses of it often appear utterly contradictory to them.

Even so, there are philosophers and musicians who assert that some of this same music that is employed to intimidate and repel our youth can somehow be construed to “humanize” them (Jorgensen, 2004; Kivy, 1993). Moreover, some claim it should rightly be canonized to disseminate a so-called “large degree of shared background beliefs and attitudes” (MacIntyre, 1987, p. 19). Yet, it is daft to consider that certain exemplars of Western art music share beliefs and attitudes with those from other distinct cultures, traditions and backgrounds, which is particularly evident in most metropolitan North American public schools. It is equally ridiculous for our youth to accept that these exemplars spring forth from a culture that genuinely concerns and supports them. According to Lerner et al. (2003), individuals across the lifespan experience “healthy, positive functioning” (p. 173) when feeling that they are making a contribution to a group or a community that also displays reciprocal support for them (p. 175). Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) is one way to locate which musical communities might be perceived as being both supported by and supportive to our youth. Research from the Simon Fraser University *Music Matters* project indicated that school band and choir programs neither warranted nor gave support, while dance and popular music in both general music and performance programs did. Therefore, to involve students in a reconceptualization of their music curriculum might develop student voice and provide an avenue for mutual support between teacher and student. If school music programs can engage youth at a musically or artistically stimulating level, then it might be possible for them to express a sense of purpose to causes “greater than the self” and demonstrate “consolidated identities and deeper senses of meaning” (Damon

et al., 2003, p. 9). Unfortunately, by maintaining traditional school music paradigms that do not reflect the wide interests of our students, any hope to develop purpose, identity and meaning is doomed to fail. It is my sincere hope that music educators will critically examine their approaches to curriculum and pedagogy before music becomes increasingly more trivial in our public schools.

References

- Abramo, M. N. (2008). Music educator as change agent: A personal narrative. In L. K. Thompson & M. R. Robinson (Eds.), *Diverse methodologies in the study of music teaching and learning*. (pp. 91-109). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- Allsup, R. (2007). Editorial. In *Music Education Research*, 9(2), 167-168.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1987). *Education under siege: The conservative, liberal, and radical debate over schooling*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis. Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://lib.mylibrary.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca?ID=10486>.
- Bates, V. (2004). Where should we start? Indications of a nurturant ethic for music education. *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education*, 3(3), 1-16.
- Bennett, A. (2000). *Popular music and youth culture: Music, identity, place*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Besley, T. (2005). Foucault, truth telling and technologies of the self in schools. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, (6)1, 76-88.
- Birns, N. (n.d.). *Ressentiment and counter-ressentiment: Nietzsche, Scheler, and the reaction against equality*. Retrieved May 9, 2011, from <http://www.nietzschecircle.com/RessentimentMaster.pdf>
- Björck, C. (2011). Freedom, constraint, or both? Readings on popular music and gender. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 10(2), 8-31.
- Bloomstran, S. (2002). Student-activity groups address gender and sexuality. *The Education Digest*, 67(8), 55-58.
- Blumenfeld-Jones, D. (2004). The hope of a critical ethics: Teachers and learners. In *Educational Theory*, 54(3), 263-279.
- Blumenfeld-Jones, D. (2004). Dance curricula then and now: A critical historical-hermeneutic evaluation. In W.M. Reynolds and J. A. Webber (Eds.), *Expanding Curriculum Theory: Dis/positions and Lines of Flight*. (pp. 125-153). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Blumenfeld-Jones, D. (2006). Message from the vice-president. In E. Malewski & J. Phillion (Eds.), *American Educational Research Association, Division B: Curricular Studies Newsletter, Winter*, (pp. 1-11). Retrieved May 9, 2011, from [http://www.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Divisions/Curriculum_Studies_\(B\)/Newsletters/Spring2006.pdf](http://www.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Divisions/Curriculum_Studies_(B)/Newsletters/Spring2006.pdf)
- Bové, P. (1990). Power and freedom: Opposition and the humanities. *The Humanities as Social Technology*, 53 (October), 78-92.
- Bowman, W. (2005). Music education in nihilistic times. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, (37)1, 29-46.
- Bowman, W. (2010). No one true way: Music education without redemptive truth. In *Music Education for Changing Times: Guiding Visions for Practice*, 7(1), (pp. 3-15). London: Springer.
- Bronner, S. (2002). *On critical theory and its theorists* 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Broudy, H. (1964). Educational theory and the music curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, 51(2), 32-147.
- Brown, A. (2007). *Computers in music education: Amplifying musicality*. Routledge: New York.
- Bruenger, S.D. (2004). Teaching the masses or coaching the elite: A comparison of the challenges facing high school music and sports educators. In L. Bartel (Ed.), *Questioning the music education paradigm*. (pp. 191-209). CMEA Biennial Series Research to Practice, Vol. 2, L. Bartel (Senior Ed.). Waterloo, Ontario: CMEA.
- Burstyn, V. (2000). *The rites of men: Manhood, politics, and the culture of sport*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Busoni, F. (1962). Sketch of a new esthetic of music. In *Three classics in the aesthetic of music*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.
- Campbell, P. S. (1998). *Songs in their heads: Music and its meaning in children's lives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). *Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Compas, B. E., Oppedisano, G., Connor, J. K., Gerhardt, C. A., Hinden, B. R., Achenbach, T. M., et al. (1997). Gender differences in depressive symptoms in adolescence: Comparison of national samples of clinically referred and nonreferred youths. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 617-626.
- Cusick, S. (1994). Feminist theory, music theory, and the mind/body problem. *Perspectives of New Music*, 32(1), 8-27.
- Damon, W. (1995). *Greater Expectations*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Damon, W., Menon, J., & Bronk, K.C. (2003). The development of purpose in adolescence. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(3), 119-28. doi: 10.1207/S1532480XADS0703_3.
- Darling, J. (1993). Rousseau as progressive instrumentalist. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, (27)1, 27-39.
- Deleuze, G. (1962). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2006). *The fold: Leibnitz and the baroque*. (Foreword and Translation by Tom Conley). London: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (Translation and Foreword by B. Massumi). Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Demetrian, G. (2001). Reading Giroux through a Deweyan lens: Pushing utopia to the outer edge. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 33(1), 57-76.
- Deutsch, H. (2009). Where was technology and music education twenty years ago? *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, 21(1), 90–96.
- DeVeaux, S. (1997). *The birth of bebop: A social and musical history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
- Dunbar-Hall, P. (2009). Ethnopedagogy: Culturally contextualised learning and teaching as an agent of change. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 8(2), 60–78.
- Eagleton, T. (2004). *After theory*. London: Penguin Books.
- Eccles (Parsons), J. S., Midgely, C., & Adler, T. (1984). Grade-related changes in the school environment: Effects on achievement motivation. In J.G. Nicholls (Ed.), *The development of achievement motivation*. (pp. 283-331). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Eder, B. (1999). Live at Carnegie Hall: 1938 complete. Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://www.allmusic.com/album/live-at-carnegie-hall-1938-complete-r443459/review>
- Egan, K. (1983). Educating and socializing: A proper distinction? *Teachers College Record*, 85(1). Retrieved May 9, 2011, from <http://www.educ.sfu.ca/kegan/read823/Edsoc.html>
- Eisenberg, J. A. (1992). *The limits of reason: Indeterminacy in law, education, and morality*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

- Eisner, E. (1995). What artistically crafted research can help us understand about schools. *Educational Theory*, 45(1), 1-6.
- Eisner, E. (2001). Music education six months after the turn of the century. In *International Journal of Music Education*, 37(1), (5-12).
- Eisner, E. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Eisner, E. (2008). What education can learn from the arts. In L. Butler-Kisber (Ed.) *Learning landscapes: Education and the arts: Blurring boundaries and creating spaces*, (2)1. (pp. 22-29). Retrieved October 18, 2011, from the LEARN Web site, www.learnquebec.ca.
- Ellington, D. (1954). *Look*. Retrieved May 9, 2011, from http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:6xkqXCU7f9IJ:en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Duke_Ellington+Playing+%22Bop%22+is+like+playing+Scrabble+with+all+the+vowels+missing.&cd=10&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&client=safari
- Elliott, D. (2005). Musical understanding, musical works, and emotional expression: Implications for education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 37(1), 93-103.
- Elliott, D. (2006). Music education and assessment: Issues and suggestions. In P. Taylor, (Ed.), *Assessment in arts education*. (pp. 41-56). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Erickson, D. (2005). *Language, ineffability and paradox in music philosophy* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://summit.sfu.ca/system/files/iritems1/9462/etd1783.pdf>
- Feichas, H. (2010) Bridging the gap: Informal learning practices as a pedagogy of integration. *British Journal of Music Education*, 27(1), 47-58.
- Finney, J. (1999). The rights and wrongs of school music: Considering the expressivist argument and its existential component. *British Journal of Music Education*, 16(3), 237-244.
- Finney, J. (2002). Music education as aesthetic education: a rethink. In *British Journal of Music Education*, 19(2), 119-134.
- Finney, J. (2003). From resentment to enchantment: What a class of thirteen year olds and their music teacher tell us about a musical education. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 4(6). Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://www.ijea.org/v4n6/>
- Finney, J. (2006). Book Review of Paul G. Woodford's Democracy and music education: Liberalism, ethics and the politics of practice. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23(2), 239-243.

- Finney, J. (2007). Music education as identity project in a world of electronic desires. In J. Finney & P. Burnard (Eds.), *Music Education with Digital Technology* (pp. 9-20). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Finney, J. & Philpott, C. (2010). Informal learning and meta-pedagogy in initial teacher education in England. *British Journal of Music Education*, 27(1), 9-20.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the Self* (pp. 16-49). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom: An interview with Michel Foucault on January 20, 1984. In J. Bernauer and D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The Final Foucault* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish*. (Trans. By A. Sheridan). New York: Vintage Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum International: New York.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum International: London.
- Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum International: New York.
- French, D. (2003). Addressing the middle grades gap. *The Term Paper*, 1(6). Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://www.ccebos.org/MidGradesGap.french.5.03.pdf>.
- Frith, S. (1978). *The sociology of rock*. London: Constable.
- Frith, S. (1983). *Sound effects: Youth, leisure, and the politics of rock 'n' roll*. London: Constable.
- Frith, S. (1987). Towards an aesthetic of popular music. In R. Leppert, and S. McClary (Eds.), *Music and society – The politics of composition, performance and reception* (pp. 133-149). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frith, S. (1996). Music and identity. In S. Hall and P. Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 108-127). London: Sage.
- Frith, S. (2001). The popular music industry. In S. Frith, W. Straw & J. Street (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to pop and rock* (pp. 26-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frith, S. (2007). *Taking popular music seriously*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Froehlich, H. (2007). Institutional belonging, pedagogic discourse and music teacher education: The paradox of routinization. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(3), 7-21.

- Galaif, E. (2007). Suicidality, depression, and alcohol use among adolescents: A review of empirical findings. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 19(1), (27-35).
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory into practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, J.W. (1965). *Speech*. Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://www.pbs.org/johngardner/chapters/4.html>
- Georgii-Hemming, E. & Maria Westvall, M. (2010). Music education – A personal matter? Examining the current discourses of music education in Sweden. *British Journal of Music Education*, 27(1), 21–33.
- Gerson-Kiwi, E. (1968). Book review: Musical notations of the Orient: Notational systems of continental east, south and central Asia. By Walter Kaufmann in *Ethnomusicology*, 12(1), 144-146.
- Gilligan, V. (2008). Cancer man. *Breaking Bad* Season one, episode four of the American Movie Channel television drama series.
- Giroux, H. (2010). *About Henry A. Giroux, Ph. D.* Retrieved May 9, 2011, from http://www.21stcenturyschools.com/Henry_Giroux.htm.
- Giroux, H., & Giroux, S. in R. Quantz (Auth.) (2011). *Rituals and student identity in education: Ritual critique for a new pedagogy*. (p. i). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Glover, C. (2000). The faulty logic behind competitive school sports. *The Education Digest*, 65(5), 65-68.
- Goehr, L. (1992). *The imaginary museum of musical works*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gould, E. (2007). Social justice in music education: the problematic of democracy. *Music Education Research* 9(2), 229-40.
- Gould, E. (2012). Re-membering bands in North America: Gendered paradoxes and potentialities. In C.A. Beynon & K. K. Veblen (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives in Canadian Music Education*. (pp. 101-121). Canada: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Gouzouasis, P. (2001). The internet music instruction project: Music achievement, technology, and motivation issues in distributive computer-mediated interactive instruction environments. From proceedings of the 2nd *International Conference on Technology in Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*. (C. Spirou, ed.), 125-133.

- Gouzouasis, P. (2002). The FAME project: New media fluency through arts integration. From proceedings of the *International Society for Music Education, Research Commission on Mass Media, Music and Culture, Helsinki, Finland* (C. Spirou, ed.), 66-86.
- Gouzouasis, P. (2003). The FAME project: New pedagogies and praxis for teachers and students in the 21st century. From proceedings of the *3rd International Conference on Technology in Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*. (C. Spirou, ed.), 83-88.
- Gouzouasis, P. (2005). Fluency in general music and arts technologies: Is the future of music a garage band mentality? *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 4 (2), 1-18.
- Gouzouasis, P. & Bakan, D. (2011). The future of music making and music education in a transformative digital world. *The UNESCO Observatory E-Journal*. Retrieved May 27, 2012, from <http://www.abp.unimelb.edu.au/unesco/ejournals.html>
- Gouzouasis, P., Henrey J., & Belliveau, G. (2008). Turning points: a transitional story of grade seven music students' participation in high school band programmes. *Music Education Research*, 10(1), 75-90.
- Gouzouasis, P. & LaMonde, A. (2004). The classroom use of portable and wireless technologies. *International Journal of Learning*, 11, 186-194.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Green, J.P. & Vogan, N. (1991). *Music education in Canada: A historical account*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Green, L. (1988). *Music on deaf ears: Musical meaning, ideology, education*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Green, L. (2001). *How pop musicians learn: A way ahead for music education*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Green, L. (2002). From the western classics to the world: Secondary music teachers' changing attitudes in England, 1982 and 1998. *British Journal of Music Education*, 19(1), 5-30.
- Green, L. (2003a). Music education, cultural capital, and social group identity. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert & R. Middleton (Eds.), *The cultural study of music: A critical introduction* (pp. 263-273). New York: Routledge.
- Green, L. (2003b). Why 'ideology' is still relevant for critical thinking in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 2(2), 1-24.

- Green, L. (2005). Musical meaning and social reproduction: A case for retrieving autonomy. In D.K. Lines (Ed.), *Music education for the new millennium: Theory and practice futures for music teaching and learning* (pp. 75-90). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Green, L. (2006). Popular music education in and for itself, and for “other” music: Current research in the classroom. In *International Journal of Music Education*, 24(2), 101-118.
- Green, L. (2008a). *Music, informal learning and the school: A new classroom pedagogy*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Green, L. (2008b). Response to Panel. In *Special Edition - Beyond Lucy Green: Operationalizing Theories of Informal Music Learning* Panel Presentation, American Educational Research Association Conference 2008, New York, NY. 12, 1-9.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Greene, M. (1997). Teaching as possibility: A light in dark times. *The Journal of Pedagogy Pluralism & Practice*, (1)1. (1-11). Retrieved May 9, 2011, from <http://gayleturner.net/Maxine%20Greene.pdf>.
- Greene, M. (2001). *Variations on a blue guitar*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Grout, D. & Palisca, C. (1988). *A history of western music: Fourth edition*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Grumet, M. (1997). Restaging the civil ceremonies of schooling. In *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 19(1), 39-54.
- Hal Leonard Performing Arts Publishing Group. (2012). *Webpage*. Retrieved May 9, 2012, from <http://www.halleonardbooks.com/product/viewproduct.do?itemid=332856&lid=0&keywords=youtube%20in%20music%20education&menuid=10266&subsiteid=164&>
- Hall, G. S. (1904). Diseases of body and mind. In *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education*, (1). New York: D. Appleton & Company.
- Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2009). *The fourth way: The inspiring future for educational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hargreaves, D. (2006). *A new shape for schooling?* London: Specialist Schools and Academies Trust.

- Harvard University Press. (2012). *The ethics of authenticity* (anonymous book description). Retrieved May 9, 2012, from <http://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674268630>
- Hawes, N. (2003). *Basic music theory on the world wide web: History of notation*. Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://neilhawes.com/sstheory/theory22.htm>
- Hays, T., & Minichiello, V. (2005). The meaning of music in the lives of older people: A qualitative study. *Psychology of Music*, 33(4), 437-451. doi: 10.1177/0305735605056160
- Helden, E. & Murphy, M. *Chris Cornell*. (2011). *On revisiting Soundgarden*. Rolling Stone Interview. Retrieved May 9, 2011, from <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:j0Z0eQWEgYoJ:www.rollingstone.com/videos/new-and-hot/chris-cornell-on-revisiting-soundgarden-20111003+chris+cornell+rolling+stone+interviewyoutube&cd=4&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&client=safari>
- Hicks, G. (1991). Manual and syllabus of instruction in vocal music. In *Music education in Canada*, by J.P. Green & N.F. Vogan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hirsch, L. (2007). Weaponizing classical music: Crime prevention and symbolic power in the age of repetition. *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, 19(4), 342–358. Article first published online: DOI: 10.1111/j.1533-1598.2007.00132.x
- Hoffer, C.R. (2009). *Introduction to music education*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Huizinga, J. (1960). *Homo ludens (Man the Player)*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hulse, B. (2010). Thinking musical difference: Music theory as minor science. In B. Hulse & N. Nesbitt (Eds.), *Sounding the virtual: Gilles Deleuze and the theory and philosophy of music*. (pp. 23-50). Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Humphreys, F. (1896). *The evolution of church music*. New York, C. Scribner's Sons. Retrieved May 9, 2011, from <http://archive.org/details/evolutionchurch00humpgoog>
- Hunt, A. (1976). *Hopes for great happenings: Alternatives in education and theatre*. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Huyssens, A. (1986). *After the great divide: Modernism, mass culture and postmodernism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Hwu, Wen-Song. (2004). Gilles Deleuze and Jacques Daignault: Understanding curriculum as difference. In W.M. Reynolds and J. A. Webber (Eds.), *Expanding curriculum theory: dis/positions and lines of flight*. (pp. 181-202). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Jaffurs, S. (2004). The impact of informal learning music learning practices in the classroom, or how I learned to teach from a garage band. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 189-200.
- Jones, P. J. (2008). Preparing music teachers for change: Broadening instrument class offerings to foster lifewide and lifelong musicing. In *Special edition - Beyond Lucy Green: Operationalizing theories of informal music learning*, 12 (September). Panel Presentation, American Educational Research Association Conference 2008, New York, NY. 1-15. Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/v12n1/vision/2%20AERA%20-%20Jones.pdf>
- Jorgensen, E., (1996). Justifying music in general education: Belief in search of reason. In F. Margonis (Ed.), *Philosophy of Education Society*, (pp. 228-236) Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://ojs.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/pes/article/view/2269/963>
- Jorgensen, E., (2003a). Western classical music and general education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 11(2), 130-140.
- Jorgensen, E., (2003b). *Transforming music education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Jorgensen, E. (2004). Pax americana and the world of music education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 38(3), 1-18.
- Jorgensen, E. (2007). Concerning justice and music education. *Music Education Research*, 9(2), 169-189.
- Kant, I. (1790). *Critique of judgement*. (Trans. by J.C. Meredith). Oxford University Press. Retrieved 7 December 2010, from <http://lib.myilibrary.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/?ID=114689>
- Kaufmann, W. (1967). *Musical notation of the Orient: Notational systems of continental east, south, and central Asia*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington.
- Keenan-Takagi, K. (2000). Embedding assessment in choral teaching: Embedding assessment in the regular activities of a choral ensemble can give students valuable information about their progress without sacrificing instructional time. *Music Educators Journal*, 86(4), 42 -63.
- Kivy, P. (1990). *Music Alone: Philosophical Reflections on the Purely Musical*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kivy, P. (1991). Is music an art? *The Journal of Philosophy*. Eighty-Eighth Annual Meeting American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division. 8(10), 544-554.
- Kivy, P (1993). Music and the liberal education. In E. Jorgensen (Ed.), *Philosopher, Teacher, Musician: Perspectives on Music Education*. (pp. 79-93). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lang, P. (1941). *Music in western civilization*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

- Langer, S. (1957). *Philosophy in a new key: A study of the symbolism of reason, rite, and art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Langhout, R. D., & Thomas, E. (2010). Imagining participatory action research in collaboration with children: An introduction. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(1-2), 60-66. doi: 10.1007/s10464-101-9321-1
- Large, I. G. (1912). Music among the Coast Indians of Northern British Columbia. *Conservatory Monthly*, 2(7), 211-214.
http://www.archive.org/stream/conservatorybimo04torouoft/conservatorybimo04torouoft_djvu.txt
- Larsen, D., & Akmal, T. (2010). Help wanted: Enthusiastic middle-level teacher. *Principal*. March/April. 62-63.
- Lee, E. (1976a). A note on conventions of notation in Afro-American music. In G. Vulliamy and E. Lee (Eds.), *Pop music in school*. (pp. 62-73). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, E. (1976b). Pop and the teacher: Some uses and problems. In G. Vulliamy and E. Lee (Eds.), *Pop music in school*. (pp. 158-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LeGuin, E. (2005). *Boccherini's body: An essay in carnal musicology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lerner, R. M. (2003). Dowling, E. M., & Anderson, P. M. Positive youth development: Thriving as the basis of personhood and civil society. In *Applied Developmental Science*, (7)3. 172-80.
- Lindgren, M. & C. Ericsson. (2010). The rock band context as discursive governance in music education in Swedish schools. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 9(3), 35-54.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1987). The idea of an educated public. In G. Haydon (Ed.), *Education and values: The Richard Peters Lectures delivered in the Institute of Education* (pp. 15-36). London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- MacIntyre, A. & Dunne, J. (2002). Alasdair MacIntyre on education: In dialogue with Joseph Dunne. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36(1), 1-19.
- MacKinnon, A. & Erickson, G. (1992). The roles of reflective practice and foundational disciplines in teacher education. In T. Russell & H. Munby (Eds.), *Teachers and Teaching: From Classroom to Reflection* (pp. 192-210). London: The Falmer Press.

- Magazine. (1980). Because you're frightened. On *The correct use of soap*. [CD]. London, U.K.: Virgin Music.
- Mark, M. (2008). *A Concise History of American Music Education*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Maus, F. (2010). Somaesthetics of music. *Action for Change in Music Education*, 9(1), 9-25.
- May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- MayDay Group (2009). Action for change in music education. In T.A. Regelski & J. T. Gates (Eds.), *Music education for changing times: Guiding visions for practice* (pp. xxxi-xxxvii). New York: Springer.
- McCarthy, M. (2009). Re-thinking "music" in the context of education. In T.A. Regelski & J. T. Gates (Eds.), *Music Education for Changing Times: Guiding Visions for Practice* (pp. 29-38). London: Springer.
- McCauley, C. (2005). *Introduction to correct posture for singing*. <http://teachers.net/lessons/posts/3514.html>
- McGuinn, R. & Crosby, D. (1966). Why? [Recorded by the Byrds]. On *Younger than yesterday* [CD]. Hollywood, CA: Columbia Legacy.
- Middleton, R. (1990). *Studying popular music*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Midgley, C., & Feldlaufer, H. (1987). Students' and teachers' decision-making fit before and after the transition to junior high school. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 7(2), 225-241. Doi: 10.1177/0272431687072009.
- Mohnsen, B.S. (2008). *Physical Education and training: Study and Teaching (Middle School)* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Montaigne, M. (2006). Project Gutenberg's *The Essays of Montaigne, Complete* <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3600/3600.txt>
- Moore, C. (2003). *One voice: My life in song*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Müller, U., Sokol, B., & Overton, W. F. (1998). Reframing a constructivist model of the development of mental representation. *Developmental Review*, 18, 155-201.
- Music Monday (2012). Music Makes Us: Coalition for Music Education in Canada 2012. <http://musicmakesus.ca/musicmonday/>
- Musical Futures Canada (2012). <http://musicalfuturescanada.org/>
- Musical Futures UK (2012). <http://www.musicalfutures.org.uk/>

- National Association for Sport and Physical Education's (NASPE) Middle and Secondary School Physical Education Council (MASSPEC) (2002), Co-curricular physical activity and sport programs for middle school students. Retrieved from Association for Middle Level Education website 2002.
<http://www.amle.org/AboutAMLE/PositionStatements/SportPrograms/tabid/292/Default.aspx>
- Nelson, K. (1998). *Developing students' multiple intelligences*. New York: Scholastic.
- Nietzsche, F. (1872). Lecture 5. In *On the future of our educational institutions*
<http://www.thenietzschechannel.com/lectures/fed/fed5.htm>
- Nietzsche, F. (1956). *The birth of tragedy and the genealogy of morals*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Nietzsche, F. (1973). *Beyond good and evil: Prelude to a philosophy of the future*. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Nietzsche, F. (1980). The wanderer and his shadow. In *The Portable Nietzsche*, (trans. W. Kaufmann). Kingsport: Kingsport Press, Inc.
- North, R. (1959). *Roger North on Music*. London: Novello.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- O'Neill, S. (2011) Learning in and through music performance: Understanding cultural diversity via inquiry and dialogue. In M.S. Barrett (Ed.), *A Cultural Psychology of Music Education* (pp. 179-200). New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Neill, S. & Erickson, D. (2011). Engaging youth in artistically crafted participatory action research. In S. O'Neill (Chair), *Symposium on youth artistic participatory culture and music engagement: Implications for curricula and expansive learning*. Symposium conducted at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE), University of Fredericton & St. Thomas University, New Brunswick, Canada. (May 2011).
- O'Neill, S. & Senyshyn, S. (2011). How learning theories shape our understanding of music learners. In R. Colwell & P. Webster (eds.), *MENC Handbook of Research on Music Learning, (1) Strategies*. (pp. 3-34). New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Toole, P. (1993-1994). I sing in a choir but "I have no voice!". *The Quarterly*, 4-5 (5-1), (Reprinted with permission in *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 16(5), Autumn, 2010). 65-76. Retrieved from <http://www--usr.rider.edu/~vrme/>.
- O'Toole, P. (2005). Why don't I feel included in these musics, or matters. In D. J. Elliott (Ed.), *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues* (pp. 297-307). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Oakeshott, M. (1972). Education: The engagement and its frustration. In R.F. Dearden, P.H. Hirst and R.S. Peters (Eds.) *Education and the development of reason* (pp. 19-49). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Overton, W. (1997). Beyond dichotomy: An embodied active agent for cultural psychology. *Culture & Psychology*, (3), 315-334.
- Overton, W. (1998). Relational-developmental theory: A psychological perspective. In D. Gorlitz, H. J. Harloff, G. Mey & J. Valsiner (Eds.) *Children, Cities, and psychological theories: Developing relationships*, (pp. 315-335). Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co.
- Overton, W. (2003a). Understanding, explanation, and reductionism: Finding a cure for Cartesian anxiety. In B. Brown, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Reductionism and the development of knowledge*. (pp. 29-51). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Overton, W. (2003b). Development across the life span: Philosophy, concepts, theory. In: R. M. Lerner, M A. Easterbrooks, & J. Mistry (Eds.) *Comprehensive Handbook of Psychology: Developmental Psychology*, 6 (pp. 13-42). Editor-in-Chief: Irving B. Weiner. New York: Wiley.
- Overton, W. (2004). Embodied development: Ending the nativism-empiricism debate. In C. Garcia Coll, E. Bearer, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Nature and nurture: The complex interplay of genetic and environmental influences on human behavior and development* (pp. 201-223). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Overton, W. (2006). Developmental psychology: Philosophy, concepts, methodology. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.) *Theoretical models of human development. Volume 1 of the Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 18-88). (6th ed.), Editor-in-Chief: William Damon; Richard M. Lerner. New York: Wiley.
- Ozer, E., Ritterman, M. L., & Wanis, M. G. (2010). Participatory action research (PAR) in middle school: Opportunities, constraints, and key processes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46, 152-166.
- Paynter, J. (2002). Music in the school curriculum: Why bother?. *British Journal of Music Education*, 19(3), 215-226.
- Pinar, W. (2011). *The character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurring question of the subject*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pollock, G. (1999). *Differencing the canon: Feminist desire and the writings of art's histories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Plummeridge, C. (1991). *Music education in theory and practice*. London: The Falmer Press.

- Prendergast, M., Gouzouasis, P., Leggo, C., & Irwin, R. (2009). A haiku suite: The importance of music making in the lives of secondary students. *Music Education Research, 11*(3), 303-317.
- Price, D (2006). Personalizing music learning: Shaping music education – An emerging vision. In *Musical Futures UK*.
http://media.musicalfutures.org.uk/documents/resource/27247/personalising_Music_Learning_Col2.pdf, <http://www.musicalfutures.org.uk/resource/27247>
- Rainbow, B. & Cox, G. (2006). *Music in educational thought and practice: A survey from 800 BC*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press.
- Rauscher, F. H., Shaw, G. L., Levine, L. J., & Ky, K. N. (1994). *Music and spatial task performance: A causal relationship*. Presented at the American Psychological Association 102nd Annual Convention.
- Rauscher, F.H. (2006). The Mozart effect in rats: Response to Steele. *Music Perception, 23*, 447-453.
- Regelski, T. (1996). Taking the “art” of music for granted: A critical sociology of the aesthetic philosophy of music. In L. R. Bartle and D.J. Elliott (eds.), *Critical Reflections on Music Education* (pp. 23-58). Toronto: University of Toronto/ Canadian Music Education Research Centre.
- Regelski, T. (2002a). Critical education, culturalism and multiculturalism. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 1*(1), 1-40.
- Regelski, T. (2002b). On “methodolatry” and music teaching as critical and reflective praxis source. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 10*(2), 102-123.
- Regelski, T. (2003). About this issue: Ideology as reflexive or reflective. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 2*(2), 1-11.
- Regelski, T. (2004). *Teaching Music in Grades 4-8: A Musicianship Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Regelski, T. (2005). Music and music education: Theory and praxis for ‘making a difference’. In D. Lines (Ed), *Music Education for the New Millenium: Theory and Practice Futures for Music Teaching and Learning* (pp. 7-27). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Regelski, T. (2007). Amateuring in music and its rivals. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 6*(3), 22-50.
- Regelski, T. (2012). Musicianism and the ethics of school music. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 11*(1) 7–42.
- Reimer, B. (1996). David Elliott's ‘new’ philosophy of music education: Music for performers only. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 128*(4), 59-89.

- Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Richmond, S. (2004). Remembering beauty: Reflections on Kant and Cartier-Bresson for aspiring photographers. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 38(1), 78-88.
- Roberts, B. (2004). The social construction of music as a school subject. *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education*, 3(3), 1-18.
- Robinson, K. (2001). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. Retrieved May 9, 2011, from <http://books.google.ca/books?id=kWc7RyRoBjsC&pg=PT56&lpg=PT56&dq=#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Rocksmith Electric Guitar Games Website (2012). <http://rocksmith.ubi.com/rocksmith/en-us/home/index.aspx>
- Rorty, R. (1993). In a flattened world. *London Review of Books*, 1, 1-9. (Review of the book *The ethics of authenticity*, by C. Taylor). *London Review of Books*, 15(7), 3.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1979). *Émile or On Education*. (Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Allan Bloom). United States: Basic Books.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1998). Dictionary of music. In *Essay on the origin of languages and writings related to music*. (pp. 366-485). (Translated and edited by John T. Scott). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1998). Essay on the origin of languages. In *Essay on the origin of languages and writings related to music*. (pp. 289-332). (Translated and edited by John T. Scott). Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Rudolph, T & Frankel, J. (2009). *YouTube in music education*. Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard Books.
- Ruprecht, L.A. (1996). *Afterwords: Hellenism, modernism and the myth of decadence*. New York: State University of New York.
- Saunders, J. A. (2010). Identity in music: Adolescents and the music classroom. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 9(2), 70-78.
- Scheler, M. F. (1998). *Ressentiment*. Milwaukee, WI.: Marquette University Press.
- Schmidt, N. (2012). Numbered music – Rousseau’s notational system on your mobile phone! <http://normanschmidt.net/rousseau/musicpad/>
- Schoenberg, A. (1984). *Style and idea: Selected writings of Arnold Schoenberg*. In L. Stein. (Ed.), (L. Black, Trans.). New York: Belmont Music Publishers.

- Schuller, G. (1996). I. Jazz: A historical perspective II. Duke Ellington III. Charles Mingus. In *The Tanner lectures on human values*: Delivered at Cambridge University: February 5-7, 1996. pp. 203-251
<http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/documents/schuller97.pdf>
- Senyshyn, Y. (2004). Popular music and the intolerant classroom. In L. Bartel (Ed.), *Questioning the music education paradigm*. (pp. 110-120). CMEA Biennial Series Research to Practice, Vol. 2, L. Bartel (Senior Ed.). Waterloo, Ontario: CMEA.
- Senyshyn, Y. (2010). *The artist in crisis: Kierkegaard's philosophy of the aesthetic stage of existence and live musical performance*. Vancouver, Canada: Platon Promotions Publishing.
- Sherman, L. (2005). *The Homeless Hate Handel...* posted April 14, 2005
<http://strangeobservations.tribe.net/thread/0c1f5a8f-90e9-4229-857a-1090d59296cb>
- Shieh, E. & Conway, C. (2004): Professional induction: Programs and policies for beginning music teachers. In L. Bartel (Ed.), *Questioning the music education paradigm*. (pp. 162-178). CMEA Biennial Series Research to Practice, Vol. 2, L. Bartel (Senior Ed.). Waterloo, Ontario: CMEA.
- Shively, Joseph. (2004). In the face of tradition: Questioning the roles of conductors and ensemble members in school bands, choirs, and orchestras. In L. Bartel (Ed.), *Questioning the music education paradigm* (pp. 179-190). CMEA Biennial Series Research to Practice, Vol. 2, L. Bartel (Senior Ed.). Waterloo, Ontario: CMEA.
- Simon, J. (2004). Singing democracy: Music and politics in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's thought. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 65(3), 433-454.
- Simmons, R. (1987). *Moving into adolescence: The impact of pubertal change and school context*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Small, C. (1977). *Music, society, education*. London: John Calder.
- Smith, R. (1993). Teaching music as one of the humanities. In E. Jorgensen (Ed.), *Philosopher, Teacher, Musician: Perspectives on Music Education* (pp. 115-128). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Snell, K. (2006). Book review: Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education. *International Journal of Music Education*, 24(2), 188-189.
- Snell, K. (2009). Democracy and Popular Music In E. Gould, J. Countryman, C. Morton & L.S. Stewart (Eds.), *Exploring social justice: How music education might matter* (pp. 166-183). CMEA Biennial Series Research to Practice, Vol. 4, L. Bartel (Senior Ed.). Waterloo, Ontario: CMEA.

- Snell, K. (in press). The musical personhood of three Canadian turntablists: Implications for transformative collaborative practice. In S.A. O'Neill (Ed.), *Personhood and music learning: Multidisciplinary perspectives and narrative voices*. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Music Educators' Association. Retrieved from <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1060&context=lme&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.ca%2Furl%3Fsa%3Dt%26rct%3Dj%26q%3Dkaren%2520snell%2520turntable%26source%3Dweb%26cd%3D1%26ved%3D0CFYQFjAA%26url%3Dhttp%253A%252F%252Fir.lib.uwo.ca%252Fcgi%252Fviewcontent.cgi%253Farticle%253D1060%2526context%253Dlme%26ei%3DQBizT6uSG->
- Snowber, C. (2004). *Embodied prayer: Towards wholeness of body mind soul*. Kelowna, British Columbia: Northstone Publishing.
- Stauffer, S. (2003). Identity and voice in young composers. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and how to teach music composition: A new horizon for music education* (pp. 91–112). Reston, VA: MENC.
- Subotnik, R. (1987). The challenge of contemporary music. In P. Alperson (Ed.), *What is music?* (pp. 359-396). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Subotnik, R. (1991). *Developing variations: Style and ideology in western music*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Supplement to the Music 8 to 10 IRP (1995)
http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/pdfs/arts_education/support_materials/mu10_sup.pdf
- Taylor, C. (1992). *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, P. (2006) Introduction: Assessment in arts education. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Assessment in Arts Education*. (pp. xiii-xxvii). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Todorov, T. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogical principle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tolman, D. L., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2001). Interpretive and participatory research methods: Moving towards subjectivities. In D. L. Tolman & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *From subjects to subjectivities: A handbook of interpretive and participatory methods*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tomlinson, G. (2003). Musicology, anthropology, history. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert & R. Middleton (Eds.), *The cultural study of music: A critical introduction*. (pp. 31-44). New York: Routledge.
- Torchia, J. (2008). *Exploring personhood: An introduction to the philosophy of human nature*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Usher, R. & Edwards, R. (2005). *Postmodernism and education*. New York: Routledge.

- Väkevä, L. (2010). Garage band or GarageBand®? Remixing musical futures. *British Journal of Music Education*, 27(1), 59-70.
- Väkevä, L. & Westerlund, H. (2007). The 'Method' of Democracy in Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6(4), 96-108.
- Valiquette, N. J. (2006). Musical persuasion: Rousseau's platonic democracy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Marriott, Loews Philadelphia, and the Pennsylvania Convention Center, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved May 9, 2011, from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p152603_index.html
- Vulliamy, G. (1976a). Definitions of serious music. In G. Vulliamy and E. Lee (Eds.), *Pop music in school*. (pp. 33-48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vulliamy, G. (1976b). Pupil-centered music teaching. In G. Vulliamy and E. Lee (Eds.), *Pop music in school*. (pp. 49-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vulliamy, G. (1977). Music and the mass culture debate. In J. Shepherd, P. Virden, T. Wishart & G. Vulliamy (Eds.), *Whose music: A sociology of musical language*. (pp. 179-200). London: Latimer New Dimensions.
- Vulliamy, G. & Lee E. (1982a). *Pop, rock and ethnic music in school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vulliamy, G. & Lee E. (1982b) *Popular music: A teacher's guide*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Walker, R. (1984). *Music education: Tradition and innovation*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Musical beliefs: Psychoacoustic, mythical and educational perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wallin, J. J. (2010). *A Deleuzian approach to curriculum*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice : learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wesley, J. (1743). *Instructions for children*. London: M. Cooper.
- Wesley, J. (1760). On obedience to parents: Sermon 96. In *Sermons on several occasions: In four volumes*. Retrieved from http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/ecco/infomark.do?&contentSet=ECCOArticles&type=multipage&tabID=T001&prodId=ECCO&docId=CW119725341&source=gale&userGroupName=sfu_z39&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE.
- Wesley, J. (1872). A thought on the manner of educating children. In F. Baker and R.P. Heitzenrater (Eds.), *Works (XIII)*. (pp. 474-477). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- West, M.L. (2007). Ancient Greek music. In A.F. Christidis (Ed.), *A History of ancient Greek: From the beginnings to late antiquity* (pp. 1428-1436). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiggins, J. (2011). When the music is theirs: Scaffolding young songwriters. In M.S. Barrett (Ed.), *A cultural psychology of music education* (pp. 83-113). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Will, U. (1999) La baguette magique d'ethnomusicologie: Re-penser la notation et l'analyse de la musique. [The magic wand of ethnomusicology: Re-thinking notation and its application in music analyses] (pp. 1-20).
<http://ethnomusicology.osu.edu/EMW/Will/Magic%20Wand.pdf>
- Winter, N. (2004). The learning of popular music: A pedagogical model for music educators. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 237-247.
- Woodford, P. (2005). *Democracy and music education: Liberalism, ethics, and the politics of practice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.